

# The Verbal Strategies in Jokowi – Prabowo Debates

## *A Pragmatics Perspective*

Pahriyono Damanhuri<sup>1,2</sup>, Sri Samiati Tarjana<sup>2</sup>, Joko Nurkamto<sup>2</sup> and Sri Marmanto<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>*Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan PGRI Jombang, Jl. Pattimura III/20, Jombang, Indonesia*  
<sup>2</sup>*Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia*  
*pahriyono@gmail.com*

**Keywords:** Verbal Strategies, Pragmatics, Speech Acts, Politeness, Presidential Debates.

**Abstract:** The verbal strategies are variously performed by the politicians, as well as by Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto in presidential debates in 2014 to attract the voters or to make a certain impression to their prospective voters. This study aims to investigate Joko Widodos' and Prabowo Subiantos' verbal strategies in acclaiming, attacking, and defending themselves from pragmatics perspective. The data are utterances containing or implying three speech acts which are acclaiming, verbal attacking and defending. The data collected through indirect observation, also through listening and note-taking. The data then broken down by using a pragmatic analysis method, particularly called the 'means-end'. The results revealed that Jokowi used more acclaims (69%) and attacks (59%), but less defends (38%). On the other hand, Prabowo used more defends (61%), but less attacks (41%) and acclaims (30%). The previous prefers performing a negative politeness, when the latter prefers performing a positive politeness.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Presidential debate of Indonesia is a relatively new event of political life over the decade. It is organized by Committee of General Election of Indonesia dealing six segments of debate, such as vision and mission statements, vision and mission discussion, questions and answers (moderator-candidates), questions and answers (candidates), questions, answers, and rebuttals (candidates), and closing statements. Presidential debate of Indonesia in 2014 was attended by Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto as the candidates.

Joko Widodo – Prabowo Subianto debate has many speech acts to investigate. The study focuses on the speech acts of acclaims, attacks, and defences and the verbal strategies related with politeness strategies employed by the candidates. It is due to such political debate drives the candidates to perform such acts. The three acts are considerably interesting aspects in the political debate to study and attracts audiences to follow it (Benoit, 2004, cited by Napierala, 2014). In fact, the other dominant acts are also done, such as commissive acts covering promises, wants, and pledges, but they are excluded in the study.

The act of acclaims, attacks, and defences are performed inherent with verbal strategies which are particularized in politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) refer to two folds of faces, i.e. positive face focused on positive politeness and negative face focused on negative politeness. The candidates are both born in Java who behave in a different ways in producing speech acts and politeness. Distinctively, Joko Widodo is the real Javanese who keeps a Javanese tradition in speaking and politeness bound. Prabowo Subianto is famous of a national leader who mostly spends their time in the army tradition and consequently affects his speaking stereotypes and politeness strategies. Thus, the politeness as the verbal strategies inherent with the acts of acclaims, attacks, and defences are considered important to investigate.

The study is conducted also based on the previous researches to convince the gaps and the novelties. The previous were done with the objects of presidential debates organized in other countries, such as the United States (Napierala, 2014; Jabber and Jinquan, 2013; Jessica and Ewald, 2013; Pakzadian, 2012; Utomo, 2010; and Wang, 2010), Spain (Garcia, 2014), French (2010), and Nigeria (David, 2013). All of them do not discuss the speech acts of acclaims, attacks, and defences related with

the politeness as the verbal strategies. Specially, Napierala (2014) investigated the verbal strategies in the perspective of discourse analysis using Gigot Theory, while the study is done on the pragmatics perspective using Grice Theory, and Brown and Levinson Theory. It is aimed at looking into the politeness strategies as the verbal strategies employed by the candidates in performing the speech acts of acclaims, attacks, and defences.

## 2 THEORETICAL REVIEW

There are some primary concepts to deal with related with the focus of the study, i.e. speech acts, verbal strategies and politeness strategies, implicature, and presidential debates.

### 2.1 Speech Acts

Talking about speech acts surely reminds the author on the scholar, Austin (1962) who proposes his statement of the art that speaking something means doing something. Words and acts occur at the same time on a particular context. His mind is stated in his book *How to Do Things with Words* and the essential contents are made up by his student, Searle. Speech acts contains three acts inherent with a particular utterance and they are not separated each other in the normal occasion (Austin, 1962). The acts are locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. The previous is saying something with words, the middle is doing something with words, the latter is affecting someone (the hearer) with words.

### 2.2 Verbal Strategies

Anyone says something surely has a purpose (end) and to achieve it, he/she needs a way or a strategy (means). In a pragmatic perspective, the utterance delivered to the hearer does not only function as communicating something but also maintaining a personal contact. To make the functions effective, the speaker usually chooses politeness strategies as verbal strategies in pragmatics sense. Utterances may be said to be polite or impolite whether they threaten the hearer's face or not or how high they potentially threaten the hearer's face, both positive face and negative face (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Basically, all utterances have potential to threaten faces, the hearer's face and the speaker's face as well. In other words, any utterances have probability to make hearer offended, angry, disappointed, or

dissatisfied. If so, they are said to be impolite. The impolite utterance, in turn, causes interpersonal and social frictions. Thus, the impoliteness is not preferred because it certainly makes bad sound of social life. It is obvious that a good speaker always tries to choose the politeness strategies based on the hearer's stereotypes and the context of situation.

Regarding with politeness as the verbal strategies, Brown and Levinson (1987) propose a notion of politeness derived from the notion of face. They urge that there are two faces should be taken into account, such as a positive face referring to positive politeness and a negative face referring to negative politeness. The previous orients to speaker's tendency to choose the verbal strategies that drum in his/her solidarity with the hearer. The strategies involve claiming common ground with the hearer, stating that the speaker and the hearer are co-operators, and satisfying the hearer's wants. The latter orients to opt for the verbal strategies that focus on the speaker's deference to the hearer. The speaker who uses such strategy usually performs the indirectness, hedges, and apologies (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

### 2.3 Implicature

Pragmatics is study of meaning bound to contexts (Mey, 2001; Grundy, 2008). The meaning of utterance may be stated or spoken and implied. The spoken meaning of utterance is called explicator and the implied meaning of utterance is named implicature (Huang, 2007). The notion of implicature firstly proposed based on Grice's theory of conversational implicature. In a particular occasion, the maxims of co-operative principle are not met by the speaker due to a particular consideration. In other words, the speaker decides to break the maxims because he prefers maintaining the personal contact or a good sound of social interaction which is commonly called a convivial gregariousness. Such theory of co-operative drives the concept of implicature focusing the inferred meaning or the meaning of utterance that are not said by the speaker but it is intended. The implicature is grasped or understood only by identifying the contexts of utterance, both linguistic context and situation context.

### 2.4 Presidential Debate of Indonesia

Historically, Indonesia has some periods of governmental leadership, such as *Order Lama* (old order) or Soekarno era, *Orde Baru* (new order) or

Soeharto era, and *Reformasi* (reformation), Abdurrahman Wahid era and Megawati era. Afterward, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono held the governance. Then, today president is Joko Widodo. Presidential debate was commencing to organize when electing the last two presidents. In fact, the debate organization is reaching a better performance just in the last general election.

Presidential debate of Indonesia 2014 is distinctively organized by Committee of General Election of Indonesia, moderated by some professionals and academicians with the purpose of encouraging and taking up the candidates' sense, skills, capabilities, official achievements, and vision and mission surely contribute to Indonesian people and development. The important themes are well designed covering democracy development, clean governance, and law supremacy discussed in the first round. Economy development and social welfare is dealt with in the second round. International political affairs and national defence is discussed in the third round. Then, food, energy, and environment comes in the last round. The debate contains many speech acts of acclaims, attacks, and defences performed by the candidates.

### 3 METHODS

The data of the study are utterances on acclaims, attacks and defences produced by the two presidential candidates. They were collected by downloading from internet in the form audio-video records. The debate record was transcribed in the form of orthographic data for classification and categorization. The data needed are utterances containing acclaims, attacks, and defences. Each of them is classified as a speech act identified by analysing the contexts. Under the contexts of utterances, the pragmatic meaning of the utterances and the politeness strategies used by the speakers are also inferred. Such method of analysis is called a pragmatic method of analysis (Grice, 1975).

### 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The three speech acts of acclaims, attacks, and defences are identified in the debate with various percentages and strategies produced by Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto. It is found that Joko Widodo performs more acclaims (37%) and attacks (42) than his counterpart, Prabowo Subianto

who performs acclaims 21% and attacks 37%. However, Prabowo undertakes more defences (42%) than Joko Widodo who just performs defences 21%. This explanation is presented briefly in Table 1. Furthermore, the politeness strategy used by both candidates is as shown on table 2.

Table 1: The Speech Acts Performed by the Candidates.

No.	Speech acts	Presidential Candidates	
		Joko Widodo	Prabowo Subianto
1.	Acclaims	9 (37%)	4 (21%)
2.	Attacks	10 (42%)	7 (37%)
3.	Defences	5 (21%)	8 (42%)
	Total	24	19

Table 2: Politeness Strategy Employed by the Candidates.

No.	Politeness Strategy	Presidential Candidates	
		Joko Widodo	Prabowo Subianto
1.	Negative Politeness	18 (75%)	10 (53%)
2.	Positive Politeness	6 (25%)	9 (47%)
	Total	24	19

#### 4.1 Acclaims

The speech act of acclaim refers to the act of enhancing speaker's own credentials as a desirable office-holder (Benoit, 2004, cited by Napierala, 2014). The speaker acclaims on policy regarding with the past achievement. Joko Widodo had been a leader in Solo City Governance and a governor of Jakarta afterward. During his governance, he made some achievements related with his policy and character and they were acclaimed in the debate to convince the voters. He performs more acclaims (37%) than his counterpart, Prabowo Subianto (21%).

Prabowo Subianto is a prominent person, a national leader who spends his time more in the army. He was a commander of special land force of Indonesia. His background of army organization is stronger reflected by his communication and leadership style. In the debate, in fact, he performs less acclaims on policy regarding with his past achievements.

The way of performing acclaims between the two politicians is different. Joko Widodo tends to acclaims indirectly as stated in the example [1].

- [1] (JW) *Demokrasi menurut kami adalah mendengar suara rakyat dan melaksanakannya. Oleh sebab itu, kenapa setiap hari kami datang ke kampung-kampung, datang ke pasar-pasar, datang ke bantaran sungai, datang ke petani, datang ke tempat pelelangan ikan. Karena kami ingin mendengar suara rakyat. Dengan cara*

*apa? Dengan cara dialog. Pak JK saya kira sudah banyak menyelesaikan konflik dengan cara dialog untuk musyawarah, untuk sebuah kemanfaatan bagi rakyat banyak. Penyelesaian Tanah Abang, Waduk Pluit juga kita selesaikan dengan cara dialog, bermusyawarah, mengundang makan, mengajak musyawarah kemudian menemukan manfaat dari pemindahan itu.*

(Democracy, in my opinion), is to hear the people's words and execute them. Therefore, every day we come to the villages, the markets, the river areas, the farmers, and the fish markets. We do want to hear their words. What ways to do? Dialogue. Pak JK, I think, has done it more. The solution of Tanah Abang, Waduk Pluit have been accomplished through a dialogue, discussion, and having a meal together followed with discussion for the advantages of relocation).

The utterance [1] implies that the speaker acclaims on character of being closed to the people, aware of their problems and responsive in solving their problems. He behaves as what is commonly called 'blusukan' (walking around in the low-income areas). Such leadership style is not performed by other politicians who prefer staying in the office rather than walking around in the remote areas as done by Joko Widodo. In fact, it is effective in attracting people to do things what he wants. The following utterance stated in example [2] explains his acclaim on policy regarding with the system employment in his governance.

The lingual marker of politeness strategy used by the speaker is a 'hedge' of *menurut kami* (according to us) indicating that the utterance [1] is performed politely classified in negative politeness. Moreover, the utterance is delivered in the form of indirect speech also referring to negative politeness.

[2] (JW) *Pembangunan sistem. Sistem yang seperti apa? Telah kita lakukan dan telah kita buktikan, baik waktu kami jadi Wali Kota maupun jadi Gubernur, 'e-budgeting', 'e-procurement', 'e-purchasing', 'e-catalog', 'e-audit', pajak on-line, IMB on-line. Cara-cara seperti itulah yang saya kira kita lakukan dan bisa dinasionalkan, Semua daerah bisa, nasioanl bisa melakukan ini apabila Jokowi dan JK diberi amanah untuk megang pemerintahan ini.*

(Sytem development. What system looks like? We had done it and proved it when we were in Solo and in Jakarta, such as e-budgeting, e-procurement, e-purchasing, e-catalog, e-audit, Tax on-line, IMB on-line. Such system will be

done and nationalized. All regions and areas may be facilitated if Jokowi and JK is trusted to handle the government).

The utterance [2] states that Joko Widodo acclaims on policy of implementing successful system during his governance in Solo and Jakarta. Also, it will be done for his governance if he is elected. The system is believed as an effective way in anticipating the wrong practices for individual benefits in governmental practices.

In the case of the verbal strategy used in the utterance [2], Joko Widodo picks up a 'hedge' of *saya kira* (I think) indicating that the utterance is performed by using negative politeness. He also uses the word *kita* (we) implied the inclusiveness for which the utterance is soften or politely performed.

Prabowo Subianto also performs acclaims that is considerably distinctive with what is done by Joko Widodo. He tends to performs acclaims directly reflecting a strong sound and words explaining his acclaims. He states the following acclaim as in the utterance [3] to answer the moderator's question on *Bhineka Tunggal Eka*.

[3] (PS) *Baik, terimakasih. Pertanyaan tadi adalah kerangka hukum apa yang akan dibangun untuk menjamin nilai Bhineka Tunggal Eka. Kalau kita berbicara itu sebetulnya peranti hukum yang ada di bangsa kita sudah cukup. Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 sebetulnya sudah sangat jelas apalagi dalam versi yang asli tanggal 18 Agustus 1945. Dan kami juga saya kira sudah jelas dan tegas ya, kami yang mencalonkan orang minoritas menjadi wakil gubernurnya saudara Joko Widodo, saudara Ahok waktu itu cukup kontroversial tetapi saya sebagai pimpinan partai GERINDRA, ketua dewan Pembina, sayalah yang keras mempertahankan waktu ada serangan-serangan bahwa tidak baik atau tidak mungkin orang minoritas menjadi wakil gubernur.*

(Alright, thank you. The question is what frame of law that will be built to convince the values of *Bhineka Tunggal Eka*. If we talk about it, the law appliance we have is enough. *Undang-Undang Dasar 1945* is surely obvious for that, especially the original version of 18<sup>th</sup> August 1945. And we are also..., I think it is clear and sure that we propose a candidate from minority community, Ahok, as a vice governor of Joko Widodo. It is so controversial, but I am a leader of GERINDRA Party, the only person who strongly defends on attacks stating that it not good and

impossible for the minority to be a vice governor).

In the utterance [3] Prabowo Subianto acclaims that the values of *Bhineka Tunggal Eka* are high and he surely appreciates them realized in the form appreciating the minority communities' right. It is because that the values is obviously stated in *Undang-Undang Dasar 1945* so that there is no doubt for that. As known that Ahok, the vice governor of Joko Widodo, was from the minority proposed, supported, and struggled by Prabowo Subianto till he was elected. This is included in the appreciation of his for the values of *Bhineka Tunggal Eka* as stated in the law. Such acclaim is categorized as an acclaim on character in which he behaves to appreciate the values. The acclaim on policy is also performed as stated in the example [5].

Regarding with the verbal strategy employed by Prabowo Subianto, he uses the word *baik* (alright) and *terima kasih* (thank you) at the commencing utterance indicating that the utterance [3] is politely delivered categorized as negative politeness. However, he uses the word *sayalah* (only me) indicating that the speaker puts himself as the real figure excluding inclusiveness. It potentially decrease the level of politeness of the utterance.

[4] (PS) *Saya telah menandatangani deklarasi bahwa manakala saya menerima mandat dari rakyat saya akan alokasikan 1 milyar rupiah minimal satu tahun untuk tiap desa dan kelurahan di seluruh Indonesia.*

(I have already signed a declaration that if I get a mandate from the people, I will allocate at least one billions per year for each village all over Indonesia).

It is inferred that the utterance [4] contains an acclaim on policy as stated in the act of signing a declaration. It is a rule and commits the speaker to allocate at least one billions per year for each village in Indonesia. Such statement also attracts the people to vote and motivate them to build their villages under his governance. The 'hedge' of *manakala saya menerima mandat dari rakyat* (if I get a mandate from the people) is the lingual marker of negative politeness as the verbal strategy for the utterance.

## 4.2 Attacks

The speech act of attack refers to the act of downgrading the opponent's credentials as an undesirable office-holder (Benoit, 2004, in

Napierala, 2014). In the presidential debate of Indonesia, Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto perform attacks with different ways and frequencies. The previous candidate performs more attacks (42%) than the latter candidate (37%). The utterances of attacks produced by Joko Widodo are considerably indirect utterances indicating that they are politely delivered as a reflection of Javanese politeness referring to negative politeness. Prabowo Subianto perform less attacks referring to positive politeness, meaning that the speaker emphasizes his solidarity with the hearer (opponent).

[5] (JW) *Iya. Tradisi yang baru, tradisi yang baru ini harus kita mulai bahwa yang menjadi capres tidak harus ketua umum partai, seperti saya dan pak JK bukan ketua umum partai. Ini tradisi baru yang harus kita mulai dan saya kira dengan cara-cara seperti ini nanti yang akan maju adalah yang terbaik bukan yang ketua partai. Terimakasih.*

(Yes, it is the new tradition. The new tradition should be commenced that the presidential candidate must not be a head of party. Pak JK and I are not the head of party. It is a new tradition that should be done and I think it is the way of giving a chance to the capablest to be a candidate, not the head of party. Thank you).

It is inferred that Joko Widodo performs an attack on his counterpart as known a head of *Gerindra Party*. He is not a head of party proposed by the Struggling Indonesian Democratic Party as a presidential candidate and it is considered to be unusual for political tradition in Indonesia. Indeed, the head of party takes a priority in any political opportunities on the common sense. The utterance [5] also implies that Joko Widodo is proposed to be a presidential candidate due to his capabilities rather than his position in his party. Thus, it obviously attacks on his counterpart although he is the highly capable figure. However, the distinctive matter, a head of party, contains an attack on him.

On the other example, Joko Widodo also performs an attack as a response to his counterpart's answers. The euphemistic expression is used to soften his attack and the other politeness marker as well.

[6] (JW) *Iya. Tadi yang disampaikan oleh Pak Prabowo belum mungkin. Saking semangatnya belum disampaikan hal-hal yang kongkrit ke depan akan dilakukan apa? Dan yang kedua, juga belum dijawab mengenai masalah diskriminasi tadi juga ditanyakan oleh Pak Jusuf*

*Kalla juga belum dijawab karena terlalu semangatnya menjawab masalah hak asasi manusia. Oleh sebab itu, kami mohon agar ini lebih diberikan apa perhatian lagi masalah pertanyaan yang disampaikan oleh Bapak Jusuf Kalla.*

(Yes, what has been delivered by Pak Prabowo is impossible. Because of his eagerness, he leaves the concrete matters to do in the future. Secondly, the discrimination matters asked by Pak Jusuf Kalla are not yet answered either because of his high eagerness to explain about human right issues. Therefore, we hope that the matters asked by Pak Jusuf Kalla are more considered to be a focus of thought).

The utterance [6] is implied that Joko Widodo performs an attack after his counterpart answers Pak Jusuf Kalla's question on human right issues. Jusuf Kalla is the vice presidential candidate standing next to Joko Widodo. However, his answers are considered not to touch some points also asked, i.e. the real plans to do in the future and the discrimination issues related with the human right. Using the word 'eagerness', Joko Widodo tries to soften his attack and he uses the word 'hope' as a politeness marker for a request.

At the other occasions, Prabowo Subianto performs some attacks on his counterpart, Joko Widodo, concerning the regional development, the budget leak, and the other countries' acclaims on Indonesian's lands. His attacks are stated in the example [7], and [8].

Regarding with Joko Widodo's acclaims on free education and health service and other programs, Prabowo Subianto as stated in example [7] performs an attack focusing on the budgets that are over or leak due to malpractice of governance. He sees that there are so many good programs for the people, but the budgets are not promptly considered. Of course, they will get any serious problems of implementation.

[7] (PS) *Saudara moderator, saudara Joko Widodo calon presiden nomor urut dua. Malam ini kita membahas pembangunan ekonomi dan kesejahteraan sosial. Kita mengerti bahwa tujuan kita bernegara adalah untuk mencapai kemakmuran bersama. Masalahnya adalah bagaimana mencapai itu. Banyak program indah, bagus, kita harus begini, kita harus begitu, kita harus membangun ini, membangun itu, pendidikan gratis, kesehatan gratis dan sebagainya. Dari mana uangnya? Dari mana*

*sumber daya untuk kita pakai, untuk kita tumbuhkan kesejahteraan itu?*

(Brother Moderator, brother Joko Widodo, the presidential candidate, the list number two. This night we discuss about economy development and social welfare. We understand that our governmental goal is to achieve a common welfare. The problem is how to achieve that. There are many beautiful and good programs: we should do this, we should do that, we should build this, build that, free education and health services, etc. Where do we get the money? Where do we get the resources for those, directed to realize the welfare?

The utterance [7] also implies that Prabowo Subianto focuses on financial safety of our country, maintaining and preventing the wrong use of budgeting that potentially makes people sorrow. He perceives that great leak of the budgets is so serious so that he is intended to struggle harder maintain and close it which in turn people will get a better lives and welfare if the budgets are sufficient for all programs.

Related with the international issues, Prabowo Subianto also performs an attack on his counterpart especially what happens in the sea of South China. It closely touches the international relation, the defend, and Indonesia roles as a member of Asean. Such attack is stated in example [8] below.

[8] (PS) *Masalahnya Pak Joko Widodo adalah bahwa sebagian wilayah maritim kita termasuk di klaim oleh salah satu Negara yang, yang jadi masalah di laut Cina selatan. Itu masalahnya. Jadi, yang saya ingin tanya bagaimana sebaiknya kita bersikap dalam hal itu karena kita juga bagian dari Asia. Ada empat Negara Asean yang punya klaim, bagaimana kita sebagai katakanlah Negara terbesar di Asian, apakah kita absen sama sekali atau kita membela empat kawan-kawan kita di Asean itu dalam masalah laut Cina selatan itu. Terimakasih.*

(The problems, Pak Joko Widodo, are a part of our marine area is acclaimed by one of the countries, it becomes a problem at the sea of South China. That is the problem. Thus, my question is how is our attitude to such condition as known we are part of Asian countries? There are four Asean countries whose acclaim on that. How to do as a the biggest Asean country?. Are we absent at all or do we support the four countries in the case of the sea of South China. Thank you).

The utterance [8] contains a question that potentially attacks Joko Widodo which is out of his field. The speaker is more considered to know it well because it relates to national defend as his field. It is inferred that it contains a speech act of attack delivered in the form of directive. The speaker realizes such act politely by providing some alternatives for answers and of course each of them has a consequence to deal with. Finally, the speaker closes his utterance using the word ‘thank you’ to soften the utterance or avoid face threatening act.

### 4.3 Defences

Defending in the debate refers to the act of responding to the attacks with the purpose of repairing the image by some strategies, such as denial, evading responsibility or reducing offensiveness (Benoit, 2004, cited by Napierala, 2014). The following example [9] is defend performed by Joko Widodo and example [10] is performed by Prabowo Subianto.

[9] (JW) *Tadi sudah saya sampaikan kalau kita berperan dan peran itu kita bisa memberikan keuntungan pada Negara kawan kita itu, kita lakukan tetapi kalau kita tidak mempunyai sebuah solusi yang benar, tidak mempunyai sebuah jalan keluar yang benar, proses diplomasi yang ingin kita lakukan tidak memberikan manfaat, untuk apa? Setahu saya apa yang terjadi di laut Tiongkok itu kita tidak mempunyai konflik sama sekali. Masuk harus ada manfaatnya, harus bisa memberikan solusi agar konflik itu tidak meluas.*

(I have said that we play a role and it should be beneficial for the neighbour. We should do it. However, if we do not have a right solution, not provide a right way out, and the process of diplomacy of ours is considerably not useful, what for. As I know that what happens in the sea of Tiongkok does not take us to a conflict at all. Deciding to involve in should bring fort a good solution so that the conflict is not getting wider).

The utterance [9] is performed as a defence for the attack stated in the utterance [8]. Joko Widodo denies involving in the case of South China problem because Indonesia does not have any conflicts for that area. He prefers not being involved as long as it is considered not advantageous, there is no best way proposed for the solution. It is inferred that he is so careful in deciding to enter such uncertain case.

A surprising defence comes up from Prabowo Subianto who performs a distinctive act of defence

as stated in the example [10]. It is inferred that he uses a positive politeness indicating that he preserves the positive face of the counterpart by emphasizing his solidarity with him and claiming common sense with him.

[10] (PS) *Iya saya kira tanggapan Pak Joko Widodo sebetulnya sejalan dengan jawaban saya ya. Bapak bilang trans, saya bilang mereka curiga, sama kita. Kita harus yakinkan mereka bahwa bukan ancaman sama mereka, kita ingin menjadi good neighbour. Kita ingin jadi tetangga yang baik, jadi sebetulnya dalam hal ini kita sama pak. Loh!, bukan kalau baik ya baik ini pak? Penonton lebih galak dari pada kita ya pak? Ya penonton galak galak kayak nonton bola aja. Jadi, dalam hal itu benar kita harus ber-trans, kita harus, kita ingin damai, kita tidak mau macam-macam tetapi bahwa kita dianggap lemah, kita harus cek ke diri kita jangan-jangan memang kita lemah saudara-saudara.*

(Yes, I think Pak Joko Widodo’s response is really in a line with mine, ya. Bapak says ‘trans’, I say they are suspicious. Thus, we are the same. We should convince those (Australians) that we are not a threat for them, we want to be a good neighbour. Thus, in this case, we have the same ide pak. Loh! If it is good, it will be good, won’t it, pak? The audiences are more impudent than us, aren’t they, pak? Yes, the audiences are more impudent like football supporters. Thus, in this matter, we should do ‘trans’, we must do it, we want a peace, we do not want to do the worst. However, if we are perceived as the weak, we must introspect ourselves for ensuring that whether we, in fact, are weak, brothers).

Thus, it is obvious that the utterance [10] is performed on the focus of similarity in idea or sense. It is also soften with politeness markers such as *saya kira* (I think), *Pak* and *bapak*. The appreciation and claim of close personal matter is marked with his joke of *Penonton lebih galak dari pada kita ya pak?* (The audiences are more impudent than us, aren’t they, Sir?).

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

The study is concluded that Joko Widodo (Jokowi) used more acclaims (69%) and attacks (59%) but used less defends (38%). On the other hand, Prabowo used more defends (61%), but used less attacks (41%) and acclaims (30%). In the case of the

verbal strategies, the previous prefers performing a negative politeness (negative face) and the latter prefers performing a positive politeness (positive face). The lingual markers used by Jokowi in softening his utterances for politeness are hedges, inclusiveness, thank-giving, and indirect speech acts, while Prabowo prefers using hedges, inclusiveness, and thank-giving.

## REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L., 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press. London.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., 1987. *Politeness: Some Universal In Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- David, T. W., 2013. A Pragmatic Analysis of Victory and Inaugural Speeches of President Jonathan: A Measure for Transformation and Good Governance in Nigeria. Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages University of Nigeria. *Nsukka*, 1(2), pp.1-21.
- Garcia, F. F., 2014. Impoliteness, Pseudo-Politeness, Strategic Politeness on the Nature of Communicative Behaviour in Electoral Debates. *Circulo de Linguistica Aplicada a la Communication*, 58, pp.60-89.
- Grice, H. P., 1975. *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Grundy, P., 2008. *Doing Pragmatics*. Hodder Education. London (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.).
- Huang, Y., 2007. *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, Inc. New York.
- Jabber, K. H., Jinquan, Z., 2013. The Modal Verbs: A Speech Acts of Request in the Speech of the President of the United States Barack Obama. *The Criterion an International Journal of English*, 5(12), pp.1-13.
- Loughery, J., Ewald, J.D., 2013. Rhetorical Strategies of McCain and Obama in the Third 2008 Presidential Debate: Functional Theory from a Linguistic Perspective. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 19.
- Mey, J. L., 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Blackwell Publisher. Oxford.
- Napierala, K., 2014. The Verbal Strategies in the Obama-McCain Debates. *The Criterion an International Journal in English*, 5(3), pp.128-137.
- Pakzadian, M., 2012. Politeness Principle in 2008 Presidential Debates between McCain and Obama. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), pp. 351-357.
- Utomo, S., 2010. *The Rhetorical Structure of Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's Debates during Democratic Campaign Period of America Presidential Election in 2008* (Dissertation). Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang.
- Wang, J., 2010. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), pp.254-261.