

“HILLARY, YOU HAVE NO IDEA”: IMPOLITENESS STRATEGY IN UNITED STATES PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE CASE

Hanna Maria Panggabean

Politeknik UCM

hannapanggabean15@gmail.com

Abstract

Impoliteness strategy is a social phenomenon practically used to threaten someone's face and an act of raising a conflict in the interaction. However, impoliteness is unable to reveal under politeness theory since it focuses on the constraint of verbal interaction used to save someone's face (Mohammed & Abbas, 2015, 2016). Therefore, Culpeper (2016) suggests an impoliteness strategy to emphasize a communicative strategy used to damage the hearer's face. One of the controversial events occurred in the 3rd presidential debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in 2016. Political debate is a media for candidates to campaign the information and enhance the accountability to the voters for winning the election (Dalimunte & Wen, 2022). The data were primary sources collected from a Youtube video and transcriptional script from a website focusing on the 3rd U.S. Presidential Debate (Blake, 2016). Thus, it was analyzed qualitatively using Culpeper's impoliteness framework (Culpeper et al., 2003). The data was coded periodically into the appropriate category, interpreted and compared between facial expressions and the speech act. Then, the data was analyzed descriptively based on the definition of the theme category (Heigham & Croker, 2019). This study highlighted the use of positive impoliteness as a defensive communicative strategy and negative impoliteness as an attacking communicative strategy that occurred in the 3rd U.S. Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton.

Keywords: *face-threatening acts, impoliteness strategy, politeness theory, political discourse, U.S. Presidential debate.*

INTRODUCTION

Impoliteness is the extended study of politeness used to examine the social pragmatic on people conducting disharmony or raising conflict in the interaction (Harris, 2001). After many researchers and linguists were focusing on discussing politeness strategy, impoliteness is considered to allow the users in achieving certain goals. Bousfield & Locher (2008) defined impolite as a 'behavior that is face-aggravating in a particular context' (as cited Toddington, 2015). In Culpeper et al. (2003), impoliteness defined as "communicative strategies designed to attack the face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony." As cited Rudanko (2006), it is contrasted with a politeness which demands speaker to save hearer's face to maintain the relationship. Impoliteness deals with face-threatening acts (FTA) that often occur in social interaction. In the real situation, the use of impoliteness associated with conflict and arguments such as in the political debate.

In political debate, it was normally found that one candidate use some strategies to gain political interest from the audience to win the debate. As Fracchiolla (2011), an extreme

deferences and politeness are used as a strategy to attack a woman as an opponent in a political debate. In this case, woman is seen as the weakest role to win the position. In Al-Dilaimy & Khalaf (2015), impolite interruptions is used to achieve certain goals such as to show disagreement of views, to ridicule opinions, or to try to gain the floor. In contrast, García (2014) found that politeness and impoliteness strategy shifted naturally in an electoral debate as a strategy to prevent him/her leaning on a certain communicative behaviour.

The third U.S. presidential debate in 2016 was the most intriguing and critical occasion to convince the voters. Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton were considered the most controversial candidate and the campaign has seen neither unity nor positivity. Their standing was determined by building the image and tackling the issues behind them. However, this debate dominantly showed the dynamic styles of both candidates in their argumentative and delivered speeches.

Impoliteness studies attracted large attention over the past few years, however, it has been limited compared with politeness strategy. Haugh (2015) noted how taking offense that lies at the core of current models of impoliteness is suggested as a part of a pragmatic act. Limberg (2009) found that responses to the successful threat lead to a tendency to a notion of impoliteness such as mitigating and aggravating moves. In Culpeper et al. (2003), they examined discourses with extended strategy (lexically and grammatically defined) to see impoliteness and how the role of prosody in conveying impoliteness. They found that people choose to use impoliteness to expedite their goals in car parking disputes. A study across cultures such as Sifianou (2013) reveals that the use of formality in customer service utterances may be polite in Sweden but it may not be polite in another country. The research could not prove that globalization leads the way for politeness and impoliteness to become homogeneous across the world. It might occur because globalization is still in process and its development is always unpredictable and uncertain.

In fact, there has a limited amount of research that examines impoliteness in political debate. Therefore, this study aims to explore impoliteness strategies used by Trump and Clinton in the third 2016 presidential debate. It is considered that each candidate has a strong image of attacking their opponent's face and defending their views during the first and the second presidential debate and they are in strong opposition to one another. The way they share their program and views would affect the voters' decision to put their support. In this study, the importance of giving the speech and arguments in the debate could be used to declare their opponent's weaknesses blatantly and gain power. It is also interesting to figure out how two candidates could maintain their opinion and prevent attacks from their opponents.

Therefore, this study derives questions to be discussed as follows; 1) What are impoliteness strategies used by Trump and Clinton?; 2) Why are certain strategies used in a presidential debate? To calculate impoliteness strategies used in the political debate, the author used one framework from Jonathan Culpeper. Culpeper, (2016) proposed five super strategies that are related to the degree of face threats including Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Off-record and Don't do the FTA. Bald-On-Record Impoliteness is a strategy that performs the face-threatening act in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way in circumstances where the face is not irrelevant or minimized. Positive Impoliteness is the use of strategies that are designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. Negative impoliteness is the use of strategies that are designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. Off-record impoliteness is a strategy for performing the FTA in such a way that does not show conflict but allows implicature. Withhold politeness is a strategy that does not do the politeness at the time it should use. For example, failing to thank somebody for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness.

Culpeper (2016) also proposed these sub-strategies for positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness. Some strategies identified as positives impoliteness include a) ignore, snub the other—fail to acknowledge the other's presence; b) exclude the other from an activity; c) disassociate from the other—for example, deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together; d) be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic; e) use inappropriate

identity markers—for example, use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains; f) use obscure or secretive language—for example, mystify the other with jargon, or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target; g) seek disagreement—select a sensitive topic; h) make the other feel uncomfortable—for example, do not avoid silence, joke or use small talk; j) use taboo words—swear, or use abusive or profane language; k) call the other names—use derogatory nominations.

While negative impoliteness covers speech act which include a) frighten—instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur; b) condescend, scorn or ridicule—emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g. use diminutives); c) invade the other’s space—literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship); d) explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect—personalize, use the pronouns “I” and “you”; e) put the other’s indebtedness on record; f) violate the structure of conversation—interrupt.

However, previous studies seemed to focus on investigating politeness strategy and had little discussion on comparing the impoliteness strategy used by Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton (Batubara et al., 2022; Dalimunte & Wen, 2022; Greenwood et al., 2017; Maharani, 2018). In the third U.S. political debate, Hillary Clinton seemed to be affected in using more impoliteness strategy since her opponents kept attacking her by highlighting controversies. The role of hearer cannot be underestimated because it can have a great offensive effect that lead them to be impolite. (Culpeper et al., 2003). The third political debate is the final session to determine win-lose arguments, therefore, both candidates maximize their strength to attack and defense their position.

An implication of the study is to enhance pragmatic competence by using impoliteness strategy in debates, to increase the awareness of impoliteness strategy in the political debates, and to teach the learners how to convince audiences through arguments and critical thinking. By understanding the argumentative discourse, the audiences are invited to learn how to criticize the political programs offered by the candidates. The current research can also depict the nature of blatant impoliteness with intentional face-attacking behaviour as a new concept of communication strategy in political debate and consider the great offensive effect on the hearer. Rudanko (2006) emphasizes that when a speaker attacks the hearer’s face with a prepared impoliteness plan, the attack is likely to perceive more severely by hearer and the speaker, escalating the intensity of the attack from both perspectives.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Impoliteness strategy

The studies of pragmatics in investigating politeness and impoliteness strategy are used to show the way people treat other’s faces by evaluating cultural, social, and linguistic behavior and norms and the role of gender in social interaction. According to Brown and Levinson’s theory, politeness strategy defines as “showing concern for people’s face (as cited in Holmes, 2006). It is practically occurred to maintain a positive self-image and the need to be imposed on one’s space. (Aydınoglu, 2013; Fracchiolla, 2011). However, some studies acknowledged that there had been overlapping analyses on the weightiness of face-threatening acts (FTA) in certain discourses, especially political discourse (Holmes, 2006).

Therefore, impoliteness should be paid as a distinctive and distinguished case since some discourses presented deliberate face-threatening acts (FTA) in a more aggressive and unmitigated way. Recently, impoliteness strategy has been commonly discussed within politeness studies and continues to undergo in political discourse. In political debate, impoliteness plays rhetorically to dominate Others, cause offense and build the image of toughness (Ardila, 2019). It is considered to be a part of communicative goals in order to influence and gain more voters. However, García (2014) argued that impoliteness strategy appeared when the event allowed them to present the linguistic resources and mechanism.

On the other hand, the political debate might also play differently in Japan if the candidates employed the tool of honorifics. Honorifics in this context are used as self-defense of the society and acts of speech to elevate the opponent in order to attack them (Shibamoto-smith, 2011). Moreover, impoliteness is the mainstream rule in a win-lose game of political debate. The frequency of applying impoliteness is higher when it engendered on the final day of the debate (Aleml & Latifi, 2019; Neshkovska, 2020). In the same vein, Harris (2001) emphasized that political discourse is closely related to a community of practice who accept and expect the presence of impoliteness as an intentional FTA in order to build adversarial and confrontational processes toward their opponents. Therefore, the analysis should be separated from the politeness strategy for it has a significant absence of mitigating linguistic approach.

Political Debate Communication Strategy

Political debate has been naturally designed to highlight personal image, political clash, and spontaneous speech and response. It is not created to build political ally instead it leads them to oppose the perspectives and opinion from each other (Hart & Jarvis, 1997). In presidential debate, there are three participants which includes moderator who lead and control the discussion and two candidates who deliver speech and answer the questions. The nature of presidential debate runs by having a certain length of time to discuss some set of issues and topics. It is divided into some sections in which the candidates receive and answer the questions, then, exchange their thoughts towards each candidate's response (Pandov, 2021).

Furthermore, the presidential debate is held to share programs and views from the party they represent and also a win-lose event for both candidates in convincing the voters before the election. Both candidates can use the opportunity to convince the voters in believing them as the future president. However, each candidates seemed to play their own speech strategies and use this opportunity to attack and threat their opponent's face without considering the risk of losing their voters. U.S. presidential election in 2016 period led Donald Trump from Republican Party and Hillary Clinton from Democratic Party to compete in the final debate in more dynamic and aggressive way.

METHOD

In the current study, the data collection and analysis was conducted by using qualitative content analysis. Political debates are unique interaction which is restricted into several sets of times, turn-taking, and employing different ethical and rhetoric stances. Content analysis worked to examine the unit of meaning that conform the category theme (Greenwood et al., 2017; Strijbos et al., 2006). The data collection should be purposively selected from the reliable source that was transcribed into a corpus set of impoliteness identified data. (Angouri & Tseliga, 2010; Aydınoglu, 2013; Dobs & Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 2013; Khosravi, 2015). Impoliteness strategy should be coded by identifying the patterns and assessing the context of issues being discussed (Fracchiolla, 2011; Holmes, 2006; Rudanko, 2006).

Therefore, the data was selected from the third presidential debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton that was held in Las Vegas on October 19th, 2016. The data was adopted from a website of The Washington Post which provided video recording and transcription data thoroughly. The video of the first 1-hour duration was analyzed and compared along with the transcription data. The data analyzing focused on face threatening acts and linguistic behavior which led to impoliteness attitude by using content analysis, then it was coded and interpreted into the appropriate category based on Culpeper's impoliteness framework. Last, Culpeper's model of impoliteness strategies was adopted as a reference in determining the impoliteness patterns in political debate.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the utterances is restricted to the interaction between Trump and Clinton

and thus identified by using codes. The codes that indicate impoliteness strategies based on Culpeper’s model are calculated and the percentage is displayed to show the distribution of the data. The codes are elaborated on in detail and then listed in a table. The description of Table 1 is explained in the following section.

Table 1. Quantitative Distribution of Impoliteness Strategies

Impoliteness Strategies	Trump		Clinton		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
(1) Bald on-record Impoliteness	13	17.33	1	2.17	14	11.57
(2) Positive Impoliteness	30	40.00	41	89.13	71	58.68
(3) Negative Impoliteness	32	42.67	2	4.35	34	28.10
(4) Off-Record Impoliteness	-	-	2	4.35	2	1.65
(5) Withhold Politeness	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	75	100.00	46	100.00	121	100.00

The result of the analysis of impoliteness strategies revealed that mostly both candidates used positive impoliteness at 71 (58.68%) out of 121. The second highest strategy used negative impoliteness at 34 (28.10%). None of a strategy to withhold politeness emerges since the two candidates seem very forthright in stating their views and rejecting allegations against their opponents. Moreover, the impoliteness strategies used by Trump are twice highest as Clinton's for overall speech. Moreover, Trump mostly uses negative impoliteness in 42.67%. It is significantly different from his opponent who mostly uses positive impoliteness in 89.13%.

Since positive and negative impoliteness has sub-strategies, its detail is listed in Table 2. In this analysis, the result revealed that Trump mostly use a strategy to violate the structure of conversation 20 times out of 75 (26.67%) while Clinton mostly use a strategy to call the other name 20 times out of 46 (43.48%). It is proved by the way Trump shows interruption many times in the debate to deny what his opponent said. While Clinton constantly calls the name of her opponent without using a title or surname as the moderator did.

Table 2. Frequency of Impoliteness Strategies including Sub-Strategies

Impoliteness Strategies	Trump		Clinton		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
(1) Bald on-record Impoliteness	13	17.33	1	2.17	14	11.57
(2) Positive Impoliteness						
(a) Ignore, snub the other—fail to acknowledge the other’s presence.	16	21.33	12	26.09	28	23.14
(b) Exclude the other from an activity.	-	-	-	-	-	-
(c) Disassociate from the other—for example, deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together.	1	1.33	2	4.35	3	2.48
(d) Be disinterested,unconcerned, unsympathetic.	-	-	-	-	-	-

(e) Use inappropriate identity markers	-	-	-	-	-	-
(f) Use obscure or secretive language	-	-	1	2.17	1	0.83
(g) Seek disagreement—select a sensitive topic.	2	2.67	2	4.35	4	3.31
(h) Make the other feel uncomfortable - for example, do not avoid silence, joke or use small talk.	2	2.67	4	8.70	6	4.96
(i) Use taboo words—swear, or use abusive or profane language.	-	-	-	-	-	-
(j) Call the other names—use derogatory nominations.	9	12.00	20	43.48	29	23.97
(3) Negative Impoliteness						
(a) Frighten	-	-	-	-	-	-
(b) Condescend, scorn or ridicule	8	10.67	-	-	8	6.61
(c) Invade the other’s space	-	-	-	-	-	-
(d) Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect	4	5.33	-	-	4	3.31
(e) Put the other’s indebtedness on record.	-	-	-	-	-	-
(f) Violate the structure of conversation—interrupt.	20	26.67	2	4.35	22	18.18
(4) Off-Record Impoliteness	-	-	2	4.35	2	1.65
(5) Withhold Politeness	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	75	100.00	46	100.00	121	100.00

Furthermore, the writer explained five super strategies from Culpeper’s model by providing some examples. From all impoliteness strategies, positive impoliteness places the highest rank emerged in the speech and is then followed by negative impoliteness, bald-on-record impoliteness, and withhold impoliteness.

Bald on Record Impoliteness

It is a strategy that directly attacks the hearer’s face in non-harmonious ways or outright conflicted ways. From all speeches, bald on record strategies emerges several times. Here is one example done by Trump that occurred in the middle of the debate when the section allows them to discuss the issue of the economy.

“The problem is, you talk, but you don't get anything done, Hillary. You don't. Just like when you ran the State Department, \$6 billion was missing. How do you miss \$6 billion? You ran the State Department, \$6 billion was either stolen. They don't know. It's gone, \$6 billion. If you become president, this country is going to be in some mess. Believe me.”

In this part, Trump criticizes Clinton’s works over 20 years that have not got anything done, however, Clinton still uses the same strategy to boost the American economy. It is obvious that Trump is very direct and does not try to mitigate his words. This strategy is used to invite the voters not to believe their opponent because she only promises but does nothing.

Positive Impolitenes

The use of this strategy aims to attack the positive face of the hearer. It is found that ignoring the other hearer is the second highest strategy after calling the other names used by both candidates. Since these two strategies, ignore, snub the other and call the other names are highlighted. The following interaction is the section in which they are discussing immigration.

"TRUMP: I think I should respond to that. First of all, I had a very good meeting with the president of Mexico. Very nice man. We will be doing very much better with Mexico on trade deals. Believe me. The NAFTA deal signed by her husband is one of the worst deals ever made of any kind, signed by anybody. It's a disaster. Hillary Clinton wanted the wall. Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006 or thereabouts. Now, she never gets anything done, so naturally the wall wasn't built. But Hillary Clinton wanted the wall.

WALLACE: Well, let me -- wait, wait, sir, let me...

TRUMP: We are a country of laws. We either have -- and by the way...

WALLACE: Now, wait. I'd like to hear from...

TRUMP: Well -- well, but she said one thing.

WALLACE: I'd like to hear -- I'd like to hear from Secretary Clinton.

CLINTON: I voted for border security, and there are...

TRUMP: And the wall."

In the following utterances, Trump has a turn to state his views on the border issue. He has been attacked by Clinton. Clinton charges that he is going to take families apart by sending illegal immigrants back to their home country and that the president of Mexico will not pay for the wall. Due to this claim, Trump tried to argue her statement by accusing her want the wall as well. This sensitive issue leads the moderator to ask for Clinton's clarification, however, Trump seems fail to acknowledge the moderator's presence.

In the following example, the strategy of calling the other names are done by Clinton.

1. "There's only one of us on this stage who's actually shipped jobs to Mexico, because that's Donald. He's shipped jobs to 12 countries, including Mexico."
2. "Donald has bought Chinese steel and aluminum."

In this part, Clinton calls "Donald" many times and also the moderator's name. In fact, I consider that his opponent starts to call the name first, thus, I suppose that it is the way for her to stand her position on the same level. As she is a woman in the race, she does not want to look flimsy and prone to being attacked.

Negative Impoliteness

The highest strategy used to attack the negative face of the addresses are condescend, scorn, or ridicule and violate the structure of the conversation. Here are the following examples.

"CLINTON: And I think it's time you take a stand...

TRUMP: She has no idea whether it's Russia, China, or anybody else.

CLINTON: I am not quoting myself.

TRUMP: She has no idea.

CLINTON: I am quoting 17...

TRUMP: Hillary, you have no idea.

CLINTON: ... 17 intelligence -- do you doubt 17 military and civilian...

TRUMP: And our country has no idea."

CLINTON: ... agencies.

TRUMP: Yeah, I doubt it. I doubt it.

As it can be seen, Trump interrupts Clinton for few times in order to prevent Clinton from stating the charges to him. In this part, Clinton charges him that he is encouraging Putin, the president of Russia to espionage against America. He does not allow Clinton to continue her turn and keeps arguing her statement.

Condescend, scorn, or ridicule is mostly used by Trump. One example is stated by Trump.

TRUMP: "We need a Supreme Court that in my opinion is going to uphold the Second Amendment, and all amendments, but the Second Amendment, which is under absolute siege. I believe if my opponent should win this race, which I truly don't think will happen, we will have a Second Amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now. But I feel that it's absolutely important that we uphold, because of the fact that it is under such trauma."

This utterance occurs when each candidate is given the opportunity to state their views toward the Court and the Constitution of the Second Amendment. As he put himself to support the Constitution, he also stated explicitly that his opponent is impossible to win and belittled her competence to see the Court functioning in the right direction. This strategy helps Trump to affirm his views and invite the voters to believe him to be president.

Off Record Strategy

This strategy arises where the face-threatening act is conveyed indirectly by way of an implicature and can be canceled. It is the least strategy merely used by Clinton.

CLINTON: "And, you know, look, I understand that Donald's been strongly supported by the NRA. The gun lobby's on his side. They're running millions of dollars of ads against me. And I regret that, because what I would like to see is for people to come together and say: Of course we're going to protect and defend the Second Amendment. But we're going to do it in a way that tries to save some of these 33,000 lives that we lose every year."

In this statement, Clinton seems to attack by belittling him that he can not ensure the citizens to protect the Second Amendment because he is NRA's side. She minimized her statement to keep the voters do not stay out of her area.

DISCUSSION

Having analyzed the data, there are some difficulties in identifying the impoliteness strategies. Certain strategies are overlapped to one another and thus, the writer decided to code them based on the context as well as their facial expression. Moreover, the use of quantitative analysis is very useful to explain the interpretation clearly for the frequency use of impoliteness strategies so that it can represent a huge amount of data. Then, qualitative analysis is used to explain why the certain strategies appear during the debate.

This study shows five impoliteness strategies employed in the third U.S. political debate which includes bald-on impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off-record impoliteness and withhold politeness. Positive impoliteness appears to be the most frequent strategies especially when they ignore or snub the other and call the other names. As it is reviewed,

Hillary Clinton plays call the other names at 20 times higher than ignore or snub the other at 12 times. It is occurred when she is being interrupted by Donald and she needs to continue standing up on her statement and does not want to be defeated because her opponent has a strong figure. While Trump is found to ignore at 16 times and call other names at 9 times because he tried to reinforce that his statement are more acceptable than his opponent. In this case, Hillary seemed to build a high defense for tackling all issues that is targeted to her and at the same time, she wants to maintain her voters to keep believing on her programs. It is supported by (García, 2014) that the candidate can shift from politeness to impoliteness by maintaining the social balance to reach discursive goal.

On the other hand, Trump plays negative impoliteness more frequently especially on the use of condescend, scorn or ridicule at 8 times, explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect at 4 times, and violate the structure of conversation – interrupt at 20 times because he wants to grow an influence to his voters. The power relation in his personal background is emerged to be one of the factor that affect his communication style. During the debate, he shows a communication style that is freedom of speech, frontal, and dismissive. Interruption frequently appears to emphasize his position since his opponent is well-known as a candidate of experience. It is noted from Pandov (2021) that impoliteness arises when the power is equal. It is seen that Trump plays more interruptions towards the moderator and his opponent as a counterattack to gain control of the debates even though there are no attacks from his opponents.

Moreover, it seems that Clinton is very cautious to choose certain words when giving her statements during the debate. She attempts to keep the hearer have a positive belief in her. It is significantly different with Trump who mostly uses negative impoliteness. The way he expresses his views is very direct and unambiguous. He put himself completely contradict with his opponent and seems to belittle his opponent and violate the structure of debate. This strategy may be used to benefit him to gain the political interest as characterized him as a leader who stands firm and is not easily influenced by certain circumstances. It is obviously seen that Trump is very dominant in the speech since the way he uses to attack is by doing interruption. It can be seen from how he keeps denying all negative issue that has been addressed to him.

Overall, this arguments may appear because it may have been set by the organizer of the debate. It is common to find these impoliteness strategies as a new approach of communication style in the debate because each candidate needs to take this opportunity to affect the choice of the voters in the election.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, Culpeper's model is used to analyze the impoliteness strategies in the presidential debate between Trump and Clinton. The linguistic behavior is analyzed that refers to impoliteness from a transcript and a video recording. Based on the result, it is concluded that positive impoliteness is very frequent to use especially by Clinton and negative politeness is the second highest strategies that are used especially by Trump. Clinton frequently shows positive impoliteness through the use of

The study has implications for improving pragmatic competence through the use of impoliteness strategy in debates and raising awareness on the use of impoliteness strategy particularly in political debates. Besides, this study also contributes to the pedagogical implication that could help teachers or trainers in instructing students on how to persuade audiences through reasoning and critical thinking. Moreover, impoliteness strategy could shed a light as a new approach for the next debate styles. Interestingly, it can be concluded that impoliteness is no longer considered to be politically rude but it becomes a communication strategy to reach certain goals, especially, in strengthening someone's face and stance.

However, the effect of the use of impoliteness strategy, the gender role and the cultural background cannot be explained in this research. For the future studies, it needs further analysis to discover this possibility. Moreover, the result can not be generalized since the debate belongs

to special event in America and the nature of the debate is always unpredictable.

REFERENCES

- Al-Dilaimy, H. H. M., & Khalaf, A. S. (2015). A Pragmatic Analysis of Impolite Interruptions of Selected Debates in the Opposite Direction of Al-Jazeera Channel. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 3(12), 1570–1578. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-3-12-14>
- Alemi, M., & Latifi, A. (2019). The realization of impoliteness in arguments between the democrats and republicans over the government shutdown issue in the US. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182-2019-23-1-83-97>
- Angouri, J., & Tseliga, T. (2010). "You have no idea what you are talking about!" from e-disagreement to e-impoliteness in two online fora. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 6(1), 57–82. <https://doi.org/10.1515/JPLR.2010.004>
- Ardila, J. A. G. (2019). Impoliteness as a rhetorical strategy in Spain ' s politics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 140, 160–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.11.017>
- Aydınoglu, N. (2013). Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies: An Analysis of Gender Differences in GERALYN I. HORTON'S PLAYS. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83, 473–482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.093>
- Batubara, M. H., Dara, C., Rahila, I., & Fitri, H. (2022). *An Analysis Of Politeness Strategies Used By Donald Trump And Hillary Clinton Presidential Debate 2016*. 1(2), 51–58.
- Blake, A. (2016). *The final Trump-Clinton debate transcript, annotated*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/19/the-final-trump-clinton-debate-transcript-annotated/>
- Bousfield, D., & Locher, M. A. (2008). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (21st ed.).
- Culpeper, J. (2016). Impoliteness Strategy. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society*, September, 421–445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6>
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10–11), 1545–1579. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00118-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2)
- Dalimunte, A. A., & Wen, F. (2022). *Shaping political image through politeness strategies in the presidential debates*. 7(1), 102–109. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v7i1.1660>
- Dobs, A. M., & Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, P. (2013). Impoliteness in polylogal interaction: Accounting for face-threat witnesses' responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 53, 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.05.002>
- Fracchiolla, B. (2011). Politeness as a strategy of attack in a gendered political debate-The Royal-Sarkozy debate. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(10), 2480–2488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.02.006>
- García, F. F. (2014). Impoliteness, pseudo-politeness, strategic politeness? On the nature of communicative behaviour in electoral debates. *Circulo de Linguistica Aplicada a La Comunicacion*, 58, 60–89. https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_CLAC.2014.v58.45470
- Greenwood, M. M., Coker, C. R., Bachmann, M., Greenwood, M. M., & Coker, C. R. (2017). *The Political is Personal : Analyzing the Presidential Primary Debate Performances of Hillary Clinton and Michele Bachmann THE POLITICAL IS PERSONAL : ANALYZING THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY DEBATE PERFORMANCES OF IHELLARY CLINTON AND. 1431*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.2016.11821868>
- Harris, S. (2001). Being Politically Impolite. *Discourse & Society*, 12(4), 451–472.
- Hart, R. P., & Jarvis, S. E. (1997). Political Debate: Forms, Styles, and Media. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(8), 1095–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764297040008010>
- Haugh, M. (2015). Impoliteness and taking offence in initial interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 36–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.018>
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2019). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical*

introduction. Springer.

- Holmes, J. (2006). Politeness Strategies as Linguistic Variables. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 684–697.
- Khosravi, M. (2015). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Reply Articles as an Instance of Academic Conflict*. 2(3), 223–231.
- Limberg, H. (2009). Impoliteness and threat responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(7), 1376–1394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.02.003>
- Maharani, T. (2018). *A STUDY OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED BY HILLARY CLINTON AND DONALD TRUMP ON THE SECOND PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE A STUDY OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED*. Sanata Dharma University.
- Mohammed, H. N., & Abbas, N. F. (2015). Pragmatics of Impoliteness and Rudeness. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 4(6), 195–205. www.ajssnet.com
- Mohammed, H. N., & Abbas, N. F. (2016). Impoliteness in literary discourse: A pragmatic study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5(2), 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.2p.76>
- Neshkovska, S. (2020). Impoliteness on The Political Stage: The Case of the 2019 Final Macedonian Presidential Debate. *Lods Papers in Pragmatics*, 16(2), 285–304.
- Pandov, K. (2021). *Politics and ‘ Playing Rude ’ Politics and ‘ Playing Rude .’*
- Rudanko, J. (2006). *Aggravated impoliteness and two types of speaker intention in an episode in Shakespeare’s Timon of Athens*. 38, 829–841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.11.006>
- Shibamoto-smith, J. S. (2011). Honorifics , “ politeness ,” and power in Japanese political debate. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(15), 3707–3719. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.003>
- Sifianou, M. (2013). The impact of globalisation on politeness and impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 55, 86–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.05.016>
- Strijbos, J., Martens, R. L., Prins, F. J., & Jochems, W. M. G. (2006). *Content analysis : What are they talking about ?* 46, 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2005.04.002>