

The Application of Functional Theory: Indonesian Presidential Debate

Wahyuningsih

*Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang
ayunope@gmail.com*

Deli Nirmala

*Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang
deliundip@gmail.com*

Abstract:

Functional theory is a one of theories that are common used on the research of political debates in American campaign discourse. In the present article, Indonesian presidential debate is analyzed from the perspective of functional theory. The goal of this study is to analyze language function produced by candidates and to evaluate the applicability of functional theory in analyzing Indonesian presidential debate. The authors employ qualitative method in analyzing data. Supporting instruments in analyzing data were functional theory and political discourse analysis (PDA). PDA used in interpreting language function in political context. While, functional theory provides three functions, namely: attacks, defends, and acclaims. The finding shows that two different axioms are found. The first is the use of attack more than defense; it is line with the prediction of functional theory that has been tested in American political debate. Second, the use of acclaims less than attack, it differs in a way from the prediction of functional theory. Fundamentally, functional theory can be used as an instrument in analysis political debates in Indonesia even though the findings were not exactly consistence with the prediction. Thereby, the theory needs to be developed discursively.

Keywords: *functional theory, political debate, PDA*

1. Introduction

Presidential debate is a series of activities in delivering political messages and competing arguments that held toward general election. The presidential debate is a way for president and vice president candidates to deliver their vision and mission, programs and work planning to the public. Through debate, the candidate can elaborate more deeply and broadly an ideology and policy to audiences. This activity can provide an overview to the public, especially voters, so that they can use the information from the debate as one of the considerations in determining their choices. For those reason, presidential debate to be interesting field that attracts many attentions from any practitioners to do research from any perspectives.

A number of researchers have been conducted the research concerning Indonesian debate, for example: the research conducted by Munarisat.al (A , Munaris, & Fuad, 2015). They were examining Jokowi's linguistic aspects in the presidential debates and their usefulness in learning by using sociolinguistic approach. Similar study focused on debate also conducted by Viljanen (2019) however, she studied on American debate, which focused on the occurrence of overlapping and interruption in the presidential debates of the USA. The study was conducted by comparing the debates of the 2012 and 2016 presidential election debates.

Research focused on debates falls under the scope of political communication. Political communication is a speech event between people for political purposes containing political messages delivered to influence public opinion. Nimmo (2000: 8) states that: Political communication is a way for someone to exchange symbols, discourse, speech, images, movements, posture, temperament and clothing. Finally, people can understand the message. Effendy (1989: 277) argues that: Political communication is an activity of exchanging messages carried out by a person and group as an effort to gain authority. Political communication often occurs in campaigns such as the campaign before the general election. One research that studied relating to political communication in Indonesia is the publication with titled *Transcoding of the Construction and Contestation Discourse of Jokowi and Prabowo in Social Media* in the 2014 presidential election campaign (Leiliyanti, Diyantari, & Irawaty, 2017). This study is aimed to see the extent of the expression used as participation in political campaigns on social media.

Many theories are applied in the analysis of political communication from any different theoretical perspectives, but the systematic development that focuses on the content of debate is not extensive. One theory that has been systematically tested in the analysis of political communication is functional theory, for example research and theory developed by Benoit (2007). Functional theory has been used in the analysis of political discourse and debates. One of the foundations of functional theory is how to build a public image through acclaims, attack, and defense. In political debates, candidates may use those three strategies to achieve their goal. Benoit argues that there is a hypothesis of the functional theory that those of the three functions are likely occurred with different frequencies. The theory makes two predictions about the function in the discourse of political campaigns. First, it is expected that candidates will use acclaims more often than attacks. Second,

candidates will use attacks more often than defense (Benoit W. , 2007). This prediction has also received support from several studies that have been conducted (Benoit et al. 1999; 2003; 2005).

Functional theory is applied not only in campaigns in America but also applied as in presidential debates in Korea (Benoit & Lee, 2005), Ukraine (Benoit & Klyukovski, 2006), Taiwan (Benoit, Wen, & Yu, 2007) and Prime ministerial debates in Israel (Benoit & Sheaffer, 2006). Isotalus (2009) also conducted different cultural studies in the Finnish presidential debate analysis. In his research, Isotalus analyzes the form of political campaigns in the Finnish presidential debate that links with Finnish communication culture. The results showed that the Finnish presidential debate was different from the American presidential debate because it was influenced by the strong communication culture of Finland. Sheaffer & Benoit (2006) also carried out similar research in a publication entitled *Functional Theory and Political Discourse: Television debates in Israel and the US*. In this research, functional theory is applied in comparative studies to compare political campaigns in the US and Israel on television debate, the result shows the two countries use more acclamation than attacks. Another research that uses functional theory is Dudek&Partacz (2009) in his publication, which applied functional theory in the parliamentary campaign in Poland in 2007, in his research; he tried to implement functional theory in Polish politics and made comparisons with political debate on Sheaffer& Benoit's research (2006).

The difference between this research and previous research lies on the research data, language culture and instrument analysis. This research will merge two instruments namely functional theory and political discourse analysis (PDA). PDA is concerned with understanding the function of political discourse that plays the role in producing, maintaining, abusing, and resisting power to public, (Chilton, 1985,2004). PDA will be used in analyzing the language function based on political context in debate. Indeed the result will be interpreted as categorization of functional theory including attack, defense, and acclaim. The analysis will be focused on the utterances produced by two candidates in Indonesian presidential election debates 2019.

Since functional theory works effectively in American political culture, it will try to be applied in different culture such as Indonesian political culture. The presidential debate program chosen as field of the study because it included more disputes among candidates than other debates, besides that the presidential debates in Indonesia were comparable to those of other countries. In other hand, this debate was interesting subject for it known by most of Indonesian.

The aim of this article is to describe the characteristics of language function that represent candidate's ideology by applying the functional theory and to critically evaluate the applicability of functional theory in the analysis of Indonesian political debate. The goal is to ascertain the extent to which the theory can be applied in Indonesian presidential debate and to consider what results are obtained by using the theory. By the application of functional theory, it is expected to answer the question

how the categories describe Indonesian presidential debate from the perspective of attack, defense, and acclaim.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Functional Theory

One of the most widely theories utilized in political discourse research is functional theory. William L. Benoit developed the functional theory. The idea has been applied primarily within the study of American presidential campaigns. This theory has considered that political discourse in campaign as an inherent instrument and as a way to convey information in achieving the specified goals to win the election. Functional theory can be an appropriate basis for simplifying the form of political discourse and has proven to be an excellent analytical tool. This theory has been used successfully in various studies and proven practical and able to predict the form of political campaigns. Benoit (2007) considers that one of the advantages of functional theory is that it can categorize statements in more diverse ways than do many others analyzes. Another advantage is using themes as a coding unit.

Benoit (2003; 2007) in his books defines five axioms on which his functional theory is established. They are:

1. Voting may be a comparative act.
2. Candidates must distinguish themselves from opponents.
3. Political campaign messages allow candidates to tell apart themselves.
4. Candidates establish prefer ability through acclaiming, attacking, and defending.
5. Campaign discourse occurs on two topics: policy and character.

For the needs of this paper, only the fourth axiom of functional theory is employed. According to the fourth, the discourse can take just one of three forms: acclaim, attack, and defend accustomed build a public image. Therefore, candidates may use these strategies to realize their goal. The strategies are including: (1) candidates can recognize their positive characteristics or their policy position. (2) Candidates can attack their opponents by weakening the opponent's policy position. A successful attack is increasing the charisma by mitigating the desires of the opponents. If the candidate decides to reply to the attack, he will make a defense. (3) Defense may be a strategy to try to prevent accusations or criticisms that can bring down the speaker's self-image. (Benoit & Hartcock 1999; Benoit et al. 2003; Benoit 2007).

There are hypothesis toward the utilization of three functions of acclaim, attack, and defend within which likely occurring in numerous frequencies. The idea makes two predictions about the function within the political discourse. First, it is expected that candidates will use acclamation more often than attacks. Second, candidates will use attacks more often than defense (Benoit 2007). This prediction has also received support from several studies that have been conducted (Benoit et al. 1999; 2003; 2005).

2.2 Political Discourse Analysis (PDA)

Politics is viewed as the practices that some parties should resolve clashes of interest over power, influence, liberty, and so on. As Jones et al. (1994:5) in Van Dijk (1997) argues that the politics orientation is between 'micro and macro'. [a] At the micro level there are conflicts of interest, struggle for dominance and efforts at co-operation between individuals, between genders, and social groups. [b] the macro level there are various techniques to induce its own way on persuasion, rational argument, irrational strategies, threats, entreaties, bribes, manipulation anything which may be worked in analytical way, and check out to supply some answers to the question of what may be an adequate way of 'doing' political discourse analysis (PDA). The current article associated with macro level since presidential debate using many strategies like candidate using language styling to influence public, to threats opponent, to govern situation or fact in achieving the position and getting power.

PDA focused on the analysis of 'political discourse'. Political discourse means the unity of verbal communication bearing on the matter of political interest among politicians. The broad of studies of political discourse is about the text and talk of professional politicians like presidential debate and other cases like parliament or political parties. The study generally focused on political communication and rhetoric (Bitzer, 1981; Chaffee 1975; Graber 1981; Swanson & Nimmo of political 1990). Political communication could be a speech event between people for political purposes containing political messages to influence and establish public opinion. Nimmo (2000: 8) says that: "political communication is that the way someone exchanges symbols, gestures, verbal and discourse." Discourse is language in context discuss with language in action both written and spoken. Discourse analysis could be a method to look at language use in politics. PDA can discuss with the analysis of political discourse defined as the text and talk of politicians within overtly political contexts, (van Dijk, 1996). PDA, then, is anxious with understanding the function of political discourse that plays the role in discourse.

In this present paper, PDA will be used as analytical tools which focused on analyzing how language acts in creating ideology by the candidates in presidential debate. Meanwhile, FT is applied to look at the proceeds of PDA's analysis through prefer ability act of acclamation, attack and defense. Research into politics of language and language ideology focused on identifying and critiquing any sets of beliefs about language uttered by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use' (Silverstein 1979: 193). As in the political debate, candidate produced utterances representing their thought affirm to ideology by means of language usage. Language Ideology in debates explores what Blommaert (1999) identifies how are language ideologies inherit being; why some ideologies become dominant at al. marginalized; and therefore the relationships between language ideologies and political developments. PDA concerning linguistic framework for examining the intricacies of political thought and behavior such work is anxious with understanding the language practices through political speakers "inspire their utterances with evidence, authority, and truth" and, thereby, achieve

legitimacy specifically political contexts. Those might be linked to Benoit's functional theory (FT) for it takes account onto political campaign that focused on language usage.

2.3 Indonesian Presidential Debate

Debate referred in this study is a political debate, it can be described as an activity of exchange the ideas and arguments by maintaining candidate's vision-mission based on concepts and views, attitudes and personal considerations between candidates. The Presidential debate in Indonesia is a series of debate activities in presenting vision and mission and competing arguments that held toward general election. Through presidential debate, politicians produce argument and employ political speech that may affect to the opponent and audiences. Debate may refer as political communication. Gazali explained that political communication in elections include: (1) Communication contains messages and images (impressions); (2) Information (any policies that benefit voters when choosing a candidate), and (3) Public image (strengthening the impression or memory that a candidate will indeed carry out what he promised). Political communication in debate is a competition to provide information about candidate policies that are benefit to voters and create an image embedded in the memory of voters that a candidate will carry out his promises more than the opponent is.

According to Indonesian Constitution, the President is elected for a term of five years. The President elected by a direct vote. The occasion of Indonesian debate is two parties came face to face as candidates in a prepared podium. If one of the candidates receives more than half of the votes cast in the election, he or she elected to be President.

Participants in 2019 presidential election debate consisted of incumbent President JokoWidodo with vice-presidential candidate Ma'ruf Amin and presidential candidate Prabowo Subiyanto with vice-presidential candidate Sandiaga Uno. The debate series consists of five segments, each segment consisting of six rounds. Topic debates include governance issues in the fields of law, human rights, economics, social, social education and other issues related to government policies. The debate took place on January 17 - April 13, 2019.

Presidential debate in Indonesia has followed the same trend as in other democracies all over the world like America. In Indonesia, the interaction between participants still adheres to Indonesian communication culture in which still consider to the politeness. Additionally, moderator organizes turns taking between candidates; hence, candidates have the same opportunity in delivering speech and responding to the question. They are not being able to interrupt each other because the turn taking is managed. Candidates supposed have different communication styles. Prabowo's communication style was more colloquial and characterized by rapid turn taking. Jokowi, by contrast, has characterized by indirect formulation and hesitation in verbal style.

3. Methodology

In the present paper, author employed qualitative method in conducting the research. Qualitative method is used to analyze language systematically, objectively that view all types of messages produced as texts that cannot be separated from the speaker's interests, (Kriyantono, 2006). In this research, authors intended to describe language usage on candidates' debate based on the functional approach and political discourse analysis approach that presented in the form of words or sentences.

The subject in this research was two candidates debate namely Prabowo Subiyanto and Joko Widodo. The source of research data is a visual recording of prime presidential election debates 2019. Data taken for sample were utterances produced by candidates in the prime of presidential election debate. Series of debates used as data sources consists of four debate segments including the question and answer segment and responding to statements from moderators regarding government issues and policies. Data selected as sample are 36 utterances in the form of phrase, clause and sentences. Data that have been selected contained meanings of political interest based on the discourse context.

The methods in collecting data in this study were documentation, observation and note-taking technique (Sudaryanto, 2015). Data obtained by following stages, first, researchers downloaded video debate from YouTube. Then, researchers watched the video recording of debate to make observation accompanied by taking note in making transcription. The instruments used to gather the data included computer device, internet data, file note and external memory. Authors used computer device along with the internet data to download and to observe the video recording of presidential debate. File note was used to make transcription. External memory is used to save downloaded video debate.

After the data have been collected in the form of text, it took several stages in analyzing data: the first stage was identifying each utterance based on context of political purposes. The second, data processing, researchers clustered the utterances based on thematic functions: acclamation, attack, and defense (Benoit et al. 2003; Benoit 2007). Functional theory is applied to prove the political language as function in doing politics through those three functions. The next is the data analysis; researchers describe the data by interpreting language function using PDA's approach by Chilton (2004). This approach used to identify how language used as an ideology for political interest. The final stage was drawing conclusion.

4. Result

This section shows the finding based on data analysis according to the main functions of functional theory in the prime of presidential debate. Each candidate gets the same turn of speech to produce answer or arguments that leads by moderator. The total numbers of utterances that clustered to be analyzed by functional theory were 36 turns. Those produced by two candidates. The total of turns showed in the table 1 below:

Table: 1 the total of turns

| Functions | Prabowo (PS) | Jokowi (JW) |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| Attack | 11 | 4 |
| Defense | 4 | 8 |
| Acclaims | 5 | 4 |
| Total | 20 | 16 |

The table 1 shows that the most common turns produced were attacks, followed by defenses and then acclaims. The candidates Prabowo Subiyanto (PS) and JokoWidodo (JW) used the turns differently. PS's turns was dominant, particularly on attacks, and followed by acclaims and then defenses. The defenses coded respectively by attack from JW. Thus, the turns produced by JW the most dominant were defense; it was not proportional with the attacks that he received. Moreover, acclaims were produced almost the same by two candidates which only has one deviation. In this debate, PS used general goals eleven times to attack, four times to defend and five times to acclaim. JW used general goals four times to attack, eight times to defend and four times to acclaim.

Through qualitative analysis, we will consider classifying of the categories of attack, defense and acclaim then provide the brief analysis on language role in political interest using PDA approach. The analysis will show how politicians use language ideology by examining the impact of culture on linguistic and social behavior, contradiction, and contention between different ideologies among candidates. It's the means by which politicians assert, produce, maintain, and resist positions of authority, claims of legitimating (Chilton 2004: 4).

Attacks

The categories of attack indicate that candidates expressing disagreement or criticism for weakening the opponent's policy position (Benoit 2007). In this debate, the turns categorized as attack stated by PS formulated as *criticism, judgment, hint, on behalf others* and the attack stated by JW formulated as *statement referring to a case and comparing*. The discussion shown in the following examples:

Extract (1)

Yang kita temukan ada perasaan di masyarakat, bahwa kadang kadang aparat itu berat sebelah. Sebagai contoh kalua ada kepala daerah yang mendukung paslon no 01 itu, itu menyatakan dukungan tidak apa-apa. Tapi ada kepala desa JawaTimur menyatakan dukungan kepada kami, sekarang ditahan pak, ditangkep. (PS)

What we found there was a sense in the community, that sometimes the authorities were biased. For example, if a regional head supports candidate no 01 does not matter. Nevertheless, a village head in East Java expressed his support for us, and is now imprisoned. (PS)

The turn on extract (1) expressed as *criticism* through JW's governance that speaker claims it was unfair to the community. Speaker's argument may affect of weakening the opponent's position. The attack stated by adding examples of cases there considered unfair toward PS's supporters. The statement is kind of attack that he resist and might threaten debate's opponents who is the current government leader.

Extract (2)

Jadi kalau kami menilai bahwa perlu ada langkah-langkah yang lebih praktis, konkret, dan segera. Sebagai contoh bagaimana bisa seorang gubernur gajinya hanya Rp 8 juta. Jadi ini hal-hal yang tidak realistis. (PS)

Therefore, if we assess that it needs steps that are more practical, concrete, and immediate. As an example: how was the wage of governor only 8 million, it was things that are not realistic. (PS)

Extract (2) shows a *judgment* that resists the opponent by evaluating the incumbent government leader considered not worthy in the case of official wage. The speaker argues that current administration considered impractical and needs more efficient steps and innovation. He also employed an example of giving a negative impression about the salary of the governor that is considered too low and unrealistic.

Extract (3)

Jadi saya kira seorang kepala pemerintah, eksekutif, kalau benar-benar niat memperbaiki itu, kita harus segera berani melakukan terobosan-terobosan supaya penghasilan para pejabat public itu sangat besar. (PS)

Therefore, I think a head of government, executive, if we really have an intention to improve it, we must immediately dare to make breakthroughs, so that the income of public officials is large. (PS)

Extract (3) is PS's statement that shows a *hint*. The phrase "if there is really intention" refers to the speakers who indirectly said that the current head of government has no desire to fix the policy problem regarding the wage of officials who are deemed to be lacking and did not want to make changes. The speaker claims legitimization to make a change the authority.

Extract (4)

...tapi juga sekarang masyarakat juga menilai beberapa yang Bapak tadi banggakan, justru yang menunjukkan suatu kerugian-kerugian besar bagi kepentingan bangsa dan rakyat. (PS)

... but now *the community is also judge* some things that you were proud of, precisely those which show a great loss to the benefit of the nation and people. (PS)

Extract (4) refers to the statement that against debate opponent *on behalf others* by saying, "the community also judges", in this case, the speaker has used the name of community as self-rhetoric as if the community gave criticism and evaluation if there was a big loss related to the official has chosen by the incumbent President. It

can be said that on behalf the community is one strategy in attacking opponents, in this case the speaker maintaining his prestige as that the statement expressed by community and not by the speaker himself.

Extract (5)

Tapi menurut ICW, partai yang Bapak pimpin termasuk yang terbanyak mencalonkan mantan koruptor atau mantan napi korupsi. Yang saya tahu caleg itu yang tanda tangan adalah ketua umum, berarti Pak Prabowo yang tanda tangan. Bagaimana Bapak menjelaskan mengenai hal ini? (JW)

Nevertheless, according to ICW, the party that you lead is among the most nominating ex-corruptors or ex-convicts of corruption. What I know is the legislative candidate is signed by the chairperson, means you makes the signature. How do you explain this? (JW)

Extract (5) is kind of attack formulated as question that refers to a case in which ex-corruptor being accepted as a candidate for party members. JW asked the decision that PS made by giving permission to ex-corruptors as party members, as it is known legally that a person who has been entangled in crime cases have a bad social track records, therefore JW claims to PS for this case to be explained.

Extract (6)

...tetapi bahwa apa yang sudah di akui tadi kalau boleh bandingkan mohon maaf misalnya di cabinet saya. Saat saya membentuk kabinet, ada 9 menteri perempuan yang menempati tempat-tempat strategis. (JW)

... but what has been admitted before, excuse, if it may compare with my cabinet for example. When I formed the cabinet, there were 9 women as ministers who occupied strategic position. (JW)

Extract (6) refers to the assertion of attacks by *comparing* gender equality, in which the inclusion of women in the governance system. JW compared the female members of PS's party that does not include female whereas PS had said in his vision to prioritize gender equality; therefore, JW questioned this as an attack by comparing the system currently lead by JW that involved several women in the government system.

Defense

The turns refer to defense are responses to assault attack. Candidates have tried to defend from attack they received. The statement of defense was over dominant stated by JW who received many attacks. The defense produced by candidate Prabowo (PS) is *arguing* and *denial*. Moreover, defense stated by Jokowi (JW) includes *resist*, *denial* and *transforming*. The discussion shown in the following example:

Extract (7)

Jadi mantan korupsi, saya kira, pelajari, ini demokrasi Pak. Kita umumkan kerakyat ..., kalau kasus itu sudah melalui proses, dia sudah dihukum. Kalau

memang hukum mengizinkan kalau dia masih dianggap, masih bisa, dan rakyat menghendaki dia karena dia punya kelebihan-kelebihan lain, mungkin korupsinya juga enggak seberapa. (PS)

So, ex-corruption, I think and learned, this is democracy, Sir. We announce it to public...if the case has been processed, he has already been punished. Indeed, if the law allowing if he is still considered, he still could do, and the public want him because he has other merits, and maybe the corruption is also not much. (PS)

Extract (7) shows a defense for attack questioned by JW about PS nominated Ex-corruptors as party members. PS defends himself by *arguing* that it was a democracy. On behalf of the public, the people choose him as party members. The defense is then followed by a denial; PS said that the person who has ever been convicted has other merits. His argument maintains the ideology to hedge off a case that he has ever made.

Extract (8)

Ya jangan menuduh seperti itu Pak Prabowo, karena kita ini adalah Negara hukum, ada prosedur hukum,...Kalau ada bukti, sampaikan aja ke aparat hukum..., kalau ada bukti, Lho ini Negara hukum, kalau ada bukti-bukti, silakan lewat mekanisme hukum. (JW)

Please do not accuse like that Sir because we are a state of law, there are legal procedures. If there is a proof, just tell to the authority..., if there is evidence, you know, this is a state of law, if there are evidences, please finished by legal mechanism (JW)

On extract (8), JW shows a defense that *resists* the attack question related to the “supporter case” mentioned in previous attack in which the PS raised that the authorities were unfair. The community was detained if they support PS. In this case, JW stated his defense by refusing that if there was a violation or discrimination to a certain community or group, or there was an injustice committed by the authority, JW resisted by allowing the PS to report cases to authoritarian related to violence. JW resisted PS's statement that it is considered irrational case.

Extract (9)

Saya tidak setuju apa yang tadi disampaikan oleh Pak Prabowo. Karena kita tahu gaji ASN kita, PNS kita saat ini menurut saya cukup. Dengan tambahan tunjangan kinerja yang sudah besar. (JW)

I disagree with what was said by Pak Prabowo. Because we know our ASN salary, our civil servants currently are enough with the addition of a large performance allowance. (JW)

Extract (9) refers to defense stated by JW in the form of *denial*. The turn shows the denial of the PS's attack that refers to the salaries of officials that PS considers unrealistic. Whereas, JW as the incumbent government leader maintaining his

argument that ASN's salaries are sufficient since they still receive allowance so that JW stated disagreement if ASN's salaries are considered too small.

Extract (10)

Saya akan lakukan revisi-revisi Undang-Undang yang menghambat berkembangnya UKM-UKM kita. Kita akan revisi banyak sekali Undang-Undang yang tidak pro pada investasi, kita juga akan perbaiki aparat-aparat ... (JW)

I will revise the Law, which stop the development of our SMEs. We will revise many laws that are not pro-investment; we will also want to improve securities ... (JW)

Extract (10) shows as defense by JW that refers to an act of transformation from the attack question related to the law in which considered overlapping by the debate's opponent. JW made a defense by stated that he wants to make a change or improvement that is to revise the law, which blocked the development of SMEs. JW asserts his idea by showing the desire to transform that will make changes the law to be better.

Extracts (7-10) are the statement of defense from the previous attack. PS produced defense was equal with attacks he received. However, JW produced fewer defense than attacks he obtained. The defense is the effect of the attack to restore good image that was attacked (Benoit & Hartcock 1999; Benoit et al. 2003; Benoit 2007). In this case, JW's public image was treated since he received many attacks and he did not do in balance with defense he made.

Acclaims

Turns that refer to the function of acclaims are statements containing positive meaning or favor of speakers that can cause the audience giving acceptance or a kind of praise. The acclamation is stated almost the same frequency by each candidate. PS's acclaims were statement of promotion on *welfare* and *safety*. While the acclamation stated by JW includes *improvement* and *hospitality*. The discussion shown as in the following example:

Extract (11)

Untuk itu Prabowo-Sandi, manakala kita yang memimpin pemerintahan, kita akan benar-benar investasi besar-besaran dalam pendidikan, dalam kesehatan. Untuk membantu rakyat yang paling bawah, rakyat paling miskin. Kita akan bantu pesantren-pesantren, guru-guru di mana-mana harus kita perbaiki kapasitasnya. (PS)

For Prabowo-Sandi, if we lead the government, we will truly invest heavily in education, in health to help the lowest, the poorest people. We will help Islamic boarding schools, for teachers in everywhere; we have to improve its capacity. (PS)

The turn on extract (11) shows the acclamation in the form of promotion for *welfare* by saying that when a pair of candidates PS is won the election, it will prioritize the

welfare in the sector of health and education for the people in all groups. With the promotional statement about good programs for Indonesian, it may have effect of hegemony to the community in which they will give praise to the speaker related to the work planning he stated.

Extract (12)

Saya akan meningkatkan investasi di bidang polisi, intelijen, dan angkatan bersenjata, angkatan perang kita harus kita perkuat. Supaya kita bisa tahan, kita bias mendahului, mencegah terorisme. (PS)

I will increase the investment of police, intelligence and armed forces. We must strengthen our army. So that we can maintain, we can go ahead preventing terrorism. (PS)

Extract (12) is a PS's statement that refers to acclaims for he shows his positive effort to public. His turn contains the promotion in which the speaker will increase investment in the security sector. The promotion will increase safety and prevent terrorism. This may affect the memory of the listener as Indonesian who think will be saved when the candidate is being elected.

Extract (13)

Saya melihat bahwa paradigma terhadap kaum disabilitas disini sudah berubah... Pemerintah kita sudah memberikan fasilitas-fasilitas saat ini, untuk pangan hal itu baik, hak untuk pekerjaan untuk perumahan untuk fasilitas umum yang ramah terhadap disabilitas.(JW)

I see that the paradigm for people with disabilities here has changed ... Our government currently has provided facilities, for food, the right for a job, for housing, for public facilities that are kind for disability. (JW)

Extract (13) refers to the acclamation. Speaker shows his success that he was able to improve the condition of people with disabilities such as giving kind of facilities. His statement shows *improvement* to the public that there is a positive result for the current President. The people may acclaim for the case of disability that there are change and progress through JW's leadership.

Extract (14)

... kita harapkan kita bias memangkas politik uang, bisa memangkas suap, bisa memangkas korupsi, dan kita bisa mendapatkan pejabat-pejabat publik yang memiliki integritas, yang memiliki kapasitas yang baik. (JW)

We hope that we can cut money politics, can cut bribes, can cut corruption, and we can obtain public officials who have integrity, who have good capacity. (JW)

Extract (14) shows acclaims that speaker produces positive statement that has to plan and minimize fraud such as bribery, corruption and other money politics. It such *improvement* that the condition to be better. On the other hand, the audiences

are suggested to give a positive response to the speaker and assume that the speaker has integrity in leading the government to make a better rule and life.

Extract (15)

Asset terbesar bangsa ini adalah kerukunan. Oleh sebab itu saya mengajak marilah kita menjaga ukhuwah terbesar bangsa yang kitacintai ini. (JW)

The greatest asset of this nation is harmony; therefore, I invite all to maintain the biggest communion of our beloved nation. (JW)

On extract (15), JW's turn refers to acclaims. JW has shown *hospitality* indicated by the phrase "I invite all" which means an invitation to all Indonesian people for the purpose of communion and harmony. His turn shows the familiarity between speakers and public in maintaining his prestige as the President. People will positively acclaim for the hospitality expressed through stimulus way.

Extracts (11-15) are example of acclamation with brief discussion. Candidates express positive reinforcement to the audience's memory that they will proof what he uttered. Candidates admitted their positive characteristics to get compliment from the public (Benoit, 2007).

5. Discussion

In the present paper, the functional theory was applied to the Indonesian presidential debate. The analysis focused especially on the fourth axiom of functional theory. The fourth axiom states "candidates establish prefer ability through acclaiming, attacking, and defending". The main functions predicted by functional theory, may be inherent in the electoral situation. Candidates for elective party must persuade voters that they are preferable to their opponents, and these three functions are the means of achieving this goal. Functional theory predicts that general goals will be used more often acclaim than attack (Benoit 2007). The theory has two predictions about the frequencies of three main functions: candidates will use acclaims more frequently than attacks and political candidates will use attacks more frequently than defenses. The prediction has been proven on the previous research conducted by Benoit at all in American campaign debate. In most cases, the categories of the theory were applicable to the turns in the debate, but not all- although the categories were understood in a broad sense however only applicable in a part, it be seen from the study in Finnish debate.

As the result of the Finnish debate campaign (Carbaugh 1995; Sallinen-Kuparinen 1986), the frequency of these functions was thus completely opposite to what the theory predicts. The result showed that direct attacking and acclaims are rare and the large number of defenses occurs, it was because the role of the moderators is active. They ask the candidates tricky questions therefore; the candidates have to defend themselves when answering these questions. It was supported by the Finnish communication culture that has also been described as listener centered (Sallinen-Kuparinen 1986) and oriented toward matters of fact (Wilkins 2005), which means that a speaker would not emphasize him-/herself as an intelligent instead of that issues are regarded as more important than the speaker in public situations. This, in

turn, may explain why acclaims are so rare. In Finnish culture, attacks done by indirect statements to those who do not refer to something clear (Isotalus, 2011: 38).

The styles of Indonesian presidential debate indeed almost the same with the Finnish debate but not completely the same. We did not employ the role of moderator involved in the analysis in Indonesian debate, instead; we focused on comparison between candidates. The application of functional theory in Indonesian debate however, the frequency of these main functions was partly opposite to what the theory predicts. It seems obvious that acclaims used so rare and attacks used more only by one candidate. It can be because the communication culture has mighty influence on language usage on debates since Indonesian's culture direct attacking and praising of oneself often avoided. The primary function of communication in Indonesian culture fundamentally that is to maintain harmony, and conflicts generally avoided.

In the debate analyzed, both candidates used attacks and defense differently, however acclaims used almost the same. PS produced attack more frequently than defenses and acclaims are so rare. While, JW produced mostly defenses and the frequency of attacks and acclaims are equally. Further, the theory takes for granted that all defenses are caused by the attacks of other candidates. It was in line with the result in the Indonesian debate that a great deal of the candidates' defenses were responses to the attacks from the debate's opponent. On the other hand, one candidate showed the result in line with the theory predict that is candidates use attacks more frequently than defenses whereas it was opposite with the debate opponent that he used less attack than defense. Further, the theory predicts that the ideals will be used more often to acclaim than to attack, it was applicable only by one candidate in Indonesian debate.

We would also note another finding that has similar result from earlier studies (e.g., Benoit & Sheafer 2006; Lee & Benoit 2005) in American and Israel debates that the incumbents defend more than their opponent does. In both countries, the challengers attack more than the incumbents do. The challengers attack the incumbents more than incumbents attack challengers means that incumbents have more opportunities and more motivation to defend than challengers. In Indonesian debate, a challenger candidate (PS) used attacks more than the incumbent did (JW), nevertheless JW used defense less than attacks he received. One-reason of incumbents did less defense that is the fact during his regime, only the incumbent has a record on political policy in the office. Interestingly, the record of the incumbent has a role as political tool. The incumbent's successes in manifestation a lot of positive changes in the development and welfare makes him confident that may support authority to public, and therefore he did less of attacks and defense than the challenger did. He also made less acclamation since what he had done further as incumbent has proven not only by speech but also by proving that the public welfare and infrastructure are developed well than before. He also made minimize attack as possible strategy in politics, in which from the previous election debate he won the election. The possibility is which Indonesian people did not see the speech ability but they look more to the fact, as already happened who actually received many attacks he is

elected. Meanwhile, PS did many attacks for his opportunity to critic the current government related to cases or things from the negative point of view. It might be to show his power to achieve attention from public by giving criticisms that seems to have a negative effect on the opponents. PS produces the same frequency of defense toward attacks he received, due to he needs to restore positive image from the attacks he received that may have negative impression to public. Indeed this also shows his desire to strengthen his ideology.

Political debates in Indonesia emphasize policy over character. The Indonesian thought that policy is more important determinant of vote than character. It can be seen from analysis of electoral behavior in previous Indonesian election indicated that policy has a larger impact than evaluations of the candidates speech. It indicated by the incumbent candidate (JW) when he won election. Eventually, the present results do not support the theory's predictions since the accuracy of prediction is applicable only a part.

6. Conclusion

The functional theory was applicable in the political regime in the America and Israel. In both Israeli and American debates, the candidates tended to use general goals more as the basis for acclaims than attacks. Indeed, in both American and Israeli debates, incumbents acclaim more, and attack less than challengers attack. Yet this theory was not applicable in Finnish debate that is exactly by contrast. It shown that defense mostly used whereas attacks and acclaims are rare. Indonesian debate in fact, the categories of functional theory did work partly, however the predictions of the theory did not absolutely functioned. In the analysis of Indonesian presidential debate both of candidates did not use as ideals as the prediction of functional theory did. Only one candidate corresponds to the second prediction of the theory that is attacks used more than acclaims and challenger attacks more than incumbent but acclaims and defense less than challenger does. These differences were significant for the application of the theory broadly. In conclusion, functional theory can be used as an instrument for analyzing Indonesian political debate even though the results were not precisely equal with the prediction. Nevertheless, this theory can be as a starting point for intercultural research since speech culture has a strong influence on persons' communication. Despite of the theory has been tested in research from many countries; this theory still needs further development.

References

- A , S., Munaris, & Fuad, M. (2015). Aspek kebahasaan Jokowi pada debat calon Presiden dan kegunaannya dalam pembelajaran. *Kata*.
- Benoit , W., & Sheaffer, T. (2006). Functional Theory and Political Discourse:Televised Debates in Israeland the United States. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83(2): 281-297.
- Benoit, W. (2007). *Communicationin Political Campaigns*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Benoit, W., & D, A. (2005). A Functional Analysis of American Vice Presidential Debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 41: 225-236.

- Benoit, W., & Klyukovski, A. (2006). A Functional Analysis of 2004 Ukrainian Presidential Debates. *Argumentation*, 20:209-225.
- Benoit, W., & Lee, C. (2005). A Functional Analysis of the 2002 Korea Presidential Debates. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 15, 115-132.
- Benoit, W., McHale, J., Hansen, G., Pier, P., & McGuire, J. (2003). Campaign 2000. A Functional Analysis of Presidential Campaign Discourse. *Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield*.
- Benoit, W., Wen, W.-C., & Yu, T.-H. (2007). A Functional Analysis of 2004 Taiwanese Political Debates. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 17(1), 24-39.
- Bitzer, L. (1981). Political rhetoric. In D.D. Nimmo, & K.R. Sanders eds, Handbook of political communication. *Beverly Hills, CA: Sage*, 225-248.
- Blommaert, J., & Verschueren, J. (1992). The role of language in European nationalist ideologies. *Pragmatics*, 2(3), 355-375.
- Chaffee, S. (ed. 1975). Political communication. *Beverly Hills, CA, Sage*.
- Chilton, P. (1985). *Words, Discourse and Metaphors: The Meanings of Deter, Deterrent and Deterrance* In P. Chilton ed, *Language and the Nuclear Arm Debate: Nuke speak Today*. London: Pinter.
- Dudek, P., & Partacz, S. (2009). Functional theory of political discourse. Televised debates during the parliamentary campaign in 2007 in Poland. *Central European Journal of Communication*.
- Effendy. (1989). *Kamus Komunikasi*. Bandung: PT. Mandar Maju.
- Gazali. (n.d.). *Strategi Komunikasi Politik Memenangkan Hati Publik*.
- Graber, D. (1981). Political Languages In: D.D. Nimmo, K.R. Sanders (eds). Handbook of Political Communication. *Beverly Hills, CA: Sage*, 195-223.
- Harthcock, A., & Benoit, W. (1999). Functions of the Great Debates: Accalims, Attacks, Defenses in the 1960 Presidential Debates. *Communication Monographs*, 66:341-357.
- Isolatus, P. (2011). Analyzing Presidential Debate Functional Theory and Finnish Political Culture. *Nordicom Review*, 32(1), 31-43.
- Kriyantono, R. (2006). *Teknik Praktis Riset Komunikasi*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Leiliyanti, Diyantari, & Irawaty. (2017). Transcoding Wacana Konstruksi dan Kontestasi Citra Jokowi dan Prabowo dalam Media Sosial pada masa Kampanye Pilpres 2014. *Mozaik Humaniora*, 192-213.
- Nimmo, D. (2001). *Komunikasi Politik: Khalayak dan Efek*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Silverman, M. (1991). *Race, discourse and power in France*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa (Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik)*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Swanson, D., & Nimmo, D. (1990). *New directions in political communication: are source book*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. (1996). *Discourse, power and access*. In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (eds) *Texts and Practices. Reading in Critical Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Viljanen, J. (2019). *Interrupting and overlapping in the US presidential debates-comparative study: MA thesis, 72, 1 app.* . English Language Specialist Path, University of Turku.

Sources from internet:

<https://tirto.id/transkrip-lengkap-debat-perdana-pilpres-2019>

<http://youtube/debatpilpres2019>