



# AN ANALYSIS OF SATIRICAL EXPRESSION USED IN THE 2024 WEST SUMATRA GUBERNATORIAL DEBATE

Nadhira Dwi Prastiwi<sup>1,\*</sup>, Andry Azhari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>*Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing Prayoga, Padang 25157, Indonesia*

---

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Keyword 1: Satire

Keyword 2: Satirical  
Expression

Keyword 3: Debate

Keyword 4: Gubernatorial  
Debate

---

### Article History:

Received : 30/11/2025

Revised : 10/12/2025

Accepted : 19/12/2025

Available Online:

29/12/2025

---

## ABSTRACT

Satire is an expression or sentence used to indirectly mock someone or something. This study aims to find out the types of satirical expressions used in the 2024 West Sumatra Gubernatorial Debate. This is due to the fact that the opponents of the West Sumatra Gubernatorial Debate often used satirical expressions during the debate session. The satire utterances were classified based on the theory of Abrams and Harpham (2015), which divides satire into two types: direct (Horatian and Juvenalian) and indirect (Menippean). This study was qualitative descriptive and collected the data by using non-participant observation. The data were analyzed using the intralingual padan method, which involves form testing and context testing. The data were taken from the transcription of the 2024 West Sumatra Gubernatorial Debate. The debate for the election was held twice. This research found all types of satire in the 2024 West Sumatra Gubernatorial Debate. There are 47 data of satire which 17 categorized as Horatian, 25 categorized as Juvenalian, and 5 categorized as Menippean satire. These findings indicate that satire functioned not only as a rhetorical strategy but also as a form of verbal attack in the context of political campaigns and also to undermine opponents' capabilities

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Satire is an expression or sentence used to directly or indirectly mocks someone or something, usually to convey criticism, ridicule, or a specific message conveyed indirectly or implicitly. Satire is usually found in the form of sentences, speeches, or even images, and its purpose is to convey a message subtly or to mock it in a non-offensive way. Satire is the literary technique of mocking or diminishing a subject by rendering it ridiculous and eliciting feelings of entertaining, disgust, derision, or anger (Abrams & Harpham, 2015). Besides its form and purpose, satire has various functions in different contexts, including everyday interactions. Satire has various functions and is often used by humans in various situations, including in everyday conversation. In the context of entertainment, media, and interpersonal communication, satire acts as a means to subtly criticize sensitive issues without causing confrontation. One example is the television program Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC). Although ILC is a serious discussion program that discusses political and legal issues, for some viewers, its debate style, filled with rhetoric, attacks between sources, and dramatization of topics, indirectly creates a satirical effect on the world of politics itself. In addition, satire can also appear in the political field as a way to convey criticism, complaints, or distrust without having to express them explicitly. Satire is often seen in the context of political debates, where the politicians argue with each other with a sharp rhetorical style. In situations like this, satire allows someone to satirize or mock in a more subtle way, but st

ill hits the target. Sometimes the style of political debate actually becomes the subject of satire itself, especially when the debate emphasizes personal conflict more than the substance of the issue being discussed. Through its creative delivery style, satire opens up space to express disagreement or introduce alternative points of view in a way that is more acceptable to society. The use of satire in politics is becoming increasingly important because of its ability to influence public perception. Satire in the political field is considered a powerful tool to shape public opinion (Jones, 2010). Satire can be found in political competitions, where candidates often use satire as a communication strategy to influence voters' views. In political debates, satire becomes a means to encourage public belief and thinking in the political field through subtle but effective satire.

Satire does not merely entertain or ridicule; it can also have significant social and political consequences. It may influence public perception, reinforce or challenge political ideologies, and affect a candidate's public image. In some cases, well-delivered satire can shape electoral outcomes by amplifying criticism in a way that resonates with voters. Additionally, satire may provoke public discourse, encourage critical thinking, or even incite controversy, depending on how audiences interpret it.

The election of regional heads is one of the pillars of democracy that provides an opportunity for the public to elect leaders who are considered capable of managing the government effectively. In the election process, political debate is an important aspect that helps voters evaluate the capacity and credibility of the candidates. The debate is not only a place to compete for ideas, work programs, visions, and missions, but also a battleground for arguments, where each candidate tries to build a positive image while showing the weaknesses of their opponents in front of the public.

In the context of political debate, satire can be an effective tool for candidates to subtly attack opponents without appearing too aggressive. The use of satire can also reflect a candidate's rhetorical ability and linguistic intelligence in responding to developing issues. The example of the use of satire in politics can be seen in the 2024 regional head elections debate, especially in the election of the Governor of West Sumatra. In this debate, the candidate pairs for governor of West Sumatra often used satire as a communication strategy to attack their political opponents.

This research is important to understand how satire functions as a political communication tool in the 2024 gubernatorial debate, as well as the types of satire used. This research not only contributes to the field of linguistics and political communication, but also offers insight into the dynamics of political competition in West Sumatra during the gubernatorial election.

Characteristics of satire can be identified through several linguistic and rhetorical strategies as proposed by several experts. The first from Simpson (2003) he stated that there are five characteristics of satire, including: multifunctionality, irony, echoic discourse, pragmatic risk and stylistic and cognitive complexity arises. The second from LeBoeuf (2007), he stated that satire can be recognized through three essential characteristics: critique, irony, and implicitness. The third is Dhyaningrum (2016) explains that satire typically contains irony and tends to be hyperbolic, uses wit or humor, exaggeration, direct statements or quotes, and use special vocabulary. Thus, satire can be identified through indirect language, striking rhetorical strategies, and implicit meanings conveyed through context.

Satire is divided into two types, direct and indirect satire (Abrams & Harpham, 2015). They identified two classic forms of direct satire, namely Horatian satire and Juvenalian satire, then indirect satire, Menippean satire. These three types of satire aim to provoke

thought and self-awareness in their audience. The main difference lies in the tone: Horatian is humorous, Juvenalian is bitter, and Menippean is intellectual and critical. Meanwhile, according to (Holbert, 2011), satire consists of two types: Horatian and Juvenalian. Horatian satire is light, humorous, and gently critical, aiming to entertain while subtly discussing social issues. In contrast, Juvenalian satire is harsh, serious, and more pessimistic, using sharp criticism to expose social weaknesses and injustices, as seen in Saturday Night Live political sketches or the film *Dr. Strangelove*.

The researchers chose Abrams and Harpham's theory because it gives a clear, relevant, and applicable classification framework for analyzing the form and delivery of satire in political debates. (Abrams & Harpham's, 2015) theory is constructive in identifying whether satire is delivered explicitly or implicitly and whether the delivery style is serious or light. This framework follows the focus of this research, which emphasizes the types of satire in direct debate interactions, not their impact on the audience. In contrast, Holbert's theory (2011) emphasizes the function of satire in entertainment media such as television and film, and its influence on public perception of political issues. Although relevant to the research of satire in modern mass media, Holbert's approach is less appropriate for analyzing the structure and delivery methods of satire in oral political debates. In conclusion, Abrams & Harpham's theories are chosen because they are more appropriate for studying political discourse directly and in depth through the approach of satirical language forms and styles.

Several studies such as Altamimi (2024), Dewi Puspita et al. (2019), Brock (2018), and Sitti Rahma et al. (2023) have analyzed satire in political and media discourse, highlighting its rhetorical power. The four previous researches have shown that satire in political discourse functions as a strategic rhetorical tool used by politicians to indirectly criticize and undermine political opponents, and can shape public perception. However, compared to previous research, this research provides a different perspective by highlighting the use of satirical expressions in the context of political debates, especially in the 2024 West Sumatra gubernatorial candidate debate. This research contributes to the broadening understanding in the research of satire as a rhetorical tool to convey criticism in political discourse. By referring to (Abrams & Harpam's, 2015) theory, this research analyzes how these forms of satire are used by candidates to attack, satirize, or underestimate debate opponents. This research seeks to show how satire is used strategically in direct political debate situations as a form of covert or explicit attack on political opponents.

Using (Abrams & Harpham's, 2015) classification Horatian, Juvenalian, and Menippean this study identifies and analyzes satirical utterances delivered by candidates during the debate. This research contributes to linguistic and political discourse analysis by revealing how satire is employed as a strategic and rhetorical device in public political communication.

## **2. RESEARCH METHOD**

This study employed a qualitative descriptive method to identify and classify satirical expressions used in the 2024 West Sumatra Gubernatorial Debate. The researchers used a qualitative descriptive approach because the data in this research did not involve numeric data, and the features of the research were selected based on its objectives. The researchers examined the text of the 2024 Gubernatorial West Sumatra Debate from the

TVRI Sumatera Barat YouTube channel. Therefore, in this research, satire was chosen as the research subject. The data source consists of video recordings and transcripts from two debate sessions broadcast on TVRI Sumatera Barat on November 13 and 19, 2024. The two debate sessions involving the candidate pairs Mahyeldi–Vasko and Epyardi–Ekos were thoroughly analyzed because both contained various satirical expressions that were relevant to the focus of this research. The debate served as a natural and authentic setting in which the language used by the gubernatorial candidates could be observed and analyzed in context.

The researchers used non-participant observation to collect data, applying the Simak Bebas Libat Cakap (SBLC) technique, which involves passive observation of speech events. This technique allowed the researchers to listen carefully to conversations without being involved in the communication process itself. Because the data were taken from videos of public debates, the researchers did not have an active role in the interaction but was still able to observe the speech and the accompanying context in detail. This technique was considered appropriate because it provided the freedom to observe forms of satire naturally, as shown in formal political debates. The data collection steps were carried out as follows. First, the researchers downloaded and repeatedly watched two video recordings of the 2024 West Sumatra Gubernatorial Debates to understand the communication context, including tone, intention, and candidate interaction. Second, the researchers transcribed the debate videos into text to facilitate closer and more detailed analysis. Third, the researchers conducted a preliminary to identify, sort, and roughly determine whether instances of satire were present in the debate videos, based on the general characteristics of satire. In this process, the researchers began to identify sentences containing satirical expressions in the debate transcripts. The analysis was conducted qualitatively to examine how candidates used satire as a rhetorical strategy in conveying criticism and satire toward their political opponents.

For data analysis, the researchers used the *padan intralingual* method as explained by Mahsun (2017). This method was used because the determining tool was still within the language system itself, the internal structure of linguistic units such as meaning, form, context, and utterances. This method was suitable for this research that focused on form and meaning based on context, including in identifying and classifying satirical expressions in political debates. In this research, the *padan intralingual* method was used to interpret how satire was conveyed by each candidate in the 2024 West Sumatra Governor political debate. The researchers analyzed utterances containing satire by examining and considering the context of their used in political interactions.

The analysis was carried out through two main stages: form testing and context testing (Mahsun, 2017). Form testing was used to identify linguistic characteristics that marked an utterance as satire, such as choice of diction, sentence structure, and language style. Meanwhile, context testing was used to understand the meaning of the utterance based on the speech situation, including who was speaking, to whom, under what conditions, and for what purpose the utterance was delivered.

These two stages allowed the researchers to interpret the meaning and communication strategy in delivering satire more comprehensively. After the relevant data were identified, the analysis process was carried out by presenting and explaining in detail the findings in the context of the actual debate discourse. This technique allowed for in depth interpretation of the form and strategy of delivering satire naturally in political debate. The examples of direct quotations from the debate transcript were presented to illustrate how the satirical expression was used in real situations.

Each instance of satire was coded, categorized according to Abrams and Harpham's (2015) framework, and interpreted descriptively. The analysis focuses on how satire functions within the discourse of political debate. In addition, the researchers applied a coding technique as described by (Creswell, 2018), which included reading the data repeatedly to understand the content, marking important phrases, and coding parts of the data that contained elements of satire. This process was carried out to organize the data systematically and assist in grouping types of satire based on the categories of (Abrams & Harpham's theory, 2015) theory. In analyzing the data, the researchers followed several steps of data analysis from Creswell (2018), as in the following:

1. Data Coding

After the satirical utterances were identified, the researchers coded each satirical utterance. Coding organized the data and marked each instance for further classification and analysis.

2. Satire Classification

Based on Abrams and Harpham's (2015) theory, the coded utterances were classified into direct satire (Horatian and Juvenalian) and indirect satire (Menippean). To support this classification, form tests and context tests were applied to analyze the linguistic structure and the contextual meaning of each satirical utterance.

3. Narrative Descriptive Data Interpretation

The researchers interpreted the results descriptively by contextualizing the meaning and context of each satirical utterance in the political debates. This interpretation included identifying the types of satire used and the communicative context in which they occurred.

4. Drawing a conclusion

The final step was to draw conclusions based on the analysis's findings. This stage aimed to answer the research question and summarize the types and uses of satire employed by each candidate during the gubernatorial debate.

### 3. RESULTS

From the analysis, a total of 47 satirical utterances were identified. These include 17 Horatian, 25 Juvenalian, and 5 Menippean satire expressions. Each type of satire served a different rhetorical purpose and reflected the candidate's approach to persuasion.

#### 3.1 Direct Satire

Abrams and Harpham (2015) stated in direct satire, the satiric persona speaks out in the first person; this "I" may address either the reader. In contrast, indirect satire is expressed in a literary form other than the direct form to the reader. In the direct satire category, Abrams & Harpham divide two types of satire: the first is horatian and the second is Juvenalian satire. The researchers found 42 categorized as direct satire, 17 data categorized as Horatian satire and the other 25 data categorized as Juvenalian satire.

##### 3.1.1 Horatian Satire

Horatian satire which is light, humorous, and aims to entertain while satirizing. The characteristics are light, elegant, and sometimes full of great humor. There are 17 data that can be categorized into Horatian satire, the data can be seen from the following data:

Data 2

- (2) **EY** : *Jawabannya cukup bagus, **tetapi jauh dari kenyataan yang kami rasakan di rakyat Sumatera Barat.***  
(The answer is quite good, but far from the reality that we feel as the people of West Sumatera).

From the data 2 that was uttered by EY in response to the explanation of another candidate pair regarding their programs or visions and missions for the people of West Sumatera. In his speech, EY subtly satirize that although the opponent's presentation sounded good in theory, the reality felt by the people of West Sumatera was actually the opposite of what was promised.

The type of satire contained in this utterance is Horatian satire, based on the classification of satire types according to (Abrams & Harpham, 2015). Horatian satire is characterized by the use of soft language, a tone that is not sharply offensive, and a style of delivery that implies mockery in a subtle and humorous way. In this case, EY does not use harsh or angry words, from the EY statement "Jawabannya cukup bagus, tetapi jauh dari kenyataan yang kami rasakan di rakyat Sumatera Barat." is not contain hars word. The assessment that this satire is light is based on several indicators. First, in terms of diction, the phrases used such as "cukup bagus" and "jauh dari kenyataan" indicate criticism, but without elements of insult or confrontation. Second, in terms of tone and context, this utterance was delivered in a formal debate atmosphere, without raising the volume or offending the personal character of the debate opponent.

Data 3

- (3) **MA** : *Apa yang dilakukan oleh Pak EY tadi yang disampaikan, saya kira memang itu bagus dalam retorika, **tapi dalam kenyataannya Solok yang selama ini dipimpin oleh Pak EY itu berada pada nomor 17 dari 19 kabupaten kota di Sumatera Barat, dan maka itu apa yang disampaikan tadi barangkali tidak sesuai dengan kenyataan.***  
(What Pak EY did earlier that was conveyed, I think it was good in rhetoric, but in reality, Solok, which has been led by Pak EY, is ranked 17th out of 19 regencies/cities in West Sumatera, and therefore what was conveyed earlier may not be in accordance with reality).

From the data 3 was explain by MA in response to EY speech which likely praised or highlighted the achievements of the region he led which is Solok Regency, rhetorically in front of the public. MA denied it by mentioning the fact that Solok Regency was actually in 17th position out of 19 regencies in West Sumatera province, a relatively low position. However, MA way of delivering this speech was not harsh and did not attack cynically or rudely, but rather maintained the ethics of polite debate rhetoric.

Based on the satire theory of Abrams & Harpham (2015), this sentence is included in Horatian satire. From the statement "maka itu apa yang disampaikan tadi barangkali tidak sesuai dengan kenyataan" is included in Horatian satire because it contains criticism in a

polite, but it is delivered in a non-rude manner, and non-aggressive form. MA does not corner the opponent in a frontal manner, but inserts responsibility to his opponent in the form of descriptive and neutral sentences. This style of delivery reflects a satire that raises awareness through light criticism, not confrontation. Satire is delivered in a way that allows the opponent to realize their shortcomings without feeling embarrassed in public.

Data 9

(9) VR : *Ya Pak EY, tadi itu kayaknya saya dengar pertanyaannya adalah untuk menggali visi misi Pak EY, tapi dari tadi yang kita dengar tuh hanya narasi-narasi negatif saja. Mudah-mudahan dengan dalam rangka acara hari ini kita bisa menggali lebih apa programnya Pak EY sendainya terpilih, jadi tolong dipelajari lagi Pak EY programnya sendiri.*

(Yes, Pak EY, earlier I think I heard the question was to explore Pak. EY vision and mission, but so far what we have heard is only negative narratives. Hopefully, in the context of today's event, we can explore more about Pak EY program if he is elected, so please study Pak EY own program again).

From the data 9 was stated by VR to subtly satirize EY style of delivery during the debate. Instead of explaining a clear vision and mission for West Sumatra, EY is conveyed too many negative narratives. VR expressed his hope that in the future these programs could be explored more, even implicitly suggesting that EY himself re-examine the programs he was promoting.

This satire was delivered in the form of polite advice, thus reflecting Horatian Satire. From the sentence "jadi tolong dipelajari lagi Pak EY programnya sendiri", VR criticized subtly and used expressions in the form of advice and hopes, although implicitly containing criticism and satire. VR also did not mock his debate opponent, but used subtle satire to show the inconsistency between the expectations of the debate and the reality presented by EY.

Data 12

(12) MA : *Pak EY memang perlu membaca dan perlu melihat data lebih luas lagi, jangan salah persepsi, belum ada kita menyingkirkan masyarakat, belum ada kita menzalimi masyarakat, inilah memang barangkali mungkin Pak EY karena terlalu banyak membaca berita hoax. Izin itu belum keluar sama sekali, kenapa dikatakan sudah ada menzalimi orang, ini yang barangkali mungkin perlu Pak EY pelajari lagi lebih dalam lah.*

(Pak EY really needs to read and needs to see more extensive data, don't misunderstand, we haven't

pushed aside the community, we haven't oppressed the community, this is perhaps because Pak EY reads too much hoax news. The permit hasn't been issued at all, why is it said that people have been oppressed, this is what perhaps Pak EY needs to study more deeply).

From the data 12 was uttered by MA in response to EY statement about the injustice in the issuance of regional government permits. In his response, MA satirize EY by saying that EY might have read too much hoax news so that he had a wrong perception of the real situation. He also said that the permit in question had not been issued at all, so the accusation of community oppression was baseless. In addition, MA emphasized that EY should have been more careful in searching for data and understanding the situation before making a statement in public

This satire was wrapped in a polite delivery style and used light phrases such as "*barangkali*" and "*perlu dipelajari lagi*", which is a characteristic of Horatian Satire because MA did not saying that EY did not know the facts, but instead satirized with phrases such as "*mungkin terlalu banyak membaca berita hoax*" rather than directly attacking EY credibility, MA mocked the situation lightly, suggesting that EY knowledge was shaped by misinformation. His choice of words avoided harsh language and was delivered with a calm tone, reflecting the characteristics of Horatian satire.

The utterance functions as a mild critique intended to highlight EY possible misunderstanding without causing overt offense. Thus, based on its tone, polite diction, and indirect criticism, this statement is appropriately categorized as Horatian satire.

### 3.1.2 Juvenalian Satire

Juvenalian satire is the sharp, hars and more critical. Juvenalian satire was often used to criticize social injustice. There are 25 data that can be categorized into Juvenalian satire, the data can be seen in the following:

Data 1

- (1) **EY** : ***Pak, bapak jawabannya benar, tetapi kenyataannya jauh panggang dari api. Mengingat selama ini retorika yang bapak lakukan, mohon maaf itu menyebabkan banyak orang-orang bapak yang tersangkut dengan baik kepolisi maupun kejaksaan, bahkan sampai saat ini orang-orang bapak sudah banyak yang terpidana dan juga dalam persidangan.***  
(Pak, your answer is correct, but the reality is far from the truth. Considering the rhetoric that you have been doing, sorry that this has caused many of your people to be involved with both the police and the prosecutor's office, and even now many of your people have been convicted and are also on trial).



From the data 1 was uttered by EY, in this quote EY delivers a satire on MA by referring to the difference between the ideal answer and the reality on the ground. He said that MA rhetoric has contributed to various legal problems that have befallen people close to him. The statement was made in the context of the gubernatorial candidate debate, when EY wanted to doubt the morality and effectiveness of MA leadership. This criticism was not directed at policies or visions, but at MA closeness to individuals who were mentioned as being involved in legal cases.

Rhetorically, this statement contains harsh accusations and personal attacks. Phrases such as "tetapi kenyataannya jauh panggang dari api" are just an opener that quickly shifts to accusations that "menyebabkan banyak orang-orang bapak yang tersangkut dengan baik kepolisi maupun kejaksaan". The statement exploits public assumptions about alleged corruption or violations of the law in MA circle of power, and is used by EY to openly tarnish the credibility of his opponent in the debate room. This satire can be in the category of Juvenalian satire because he delivered in a loud and serious tone. Juvenalian satire is a type of satire that is sharp, serious, and directly criticizes evil or corruption with moral anger (Abrams and Harpham, 2015). In this case, EY does not wrap his criticism in the form of jokes or subtle criticism. On the contrary, he firmly points out mistakes that are serious and personally painful. There is no attempt to reduce tension, and the satire is intended to hit back ethically and emotionally. That is the dominant characteristic of Juvenalian satire: direct, harsh, and full of moral anger.

Data 4

(4) **EY** : **Terima kasih sarannya Pak MA, mungkin bapak nggak bisa melihat kenyataannya penilaian ombusmen yang kami dulu 29 sekarang terbaik se-Indonesia. Tapi kalau bapak menilai seperti itu engak apa-apa, karena bapak ingin mencari popularitas silakan bapak menilai yang seperti itu.**

(Thank you for your advice, Pak MA, maybe you can't see the reality of the ombusmen's assessment that we used to be 29th, now it's the best in Indonesia. But if you judge like that, that's okay, because you want to seek popularity, please judge like that).

From the data 4 was explain by EY, This statement was made by EY at a time when he was responding to MA criticism or views. Although his opening began with a polite phrase such as "terima kasih sarannya Pak MA," the direction of the statement immediately changed into a personal attack. By stating "karena bapak ingin mencari popularitas," EY implied that MA statement was not sincere, but rather motivated by personal ambition to strengthen his political image in front of the public. The context of this debate shows that EY was not criticizing EY policies or the logic of his argument, but rather his intentions and morality. This was an attack, rather than refuting, he attacked the character and intentions of his opponent. In political discourse, this kind of accusation not only damages the credibility of the opponent, but is also intended to negatively and directly influence public perception.

The satire in this quote is classified as Juvenalian satire because the criticism delivered is not wrapped in a humorus or light satire, but rather direct and cynical.

Juvenalian satire as a form of satire that is serious, bitter, and used to explicitly condemn social or social injustice (Abrams and Harpham, 2015). EY sentence illustrates this clearly; the tone of his satire contains suspicion of MA integrity as a politician.

Data 5

(5) **EY** : *Terima kasih jawaban Pak MA ini memang penuh dengan kamufase, mungkin beliau enggak bisa baca, Solok adalah Kabupaten terbaik di dalam menurunkan stunting. Kalau Pak MA mungkin yang ada di pikiran dia saja, karena dia enggak pernah komunikasi dengan kami, Bupati, Walikota, sehingga beliau hanya meraba-raba secara pemikiran tersendiri.*

(Thank you, Pak MA answer is indeed full of camouflaged, maybe you can't read, Solok is the best district in reducing stunting. As for Pak MA, maybe it's just in his mind, because he never communicated with us, the regent, the mayor, so he only gropes his own thoughts).

From the data 5 was stated by EY, he responded to MA statement in a sharp and offending tone. He called his opponent's answer "kamufase," implying that MA was dishonest or trying to hide the facts. Not stopping there, EY also explicitly belittled MA intellectuality by saying that he "mungkin beliau enggak bisa baca" and "mungkin yang ada di pikiran dia saja" This attack not only targeted the content of MA statement, but also doubted his personal competence. In the discourse of political debate, this kind of statement leads to character assassination. This style of language is not intended to straighten out information, but to damage the opponent's personal image and competence. This shows a high level of verbal aggressiveness.

This statement is a form of Juvenalian satire because there is no attempt to cover up the attack with humor or subtle satirize. Instead, the satire is delivered openly, using harsh and offensive language. Juvenalian satire a form of satire that is harsh, sarcastic, and filled with moral outrage, especially against social and moral deviance or corruption (Abrams & Harpham, 2015). In this case, EY shows satire that is offensive and challenging, making it as strong as a categorized of Juvenalian satire.

Data 6

(6) **EY** : *Yang katanya partainya DAI, Sumatera Barat menempatkan program LGBT nomor 3 di Indonesia, nenek-nenek berjudi, beliau mengatakan nanti 2025 baru dibuat sekarang bapak ke mana Saja? Bapak pemimpin sebagai seorang Buya, tetapi kenyataannya Sumatera Barat LGBT-nya nomor tiga se Indonesia, nenek-nenek berjudi, nauzubillahzalik tawuran di mana-mana, apa yang sudah bapak lakukan untuk membina generasi muda yang ada pada saat ini.*

(Whose party is said to be DAI, West Sumatra placed the LGBT program number 3 in Indonesia, grandmother

gamble, he said that it would be made in 2025. Now, where have you been? You are a leader as a Buya, but in reality, West Sumatra's LGBT is number three in Indonesia, grandmother gamble, nauzubillahzalik brawls everywhere, what you have done to foster the young generation that exists today).

From the data 6 was uttered by EY, this statement appears in the context of EY criticizing MA who is considered unsuccessful in handling social problems in West Sumatra. He mentions various sensitive issues such as LGBT, gambling, and youth brawls, and then links them directly to MA failure as a leader. Not only that, he also touches on MA religious identity by calling him "a Buya," as if highlighting the contradiction between religious status and social conditions under his leadership. This statement is rhetorically and socially offensive because it raises taboo issues in Minangkabau society and directs everything as MA personal responsibility. There is an emphasis on morality with the phrase "nauzubillahiminzalik" which is used dramatically, indicating that what is being discussed is not only administrative failure, but also moral and spiritual failure.

The satire in this quote is Juvenalian satire because it has a character that is full of criticism, serious, and directly attacking. According to Abrams and Harpham (2015), Juvenalian satire is used to sharply and angrily criticize social or personal decay. EY showed no attempt to calm or disguise his criticism. Instead, he delivered his satire in an angry tone, blaming MA personally and leading public opinion as if MA were morally responsible for all the evils in society.

### 3.2 Indirect Satire

The most common form of indirect satire is when the subject of the satire is an individual who portrays themselves and their viewpoints as absurd or offensive through their thoughts, speech, and actions, often exacerbated by the author's criticism and narrative techniques.

#### 3.2.1 Menippean Satire

Menippean satire is the sharp and more critical. The central characteristic is a succession of elaborate dialogues and debates in which a group of talkative eccentrics, self-proclaimed experts, literary figures, and advocates of diverse professions or philosophical points of view serve to make the attitudes and points of view they represent ridiculous by the arguments they present in support of them. The researchers found 5 data that categorized as Menippean Satire, the data were explained as follows:

Data 21

(21) VR : ***Ya salut juga buat Pak EY, mengenai keterpilihan beberapa anggota keluarganya, semoga bukan dalam rangka membangun dinasti pak ya. Semoga untuk membangun Sumatera Barat niatnya Insyallah mudah-mudahan.***

(Yes, salute also to Pak EY, regarding the election of some of his family members, hopefully not in the context

of building a dynasty pak. Hopefully to build West Sumatra, the intention is Inshallah hopefully).

From the data 21 was delivered by VR, in the context of responding to EY previous statement or pride regarding the success of his family members (children and siblings) who managed to sit in the legislature. VR opened his response with a polite and formal statement, even appreciating the election of EY family members by saying, "ya salut juga buat Pak EY". However, the next sentence quickly shifted the tone of his statement to satire, when he added, "semoga bukan dalam rangka membangun dinasti pak ya".

VR criticism was not directly accusatory, but rather invited the audience to question the motives behind EY family's political involvement. He did not state that dynasty politics was happening, but rather framed it in the form of hope: "semoga bukan" and "semoga untuk membangun Sumatera Barat niatnya". This statement, rhetorically, still conveys doubt and suspicion in a subtle way, while inserting moral pressure.

Although it is satirize, this statement is not rude or angry, does not attack EY personal character directly, and is not intended to embarrass him in a frontal manner. On the contrary, VR uses a soft, polite, and neutral tone, when in fact he is satirizing the power structure and possible hidden motives behind the EY family's political achievements. This is clearly that this quote into the category of Menippean satire. Menippean satire focuses on deviations in ways of thinking, ideologies, or systems, rather than on direct criticism of individuals emotionally or morally (Abrams & Harpham, 2015).

Data 37

(37) VR : *Ya Alhamdulillah ya tadi Pak EY menunjukkan data, entah dapat dari mana datanya apa dari googling apa dari internet, situs-situs yang belum tahu jelas apa tidak. Sampai-sampai saya terkejut kaget sekali tadi saya Pak EY **sampai-sampai mobil ban Pak EY pecah pun Buya yang salahin. Ini gimana Pak EY kok bisa segitunya, jangan-jangan nanti ada hal-hal yang lain pula Buya juga yang disalahin. Tapi prinsipnya kita bagaimana bisa membangun Sumatera Barat ini tanpa kebencian Pak EY, mohon maaf Pak EY kalau kita bisa bersama-sama Insyaallah Sumatera Barat lebih baik lagi.***

(Yes, Alhamdulillah, Pak EY showed the data, I don't know where the data came from, whether from googling or the internet, sites that don't know whether they are clear or not. To the point that I was surprised that I was surprised at Pak EY to the point that Pak EY car tire broke. This is how Pak EY can really be that bad, lest there will be other things that Buya will also be blamed for. But in principle, how can we build West Sumatra without hatred Pak EY, sorry Pak EY if we can work together, God willing, West Sumatra will be better).

From the data 37 was explained by VR In this quote, VR responds to EY who previously criticized MA by presenting various data and accusations. VR seems to want to dismantle

EY communication pattern which he thinks is too cornering other parties, especially MA, even in irrelevant matters. The satire appears in the form of mild hyperbole such as when VR said that "sampai-sampai mobil ban Pak EY pecah pun Buya yang salahin". This statement is not just a satirical comment, but rather a form of expression of a way of thinking that blames other parties too much in all situations. Although he criticized harshly, VR still closed the statement with a peaceful tone and an invitation to cooperate, implying that the purpose of his satire was not to embarrass, but to invite clear and more rational thinking.

This quote is included in the Menippean satire type based on the theory of types of satire according to Abrams and Harpham (2015) because this quote does not attack EY morality or personal integrity, but rather criticizes a mindset that is considered irrational and unfair. VR criticized the habit of excessive blame and questioning the origin of the data used by EY with statements such as "entah dapat dari mana datanya apa dari googling apa dari internet".

Data 43

(43) **EY** : *Kita ini adalah praktisi bukan akademisi, enggak usah berdefinisi-definisi di sini, langkah konkret apa yang kita lakukan untuk membangun Sumatra Barat bersama-sama. Kalau teori itu S1 S2 S Doger dan S Teler namanya, kalau di sini langkah konkret apa yang kita lakukan untuk membangun Sumatra Barat.*

(We are practitioners not academics; there is no need to define here, what concrete steps we take to build West Sumatra together. If the theory is S1 S2 S Doger and S Teler, if here we take concrete steps to build West Sumatra).

From the data 43 was uttered by EY, he delivers a response to his opponent in the debate, VR, who discusses regional development with a theory-based approach or formal definition. He emphasizes that he speaks as a practitioner, not an academic, and considers theory as something irrelevant in field practice. The most prominent satire appears when EY says: "kalau teori itu S1 S2 S Doger dan S Teler namanya, kalau di sini langkah konkret apa yang kita lakukan untuk membangun Sumatra Barat". This is a form of parody or wordplay that belittles the use of academic theory by equating it with the names of drinks, a humorous but cynical way of questioning the relevance of academic discourse. This statement is included in Menippean satire because this statement does not attack the morals or personal character of the opponent, but rather mocks the way of thinking and communication style that is too academic or theoretical. This statement is included in Menippean satire.

Data 47

(47) **VR** : *Pak EY katanya sudah 3 periode jadi anggota DPR RI tapi kok gini aja enggak ngerti Pak EY. Pak EY memang hal semua ini harus melibatkan segala aspek Pak EY, termasuk pemerintahan provinsi yaitu Gubernur yaitu Buya MA.*

(Pak EY you have been a member of the Indonesian House of Representatives for 3 terms, but how come

you don't understand this, Pak EY? Indeed, all of this must involve all aspects, including the provincial government, the Governor, Buya MA).

From the data 47 was delivered by VR, he makes a sharp satire at EY, saying that EY has been a member of the Indonesian House of Representatives for three terms, but still *"gini aja enggak ngerti"*. This sentence contains strong pressure because it openly doubts the competence and thinking capacity of a senior politician. This statement appeared in the context of a debate, when VR responded to EY views or attacks, and implied that EY failed to understand the importance of collaboration between the center and the regions, including the role of the Governor in decision making. The next sentence, *"memang hal semua ini harus melibatkan segala aspek pak epy, termasuk pemerintahan provinsi yaitu Gubernur"*, does sound explanatory, but serves as an additional blow, because it was delivered after saying that EY "doesn't understand."

Based on the classification and analysis of 47 satirical utterances found in the 2024 West Sumatra gubernatorial debate, the researchers found three types of satire, which support (Abrams & Harpham's, 2015) theory about types of satire. The most dominant type of satire identified was Juvenalian satire, followed by Horatian satire, with Menippean satire appearing least frequently. The dominance of Juvenalian satire indicates that the candidates primarily used harsh and harsh criticism to address political, economic, or social issues. This finding aligns with (Abrams & Harpham's, 2015) explanation that Juvenalian satire is harsh and sharply critical. Menippean satire was the least frequent. This is likely due to its complex structure, indirect delivery, and tendency to target broader worldviews rather than specific individuals. Among the candidates, EY is the candidate who often uses satire, especially the Juvenalian type, which reflects his tendency to deliver strong criticisms and biting commentary throughout the debate. His use of satire may also relate to Minangkabau cultural norms, where implicit and indirect communication is often favored in public discourse. However, despite the cultural relevance, the strategic use of satire proved ineffective in this political context. EY, who relied heavily on satirical rhetoric, only received 16% of the public vote, equal to his opponent MA, who used significantly less satire. This suggests that satire, while rhetorically engaging and useful, may not be a persuasive or successful strategy in political debates within this regional context.

This finding also supports characteristics of satire outlined by (Dhyaningrum, 2016), which emphasised that satire often incorporates irony, exaggeration, and humour as key tools for conveying subtle criticism. Many of the utterances analysed in this study, particularly those categorised as Horatian and Juvenalian, employ such linguistic strategies. Similarly, (LeBoeuf's, 2007) framework, which highlights implicit criticism, is reflected in candidates' use of satire, particularly in how they frame criticism through humorous or satirical tones without direct accusation. The data suggests that the use of satire in political discourse serves both strategic and rhetorical purposes, allowing candidates to challenge opponents, defend their policies, and entertain audiences through direct and indirect language. However, the results of the 2024 gubernatorial election show that such political strategies did not prove successful, as the winning pair, MA and VR, employed satire far less frequently, indicating that in this specific cultural and electoral context, a more direct or formal communicative approach may have been more effective in gaining public support.

## 6. CONCLUSION

Satire conveys criticism of debate opponents, satirises ideology, and questions credibility. The researchers concluded that three types of satire were found in the 2024 West Sumatra gubernatorial debate: Horatian, Juvenalian, and Menippean, as classified using (Abrams & Harpham's, 2015) satire theory. The researchers identified 47 satirical utterances from two debate sessions held in 2024 involving candidates Mahyeldi–Vasko and Epyardi–Ekos. The presence of all three types in the political debate confirms the relevance and applicability of this classification framework in analysing real-world political discourse. It also shows that satire, in its various forms, remains a powerful tool in rhetorical and communicative strategies among political opponents.

Additional results from the analysis show that specific candidates frequently used each type of satire. Horatian satire, which features light and humorous criticism, was mostly used by VR and MA. Juvenalian satire, which predominated in the 2024 West Sumatra gubernatorial debate, is characterized by its harsh and incisive nature. This type of satire was mostly delivered by EY during tense moments, targeting character, morality, and leadership failures. Meanwhile, Menippean satire, which is known for its intellectual and philosophical critique, was used by VR challenge ways of thinking and rhetorical logic.

Based on the findings of this research, the researchers recommend that future research on satire, particularly in political discourse, pay more attention to the contextual aspects of each utterance. Satirical expressions are often conveyed with a specific tone and social intent that may not be apparent from the text alone. Therefore, it is important to understand the speaker's intent and the situation in which the utterance was made. Future studies are encouraged to examine satire in other forms of political discourse, such as campaign advertisements, interviews, parliamentary debates, or social media content. Comparative studies across different regional or national contexts are also recommended to explore how cultural factors shape the use of satire in political communication.

For linguistics students, this research provides a useful starting point for exploring satire as a linguistic phenomenon, particularly in political discourse. Students are encouraged to deepen their understanding of how satirical language operates through critique, exaggeration, and bluntness and how it reflects power dynamics, ideology, and social critique. Studying satire can enhance students' skills in pragmatic analysis, discourse interpretation, and critical thinking about language in political contexts.

For readers, this research can serve as a valuable reference for understanding the complexity of political language, particularly the use of satire in public discourse. Political satire is not merely humorous or critical in nature, but often carries implicit messages, layered meanings, and rhetorical intent. Through this research, readers are invited to explore how satire functions as a persuasive strategy and to be more critical of the language used by politicians in shaping public perception and opinion.

### **Acknowledgment**

Not applicable

### **Competing Interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

### **Funding**

*The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article"*

### Authors' Contribution

"[Author #1] worked the project and the main conceptual ideas, collected the data, analyzing the data, wrote the manuscript. [Author #2] worked with the project, contributed in analyzing the data, , wrote the ,manuscript and data visualization

### Authors' Information

Nadhira Dwi Prastiwi is a Master Degree student in Andalas Univeristy where she studies Linguistics. She received her Bachelor degree in STBA Prayoga Padang in 2025. She also graduated from State Polytechnic of Padang where she received her Associate Degree (A.Md.) Her Current research examined a linguistics phenomenon in West Sumatera.

Andry Azhari. [andry@stba-prayoga.ac.id](mailto:andry@stba-prayoga.ac.id) is a lecturer at STBA Prayoga Padang where he teaches English skills and English for specific purposes. He is also a teacher at LIA Padang and an Assessor at LSK-BIG (English Proficiency Certification Board). He received his master degree at State University of Padang where his current research analyzing the schema theory usede by teachers in LIA. He has written numbers or article published in national and International Journal. His current research is examined the used of flipped materials used by teachers in West Sumatera.

### REFERENCES

- Abrams, M. H., & Harpham, G. (2015). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Stamford, USA: Cengage Learning.
- Altamimi, A. (2024). Donald Trump's Satirical Remarks toward Joe Biden and Kamala Harris during the 2024 Presidential Debates: A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). *Journal of Progressive Discourse Studies*, 9–17. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jpds>. Retrieved on March 18.
- Brock, Maria. 2018. "Political Satire and Its Disruptive Potential: Irony and Cynicism in Russia and the US." *Culture, Theory and Critique* 59(3): 281–98. doi:10.1080/14735784.2018.1496843. Retrieved on May 12.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dhyaningrum, A., Nababan, N., & Djatmika, D. (2016). Analisis teknik penerjemahan dan kualitas terjemahan kalimat yang mengandung ungkapan satire dalam novel *The 100-Year-Old Man Who Climbed Out of the Window and Disappeared*. *PRASASTI: Journal of Linguistics*, 1(2), 210–229. <https://doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v1i2.1074>. Retrieved on April 4.
- Holbert, R. L., Hmielowski, J., Jain, P., Lather, J., & Morey, A. (2011). Adding nuance to the study of political humor effects: Experimental research on Juvenalian satire versus Horatian satire. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(3), 187–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764210392156>. Retrieved on May 11.
- Holman, C. H. (1936). *A handbook to literature*. New York, NY: The Odyssey Press.
- Jones, J. P. (2010). *Entertaining politics: Satiric television and political engagement* (2nd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Retrieved on May 10.
- Kreuz, R. (2020). *Irony and sarcasm*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12503.001.0001>. Retrieved on May 10.



- Mahsun. (2017). *Metode penelitian bahasa: Tahapan strategi, metode, dan tekniknya*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers. Retrieved on May 21.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. Retrieved on May 10.
- Moleong, L. J. (2014). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Edisi revisi). Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya. Retrieved on May 10.
- Leboeuf, M. (2007). The power of ridicule: An analysis of satire. *DigitalCommons@URI*. <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/srhonorsprog>. Retrieved on May 9.
- Puspita, D., Faizah, H., & Charlina, C. (2021). Penggunaan gaya bahasa sindiran dalam debat pemilihan presiden 2019. *Sastranesia: Jurnal Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 9(2), 128. <https://doi.org/10.32682/sastranesia.v9i2.1897>. Retrieved on March 25.
- Rahma, S., Lubis, S., & Perangin-angin, A. (2023). The analysis of the use of satire in The Daily Show with Trevor Noah. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 10(2), 231. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v10i2.16611>. Retrieved on March 13.
- Silverman, D. (2004). *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications. <http://books.google.com/books?hl=de&lr=&id=v6X7SolgXVUC&pgis=1>. Retrieved on March 10.
- Simpson, P. (2003). *On the discourse of satire*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.