



# GIBRAN RAKABUMING RAKA'S RHETORIC IN THE 2024 CAWAPRES DEBATE IN A STUDY OF ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC THEORY

By

Rina Raflina<sup>1</sup>, Marlinda Irwanti Poernomo<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sahid University Jakarta

<sup>2</sup>LSPR Communication & Business Institute

Email: <sup>1</sup>[raflinarina@gmail.com](mailto:raflinarina@gmail.com), <sup>2</sup>[marlinda.i@lspr.edu](mailto:marlinda.i@lspr.edu)

## Article Info

### Article history:

Received Jan 05, 2025

Revised Jan 23, 2025

Accepted Feb 08, 2025

### Keywords:

Aristotle's Rhetoric,  
2024 Vice Presidential Debate,  
Gibran Rakabuming Raka

## ABSTRACT

This research wants to know phronesis (intellectual), arate (quality), eunonia (good intentions), namely the elements of ethos, as well as pathos and logos found in Gibran Rakabuming Raka's rhetoric in the 2024 cawapres debate. This research is qualitative research using a content analysis approach. Content analysis is a systematic technique for analyzing message content and characterizing messages. Data collection in this research was through interviews with key informants, namely the audience and the Prabowo-Gibran success team as well as YouTube videos of the 2024 cawapres debate carried out by the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPU). The theory used in this research is Aristotle's rhetorical theory which contains elements of ethos, phatos and logos. The results of interviews with informants (audience) in this research found that Gibran Rakabuming Raka has a unique character, straightforward, no nonsense, calm, rational, sharp, an open young man (ethos).

*This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.*



## Corresponding Author:

Rina Raflina

Sahid University Jakarta

Email: [raflinarina@gmail.com](mailto:raflinarina@gmail.com)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Presidential Election is a democratic party activity held every five years in Indonesia. There are three presidential candidates in the 2024 presidential election, namely: Anies Baswedan (Muhaimin Iskandar), Prabowo Subianto Gibran Raka Bumin Raka, and Ganjar Pranowo (Mahfud MD). Gibran's emergence as Prabowo Subianto's deputy candidate attracted widespread public attention, not only because of his young personality but also his closed communication style, especially when it comes to political issues. During the 2024 election campaign, Gibran has a calm communication style that is his trademark. In the vice presidential debate held by the General Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia (KPU RI), Gibran's style made many people in the room question his competence. Even though Gibran rarely speaks, his comments often go viral and are shared widely on social media (solopos.com 15.12.23). Many stakeholders expressed interest in Gibran Rakabumin Raka's presence in the vice presidential debate which was held on Friday, December 22, 2023. The reason is, Gibran is often absent from debate invitations from various political parties. According to Efendi Ghazali, an important vice presidential candidate took part in the debate. (Metrotv, 22 Dec. 2023). Law No. 7 of 2017 in article 275 paragraph (1) letter h states, for the election of presidential and deputy pairs, the KPU uses a campaign method through debate, by holding candidate pair debates funded by the APBN. The presidential election debate event will be held 5 (five) times guided by a moderator appointed by the KPU. Provisions of Article 50, paragraph (1) in the KPU Regulations (PKPU). Number 15 of 2023 concerning Campaigns: Presidential candidates have the right to participate in debates 3 (three) times and vice presidential candidates have the right to participate in debates 2 (two) times. The Presidential Candidate Debate and Vice Presidential Candidate Debate took place in Jakarta (kpu.go.id).

Political communication expert Gun Gun Heryanto said the discussion in the debate needed to focus on 3 (three) things: First, communication style, then content and ideas, and finally data about supporters. Heryanto explained that rhythm is just as important as maintaining the rhythm so that what they have learned is not lost on stage. The debate between Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates is an effort to communicate to the public about the candidate's profile, vision, mission and work plans for the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. The debate will provide a more in-depth and comprehensive explanation of the political direction of the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates regarding each of the issues discussed (CNBC Indonesia, 24 February 2012). The General Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia (KPU RI) is holding a debate which aims to provide an overview of the candidate profiles, vision, mission and future work plans of the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. That way, the audience, especially voters, can consider the results of the debate as a factor in making decisions. Efendi Ghazali, a political communication expert from the University of Indonesia, called the first debate between the KPU Vice Presidential candidates a "Gebran Show." Because almost all eyes are focused on Gibran as a candidate for Vice President (Metrotv, 22 December 2023). Many foreign languages appeared at the first vice presidential debate and were widely discussed by Indonesian netizens. The terminology used by Gibran Rakabumin Raka is not widely used among the general public.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

- a. Rhetoric: The rhetoric theory put forward by Aristotle in Nadhmy Dhia and Alya Pramesthi (2021). There are 2 (two) reasons regarding rhetoric: First, a good and effective resource must consider the listener or audience and must use various types of evidence in his presentation. When speaking in public, Aristotle suggested that speakers know their audience, as Griffin et al. in Nadhmy Dhia (2021). The theory put forward by Aristotle discusses three types of rhetorical evidence: ethics (ethos), emotion (pathos), and logic (logos).
- b. Political rhetoric based on; (1) Deliberative rhetoric. The goal of deliberative rhetoric is to influence the public regarding government policy issues by explaining the relative advantages and disadvantages of various alternative measures. The focus is on what will happen in the future if certain policies are implemented. This study hopes that politicians will be able to create and change hopes (expectations) in the future. Deliberative rhetoric can be found at all levels of politics. (2) Forensic Rhetoric focuses on what happened in the past and emphasizes proving guilt or innocence, responsibility, punishment, or reward. The location is usually in the courtroom but can also be in other places. (3) Demonstrative Rhetoric or Positive Rhetoric is discourse full of praise, criticism, and even insults. This rhetoric is often called epidemiological rhetoric which aims to highlight the good and bad sides of an organization, person or idea. There are many campaigns in politics (Syahreza 2016)c.Pesan:
- c. A message is something sent to a recipient from a sender. The information sent can be by body language and linguistic symbols that communicate the source's actions, feelings, thoughts, or intentions. A message is a series of nonverbal and verbal symbols that express the ideas, values, feelings, and intentions of a source. Messages can be sent directly or through communication media. This is usually translated with words such as "information", "context", and "message" (Hafied Cangara 2010).
- d. Previous research: What is more important in research is the rationale or support for the results of previous research. The results of previous research can be used as supporting data for this research. The data used by researchers is supporting data related to the problem being discussed. This research is a continuation of previous research on the same topic. Previous research referred to in this study is as follows:
  - (1) Nouredine Derki (2022). Conducted research entitled "A Critical Analysis of Persuasive Strategies Used in Political Discourse: A Case Study of Donald Trump and Joe Biden" and published by the International Journal of English Education and Literary Research (IJEEL), Federal District of Mexico. The theory used in this research is Aristotle's theory of rhetoric. The findings show that all candidates relied heavily on strategies related to personal attractiveness.
  - (2) Azad Mammadov, Maryam Isgandarli (2023). Rhetoric and Communication: A study published by Bulgaria entitled "Linguistic and Rhetorical Features of Donald Trump's Communication Style" found that the inaugural speech, which was primarily aimed at a national audience, contained repetition. It was concluded that the frequency of occurrence was low, as it included omissions, deletions and changes in word order. Speeches delivered by Donald Trump to international audiences, such as during a speech in front of participants at the UN General Assembly. The construction or theory used in this research is Aristotelian theory.
  - (3) Pier Paolo Pedrini (2021). The research was published in the US Global Journal of Human Society with the title Joe Biden's Inauguration Speech: A Persuasive Narrative. The conclusion of the research is that communication should use simple words to evoke an emotional response and attract people's attention.
  - (4) Hanan A Amaireh, Luqman M Rababah (2022) Research Title: Rhetorical Discourse Analysis Of Biden's Address To The Nation On Afghanistan: Positive Us And Negative Them. This study was published in the Journal of



Positive School Psychology in Selangor, Malaysia. The concept or theory used in this research is Aristotle's concept of rhetoric. The study concluded that President Biden uses appeals to ethos, pathos and logos to try to convince his audience of his administration's thoughts, ideas and decisions.

- (5) Hanan A. Amaireh (2023). His research was published by A Academy Publication Co., LTD, London, England, with the title "Biden Rhetoric: A Corpus-Based Study of American President Joe Biden's Political Utterances." The theory used in this research is the concept or theory of Aristotle's rhetoric. From the conclusion of his study: Biden used all three of Aristotle's rhetorical styles in his inaugural speech: ethos, pathos and logos.

### 3. RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses a content analysis approach. Content analysis is often used to characterize news. Harold D. Lasswell was a pioneer of content analysis using symbolic coding techniques. In Eriyanto (2011), content analysis is the systematic recording and then interpretation of symbols and messages. Content analysis is also a systematic method for analyzing news content, processing news, observing and analyzing communication messages. According to Holsti in Eriyanto (2011), content analysis technique is a research method that draws conclusions from news objectively and systematically. Therefore, the purpose of content analysis is to examine content such as documents, videos, news reports and so on. Content analysis is the extraction of messages from information content conveyed in the form of written symbols. Sis analysis also analyzes all communication models, including newspapers, television, radio documentary materials, newspapers and others. Eriyanto's theory (2011) regarding Holsti shows that content analysis techniques will help answer the questions "what", "to whom" and "how" in the communication process. The "What" element describes the content of the information or message sent by the source or communicator. And the "To Whom" element is used to test assumptions about the content of the message to the target audience.

### 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In analyzing evidence of vice presidential candidate Gibran Rakabumin Raka's rhetoric, researchers used analysis from Aristotle's rhetorical theory. Observers or researchers carried out data collection procedures via YouTube links during the Republic of Indonesia General Election Committee debate on 22 December 2023 and 21 January 2024. The researchers analyzed several rhetorical statements made by vice presidential candidate Gibran Rakabumin Raka during the 2024 vice presidential debate.

**Table 1. YouTube links and discussion topics**

No.	Waktu	Sumber Link Yoyube	Tema Debat Cawapres
1	Desember 22, 2023	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UQtvZgKmGJo">www.youtube.com/watch?v=UQtvZgKmGJo</a>	Economy, Finance, Tax Investment, Trade, APBN-APBD management, Infrastructure and Urban Affairs.
2	January 21, 2024	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bzgrq1KTiSY&amp;t=2s">www.youtube.com/watch?v=bzgrq1KTiSY&amp;t=2s</a>	Energy, Natural Resources, Human Resources, Food, Carbon Tax, Environment and Agrarian Affairs, and Indigenous Peoples.

Analysis of Audience Opinions on Gibran Rakabuming Raka's Rhetoric in the 2024 Cawapres debate

**Table 2. Informant Opinion Data 1**

Questions	Answers	Keywords	Indicators
What do you think of Gibran's character during the vice presidential debate?	Unique, straightforward, no-nonsense, calm, rational, sharp, open young person	Straightforward	Ethos: character
What do you think about Gibran's mastery of the material (theme) during the debate?	Adequate understanding, although not yet deep, simple, concrete logic	Not yet in depth	Ethos: intelligence
What do you think about Gibran's way of asking and responding to his debate opponents?	Ask to the point, respond calmly, focus on the substance	To the point	Ethos: Intellectual
What do you think about Gibran's question which uses an uncommon abbreviation but does not explain its abbreviation?	Needs explanation, not all audiences understand. Intends to appear concise, efficient	Needs explanation	Ethos: Intellectual

What do you think of Gibran's remarks which are outside the context of the debate?	Reflects a spontaneous personality, is not always formal, lacks discipline in debates, lacks seriousness in arguments	Lack of discipline	Pathos: appealing to emotion
How do you feel when you see Gibran doing tricks during the debate?	Generates smiles, inappropriate, disrupts the flow of discussion, less serious, reduces credibility	Not appropriate	Pathos: interesting emotion
What do you think of the arguments that Gibran builds when answering questions or explaining?	Simple, straight to the point, practical, easy to understand, not complicated, less detailed, less mature, requires analysis	Lack of detail	Logos : logic
Does Gibran's argument answer the question based on accurate data and facts?	Not always accompanied by in-depth and detailed evidence. Emphasize practical points	Not yet accompanied by evidence	Logos : proof

- 1) Ethos Element Data Analysis (Informant 1): Ethos refers to the character of intelligence, good intentions and feelings expressed through the speaker's language (West and Turner, 2010). Ethos includes an element of speaker credibility that comes from the speaker's competence and right to speak with authority (Widiastuti, 2017). According to Maarif (2015), Aristotle believes that there are three speakers' spirits when speaking in public, namely: phronesis, eunomia, and areté. Phronesis is derived from the word phronema, which means mind or intellect, and is often associated with wisdom and practical prudence. Based on data obtained from informant 1 in answering the question "What do you think about Gibran's personality during the vice presidential debate?" Informant 1 answered: In the vice presidential debate, Gibran Rakabumin Raka's personality was described as a unique young man, honest, straightforward, calm, rational, intelligent and open-minded. The ethical element in his character is clear from the way he speaks. Actually, Gibran spoke frankly. For example, when Muhaimin Iskandar stated that he answered based on his notes, or when he said to Prof. Mahfud, "Just answer my question according to my question. No need to explain here and there." From an ethical point of view (ethos), there is no such thing as eunomia, or good intentions towards others. In Gibran's statement to Muhaimin and Prof. It was as if Mahfud intended to bring them down and embarrass them in the forum, but in reality that was unnecessary.

On the other hand, in response to the question, "What do you think about Gibran's familiarity with the material (topic) during the discussion?", informant 1's response was still good understanding, simple logic, and concrete, if not deep. The ethical element is an indicator of intelligence. A communicator must have the ability to understand and consider what is being communicated to ensure that the listener understands the message he wants to convey. On the other hand, based on the answer from informant 1, Gibran's understanding is not yet deep and based on the ethos intelligence index, his logic is still simple. The ethical element is now revealed in intellectual form through the question, "What do you think about Gibran's way of asking and answering his debating opponents?" informant 1 answered, Gibran is a concise person and focuses on the main things in asking questions and answering questions from his debating opponents. When asking a question in a debate, an intellectual will usually first provide an explanation so that other people can understand the question. Gibran, on the other hand, did not provide an explanation when asking the question. As a result, the person asking the question often does not understand the meaning of the question because the question is too direct and the person asking the question cannot understand what is being asked. The element of ethos in rhetoric involving intellectual references is associated with something called phronema, where the intellectual is associated with wisdom. In this case, Gibran's method of asking and answering still doesn't make sense.

The second question was, "What do you think about Gibran's question, which uses an abbreviation in an unusual question but Gibran doesn't explain the full abbreviation?" The data obtained from informant 1 requires explanation and may not be understood by all target groups. The goal is to appear accurate and efficient. Based on mental elements with intellectual parameters or indicators in rhetoric, the communicator needs to be fully understood by the interlocutor and the audience when speaking. But Gibran did the opposite. The rhetorical ethos with its intellectual markers includes what is called "arete," or quality. Informant 1's response requires explanation. This is because informant 1 wants to answer concisely and efficiently because not all listeners can understand it. This shows that Gibran's way of asking questions in rhetoric is not in accordance with the parameters (indicators) of intellectual 'arete' (quality).

- 2) Analisis data unsur pathos (Informan 1): In Aristotle's book *Rhetorica*, deep rhetorical theory (Maarif, 2015), Aristotle describes pathos as persuading the listener's emotions. In Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, emotions are all feelings that can change people's decisions, sometimes painful and sometimes pleasant. These emotions include anger and calm, friendliness and hostility, courage and fear, confidence and shame, love and anger,

jealousy and competition. Question: What do you think about Gibran's statement outside the context of the debate? Informant 1's answer reflects a spontaneous personality. It doesn't have to be formal, it doesn't have to be obedient or disciplined in discussions and it doesn't have to be serious in debating. In Aristotle's rhetoric, the element of pathos appeals to the listener's emotions, such as joy, sadness, emotion, anger, hurt, or humiliation. Here, informant 1 seems to regard Gibran as a person who is impulsive, informal, undisciplined, and not very serious in discussions and debates.

The vice presidential debate is a solemn and formal event. The audience hopes that Gibran can give his best performance in the vice presidential debate so that the audience can see Gibran's discipline and seriousness in the debate. Meanwhile, when asked about Gibran's tactics during the debate, Source 1 said the tactics were funny, inappropriate, annoying, not serious and damaged credibility. Based on the element of pathos, namely the appeal to emotion, we can see that informant 1 (one) considered the gimmick that Gibran performed to be inappropriate. Therefore, according to informant I, this should not be used in formal discussions because it can cause a loss of credibility. Evaluations of politicians' appearances should be positive. However, Gibran's ruse was considered inappropriate because it offended the audience, and this inappropriate behavior occurred at a prestigious debate event.

- 3) Logos element data analysis (Informant 1): The Logos element is logical evidence provided by the communicator and includes arguments and rationalization. For Aristotle, logos meant the application of a set of practices that included logical writing and the use of clear language (West and Turner, 2010). When presenting logical evidence, speakers often use facts and figures to convince their audience. When asked, "What do you think about the arguments that Gibran built when answering or explaining questions?", Informant 1 answered, "Short, straight to the point, not complicated, easy to understand, practical, lacking in detail, less sophisticated, requires analysis." Informant 1 (one)'s answer was based on logos elements, namely logic, less sophisticated, less detailed, and needed to be analyzed. This shows that the logic that Gibran embedded in his arguments was not well structured and sharp, and his mastery of the material was not deep enough. Informant 1 stated that analysis was still needed. The next question is: Does Gibran's argument provide an answer based on correct data and facts? Informant 1 answered that: this is not necessarily accompanied by comprehensive and detailed evidence, emphasizing practical aspects. In rhetoric, the logos element requires indicators of proof, which means that a communicator must present facts and data to the audience as accurate evidence, that what is communicated rhetorically is true and based on facts. However, from Informant 1's response it is clear that Gibran's arguments are not accompanied by comprehensive and detailed evidence, but only emphasize practical points. Therefore, if examined from the rhetorical perspective of the logos element which contains evidentiary indicators in the form of facts and data, Gibran's argument does not meet the criteria for the logos element.

**Table 3. Informant Data Opinion 2**

Questions	Answers	Keywords	Indicators
What do you think of Gibran's character during the vice presidential debate?	Aggressive, controversial, unethical, impolite with gestures that are considered unnecessary	Controversial	<i>Ethos</i> : character
What do you think about Gibran's mastery of the material (theme) during the debate?	Quite good, conveys specific and detailed ideas	Pretty good	<i>Ethos</i> : intelligence
What do you think about Gibran's way of asking and responding to his debate opponents?	Controversial, aggressive, trapping with certain terms	Controversial	<i>Ethos</i> : intellectual
What do you think about Gibran's question which uses an uncommon abbreviation but does not explain its abbreviation?	Controversial, confusing, trapping, wants to show deep knowledge	Trap	<i>Ethos</i> : intellectual
What do you think of Gibran's remarks which are outside the context of the debate?	Controversial, causing public reaction	Controversial	<i>Pathos</i> : appeal to emotions
How do you feel when you see Gibran doing tricks during the debate?	Is impolite, arrogant, unethical, demeans the opponent in the debate, addresses serious issues in a lighter way	Unethical	<i>Pathos</i> : appeal to emotions

What do you think of the arguments that Gibran builds when answering questions or explaining?	Relevant context, easy to understand, provides examples of experience as a mayor	Easy to understand	<i>Logos</i> : logic
Does Gibran's argument answer the question based on accurate data and facts?	Data accuracy is questionable, verification of claims is needed to ensure data accuracy	The accuracy of the data is questionable	<i>Logos</i> : proof

- 1) Data analysis from informant 2 on the element of Ethos, which refers to the personality, intelligence and good intentions shown by the speaker (West and Turner, 2010). Ethos has an element of speaker credibility and is obtained because they have the right to make a speech or speak to their capacity and ability (Widiastuti, 2017). Maarif (2015) explains that the three things mentioned as ethos of public speakers by Aristotle are Phronesis, Eunomia and Arete. Phronesis comes from phronema, which means intellect or mind, and is often associated with practical wisdom or practical wisdom. Arete is the second part of a public speaker's ethos. According to Williams (2009), it means a level or quality in the form of the word "nature" (agathos/good), and can also be interpreted as a hard effort to do the best of oneself. with effort and practice Regarding the question about mastery of the debate material (theme), the second informant said that Gibran was quite good at conveying ideas clearly and in detail, based on elements of ethos and intelligence groups or categories. This data shows that Gibran is quite clever or intelligent because he is considered capable of conveying ideas clearly and in detail. Furthermore, Informant 2 stated that Gibran was controversial, aggressive and tricky with certain terms when he asked and responded to questions from his debating opponents. In rhetorical theory, according to Aristotle, he connects the element of ethos with the intellectual nature shown by wisdom, as conveyed by Informant 2. Gibran is trapping, controversial, aggressive, and even uses terms in asking and responding to debate opponents. This attitude is not a wise attitude, and an intellectually intelligent communicator should ask questions and respond in calm, easy-to-understand sentences and make their opponents argue.
- 2) Data analysis on the element of pathos (Informant 2): In Aristotle's book Rhetoric in Maarif, (2015) defines pathos as emotional persuasion for the listener. According to Aristotle's concept of rhetoric, emotions are all emotions or feelings that have the ability to change a person's decisions and sometimes feel painful and sometimes pleasant. They can be angry or calm, friendly or hostile, fearful or brave, shy or shameless, affectionate or irritated, envious or competitive. In relation to the question, "What do you think about Gibran's remarks which are outside the framework or context of the debate?" Informant 2 provides a controversial answer, which generates a public response. During the debate, Gibran often used words that did not fit the context. For example, he said to Muhaimin Iskandar, "That's nice, Gus, to answer but look at the cheat sheet." This sentence is inappropriate to use because it is offensive
- 3) Data Research on Logos Elements (Informant 2): According to Aristotle, logos includes the use of various practices, such as using rational claims and clear language. Logical evidence is presented by a communicator and includes their arguments and rationalization (West and Turner, 2010). To convince an audience, speakers often use facts and figures when presenting logical evidence. In response to the question "What do the informants think about the arguments built by Gibran when answering questions or explaining?" Informant 2 answered, it was easy to understand, relevant, and for example, Gibran already had experience as mayor. By using logos elements and indicators of reason or logic from the answers given, Informant 2 indicated that Gibran's arguments were relevant and easy to understand. Next, on the question of "does Gibran's argument answer

Table 4. Informant Opinion Data 3

Pertanyaan	Jawaban	Kata Kunci	Indikator
What do you think of Gibran's character during the vice presidential debate?	Terjebak pada citra diri, kurang tegas dan kurang kredibel	Citra diri	<i>Ethos</i> : karakter
What do you think about Gibran's mastery of the material (theme) during the debate?	Sangat terbatas, tidak mendalam, berdasarkan pengalaman	Sangat terbatas	<i>Ethos</i> : kecerdasan
What do you think about Gibran's way of asking and responding to his debate opponents?	Pertanyaan kurang kritis, menanggapi jawaban normatif, menghindari konfrontasi tajam	Normatif	<i>Ethos</i> : Intelektual

What do you think about Gibran's question which uses an uncommon abbreviation but does not explain its abbreviation?	Menunjukkan kurang peka terhadap audiens, harus lebih hati-hati memilih bahasa	Kurang peka terhadap audiens	<i>Ethos</i> : Intelektual
What do you think of Gibran's remarks which are outside the context of the debate?	Tidak fokus pada masalah yang dibahas, menurunkan bobot debat	Menurunkan bobot debat	<i>Pathos</i> : menarik emosi
How do you feel when you see Gibran doing tricks during the debate?	Gimik tidak pada tempatnya, menurunkan kredibilitas, tidak sesuai dengan situasi debat	Gimik tidak pada tempatnya	<i>Pathos</i> : Menarik emosi
What do you think of the arguments that Gibran builds when answering questions or explaining?	Kesulitan dengan data dan fakta, analisis tidak mendalam, belum menguasai isu-isu besar		<i>Logos</i> : logika
Does Gibran's argument answer the question based on accurate data and facts?	Tidak banyak argumen berdasarkan data, tanpa angka, tanpa statistik yang mendukung klaim, seringkali berdasarkan pengalaman	Tidak banyak berdasarkan data	<i>Logos</i> : bukti

- 1) Analisis Data pada unsur Ethos dari Informan : Ethos merujuk pada karakter, kecerdasan, dan niat positif yang ditunjukkan oleh orator selama dialog mereka (West dan Turner, 2010). Elemen ini mencakup tingkat kepercayaan yang dimiliki penutur, yang didapatkan melalui hak berbicara yang didasari pada kapasitas dan kemampuannya (Widiastuti, 2017). Menurut Maarif (2015), etos dalam pembicaraan publik menurut Aristoteles terdiri atas tiga komponen: phronesis, arete, dan eunoia. Phronesis berasal dari istilah phronema, yang mengacu pada pikiran atau intelektualitas, dan sering dihubungkan dengan kebijaksanaan atau kebijakan yang aplikatif. Sementara itu, "arete" bersumber dari istilah "sifat" agathos, yang berarti "baik," dan juga mencakup usaha keras untuk mencapai potensi tertinggi dan bisa dilakukan oleh seseorang. Hal ini akan terwujud melalui latihan dan kebiasaan yang dijalani.

Furthermore, in the question regarding opinions regarding Gibran's mastery of material during the debate, informant 3 gave a response that was quite limited and not in depth based on his experience. In Aristotle's rhetorical theory, the element of ethos in the category of intelligence includes the concept of phronesis which means intellect. Informant 3's response stated that Gibran's explanations during the debate were very limited and shallow, indicating the need for qualified or adequate knowledge. Therefore, a communicator must prepare himself well so that his rhetoric in conducting a debate can meet the audience's expectations. Data obtained from informant 3 regarding questions about Gibran's way of interacting with his debating opponents showed that his questions were less critical, his responses were normative, and he tended to avoid sharp confrontations. From this information, we can analyze the intellectual category in the element of ethos in rhetorical theory: phronesis, which concerns intellect and wisdom. Questions that are less critical, responses that are normative, and avoidance of sharp confrontation show that his intellect still needs to be improved by reading more relevant information and data from sources that are firm or clear in accordance with the themes set by the KPU, so that the questions asked are more critical and do not give the impression of money trapping, and the answers are not only normative. By mastering adequate debate material, the debate will be more substantial and sharp. When asked about his opinion regarding Gibran's questions using uncommon abbreviations without explanation, informant 3 considered that Gibran was less sensitive to the audience and needed to be more careful in choosing language. In Aristotle's rhetoric, the element of ethos in the intellectual category can be analyzed through the concept of arate which means level or quality. A quality resource person or communicator (arate) is an individual who can explain questions clearly so that the opponent in the debate understands the meaning. This quality (arate) is obtained from maximum effort by a communicator in studying rhetoric, so that he is able to understand the audience or audience and realizes that in rhetoric the information or message must be stated or conveyed in terms of language that can be understood by the audience so that the message is effective.

- 2) Data analysis on the element of pathos from Informant 3: In the rhetorical teachings put forward by Aristotle, emotional persuasion (pathos) is explained in the book Rhetorika (Aristotle in Maarif, 2015), where Aristotle describes pathos as an attempt to influence the listener's emotions. In Aristotle's understanding of rhetoric, emotions include all emotions or feelings that can influence a person's choices, which can sometimes feel painful or vice versa, pleasant. These feelings can include calm and anger, friendship and

hostility, courage and fear, confidence and shame, affection and annoyance, and competition and envy. From the results of the interview with Informant 3 regarding his response to "what do you think about Gibran's remarks which are not relevant to the debate?", it was revealed that this response was not consistent with the issue being discussed, thereby reducing the weight of the debate. Referring to rhetorical theory where the element of pathos plays a role in arousing emotions, Informant 3's statement assesses that not focusing on issues can influence the decisions of audiences who are initially interested and may lose interest. Informant 3's statement regarding irrelevant speeches that reduce the weight of the debate could have a significant impact on the audience's assessment. In the context of the vice presidential candidate debate, the audience of course hopes to hear relevant and quality information, and wants a leader who provides a substantive debate that is in accordance with the predetermined theme. Furthermore, when asked "what do you think about Gibran's gimmicks during the debate?", Informant 3 was of the opinion that the gimmicks were inappropriate, once again reducing his credibility, because these actions were not in harmony with the atmosphere of the debate. The element of pathos in rhetoric that involves the audience's feelings can be seen from the statement that the gimmick was inappropriate, where this shows the audience's dissatisfaction with the gimmick and Informant 3 considered that Gibran's gimmick resulted in a decrease in his credibility as a communicator, because it was deemed inappropriate to the circumstances of the debate. The debate for vice presidential candidates is a very important event, so behavior and speech must be more structured and professional.

- 3) Data Analysis on the Logos element from Informant 3: Logos refers to the rational evidence provided by the communicator, including the arguments and justifications they convey. For Aristotle, the use of logos involves various techniques, including the use of logical arguments and the use of clear and clear language (West and Turner, 2010). In conveying their logic, speakers often rely on data and numbers as a tool to convince listeners. Based on the findings from Informant 3 with the question "what do you think about the arguments presented by Gibran when answering questions or providing explanations?" shows difficulty in using data and analysis and facts that lack depth, as well as a lack of understanding of key issues. According to rhetoric theory, ethos elements related to logic are also based on explanations that rely on facts and information, so that what Gibran conveyed in the debate, according to the answer from Informant 3, Gibran still experienced limitations in using facts and data. Insufficient analysis shows that understanding of the debate material is not yet fully ready because the message or information mastered is still minimal; As a result, the logic presented is unable to provide a satisfactory explanation for the audience. Therefore, the data or information obtained does not fully reflect the logos element in rhetoric. Furthermore, data from Informant 3 related to the question, "Does Gibran's argument answer the question using valid facts and data?" his answer shows that there are not many arguments based on data, and there is a lack of numbers and statistics to support his claims, which often come only from personal experience. In the rhetoric of the ethos element with the category of evidence, the communicator is expected to present data and facts in the form of statistics or figures to convince the viewer or audience. Informant 3 revealed that Gibran did not present data, figures and statistics that could support the arguments he presented, so the audience felt doubtful. Gibran often refers to his experience as mayor, even though what the audience expects is concrete data from reliable sources. So, Gibran's rhetoric in the logos aspect does not meet the requirements for logical evidence that can display data and facts, as well as numbers that function as a logical basis to convince the viewer or audience.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

1. Based on information collected from various sources, including videos on YouTube and interviews with the audience, data was obtained that Gibran has a high level of self-confidence and quite good public speaking skills. From the research results, it can be concluded that the research entitled Gibran Rakabuming Raka's Rhetoric in the 2024 Vice Presidential Debate in the Review of Aristotle's Rhetorical Theory, seen from the elements of ethos, pathos and logos, is as follows:
  - a. Gibran Rakabuming Raka's rhetoric in the 2024 Cawapres debate was interesting, clear, without beating around the bush, calm, rational, sharp, and an open, young figure (ethos).
  - b. Gibran Rakabuming Raka's rhetoric in the 2024 Cawapres debate reflects a personality that is spontaneous, candid, and not always formal (pathos).
  - c. Gibran Rakabuming Raka's rhetoric in the 2024 Cawapres debate went straight to the heart of the problem, was practical, easy to understand, and not complicated (logos). Conclusion: Gibran Rakabuming Raka's rhetorical style can be applied by young politicians in the future.



- 
2. Research Innovation: This research provides a new contribution in the field of Aristotle's rhetorical theory, that in the current digital era, Gibran Rakabuming Raka's Rhetoric can be used by politicians to win the hearts of constituents.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Cangara, Hafied. 2010. Pengantar Ilmu Komunikasi. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- [2] Eriyanto. (2011). Analisis Isi: Pengantar Metodologi untuk Penelitian Ilmu Komunikasi dan Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Lainnya. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- [3] [https://jdih.kpu.go.id/data/data\\_pkpu/2023pkpu015.pdf](https://jdih.kpu.go.id/data/data_pkpu/2023pkpu015.pdf)
- [4] <https://solopos.espos.id/gaya-komunikasi-irit-bicara-ala-gibran-1820508>
- [5] <https://www.metrotvnews.com/play/N6GCgjYg-pakar-debat-cawapres-perdana-the-gibran-show>
- [6] M. Fahri Syahreza, Irawan Syari tanjung, "Motif dan Penggunaan Media Sosial Instagram di Kalangan Mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Ekonomi UNIMED", (Jurnal Interaksi Vol. 2 No. 1 Januari 2018)
- [7] Maarif (2015) Retorika metode komunikasi publik, Jakarta: Rajawali Pers
- [8] Nadhmy Dhia, R., & Alya Pramesthi, J. (2021). Analisis Retorika Aristoteles Pada Kajian Ilmiah Media Sosial Dalam Mempersuasi Publik. In Januari (Vol. 4, Issue 1)
- [9] West & Turner, 2010 Introduction of Communication Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 1221 Avenue of the Americas,
- [10] Widyastuti, N. W. (2017). Consumption Value Smartphone dalam Pandangan Pengelola Usaha Kecil Menengah (UKM) dan Pemanfaatannya sebagai Media Komunikasi Pemasaran Online. Prosiding Konferensi Nasional Komunikasi, 1(01).

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK