

REPETITION AS A STRATEGIC DISCOURSE DEVICE IN THE INDAH G VS. FELIX SIAUW DEBATE ON LGBT TOPIC

Shania Nabillah Putri, Nuraini Rahma Putri
Universitas Al Azhar Indonesia
seshanias@gmail.com, nurainirahmaputri2907@gmail.com

Abstract.

In the digital era, the rapid growth of digital content has resulted in the creative transformation of talk programs and podcasts into video content that is available on platforms such as YouTube, Instagram, TikTok, and others. Therefore, with a wide variety of genres to choose from, content creators can creatively develop their content to attract their audiences. A notable example channel is *The Indah G Show* on YouTube. This channel provides podcast videos inviting guests to discuss sensitive and controversial issues that frequently captivate the interest of online viewers. This study explores the use of critical discourse analysis to examine the role of repetition as a discursive strategy that Indah G. and Ust used. Felix in a YouTube debate titled “*PRO LGBT vs. ANTI-LGBT Ft. Ust. Felix SiauW | The Indah G Show.*” The analysis focuses on how repetition serves as a tool for discourse domination, enabling the speaker to assert control over the narrative, alter the audience’s perceptions, and reinforce particular viewpoints within the debate. This qualitative research approach involves transcribing the video, analyzing the repetition aspects, and categorizing the type of repetition used based on Gerard A. Hauser’s Rhetorical Theory. The findings demonstrate that repetition is not just a rhetorical device but a powerful persuasive tool, playing a pivotal role in defining the ideological boundaries of the discussion and shaping the audience's understanding of the issues at hand.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Repetition, Debate, Rhetoric

INTRODUCTION

The acronym *LGBT* refers to individuals who identify as *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Transgender*. It encompasses both *sexual orientation* (LGB) and *gender identity* (T), and is used to describe people who find these labels personally meaningful in expressing their identity. According to Youth.gov (n.d.), this acronym has expanded over time to include a broader spectrum of identities, such as *LGBTQIA+*, where the “Q” denotes *Queer* or *Questioning*, “I” stands for *Intersex*, and “A” represents *Asexual*. These terms symbolize individuals marginalized due to their sexual orientation or gender identity, and the acronym serves as a rallying call for equal rights. Researchers such as Diamond (2003), Rosario et al. (1996), and Russell et al. (2009) have highlighted the complexity and historical specificity of these identities, which have evolved in response to shifting social, cultural, and political contexts. The current debate on *LGBT* issues is divided into two broad perspectives: *Pro-LGBT* and *Anti-LGBT*. The *Pro-LGBT* stance champions equality and human rights, advocating for legal protections, social acceptance, and visibility for *LGBT* individuals. Supporters of this perspective, including various organizations and activists, emphasize the need to promote understanding and acceptance of diverse

3RD EVENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE (ELITE) 2024



identities. They argue that *LGBT* individuals should not face discrimination or violence based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. This advocacy is crucial in a society where legal challenges and societal prejudices are prevalent, reflecting broader societal shifts that view traditional heteronormative perspectives as outdated and unrepresentative of the diverse experiences in today's global society. The evolving dialogue around *LGBT* issues raises important questions about acceptance, rights, and the definition of family and relationships in a rapidly changing world.

In contrast, the *Anti-LGBT* perspective is rooted in religious, cultural, or traditional beliefs that oppose the recognition and rights of *LGBT* individuals on the grounds of morality, social impact, or the preservation of family structure. For instance, in Indonesia, legal and societal frameworks pose significant obstacles to the recognition of *LGBT* rights. As stated by Human Rights Watch, On December 6, 2022, the Indonesian parliament passed a new criminal code that contains provisions in violation of international human rights law and standards. The code criminalizes consensual sex outside of marriage, effectively rendering all same-sex conduct illegal, as same-sex couples cannot marry in Indonesia. According to the Pew Research Center, as of 2009, Indonesia has the largest Muslim population globally, with approximately 202.9 million Muslims, representing 88.2% of its total population and 12.9% of the world's Muslim population. This data highlights Indonesia's significant role in the global Muslim community, where the majority of its citizens follow Islam, shaping both cultural and religious contexts within the country. This legal framework is reflective of a broader cultural and religious context where homosexuality is considered taboo, and more than 80 percent of the population follows Islam, a faith whose leaders frequently condemn homosexual behavior. As reported by Human Rights Watch, public and political hostility towards *LGBT* individuals is also a prominent feature of the *Anti-LGBT* perspective. Conservative views dominate public discourse, often labeling homosexuality as a threat to traditional values. The National Broadcasting Commission (KPI), for example, enforces policies that ban TV and radio programs from portraying *LGBT* behavior in a positive light, arguing that such depictions "normalize" what is seen as deviant behavior. Moreover, the Indonesia Psychiatric Association classifies homosexuality, bisexuality, and transgenderism as mental disorders, reflecting and reinforcing broader societal prejudices. (HRW.org, 2016).

The discourse around *LGBT* rights in Indonesia is heavily influenced by social media, where debates, promotions, advertisements, and personal viewpoints are widely disseminated. This growing visibility of *LGBT* issues in Indonesia can be traced back to the influence of more liberal countries that have embraced *LGBT* rights and acknowledged their place in society. As a result, public discussions around *LGBT* identities have become increasingly polarized. While some view these identities as a fundamental part of contemporary lifestyles, others see them as a threat to cultural and religious values. Therefore, the polarized nature of the debate in Indonesia underscores the broader struggle between progressive advocacy for *LGBT* rights and conservative resistance rooted in traditional values. For supporters of *LGBT* rights, the focus is on human rights, equality, and social justice, advocating for the inclusion and recognition of *LGBT* individuals as equal members of society. Meanwhile, opponents argue that such acceptance would undermine cultural and religious norms, destabilizing the social fabric. Moreover, social media plays a critical role in amplifying both perspectives, enabling broader audiences to engage in the discourse and shaping public opinion. Digital platforms facilitate the rapid spread of ideas and allow for greater visibility of *LGBT* issues, but they also provide a space for conservative voices to mobilize against these developments. This dynamic highlights the importance of understanding how the discourse around *LGBT* rights evolves in the digital sphere, where messages can be shared, reshaped, and recontextualized.

The speakers in this debate are, Indah G. and Ust. Felix Siauw, represents two contrasting public figures in Indonesia's social and religious landscape. Indah G., a content creator and YouTuber, has become a controversial public figure due to her provocative content, often expressing opinions that

challenge traditional norms. She gained notoriety for her criticisms of the Indonesian language and faced significant backlash after making light of a boycott related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Her outspoken nature on sensitive issues, including *LGBTQ+ rights*, has sparked widespread public discourse and positioned her as an advocate for progressive social values. On the other hand, Ust. Felix Siauw is a prominent Indonesian Islamic preacher and writer known for his conservative Islamic perspective. His teachings often focus on maintaining traditional social values, and his views frequently align with puritanical interpretations of Islam. Felix Siauw's influence extends through his books, public speaking, and online presence, where he addresses a range of social and religious issues, including the role of Islamic values in modern society. His engagement in the debate serves as a representation of the conservative resistance against progressive advocacy for *LGBT* rights. This study highlights how repetition serves not just as a rhetorical device but as a powerful persuasive tool in contentious debates, contributing to the establishment and reinforcement of public discourses.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Digital Media Discourse Analysis

The discourse analysis is the study of language usage in social contexts. It is frequently used to comprehend linguistic social meaning, argumentation systems, and communication patterns. According to Gee (2014) discourse analysis approach in the context of digital platforms places an emphasis on comprehending the contextual meanings of language and how it functions within certain social situations, such online debates. A broad spectrum of language interactions, from informal talks to highly structured argumentation, may be seen in debates on YouTube and podcasts. The critical discourse analysis of Fairclough (2003) investigates the ways in which language use is influenced by social relations, ideology, and power. This is pertinent to discussions on YouTube and podcasts, where participants may use rhetorical devices to establish authority, stifle dissenting opinions, or support particular ideologies.

The popularity of podcasts as a platform for information sharing, debates, and opinion formation has expanded dramatically. Markman (2012) claims that podcasts frequently incorporate aspects of conventional radio with the advantages of new media, like on-demand listening and interactive elements like comments and sharing. A distinctive feature of podcasts is their casual conversational format. The flexibility format makes talks can be more impromptu and less scripted, which provides a wealth of material for researching the use of natural language. Podcasts, which combine elements of talk radio, interviews, and conversational interactions into a fluid discursive format, have been classified by researchers as a "hybrid genre" (Sullivan, 2018). Therefore the hybrid genre of podcasts allows participants to switch between formal argumentation and informal chat, podcasts present an intriguing topic for discourse analysis. Research like O'Donnell (2016) concentrate on the performative and communicative aspects of podcasts, looking at the ways in which hosts and guests construct arguments, have conversations, and establish their authority or trustworthiness (ethos). In contrast to written texts, podcasts primarily rely on oral discourse indicators (such as fillers, pauses, and intonation), they offer a unique source of information for examining how arguments are made in the moment.

On YouTube, podcasts have experienced a huge metamorphosis, moving from conventional audio-only formats to a more dynamic and captivating multimedia experience. Podcasts were first mainly audio-based and intended to be listened to on services like Spotify or Apple Podcasts. Nevertheless, podcasts are increasingly being created with a video component, combining audio and visual components for a wider and more engaged audience. YouTube podcasts combine spoken and visual communication, which adds still another level of complexity. In contrast to other podcasts, YouTube podcasts incorporate visual signals like gestures, facial expressions, and editing techniques in

addition to spoken arguments, all of which enhance the persuasive appeal. This YouTube and podcasts combination offers the most effective forum for in-depth discussion of topics, including debates.

Tolson (2010) asserts that participants in YouTube debates frequently rely on ethos, pathos, and logos in more fluid and dynamic ways, lacking the formal structure of traditional debates. Real-time audience participation is further facilitated by YouTube's comment section, which adds another level of debate and allows viewers to expand, refute, or support the arguments stated in the video. With the help of this interactive feature, YouTube debates become more lively and provide viewers greater opportunity to shape the debate's direction. Discourse analysis on YouTube' podcasts debate provides an interesting window into contemporary digital-age communication techniques. With the convergence of visual, oral, and textual elements, these platforms provide a rich site for examining how argumentation, rhetorical strategies, and audience interaction shape public discourse. Research on the effects of digital debates on public opinion, political engagement, and social change should continue as more people rely on these platforms for information and conversation.

2.2 Repetition as a Strategic Device in Debates

Repetition has rhetorical and persuasive purposes in debates. According to Tannen (1989) repetition can be used to control conversational engagement and improve coherence. Depending on the situation, it can also strengthen the debater's position or cause conflict. By repeatedly bringing up important points, debaters can use repetition to question the opponent's position, stay on topic, also lead and reroute the argument's flow. The speaker's primary point is reinforced by this informational cycle of repetition which also delicately modifies the audience's interpretation of its importance. Johnstone (1994) examines the use of repetition as a means of expressing certainty and conviction in oral arguments. This is important because in debate contexts, players want to persuade the audience with authority emotionally and logically. Repetition can serve as a strategy to develop ethos since it frequently forges a connection between the speaker's perspective and credibility when a specific word or idea is used repeatedly.

Researchers from a variety of fields have investigated the cognitive impact of repetition in communication. Cognitive psychology research by Baddeley (1992) suggests that exposure to an argument or phrase repeatedly enhances its recall value. This is particularly important during arguments since in these settings, difficult concepts are reduced to simpler versions and reiterated for clarity. Prove that repetition improves understanding and memory in debating discussions. According to Tulving and Schacter (1990), repetition also helps prime viewers. In a debate, the audience is more likely to pay attention and process the argument more carefully when important terms or phrases are used repeatedly. The speaker might deliberately use this expectation effect to increase the impact of their remarks. As well Mills and Sonsino (2016), personal anecdotes and statistical evidence are frequently combined in YouTube arguments, which reflects the more flexible way in which informal debates strike a balance between emotional appeal (pathos) and logical reasoning (logos). Therefore by this mixture, YouTube is an excellent resource for researching how individuals combine personal experiences with more general socio-political themes.

Another important area of the study is the affective dimension of repetition in debate discourse. In his examination of political speeches, Charteris-Black (2011) observes that repetition fosters emotional reactions by making arguments seem recognizable and relevant. It also improves intelligibility. As a result of constant exposure, repeated concepts get more imprinted in the minds of the audience, making them appear more reliable and acceptable. Pathos is one of the main components of Aristotle's rhetorical appeals, and this emotional link is particularly potent when dealing with it. Repetition is a common tactic used in discussions to increase audience emotional involvement. For example, repeatedly using emotionally charged terms or phrases in debates about immigration, social

3RD EVENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE (ELITE) 2024



justice, or human rights might make the audience feel pity, outrage, or solidarity. In her discourse analysis of public debates, Koller (2017) shows how the audience can be pushed toward a particular emotional response by repeatedly using emotionally charged language that heightens the sense of urgency or moral obligation.

On a sub-chapter titled Characteristics of Rhetorical Eventfulness of the chapter The Eventfulness of Rhetoric of Gerard A Hauser's book, Introduction to Rhetorical Theory (2002). By expounding a case study of Nathaniel Brazill's trial in West Palm Beach, Florida as an example. The Characteristics of Rhetorical Eventfulness elaborates the typical characteristics of an event type of rhetoric that can be found by focusing on the shared qualities of an event type. An event type consists of the general characteristic or set of characteristics that distinguishes one group of events from another (for example, rhetorical events from astronomical ones). As an event type, rhetoric falls within the general category of action. This category implies an agent who does something as a result of choices. Within the category of action, there is a subset of six modes of action that typify rhetoric and provide a conceptual framework for rhetorical theory as the categorization of repetition as the strategic device in the public discourse:

1. **Situated Action:** Rhetoric is context-specific, shaped by the immediate circumstances and audience at hand. Repetition within this framework serves to ground the argument in the specific setting, making it relevant and accessible to the audience. By adapting to the particular dynamics of the discourse, repetition ensures that the argument aligns with the immediate concerns of the audience, enhancing its relevance and persuasiveness.
2. **Symbolic Action:** Humans uniquely communicate through symbols, primarily language, which arbitrarily ascribes meaning to reality. In rhetorical events, symbolic action unites or divides people through the selective representation of reality. Repetition in symbolic action serves to reinforce key themes or symbols, turning abstract ideas into recognizable, memorable concepts. This repetition helps the audience easily grasp and retain the core message by encapsulating it in familiar or symbolic representations.
3. **Transactional Action:** In rhetorical exchanges, communication is dynamic, with all parties actively involved. Repetition in this context facilitates dialogue, ensuring the exchange remains interactive and clear. It allows speakers to emphasize important points, manage the conversational flow, and maintain engagement with their audience. This mode of repetition keeps the discussion fluid, encouraging an ongoing exchange between speakers and listeners.
4. **Social Action:** Rhetoric, as a form of social interaction, seeks to influence others by aligning arguments with shared values and community identities. Repetition here serves to connect the argument to broader social narratives, fostering a sense of shared understanding and common purpose. By invoking familiar values and beliefs, repetition in social action reinforces communal bonds and aligns the speaker's message with the audience's cultural or societal norms.
5. **Strategic Action:** Repetition in strategic action is intentional, aimed at achieving specific persuasive goals. It helps the speaker assert control over the conversation, frame the debate to favor their position, and steer the dialogue in a desired direction. Repetition serves to reinforce authority, manipulate the flow of the discussion, and ensure the argument stays aligned with the speaker's objectives, making it a tool for asserting dominance or control in a rhetorical context.
6. **Constitutive Action:** This form of rhetoric constructs realities by framing moral actions and consequences for the audience. Repetition in constitutive action helps shape identities and worldviews, evoking a shared consciousness within the audience. Rather than merely persuading, this repetition creates a symbolic universe with distinct values and ethical

3RD EVENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE (ELITE) 2024



standards, positioning the speaker and audience within a defined moral framework. It constructs rhetorical identities and defines the debate around specific values or themes, influencing how the audience perceives and engages with the issue.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research method which focuses on exploring and understanding phenomena through non-numerical data such as words, images, or objects. Qualitative research emphasizes meaning, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and detailed descriptions (Patton, 2015). This approach allows for a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the subject matter. In this study, the qualitative method is applied to examine and categorize the use of rhetorical repetition. The analysis is conducted using Gerard A. Hauser's Characteristics of Rhetorical Eventfulness as a framework for understanding how repetition functions in rhetorical discourse. The research process begins with transcription, where the video content is carefully transcribed by listening and retyping the dialogue from start to finish, ensuring all relevant details are captured. Next, the transcribed text is thoroughly examined to identify recurring elements, such as repeated topics, phrases, or concepts. Once these repetitions are identified, they are categorized according to their rhetorical function based on Hauser's theory. This categorization distinguishes between different types of repetition according to six rhetorical modes of action: Situated Action, Symbolic Action, Transaction, Social Action, Strategic Action, and Constitutive Action. Following this, a detailed content analysis is conducted on the categorized repetitions to gain a deeper understanding of how repetition contributes to the overall rhetorical strategy in the discourse. By following this methodological approach, researchers can break down the rhetorical devices used and understand how repetition serves to influence, clarify, or reinforce the argumentation within the conversation.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

After completing the analysis techniques, the researchers categorized segments of the conversations between Indah G. and Ust. Felix contains repetition. The table below presents the results, showing the frequency of categorized repetitions based on Hauser's Characteristics of Rhetorical Eventfulness for each speaker. In the discussion section, the researchers elaborate on one segment from Indah G. and Ust. Felix demonstrates repeated patterns in their dialogue, emphasizing their strongest arguments. This analysis highlights that Indah G. advocates for LGBT rights, while Ust. Felix takes an opposing stance, reflecting the contrasting viewpoints in the debate.

Speakers	Situated Action	Symbolic Action	Transaction	Social Action	Strategic Action	Constitutive Action
Indah G	5	7	6	10	9	4
Ust. Felix	3	4	5	8	6	2

Table 1. Frequency of Categorized Repetition Uttered by Indah G and Ust. Felix

4.1 Repetition as Situated Action

3RD EVENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE (ELITE) 2024



DATA 1

- Indah G: “Is there a particular verse in the Quran that specifically said that LGBT is not allowed, or is it all just interpretation-based?”

Indah G. begins framing her argument by questioning Ust. Felix's interpretation of Islamic teachings by saying, *"Is there a particular verse in the Quran that specifically said that LGBT is not allowed, or is it all just interpretation-based?"* serves as a clear example of Situated Action as Repetition. In this debate, Indah G. situates her question within Islamic theology to directly confront Ust. Felix, regarding the validity of his religious reasons for opposing *LGBT* rights, emphasizing the potential ambiguity between *"what is explicitly stated"* and *"what is interpreted,"* she aligns her argument with the religious context of the discourse. Therefore, this situational adaptation makes her investigation contextually relevant and strategically oriented since it satisfies the expectations of an audience that values scriptural proof.

Furthermore, the moment of tension in this debate is essential in the context of arguments since it can influence the audience's judgment of which argument is more compelling. The recurrent usage of *"specifically"* alongside *"interpretation-based"* creates a sense of suspense and anticipation, urging Ust. Felix to deliver a forthright response. Moreover, Indah's intentional reiteration establishes a moment of rhetorical tension, compelling Ust. Felix should either concede to the Quran's ambiguity or defend his dependence on interpretations, not to mention that she emphasizes the need for specificity in religious teachings, demonstrating her dedication to the relevance of rights and inclusivity in discussions concerning *LGBT* issues.

Continuously, the phrase *"Is it all just interpretation-based?"* is a purposeful use of terminology intended to call into doubt the authority of Islamic writings and its interpretation. Indah emphasizes the subjective nature of interpreting religious doctrine, thus positioning herself within the debate as someone who is questioning not only the content of the Quran but also the authority of interpretations that are used to justify anti-*LGBT* stances. Indah's questions serve several purposes, one of which is to develop a relationship with viewers who may have a more liberal or open-minded approach toward the comprehension of religious literature. Not only does Indah employ repetition in this instance for clarity, but she also uses it to highlight a significant weakness in Ust. Felix's position. She puts the audience in a position where they are effectively forced to assess the power and legitimacy of interpretations instead of actual scriptural commandments by asking whether the prohibition is *"specifically"* mentioned or is *"all just interpretation."* Through the intentional use of repetition, she is able to intensify the contrast that she is aiming to emphasize, consequently causing her critique to strike a more striking chord with the audience. Along with that, by focusing the discourse on *"interpretation-based"* arguments, she is inviting the audience to investigate the idea that traditional opinions may not be as straightforward as they are presented. Moreover, by using this strategy, she is able to establish a relationship with a portion of the audience that may be skeptical about the scriptural basis of all restrictions against *LGBT* identities in Islam.

4.2 Repetition as Symbolic Action

DATA 1

- Ust. Felix: “Jadi di dalam islam itu secara spesifik cuma mengatakan bahwa yang dilarang adalah action nya adalah act nya bukan feelings. Jadi adalah act yang dihukumi

yang diberikan di sebuah notions itu pada act-nya bukan pada feelings atau statenya itu yang benar benar distaste di dalam al quran karena di dalam al quran itu dikatakan (he said it wrong, the first word was women not men and then change it to women), “mereka mendatangi laki laki instead of perempuan sebenarnya, jadi mereka melakukan itu pada laki laki instead of perempuan, nah action nya ini yang di-condemn didalam al quran bukan orangnya bukan feelings-nya.”

In the provided dialogue, Ust. Felix's rhetorical strategy utilizes symbolic action as repetition to reinforce a specific interpretation of Islamic teachings and create a cohesive and memorable argument. Ust. Felix repeatedly states, “*yang dilarang adalah action nya, bukan feelings*” (“*what is prohibited is the action, not the feelings*”). As a result of this repetition, the phrases “*action*” and “*feelings*” are transformed into symbols that express his main argument—that Islam opposes only specific actions and not inner states of being. Therefore, by emphasizing this distinction, he establishes a symbolic framework that enables the comprehension of his theological stance. According to his view of Islamic law, the word “*action*” becomes more than just a noun; rather, it represents the point where moral judgment is made. Moreover, the purpose of this repetition is to underline the main point of view, ensuring that the audience understands the contrast term he is expressing. Ust. Felix clarifies and reinforces his point by repeating this sentence numerous times, making it simpler for the audience to absorb his perspective to understand it better.

The symbolic use of “*action*” is strengthened when Ust. Felix uses an example from the Quran to explain: “*mereka mendatangi laki-laki instead of perempuan*” (*they approach men instead of women*), simply by focusing on the action itself (i.e., the behavioral choice), Ust. Felix connects the symbolic meaning of “*action*” to the direct statement of the Quran. The phrase itself symbolizes the value of distinguishing behaviors from identities—furthermore, Ust. Felix uses repetition not only to highlight the point but also to clarify any possible misunderstandings that may have arisen. He preemptively addresses counterarguments that might construe his stance as condemning the individual rather than the behavior by repeating “*nah action nya ini yang di-condemn didalam al quran bukan orangnya bukan feelingsnya*.” (“*what is condemned in the Quran is the action, not the person*”). As a result, this framework not only makes a difficult theological topic more straightforward for his audience but also strengthens his authority as a religious preacher and supports his stance by guaranteeing that his message is devoid of ambiguity and clearly stated.

4.3 Repetition as Transaction Action

DATA 1

- Indah G : “But why is it okay, I'm going to assume. This is just an assumption. I'm going to assume that maybe if it's not you but the general public would be okay if a man and a woman would doing anal sex.”

Ust. Felix: “No.”

Indah G: “I'm gonna assume, maybe not you. I'm gonna assume the general public. If it's a man and a woman engaging in anal sex. That's okay but suddenly when it's a man and a man doing anal sex well, it's not?”

Indah G. opened the question by saying, “*I'm going to assume that maybe if it's not you, but the general public would be okay if a man and a woman were doing anal sex.*” In this scenario, her use of the phrase “*I'm going to assume*” establishes a point of engagement, thereby inviting Ust. Felix to

either confirm, deny, or clarify the accuracy of her assumption. Ust. Felix's response serves as a crucial aspect for the debate to progress, and each repetition helps frame her question as one seeking clarification rather than confrontation, which reduces its aggressiveness and builds rhetorical pressure.

Additionally, by stating the phrases, *"Maybe not you"* and *"I'm gonna assume the general public,"* she gently exerts pressure on Ust. Felix to engage with the hypothetical scenario and express a firm view on the matter. Considering that the purpose of this back-and-forth interaction is to refine his point of view and verify the consistency of his moral foundation, it can be classified as a Repetition of a Transaction Action. Furthermore, the question is framed around *"a man and a woman"* versus *"a man and a man."* In these instances, Indah gently shifts the emphasis from purely theological regulations to broader social views and potential prejudices. Therefore, the rhetorical device shifts the focus of the discussion and urges Ust. Felix should consider the social background of his posture and its theological consequences.

4.4 Repetition as Social Action

DATA 1

- **Ust. Felix:** "Ya, that's the importance of education so that we educate people that when you are facing some like lgbt people, jadi kita gak bisa langsung kemudian untuk stereotyping, bahwasanya setiap lgbt pasti dia kemudian melakukan sesuatu yang kita enggak suka contoh misalnya, I think diakui atau tidak diakui ada banyak orang orang yang ketika dia ngeliat orang-orang chinese dia mulai mulai enggak suka."

Indah G: "Yeah, that's called racism"

Ust. Felix: "Dan ada beberapa orang juga ketika aku juga pertama kali, saw your video about language, dan mereka gak bisa terima karena mereka, seolah-olah stereotyping setiap orang-orang yang speaking english all the time dan dia pasti sombong. Dia pasti tidak sayang indonesia. Dia pasti kemudian tidak indonesia banget. That's a stereotyping and we are working on that, also in religion very much stereotyping that we have to fight, we have to make clear that the problem itself is how they acting not how they feelings. maybe how they're feelings we can talk about it later."

Ust. Felix employs social action to widen his argument against *LGBT* stereotypes by including other forms of social discrimination, such as racism and language-based prejudices. He states, *"Jadi kita gak bisa langsung kemudian untuk stereotyping"* ["We can't just jump to stereotyping"], and immediately provides examples, *"ada banyak orang-orang yang ketika dia ngeliat orang-orang Chinese dia mulai enggak suka"* ["there are many people who, when they see Chinese people, they started to dislike them"]. Ust. Felix positions his stance within a broader social framework that opposes all forms of stereotyping by connecting *LGBT* stereotypes to racial ones. This allows him to build a sense of communal identity around shared social values, making his argument resonate with a diverse audience.

When Ust. Felix expands his argument by including language stereotypes related to Indah, as one of her podcasts with Cinta Laura became controversial after discussing incomplete vocabularies in Indonesian compared to English. *"Setiap orang-orang yang speaking English all the time, dia pasti sombong. Dia pasti tidak sayang Indonesia"* ["Everyone who speaks English all the time, they are arrogant. They must've not loved Indonesia"]. In this dialogue, Ust. Felix illustrates how prejudices can transcend different categories like nationality and language. The audience is able to build a collective

3RD EVENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE (ELITE) 2024



identity that is opposed to all types of unfair discrimination as a result of this alignment with bigger social narratives for the audience. Thus, Ust. Felix's message appeals to conservative listeners concerned with Islamic values and socially conscious audiences as opposed to stereotypes in general.

Ust. Felix portrays the fight against stereotyping as a shared social responsibility by stating, *"Itu stereotyping dan kita harus kerja melawan itu"* ["That's stereotyping, and we have to work against it"]. The use of *"Kita"* ["we"] creates a sense of collective identity, making his audience feel included in the vast effort to eliminate prejudice. In spite of this, his argument is brought into alignment with the universal value of fairness and justice, which broadens its appeal and elevates the sense of shared purpose. Ust. Felix also uses social action as a repetition in this segment, a strategic attempt to align his argument with shared social values. Forward, Ust. Felix uses the phrase *"stereotyping"* as a recurring term that applies to *LGBT*, racial, linguistic, and religious contexts. Through the development of a coherent narrative, he places his argument within the context of a more comprehensive social justice framework.

4.5 Repetition as Strategic Action

DATA

1

- Ust. Felix: **"Aku sebagai orang yang sudah menikah. Ketika aku bertemu dengan seorang perempuan yang cantik. Let's say Song Hye Kyo misalnya."**

Indah G: (Laughing)

Ust. Felix: **"Lalu aku merasa suka, nah maka merasa suka ini adalah feelings dan aku tidak bisa untuk mengatakan ini salah karena aku adalah laki - laki. "Dan tapi kan kamu sudah menikah" (giving out example). Ya tetep nggak salah karena itu adalah feelings beda kalau feelings ini aku manifest dalam bentuk action, nah itu yang kemudian menjadi problematik."**

In the present dialogue, Ust. Felix starts by describing a relevant experience that makes one attracted to someone. He mentions the well-known celebrity Song Hye Kyo to give the public a specific example. By hypothetically acknowledging his own feelings, *"Ketika aku bertemu dengan seorang perempuan yang cantik. Let's say Song Hye Kyo misalnya. Lalu aku merasa suka"* ["When I meet a beautiful woman, for example, Song Hye Kyo, then I feel like I like her"], he disarms any immediate judgment. His point is that attraction is natural. He normalizes the feelings of attraction, therefore reflecting the audience's reality. However, many people may have felt ashamed about such emotions, Ust. Felix says that feeling attracted is normal and inescapable *"aku tidak bisa untuk mengatakan ini salah karena aku adalah laki - laki"* ["I can't say this is wrong because I'm a man"]. On top of that, the audience is guaranteed to be receptive to his argument, eliminating any immediate moral concerns.

Ust. Felix then distinguishes between feelings and actions, outlining the moral boundary. He repeats the word *"feelings"* to emphasize that emotions are natural: *"Merasa suka ini adalah feelings..."* ["Liking is one of the emotions of feelings..."], but acting on those feelings is where problems arise *"Kalau feelings ini aku manifest dalam bentuk action, nah itu yang kemudian menjadi problematik"* ["If I manifest these feelings in the form of action, that's what becomes problematic"]. The significance of this separation lies in its ability to regulate behavior within the context of moral obligations or faith in marriage. Significantly, the word *"manifest"* refers to the fact that feelings, even when they are internal, can become problems when they are converted into acts. It is made clear by Ust. Felix that the responsibility is not in how we experience these feelings but instead in how we react to

them. He further emphasizes this by employing the term “*problematic*” to indicate the point at which moral responsibility starts: “*Nah itu yang kemudian menjadi problematik*” [“Well, that's what then becomes problematic”]. Additionally, Ust. Felix's strategic approach appeals to the listener's empathy by presenting himself as an approachable figure using the words “*Aku sebagai orang yang sudah menikah*” (“I am a married person”). Rather than adopting a lecturing tone, he talks from his personal experience, which helps him create trust with listeners who are either married or in relationships.

4.6 Repetition as Constitutive Action

DATA 1

- Indah G: “Do you have room to considered that those people that you said, “oh mereka dulunya homo” (giving out example), tapi ni sekarang mereka bisa jadi normal nih, bisa menjadi hetero, do you have room to perhaps considered that, you know, even if they're not telling it to you directly, but the reason why that they do that is because either they're trying to, eee ujung ujungnya, they're trying to avoid social ramification and social astres as asian. Maksudnya kaya gini, kalo aku tau, aku itu lahirnya, katakanlah aku lahirnya lesbian lah, aku suka sama cewe, tapi aku tau aku tinggal di dunia dimana itu tidak diterima. Don't you think that it's within my best interest to them pretend that I am straight?”

In this dialogue, Indah addresses the complexity of sexual orientation and the impact of social pressures on how individuals present their identities. She constructs a nuanced understanding by acknowledging that people may present themselves as heterosexual due to external pressures. Therefore, Indah suggests that those who seem to change their sexual orientation might not be genuinely changing but are instead reacting to societal expectations, such as fear of social repercussions or stress. Her repeated focus on “*social ramifications and social astres*” emphasizes the external forces influencing individuals to alter or hide their true identities.

Indah highlights the performative nature of identity by discussing how someone might claim to be straight to avoid the negative consequences that could arise from revealing their actual orientation. Nevertheless, this repetition emphasizes how social influences can pressure people to conform and present a distorted image of themselves, thereby aligning their outward behavior with societal expectations rather than their genuine preferences. To illustrate the role of stigma in shaping how sexual identity is expressed, Indah constructs a scenario where it becomes advantageous for individuals to conform to societal norms to avoid judgment or discrimination. The recurrence of themes related to social pressures highlights how people may feel compelled to conceal or suppress their true sexual identity out of fear of rejection or marginalization.

CONCLUSIONS

In the debate between Ust. Felix Siau and Indah G, repetition functions as a multifaceted rhetorical tool that transcends mere emphasis. This research uses Gerard A. Hauser's Characteristics of Rhetorical Eventfulness as categorized based on repetition; it is clear that repetition operates across six modes of action: Situated Action, Symbolic Action, Transaction, Social Action, Strategic Action, and Constitutive Action. The six repetition characteristics shape the narrative, assert control, and influence audience perceptions. Both speakers use repetition effectively to strengthen their ideas, emphasize their identities, and control the flow of the discussion. It is proven from the discussion and the data results of Indah G and Ust. Felix's public discourse that both of them use categorized repetition to argue their

3RD EVENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE (ELITE) 2024



different beliefs on the topic. Ultimately, repetition emerges not just as a linguistic device but as a mechanism of rhetorical power that enables speakers to dominate the debate, alter perceptions, and define the ideological boundaries of the discussion.

REFERENCES

- Baddeley, A. D. (1992). Working memory. *Science*, 255(5044), 556-559. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1736359>
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Diamond, L. M. (2003). Was it a phase? Young women's relinquishment of lesbian/bisexual identities over a 5-year period. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(2), 352-364. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.2.352>
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Hauser, G. A. (2002). *Introduction to rhetorical theory* (2nd ed.). Waveland Press.
- Human Rights Watch. (2016, August 11). Indonesia: LGBT crisis exposed official bias. Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/08/11/indonesia-lgbt-crisis-exposed-official-bias>
- Human Rights Watch. (2023, January 12). Indonesia's new criminal code assaults rights. Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2023/01/12/indonesia-new-criminal-code-assaults-rights>
- Human Rights Watch. (2016, March 10). Indonesia: Don't censor LGBT speech. Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/03/10/indonesia-dont-censor-lgbt-speech>
- Johnstone, B. (1994). *Repetition in discourse: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Koller, V. (2017). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Markman, K. M. (2012). Doing radio, making friends, and having fun: Exploring the motivations of independent audio podcasters. *New Media & Society*, 14(4), 547-565. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444811420848>
- Mills, M., & Sonsino, D. (2016). *YouTube debates: Exploring user interactions and argumentation*. Sage.
- O'Donnell, P. (2016). Podcasting and performativity: How audio mediates conversation. *Journal of Media Practice*, 17(3), 155-172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14682753.2016.1237775>
- Pew Research Center. (2009, October 7). Mapping the global Muslim population. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2009/10/07/mapping-the-global-muslim-population/>
- Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E. W., & Hunter, J. (1996). A model of sexual identity development among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths: Longitudinal test and extension. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(2), 157-170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.157>
- Russell, S. T., Clarke, T. J., & Clary, J. (2009). Are teens 'post-gay'? Contemporary adolescents' sexual identity labels. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 6(2-3), 288-303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361650903013550>
- Sullivan, J. L. (2018). Podcast movement: Creating new public spheres through podcasting. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 423-441. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/8664>
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tolson, A. (2010). A new authenticity? Communicative practices on YouTube. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(4), 277-289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2010.511834>

3RD EVENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE (ELITE) 2024



- Tulving, E., & Schacter, D. L. (1990). Priming and human memory systems. *Science*, 247(4940), 301-306. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.2296719>
- Universitas Airlangga. (n.d.). Chapter I: Introduction [PDF]. Universitas Airlangga Repository. <https://repository.unair.ac.id/101959/4/4.%20CHAPTER%20I%20-%20INTRODUCTION.pdf>
- Youth.gov. (n.d.). What does LGBT mean? Know the basics. Youth.gov. <https://engage.youth.gov/resources/what-does-lgbt-mean-know-basics>