IMPACT OF INTENSIFIER AS WOMEN'S PERSUASION STRATEGY IN POLITICS: VICE-PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

Britney Caren Joseph[1], Widyastuti[2]
[1] britney.19023@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [2] widyastuti@unesa.ac.id
[1,2]Universitas Negeri Surabaya

ABSTRACT This study aims to analyze the impact of intensifier as a persuasive language strategy in politics used by Kamala Harris as a female politician in the 2020 vice-presidential debate. The study attaches to the qualitative research method focusing to construe in-depth analysis. Two primary sources are used in data gathering: vice-presidential debate transcription from rev.com and the vice-presidential debate video from NBCNews on YouTube. The methodological approach is the qualitative research method. The theoretical framework used as the main theory of this research is Quirk et. al's (1992) intensifier theory and Lakoff's (1975) women's language features. The result found that there are 95 intensifiers. First, emphasizers (58%) with attitudinal and style disjuncts (46%) and 12%. Second, amplifiers (25%) with maximizers (18%) and boosters (7%). Lastly, downtoners (16%) with compromiser (1%), diminisher (1%), minimizer (7%), and approximator (6%). The most prevalent sort of intensifier used by Kamala and Hillary was the emphasizer attitudinal disjunct, e.g. "*Clearly, Actually, Of course, Probably, Certainly, Really*" The most prevalent convey varying levels of certainty and uncertainty about what is being conveyed. Additionally, it was discovered that the two female politicians were using these words as part of a persuasive strategy to convince the audience.

Keywords: intensifier, kamala harris, hillary clinton, presidential debate, politics

INTRODUCTION

Women's language in politics and the way they win a general election through presidential debate are known to use special linguistic elements. For instance, Hillary Clinton once said "*It's just awfully good that someone with the temperament of Donald Trump is not in charge of the law in our country*," while Trump immediately responded "*You'd be in jail*" (CNN, 2016). The underlined word indicates that Hillary as a female politician needs to add certain degree words that have function levels in order to make her statement appear assertive to be considered seriously by the audience as well as her male counterparts. This is so because language and gender are socially constructed. This means the roles of gender are often defined by society's expectations (Tannen, 1996). Therefore, these societal-based aspects end up affecting how each gender behave to communicate in social settings, for instance, female politician tend to be more polite and less assertive compared to the male politician who are most likely to be more direct in voicing their opinion in the floor of politics (Rudman, 1998; 2004).

Women in general use language differently for a variety of social tasks that are supposedly emphasized by gender, according to cultural norms (Holmes, 2013). Men, for instance, prefer to use language in a more aggressive, direct, and confident manner since they are naturally privileged with respect to authority and culture. Women, on the other hand, are more prone to avoid 'manly' speech mannerisms and to keep their language pleasant. Their language is marked by uncertainty, politeness, and more meaningless segments or hedges, e.g. "Oh dear, well." That is because societal hierarchy often assigns women a lower social status than males; as a result, it was believed that they would politely restrain their words in order to not upset men (Lawless, 2004). To this, Lakoff proposed women's language features where it is distinguished differently from men due to the social system. They are lexical hedges, tag questions, rising intonation on declarative, empty adjectives, precise color terms, intensifiers, hypercorrect grammar, super polite forms, avoiding using strong swear words, and emphatic stress (Lakoff, 1975).

One of women's languages as claimed by Lakoff (1975) is intensifier. According to her study, an intensifier is a boosting device that women use because they often lack social status which makes them need more standards than men. One of the common ways to intensify words is by adding adverbs since they are flexible linguistic items that can modify adjectives, verbs, and even other adverbs. Adverbs combined with adjectives will either boost or downgrade the meaning of the word. The speaker's intent may determine its function, such as impressing, offending, persuading, or changing another's point of view (Setayesh, 2018). Because of their degree of function, intensifiers are sometimes referred to as "word degrees," especially seeking intensifiers, neutral intensifiers, and intensifying downward gazes. Quirk et al. divide emphasizers, amplifiers (maximizers and boosters), and minimizers (approximators, compromisers, diminishers, and minimizers).

While previous studies mostly focused on the classification and identification of women's language features used by female politicians in presidential election debates, this study, however, intends to further examine the role of intensifier as a persuasive language tool used among female politicians. Unlike former studies that focus on doing sole identification of women's language features used by female politicians. This study, however, intends to further analyze the impact of the most dominant women's language feature–intensifier, as a persuasion strategy used in politics. Hence, two research problems are addressed as directions in this study.

1) What type of intensifiers were used by Kamala Harris as a persuasive language strategy in the vice-presidential debate in 2020?
2) What are the most dominant intensifiers used by Kamala Harris as a persuasive language strategy in the vice-presidential debate?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Quirk et al. (1992) divide emphasizers, amplifiers (maximizers and boosters), and minimizers (approximators, compromisers, diminishers, and minimizers), which will be elaborated in the following tables below (Quirk, 1992).

Emphasizers

The first type of intensifier is an emphasizer. It classifies into attitudinal disjunct and style disjunct. Each of them has different functions. Attitudinal disjunct aims to comment on the content of what is being said such as actually, certainly, clearly, definitely, indeed, obviously, plainly, really, surely: for certain, for sure, of course, surely. The most common express degrees of certainty and doubt as to what is being said. As for the second type, style disjuncts aims to express statements uttered by speakers on the style or manner in which they are speaking like frankly, honestly, literally, simply: fairly, just .

Amplifiers

The second type of intensifier is an amplifier. It categorizes into maximizers and boosters and each is used in slightly different ways. In some cases, it is quite challenging to tell them apart. They differ in terms of semantics. Maximizers are used to modify non-gradable objects like absolutely, altogether, completely, entirely, extremely, fully, perfectly, quite, thoroughly, very, totally, in all respects, the superlative most, whereas boosters are used to adjust gradable goods like tall and short for instance badly, bitterly, deeply, enormously, far, greatly, heartily, highly, intensely, much, severely, so, strongly, terribly, well, a great deal, a good deal, a lot, (Sardabi, 2015).

Downtoners

The third type of intensifier is a downtoner. It categorizes into four which are compromisers (especially, sort of, rather, enough, sufficiently, more or less), diminishers (mildly, moderately, partially, partly, slightly, somewhat; respects, to some extent; a little, least), minimizers (barely, hardly, little, scarcely, in the least, slightly, somewhat, in some respect, to some extent, a little), and approximators (almost, nearly, virtually, as good as,

practically, all but, slightest, at all). In some cases, the use of downtoners may seem quite similar to the use of filler, which is to allow the speaker a moment to consider what to say next. Downtoners imply the confidence levels of speakers.

Previously, several studies had been conducted on similar topics. First, Joseph, B.C., Hartanti, L.P., & Leliana, A. (2022) in their study entitled "*The Use of Women's Language Features by Kamala Harris in the Vice-presidential Debate*" analyzed the use of Women's linguistic features by Kamala Harris as a female politician with the women's language features theory proposed by Lakoff (1975). The result found that there are five out of ten women's language features used by Kamala Harris in the vice-presidential debates; lexical hedges (16%), empathetic stress (11%), hypercorrect grammar, (33%), super polite form (1%), and intensifier (39%) as the most dominant feature. The findings conclude that intensifier was used as an emphasizer and persuasive language tool to convince the audience in winning electoral votes.

Second, Siregar, A. J., & Suastra, I. M. (2020) in their study entitled "*Women and Men Linguistic Features in the First Presidential Debate Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016*" analyzed the use of women's language features used by Hilary Clinton in the second presidential debate 2016. The theory used was women's language features proposed by Lakoff (1975) and men's linguistic features by Coates (2003). The result found that there seven features of ten women linguistic features discovered in this study; lexical hedges (17.5%), rising intonation on declarative (0.4%), empty adjectives (1.1%), intensive adverbs (17.5%), hypercorrect grammar (30.2%), super polite forms (1.9%), and emphatic stress (31.3%). Moreover, it was found that empathetic stress (31.3%) was the most dominant women's language feature that Hillary use to strengthen her statement as a persuasion tool to win the electoral votes.

Third, Fidelia Ratih Widya Wardani and Maria Komang Grace Kristiani in their study entitled "*Women's Langauge Features in Michelle Obama's Speech "The First Lady on the Importance of Studying Abroad*" aims to pinpoint the women's language elements that can be found there. The information was gathered using a descriptive qualitative approach by watching the video of Michelle Obama's speech numerous times and reading the speech's transcript, which was posted on YouTube and contained the women's language features. Utilizing Lakoff's (1975) analysis of women's language, the data were examined. According to the study's findings, 89 items were discovered, of which 18 items (or 20%) are lexical hedges or fillers, 1 item (or 1% of declarative) uses rising intonation, 13 items (or 15%) are intensifiers, and 57 things (or 64% of them) use emphatic stress.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs the inductive qualitative research method. Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2021) state that qualitative methods are mostly concerned with observing human interaction and how meaning can be interpreted through words and actions. The theoretical framework used as the main theory to analyze the data was Lakoff's (1975) women language feature and Quirk et al. (1992) types of intensifier. There are two primary data sources used in this study: Kamala Harris' vice-presidential debate transcription from USA Today and Hillary Clinton's presidential debate transcription from CNN. The instruments used in gathering and analyzing data are the human instrument and a tabulation table. The data analysis techniques consist of four steps: skimming the data, analyzing the given theoretical framework, interpreting the result and discussion, and presenting the data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section will elaborate on the result and discussion found in this research. The theory used is Quirk et al. (1992) types of intensifiers: emphasizers, amplifiers, and

downtoners. Each type will be written in a matrix. A detailed description of each type and its examples will be also provided orderly in the paragraphs below.

Table 1. The distribution of Emphasizers

Type	Type of occurrences	Number of occurrences	Percentage (%)
Attitudinal Disjunct	6 (clearly, actually, of course, probably, certainly, really)	44	47%
Style Disjunct	3 (frankly, just, literally)	11	12%

The first type of intensifier is emphasizer which is subdivided into attitudinal and style disjunct. It was found that there are 3 types of attitudinal disjunct with 44 occurrences used by Kamala Harris in her vice-presidential debate speech with Mike Pence, and Hillary Clinton in her presidential debate with Donald Trump. They are *Frankly (1 time), Just (1 time),* and *Literally (3 times)* as the most dominant. The purpose of uttering attitudinal disjunct by these female politicians will be elaborated through conversation provided as the data below.

(1) KAMALA HARRIS: "*Can you imagine if you knew on January 28th, as opposed to March 13th, what they knew, what you might've done to prepare? They knew, and they covered it up. The president said it was a hoax. They minimized the seriousness of it. The president said, "You're on one side of his ledger if you wear a mask. You're on the other side of his ledger if you don't." And in spite of all of that, today, they still don't have a plan. They still don't have a plan. Well, Joe Biden does. And our plan is about what we need to do around a national strategy for contact tracing, for testing, for administration of the vaccine, and making sure that it will be free for all. That is the plan that Joe Biden has and that I have, knowing that we have to get. And Joe Biden is the best leader to do that. And [**frankly**] this administration has forfeited their-"*
SUSAN PAGE: "*Thank you, Senator Harris-*"
KAMALA HARRIS: "*… right to reelection based on this".*

In datum (1), Kamala Harris talked about how the Trump administration took a toll in governing the pandemic. She claimed that the administration had known what was happening but chose not to tell the public and said that the virus was only a hoax. As a consequence, 210.000 people were dead, and over 7 million people contracted the disease. Here Kamala employs *frankly*, which counts as an emphasizer style disjunct. Style disjuncts aim to express statements uttered by speakers on the style or manner in which they are speaking. Hence, the use of *frankly* by Kamala Harris as in "*And **frankly** this administration has forfeited their right to reelection based on this,*" means 'I am telling you this frankly that the administration has forfeited their right to reelection based on this particular problem.'

Aside from attitudinal disjunct, there is also style disjunct. It was found that there are 6 pieces of style disjunct with 11 number of occurrences Kamala Harris, and Hillary Clinton in her presidential debate with Donald Trump. They are: *Clearly (1 time), Actually (1 time), Of Course (2 times), probably (1 time), Certainly (3 times),* and *Really (4 times)* as most dominant. The purpose of uttering style disjunct by these female politicians will be elaborated through conversation provided as the data below.

(2) MIKE PENCE: "*President Donald Trump has put the health of America first. Before there were more than five cases in the United States, all people who had returned from China, President Donald Trump did what no other American president had ever done. And that was, he suspended all travel from China, the second-largest economy in the world. Now, Senator Joe Biden opposed that decision. He said it was xenophobic and hysterical. But I can tell you having led the white house coronavirus task force that that decision alone by President Trump bought us invaluable time to stand up the greatest national mobilization since World War Two. And I believe it saved hundreds of thousands of American lives. Because with that time, we were able to reinvent testing. More than 115 million tests had been done to date".*
SUSAN PAGE: "*Thank you, Vice President Pence. Senator Harris, would you like to respond?*"
KAMALA HARRIS: "*Whatever the vice president is claiming the administration has done, [**clearly**], it hasn't worked. When you're looking at over 210,000 dead bodies in our country".
When you're looking at over 210,000 dead bodies in our country, American lives that have been*

lost, families that are grieving that loss, and the vice president is the head of the task force and knew on January 28th, how serious this was".

In datum (2), Kamala Harris answered about how the plan Mike Pence talked about Trump's administration's coronavirus prevention did not successfully work since there is a serious loss of over 210.000 dead bodies due to the virus. Here, Kamala employs '*clearly*' in "*Whatever the vice president is claiming the administration has done, **clearly**, it hasn't worked*" which counts as an emphasizer attitudinal disjunct. As earlier mentioned, attitudinal disjunct aims to comment on the content of what is being said. The most common express degrees of certainty and doubt as to what is being said. Hence, the use of '*clearly*' in "Whatever the vice president is claiming the administration has done, clearly it hasn't worked" intends to show Kamala's certainty that Trump's administration's plan to ban China as coronavirus prevention was a total failure.

Table 2. The distribution of Amplifiers

Type	Type of occurrences	Number of occurrences	Percentage (%)
Maximiser	4 (absolutely, incredibly, very)	17	18%
Boosters	3 (so, strongly, well)	7	7%

The second type of intensifier is an amplifier which is subdivided into maximizers and boosters. It was found that there are 4 types of maximizers with 17 occurrences used by Kamala Harris in her vice-presidential debate speech with Mike Pence; Hillary Clinton in her presidential debate with Donald Trump. There are four types of maximizers: *Absolutely* (4 times); *Incredibly* (2 times)*;* and *Very* (11 times) as the most dominant. The purpose of uttering amplifier maximizers by these female politicians will be elaborated through the conversation provided in the data below.

(3) SUSAN PAGE: *"Senator Harris, as the vice president mentioned, you co-sponsored the Green New Deal in Congress, but Vice President Biden said in last week's debate that he does not support the Green New Deal. But if you look at the Biden-Harris campaign website, it describes the Green New Deal as a crucial framework. What exactly would be the stance of a Biden-Harris administration toward the Green New Deal? You have two minutes uninterrupted".*
KAMALA HARRIS: *"So, first of all, I will repeat and the American people know that Joe Biden will not ban fracking. That is a fact. That is a fact. I will repeat that Joe Biden has been [**very**] clear that he thinks about growing jobs, which is why he will not increase taxes for anyone who makes less than $400,000 a year. Joe Biden's economic plan… Moody's, which is a reputable Wall Street firm, has said will create seven million more jobs than Donald Trump's".*

In datum (3), Kamala Harris answered the host's question on what would be the stance of a Biden-Harris administration toward the Green New Deal. Before she goes to her point, Kamala made a disclaimer that Joe Biden will not ban fracking. She made her statement strong by repeating phrases such as "*That is a fact, that is a fact. I will repeat.*" She also employs the adverb '*very*' in "Joe Biden has been very clear that he thinks about growing jobs, which is why he will not increase taxes for anyone who makes less than $400,000 a year," which counts as an amplifier maximizer. As earlier mentioned, the amplifier maximizer aims to modify the non-gradable object and simultaneously strengthen statements. Hence, Kamala's intention in using '*very*' in her utterance is to modify her statement as a persuasive strategy. She wanted to put emphasis on the fact that Joe Biden will not increase taxes for anyone making less than $400,000 a year.

Aside from amplifier maximizers, there are also boosters. It was found that there are 3 types of boosters with 26 occurrences used by Kamala Harris, and Hillary Clinton in her presidential debate with Donald Trump. They are: *Strongly* (1 time) and *So* (6 times) as the most dominant. The purpose of uttering amplifier boosters by these female politicians will be elaborated through the conversation provided in the data below.

(4) HOLT: *"Our next segment is called Securing America. We want to start with a 21st-century war happening every day in this country, our institutions are under cyber attack, and our secrets are being stolen. So my question is, who's behind it, and how do we fight it? Secretary Clinton, this answer goes to you".*

HILLARY CLINTON: *We need to make it very clear whether it's Russia, China, Iran, or anybody else, the United States has much greater capacity. And we are not going to sit idly by and permit state actors to go after our information, our private sector information, or our public sector information, and we're going to have to make it clear that we don't want to use the kinds of tools that we have. We don't want to engage in a different kind of warfare. But we will defend the citizens of this country, and the Russians need to understand that. I think they've been treating it as almost a probing, how far would we go? How much would we do? And that's why I was [**so**] shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is, that is just unacceptable".*

In datum (4), Hillary Clinton answered about who is behind cyber attacks and how could the United States fight. Initially, Hillary disclaimed that the United States is one step ahead of Russia, China, Iran, and anybody else in terms of national cybersecurity. And with that, Hillary stated that the states did not want to use their technology to engage in warfare. However, quite contradictory, Hillary mentioned that Trump invited Putin to hack into Americans as can be seen from the statement "*And that's why I was **so** shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is, that is just unacceptable*." Here, Hillary employed '*so*' which counts as an amplifier booster. Amplifier booster aims to adjust gradable goods such as adjectives like tall and short; while at the same time strengthening statements. Hence, the use of '*so*' here purposes to emphasize Hillary's shocked expression toward Trump's decision to invite Putin to hack into Americans. This technique is a great persuasive method as it helps emphasize the point she wanted the audience to focus on.

Table 3. The distribution of Downtoners

Type	Type of occurrences	Number of occurrences	Percentage (%)
Compromisers	2 (quite, enough)	2	2%
Diminishers	1 (at least)	1	1%
Minimizers	1 (little)	7	7%
Approximators	2 (almost, about)	6	6%

The last type of intensifier is downtoners which are subdivided into compromisers, diminishers, minimizers, and approximators. These four types of downtoner will be explained orderly. First of all, it was found that there is 1 type of compromiser with 1 number of occurrences used by Kamala Harris in her vice-presidential debate speech with Mike Pence; and Hillary Clinton in her presidential debate with Donald Trump which is *Quite* (1 time). The purpose of uttering amplifier maximizers by these female politicians will be elaborated through the conversation provided in the data below.

(5) DONALD TRUMP: *"And, Hillary, I'd just ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you've been doing it, and now you're just starting to think of solutions".*

HILLARY CLINTON: *"Well, actually…"* [Interruption]

DONALD TRUMP: *"I will bring -- excuse me. I will bring back jobs. You can't bring back jobs".*

HILLARY CLINTON: *"Well, actually, I have thought about this [**quite**] a bit".*

DONALD TRUMP: *"Yeah, for 30 years".* [Interruption]

HILLARY CLINTON: *"And I have -- well, not [**quite**] that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again…"*

In datum (5), Hillary Clinton answered Trump's question which said why was she just thinking about solutions to the rise of unemployment in the United States due to the pandemic

after 39 years. She was in an attacked position, and hence that is why she used fillers 'quite' twice in her statements. As mentioned previously, the use of downtoners may seem quite similar to the use of filler, which is to allow the speaker a moment to consider what to say next. Downtoners imply the confidence levels of speakers. Therefore, the use of '*quite*' as in "Well, actually, I have thought about this quite a bit," and "And I have -- well, not quite that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again…" works as a hedging device to manipulate her lack of a plan, making it seem as if she–at least- still manage to work things out. This is one of the persuasive tools to cover her uncertainty about her plans for unemployment to the public.

Aside from compromisers, there are also downtoner diminishers. It was found that there is 1 type of diminisher with 1 number of occurrences used by Kamala Harris in the vice-presidential debate; Hillary Clinton in the presidential debate with Donald Trump. They are: *At least* (1 time). The purpose of uttering amplifier boosters by these female politicians will be elaborated through the conversation provided in the data below.

(6) DONALD TRUMP: *"And look at her website. You know what? It's no different than this. She's telling us how to fight ISIS. Just go to her website. She tells you how to fight ISIS on her website. I don't think General Douglas MacArthur would like that too much".*
HOLT: *"The next segment, we're continuing..."*
HILLARY CLINTON: *"Well, [**at least**]. I have a plan to fight ISIS".*
HOLT: *"..achieving prosperity..."*
DONALD TRUMP: *"No, no, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do".*
HILLARY CLINTON: *"No, we're not. No, we're not".*

In datum (6), Hillary Clinton answered Trump's attack where it was stated that Hillary had created a website that tells how to fight ISIS. Trump consider her website as a failure since it leaked the United States' tactics and information to the enemy. Responding to this, Hillary hedged by employing the word '*at least'* which counts as a downtoner diminisher. Downtoner is the opposite of an emphasizer. Therefore, her purpose of using diminisher is to downtone her wrongs; and as a justification strategy. Despite the fact that her method of fighting ISIS through the creation of a website is poor, 'at least' she still has a plan. Therefore, her purpose in using "at least" is to emphasize or reduce the effect of a statement. This is a persuasive strategy to manipulate the audience by centralizing on positive qualities.

Next, there are also downtoner minimizers. It was found that there is 1 type of minimizer with 7 number of occurrences used by Kamala Harris in the vice-presidential debate; Hillary Clinton in the presidential debate with Donald Trump. They are: *At least* (1 time). The purpose of uttering amplifier boosters by these female politicians will be elaborated through the conversation provided in the data below.

(7) HILLARY CLINTON*: "And maybe because you haven't paid any federal income tax for a lot of years.* (APPLAUSE) *And the other thing I think is important..."*
DONALD TRUMP*: "It would be squandered, too, believe me".*
HILLARY CLINTON*: "... is if your -- if your main claim to be president of the United States is your business, then I think we should talk about that. You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of [**little**] guys. And, indeed, I have met a lot of the people who were stiffed by you and your businesses, Donald. I've met dishwashers, painters, architects, glass installers, marble installers, and drapery installers like my dad was, who you refused to pay when they finished the work that you asked them to do. We have an architect in the audience who designed one of your clubhouses at one of your golf courses. It's a beautiful facility. It immediately was put to use. And you wouldn't pay what the man needed to be paid, what he was charging you to do..."*
DONALD TRUMP*: "Maybe he didn't do a good job and I was unsatisfied with his work..."*

In datum (7), Hillary talked about how Trump's focus on getting the presidency is only about business. She employed the minimizer '*little*' in "*You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of little guys.*" As mentioned, a downtoner is the opposite of an emphasizer. It aims to reduce the force of another word or phrase. Therefore, the purpose Hillary used 'little' is to describe people with whom Trump had built a business; which means they are less strong. She wanted to underline the point where Donald Trump had taken advantage of these 'little' people for his own beneficial business. This is a persuasive strategy in political language that aims to knock the opponent and get support from the audience.

Finally, there are downtoner approximators. It was found that there is 1 approximator with 6 occurrences used by Kamala Harris in the vice-presidential debate; Hillary Clinton in the presidential debate with Donald Trump. They are: *Almost* (2 times). The purpose of uttering amplifier boosters by these female politicians will be elaborated through the conversation provided in the data below.

> (8) KAMALA HARRIS: "*Well, on the issue of jobs*".
> SUSAN PAGE: "*Senator Harris*".
> KAMALA HARRIS: "*Let's talk about that. The vice president earlier referred to it as part of what he thinks is an accomplishment. The president's trade war with China. You lost that trade war. You lost it. What ended up happening because of a so-called trade war with China, America lost 300,000 manufacturing jobs. Farmers have experienced bankruptcy because of it. We are in a manufacturing recession because of it. And when we look at where this administration has been, there are estimates that by the end of the term of this administration, they will have lost more jobs than [**almost**] any other presidential administration and the American people know what I'm talking about*".

In datum (8), Kamala Harris talked about the issue of jobs amid the trade war with China which result in the loss of 300,000 manufacturing jobs in America. Here, Kamala employed the approximator '*almost*' in "And when we look at where this administration has been, there are estimates that by the end of the term of this administration, they will have lost more jobs than almost any other presidential administration and the American people know what I'm talking about. Downtoner may tell the degree of certainty of the speaker. While approximations might also be used if incomplete information prevents the use of exact representations. Therefore, the purpose Kamala uses '*almost'* in her statement is that she wanted to tell the audience that Trump's presidential administration has the most unemployment but she was not too certain–hence, that is why she employed '*almost'* as an approximator since she could not tell exactly whether Trump's administration had the most unemployment. This is a persuasive strategy to drop the opponent.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study found that there are 95 intensifiers total with emphasizers (58%) with attitudinal disjunct (46%) and style disjunct (12%); amplifiers (25%) with maximizer (18%) and booster (7%); and finally downtoners (16%) with compromiser (1%), diminisher (1%), minimizer (7%), and approximator (6%). Emphasizer attitudinal disjunct was found as the most dominant type of intensifier used by Kamala and Hillary in the presidential debate. They were '*Clearly, Actually, Of course, Probably, Certainly, Really.'* Attitudinal disjunct aims to comment on the content of what is being said. The most common express degrees of certainty and doubt as to what is being said. Moreover, it was found that the purpose of uttering these linguistic items by the two female politicians is a persuasive strategy to convince the presidential election.

REFERENCES

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). How to Design and Evaluate Research in eEducation (8th ed.). New York: Mc Graw HIl

Joseph, B.C., Hartanti, L.P., & Leliana, A. (2022). The Use of Women's Language Features by Kamala Harris in the Vice-presidential Debate. *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2021 (IJCAH 2021)*.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (4th ed.).* USA: Routledge.

Krieg, G. & Diaz, D. (2016, October 10). Donald Trump vs. Hillary Clinton II: The nastiest lines. *CNN Style.* https://edition.cnn.com/2016/10/10/politics/presidential-debate-donald-trump-hillary-clinton-quotes/index.html

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Women's Place.* New York: Harper & Row.

Lakoff., R. (2003). "Language, Gender, and Politics: Putting "Women" and "Power" in the Same Sentence," in The Handbook of Language and Gender, J. Holmes and M. Myerhoff, Ed. MA: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 161-178.

Lawless, J.L., Pearson, K. (2008). "The Primary Reason for Women's Underrepresentation? Reevaluating the Conventional Wisdom," Journal of Politics, pp. 67-82. DOI: doi:10.1017/S002238160708005X

Page, S. (2020, October 8). Read the full transcript of vice presidential debate between Mike Pence and Kamala Harris. *USA Today.* https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/10/08/vice-presidential-debate-full-transcript-mike-pence-and-kamala-harris/5920773002/

Quirk, R. G. (1992). *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* Longman Group Ltd.

Rudman, L.A., Goodwin, S.A. (2004). "Gender Differences in Automatic In-group Bias: Why Do Women Like Women More Than Men Like Men?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, pp. 494-509. DOI: doi:10.1037/0022- 3514.87.4.494

Rudman, L.A. (1998). "Self-promotion as a Risk Factor for Women," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, pp. 629-645.

Sardabi, N. &. (2015). Genderdifferences in the use of intensifiers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(7), 203-213.

Setayesh, B. & D. (2018). A corpus-based contrastive analysis of the frequency of intensifiers in native and Iranian non-native English Speakers appliedlinguistics research articles (RAs). *International Journal of Informatics, Technology & Computers*, 1(1), 49–78.

Siregar, A. J., & Suastra, I. M. (2020). Women and Men Linguistic Features in the First Presidential Debate Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016. Udayana Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (UJoSSH), 4(1), 1.

Tannen, D. (1996). *Gender and Discourse.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wardani, Fidelia & Kristiani, Maria. (2020). Women's Language Features in Michelle Obama's Speech "The First Lady on the Importance of Studying Abroad.". ELTR Journal. 1. 61-67. 10.37147/eltr.v1i2.44. https://doi.org/10.24843/UJOSSH.2020.V04.I01.P01