Questioning Strategies Used By Debate Hosts In Mata Najwa And Kick Andy

Fathul Jannah Harahap[1], Erikson Saragih[2], Nehemia Anugrah Parasian[3]

[1,2,3]*Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia*
Corresponding author's E-mail fathuljannahrp@gmail.com

Abstract

This research aimed to identify the questioning strategies used by debate hosts in Mata Najwa and Kick Andy and to investigate how these strategies influenced the flow of dialogue, issue framing, and the quality of informants' responses. This research used a descriptive qualitative method. The results showed that Najwa Shihab employed five types of questions, namely opening questions, informative questions, Socratic questions, controlling questions, and rhetorical questions. These question types were used to build rapport, obtain factual explanations, stimulate critical thinking, ensure clarity, and provide subtle critique. Andy F. Noya employed six types of questions, consisting of opening questions, informative questions, Socratic questions, directing questions, alternative questions, and closing questions. These strategies functioned to guide the discussion, clarify political positions, and maintain structured and balanced interactions. The findings indicated that both hosts effectively managed the direction and focus of the conversation, prevented digression from key topics, and enhanced audience understanding of complex legal and political issues. The implications of this research indicated that people could apply effective questioning in daily life to understand complex information and evaluate issues critically. This research contributes to discourse analysis by highlighting the role of questioning strategies in public and political debates, while offering practical insights for hosts, journalists, and educators to guide discussions.

Keywords: Debate, Kick Andy, Mata Najwa, Questioning Strategy

INTRODUCTION

Debate programs have become the most influential television shows in shaping public opinion, particularly regarding political, social, and economic issues. The host or moderator plays a role not only as a facilitator but also as a controller of the discussion through the questioning strategies they employ. The host serves as the core of a program and even becomes the pivotal point for its effectiveness for the audience, ensuring that each segment runs smoothly and successfully (Nafiza, 2021; Pratiwi & Karim, 2022; Rizqiyah et al., 2025; Syafira & Sa'i, 2025). The host delivers narratives or information in various programs or events, including television, radio, and film (Maghfiroh & Ahya, 2023). Each questioning strategy affects the flow of the debate, the quality of the arguments presented by the guests, and the audience's perception of the program's credibility.

Debate is an activity of exchanging arguments between two or more parties, either individually or in groups, by providing reasons to defend their respective opinions (Astutik, 2021; Maulani et al., 2024). Debate is one form of public communication (Adhrianti et al., 2022). In debate programs, questioning strategies are crucial for the

host, as their ability to pose questions can enliven the debate and influence how the audience understands the information. However, in the practice of debates program in Indonesia, the way hosts ask questions still presents challenges. Questions that are too provocative can turn the debate into an emotional confrontation or personal attack rather than a space for presenting rational arguments. Meanwhile, questions that are too general fail to encourage guests to provide in-depth reasoning.

A host's neutrality may be perceived as partial when certain questioning styles give the impression of favoring one side, particularly in political debates. When questions seem one-sided, the audience's perception of the debate's objectivity may shift, and the discussion could stray from the main issues. Such circumstances underscore the importance of implementing well-planned and consistent questioning strategies, ensuring that the debate remains balanced, continues to explore arguments in depth, and stays engaging for the audience.

Understanding questioning strategies in a debate can also serve as teaching material in classroom learning and instruction. For teachers, knowledge of questioning strategies can help guide discussions, foster students' critical thinking, and maintain an interactive classroom dynamic (see Azhari et al., 2021; Ismalinda et al., 2023; Patimah et al., 2024; Pradana et al., 2024; Yudiyanto et al., 2024). For students, these strategies can serve as examples of how to pose questions that are precise, focused, and in-depth, enabling them to participate actively in discussions (see Armiah et al., 2024; Nurhayati et al., 2023; Kalsum et al., 2022; Sofwan, 2016; Waruwu et al., 2023). Thus, applying questioning strategies from the context of debates not only enriches teaching methods but also enhances the quality of classroom interactions.

Previous studies have examined the questioning strategies. For instance, Isnaini et al., (2022) investigated the questioning strategy in the Hotman Paris Show and its potential as a teaching material for discussion texts. Their study focused on identifying rhetorical elements such as question types and diction used by the host. Similarly, Nafiza, (2021) the rhetorical strategies employed by the host in Mata Najwa highlight both verbal and nonverbal rhetorical expressions as integral components of the host's communication technique. Furthermore, Rehanisafira & Juita, (2022) examined the host's speaking strategies on the Vindes YouTube channel, focusing on the integration of straightforward questioning and positive politeness strategies.

Several previous studies have thus provided valuable insights into hosts' communication and rhetorical techniques. However, most have focused on persuasive language, diction, or politeness strategies rather than on how questioning strategies specifically function within the dynamics of a debate. While these studies contribute to understanding hosts' communicative styles, there remains limited discussion on how questioning strategies influence the flow of debates, issue framing, and the quality of arguments delivered by guests. This underexplored aspect represents a gap that serves as the basis for the present study.

This study was significant because it examined how a host's questioning strategies shaped the flow of discussion, framed issues, and affected the audience's understanding of debated topics. By analyzing the types of questions, their delivery, and contextual functions, the study provided insight into the host's role not only as a facilitator but also as a discussion guide who could influence audience perception, stimulate critical thinking, and obtain informative and meaningful responses from informants. Accordingly, this study aimed to answer two research questions: (1) what types of questioning strategies were used by debate hosts in Mata Najwa and Kick Andy, and (2) how these questioning strategies influenced the flow of discussion, the framing of issues, and the quality of responses provided by the informants.

This research contributed to the study of discourse analysis by highlighting the role of questioning strategies in public communication and political debates, while also offering practical insights for hosts, journalists, and communication instructors in designing strategic questions to guide discussions, enhance the quality of interactions, and strengthen audience critical thinking skills. In addition, the findings provided valuable guidance for developing teaching materials related to discussion texts, rhetoric, and political communication, making them applicable in both educational and broadcasting contexts.

METHODOLOGY

This research was a descriptive qualitative study intended to identify the questioning strategies used by debate hosts in Mata Najwa and Kick Andy. The qualitative approach allowed the researcher to examine in depth the verbal interactions, the context of the questions, and the implications of the questioning strategies on both the informant and the audience.

The instrument used in this research was content analysis, which served as the primary tool for examining and interpreting the questioning strategies used by debate hosts in Mata Najwa and Kick Andy. Through this instrument, the researcher systematically observed, classified, and analyzed the types and purposes of questions to understand how they influenced the course of discussion, issue framing, and the quality of responses given by the informants.

The data of this study consist of the questioning strategies used by debate hosts in Indonesia. The data sources collected from Mata Najwa, hosted by Najwa Shihab, specifically the episode discussing the RKUHAP, and Kick Andy, hosted by Andy F. Noya, specifically the episode covering the presidential debate.

Data analysis applied the model proposed by Miles et al., (2014), which consists of three stages, namely data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. During data condensation, relevant questions were organized and categorized. In the data display, the questions and responses were arranged according to their respective types and intended purposes to identify emerging patterns. Finally,

in the conclusion drawing and verification, the findings were analyzed to determine how questioning influenced the flow of discussion, issue framing, and the quality of responses provided by the informants.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In the Mata Najwa and Kick Andy programs, questioning strategies served as the primary tool for hosts to guide the discussion flow. Najwa Shihab predominantly used informative and Socratic questions to explore facts, stimulate critical thinking among guests, and connect legal issues with the real-life experiences of the public. In contrast, Andy F. Noya tended to emphasize directing and alternative questions, guiding guests toward specific answers and encouraging them to express their positions clearly.

1. Questioning Strategies Used by Debate Hosts in Mata Najwa and Kick Andy

Najwa Shihab's Questioning Strategies in Mata Najwa

*Figure 1. **Host of Mata Najwa (Najwa Shihab)***

From the fourteen identified types of questions, Najwa Shihab utilizes five, including opening, informative, Socratic, controlling, and rhetorical questions. These indicate that her questioning style focuses on creating a comfortable atmosphere, eliciting factual information, encouraging critical analysis, ensuring clarity of responses, and providing emphasis through subtle critique. The following table illustrates the application of these question types.

*Table 1. **Types and Frequency of Najwa Shihab's Questions***

Type of Question	Frequency	Percentage
Opening	1	9.09%
Informative	4	36.36%
Socratic	3	27.27%
Controlling	2	18.18%

Rhetorical	1	9.09%
Total	**11**	**100%**

Table 2. ***Types and Classifications of Najwa Shihab's Questions***

Types of Question	Classification
Opening	Greeting the guest, easing the atmosphere, and quoting statements to build rapport
Informative	Asking about the effectiveness of the Draft Criminal Procedure Code (RKUHAP), mechanisms, police authority, and specific article examples.
Socratic	Quoting criticism from civil society, questioning the dominance of law enforcement, and addressing potential conflicts of interest among the RKUHAP drafting team.
Controlling	Confirming the informant's stance on circulating criticisms, ensuring responses are clear and concise, and verifying the certainty of previously explained technical plans to maintain clarity of responses.
Rhetorical	Delivering subtle criticism: "if it's meant to be open to the public, then access should be as easy as possible."

Based on Hendrikus's (2015) classification, the following analysis presents the types of questions used by the host, Najwa Shihab, in the Mata Najwa program that addresses the RKUHAP, aiming to ensure that the legal process in Indonesia remains fair and non-arbitrary.

a) Opening Questions (OQ)

Table 3. ***Opening Question Used by Najwa Shihab***

Data	Qusetion
OQ 1	Yang selalu menjadi sumber rujukan soal rancangan KUHAP, ini ada mbak Maidina Rahmawati, koalisi masyarakat sipil. Apa kabar? Terima kasih sudah selalu mau untuk diajak diskusi soal ini
OQ 2	Biar gak gampang ditangkap, itu dia kata-katanya. Jadi buat teman-teman yang nanya, apasih RUU ini? Biar gak gampang ditangkap, dan kalau ditangkap enggak seenaknya digebukin polisi.

In this section, Najwa Shihab opened the program by greeting her informants, which aimed to create a relaxed atmosphere and foster a sense of connection among the host, the informant, and the audience. She restated the guest's words by quoting the phrase *"so that people won't get arrested too easily"* and added emphasis through the remark, *"If arrested, they can't just get beaten up by the police as they please."* This strategy strengthened the informant's statement and expanded the discussion by linking the RKUHAP issue to real-life experiences, making the discussion more relevant, insightful, and easier for the audience to understand.

b) Informative Questions (IQ)

Table 4. **Informative Question Used by Najwa Shihab**

Data	Question
IQ 1	Salah satu isu yang juga kerap kali dekat dengan masyarakat adalah ketika mereka datang lapor polisi, tetapi tidak ditindak lanjuti. Apakah KUHP yang baru sekarang akan bisa menjawab persoalan-persoalan itu
IQ 2	Apa mekanisme yang sekarang anda perjuangkan masuk ke dalam rancangan KUHAP ini yang akan bisa membuat persoalan itu tidak terjadi lagi?
IQ 3	Bagaimana kewenangan polisi di lapangan yang anda lihat, dan apakah RUU KUHAP ini bisa menjawab itu, atau justru khawatirnya malah melegitimasi yang selama ini dilakukan oleh kepolisian?
IQ 4	Apalagi misalnya yang spesifik, yang kemudian menjadi argument teman-teman bahwa RUU ini justru menambah kewenangan polisi bukannya malah justru membuat mekanisme pengawasan yang lebih pruden?

In data IQ 1, the host highlighted everyday realities, such as unaddressed public reports to the police, and connected them to the substance of the RKUHAP to obtain concrete information on whether the legal reform could improve practices long criticized by society. Meanwhile, in Data IQ 2, the question focused on factual information rather than opinions or criticism. By emphasizing the word "mechanism," Najwa directed the informant to provide a clear answer that revealed accountable solutions beyond merely identifying problems. In data IQ 3, the host aimed to obtain a concrete answer regarding how police authority operated in daily practice based on the informant's firsthand experiences, while also encouraging an explanation of whether the new RKUHAP would offer real solutions or exacerbate existing problems. In data IQ 4, the question prompted the informant to provide concrete examples by eliciting factual information about specific problematic articles, ensuring that the response was clear, specific, and easily understood by the public.

c) Socratic Questions (SQ)

Table 5. **Socratic Question Used by Najwa Shihab**

Data	Question
SQ 1	Kita banyak pengalaman pahit tentang bagaimana proses legislasi itu dilakukan jauh dari partisipasi public, spesifiknya koalisi Masyarakat sipil bilang khusus yang ini prosesnya ugal-ugalan katanya. Saya pinjam kata-kata yang ada di petisi, dibilangnya ini (RKUHAP) penuh kejanggalan, manipulasi, kitab undang-undang harapan palsu, prosesnya ugal-ugalan. Silahkan membela diri.
SQ 2	Apakah memang akhirnya lebih banyak perspektif aparat penegak hukum yang diakomodir? karena sejak awal prosesnya lebih banyak

Data	Question
	mereka yang didengarkan, sementara teman-teman koalisi masyarakat sipil dilibatkannya hanya di awal-awal
SQ 3	Prof tadi bagaimana, bahwa ada tim 12, timnya dari aparat penegak hukum, ada jaksa, polisi, hakim? Padahal undang-undang ini akan mengatur kerja-kerja mereka, kan konflik berkepentingan dong kalau yang merumuskan mereka

In SQ 1, the question fell into the category of Socratic questioning because Najwa not only repeated the accusation but also used it to encourage the informant to think critically and reveal the truth behind the RKUHAP legislative process. By asking the informant to "defend themselves," she prompted the informant to provide logical and rational arguments rather than mere opinions. In data SQ 2, the host went beyond seeking factual information by raising a critical statement about a potential imbalance in the legislative process, prompting the informant to consider whether the authorities' perspective dominated civil society's voice. Data SQ 3, the question aimed to evaluate the informant's reasoning by highlighting the irregularity of law enforcers participating in drafting the law, encouraging critical reflection on fairness, objectivity, and possible conflicts of interest. Overall, these questions demonstrated the effectiveness of Socratic questioning in fostering deeper analysis for both the informant and the audience.

d) Controlling Questions (CQ)

*Table 6. **Controlling Question Used by Najwa Shihab***

Data	Question
CQ 1	Jadi penilaian soal ugal-ugalan, manipulatif, janggal dan sebagainya, anda menolak itu?
CQ 2	Jadi sekarang konkritnya akan ada kamera di ruang pemeriksaan?

The questions in data CQ 1 and CQ 2 reflected the host's use of controlling strategies aimed at ensuring clarity and focus in the discussion. By asking direct and specific questions, such as confirming the informant's stance on circulating criticisms and verifying the certainty of previously explained technical plans, the host prevented the conversation from becoming overly broad or ambiguous. These questions required clear and concise answers, either affirming or rejecting a point, which helped keep the discussion structured and allowed the audience to clearly understand the informant's position and the direction of the debate.

e) Rhetorical Question (RQ)

*Table 7. **Rhetorical Question Used by Najwa Shihab***

Data	Question
RQ 1	Tapi itu bukan teknis sih, menurut saya kalau memang untuk terbuka buat publik, aksesnya ya haru semudah mungkin

In this question, Najwa Shihab didn't ask the question to obtain an answer from the informant but instead to emphasize a point. The primary purpose of this question was to convey a subtle critique or irony regarding the reason previously given by the informant. In this way, the host expressed her disagreement with the explanation provided by the informant. Additionally, the question served to engage the audience by prompting them to reflect on the issue, highlighting inconsistencies in the informant's argument, and reinforcing the host's perspective without requiring a direct response.

Andy F Noya's Questioning Strategies in Kick Andy

Figure 2. **Host of Kick Andy (Andy F Noya)**

From the fourteen identified types of questions, Andy F. Noya employed eight types: opening, informative, Socratic, directing, alternative, and closing questions. This indicated that Andy's questioning style was more diverse, serving not only to open and close the conversation but also to elicit factual information, encourage critical analysis, guide the informant's responses, and clarify his stance more explicitly. The following table illustrates the application of these question types.

Table 8. **Types and Frequency of Andy F Noya's Questions**

Type of Question	Frequency	Percentage
Opening	1	11.11%
Informative	2	22.22%
Socratic	1	11.11%
Directing	2	22.22%
Alternative	2	22.22%
Closing	1	11.11%
Total	**9**	**100%**

Table 9. Types and Classifications of Andy F Noya's Questions

Types of Question	Classification
Opening	Connecting the expectation of a peaceful presidential election with the reality of a debate filled with mutual attacks directly addresses the core issue.
Informative	Asking about the reason the human rights issue was raised in the debate, the intended meaning of political figures' statements, and clarifying the interpretation of those statements.
Socratic	Referring to the historical stance of PDIP toward Prabowo, requesting an analysis of political logic and the party's consistency.
Directing	Framing questions so that the informant responds to specific issues (for example, PDIP's change of attitude toward Jokowi or Megawati's statement as a representation of her faction).
Alternative	Presenting options such as "relevant or not" (the human rights issue) or "confident or not" (a one-round election).
Closing	Providing an opportunity for a closing statement, allowing the informant to deliver a final message.

Based on Hendrikus' (2015) classification, the following presents an analysis of the types of questions used by the host, Andy F. Noya, in the Kick Andy episode discussing the presidential election debate.

a) Opening Question (OQ)

*Table 10. **Opening Question Used by Andy F. Noya***

Data	Question
OQ 1	Pertama tentu terima kasih atas kehadirannya. Jadi masing-masing pihak inikan selalu mengutarakan bahwa di pilpres kali ini kita harus betul-betul damai, kita riang gembira. Tapi faktanya baru debat pertama kelihatannya sudah saling menyerang. Apakah emang akan terjadi terus menerus atau ini hanya strategi kampanye?

The question served to open the discussion by connecting the expectation of a peaceful and joyful presidential election with the reality of a debate that involved attacks among candidates. The purpose of this question was to lead the informant directly into the core discussion about campaign strategies. In this way, the host ensured that the conversation immediately focused on the key issues under discussion.

b) Informative Questions (IQ)

*Table 11. **Informative Question Used by Andy F. Noya***

Data	Question
IQ 1	Ada sebagian orang yang tidak menduga bahwa mas Ganjar mempersoalkan ada hilangnya seorang aktivis di tahun 98. Pak Prabowo kemudian menganggap ini tendensius, seakan-akan menuduh

	pak Prabowolah yang menghilangkan para aktivis di zaman orde baru yang lalu. Kenapa pertanyaan ini diajukan pada debat pertama?
IQ 2	Ada pernyataan Muhaimin Iskandar, bahwa kalau Anis tidak terpilih negara dalam keadaan bahaya. Apa bahayanya negara ini kalau Anies dan Muhaimin tidak memimpin negara ini?

The question in Data IQ 1 aimed to obtain factual information from the informant regarding the reason behind raising the human rights issue in the first debate. The question served to explore the context of the debate strategy, enabling the audience to understand why the matter appeared in the presidential debate. In this way, the host expected the informant to provide an accurate explanation rather than mere opinion or speculation. In data IQ 2, the question functioned to obtain a clear and specific explanation from the informant regarding Muhaimin Iskandar's statement that if Anies was not elected, the country would be in danger. Thus, the informant was required to provide an answer that clearly explained the essence of the statement in a concrete and publicly understandable manner.

c) Socratic Questions (SQ)

Table 12. **Socratic Question Used by Andy F. Noya**

Data	Question
SQ 1	Menjadi menarik, karena itu diucapkan oleh kubu Ganjar yang relatif di sana ada PDIP. Orang kemudian merefresh pada Sejarah pilpres di mana tahun 2009 bu Mega menggandeng pak Prabowo sebagai wakilnya untuk pencalonan. Di sana tidak ada pertanyaan dari PDIP, tidak ada isu HAM. Jadi sebenarnya inikan sudah selesai menurut PDIP karena bu Mega menggandeng Prabowo. Bagaimana anda menjelaskan hal ini?

The question in SQ 1 encouraged the informant to analyze and evaluate the political logic behind PDIP's change of stance on the human rights issue. The host did not merely ask for historical facts but stimulated the informant to think critically and explain the reasons for this shift in attitude from a political perspective. In this way, the audience was encouraged to understand the dynamics of political strategies shaping the debate, and the informant's response needed to be reflective and reasoning-based rather than merely chronological information.

d) Directing Question (DQ)

Table 13. **Directing Question Used by Andy F. Noya**

Data	Question
DQ 1	Anda tadi mengatakan bahwa sebagai panglima perang, anda tidak mewakili satu partai saja, dalam hal ini anda tidak mewakili semata-mata PDIP. Tapi suara PDIP adalah suara kubu nomor 3, dan suara kubu nomor 3 ini sekarang keras sekali mengkritisi semua apa yang dilakukan oleh

pak Jokowi, padahal dulu apapun yang dilakukan oleh pak Jokowi selalu benar dan selalu dibela tapi kenapa bisa berbalik 180 derajat. Anda tidak bisa mengatakan bahwa itu hanya suara PDIP mewakili seluruh koalisi tapi faktanya suara ini nyaring seakan-akan inilah suara kubu nomor 3. Kenapa harus beruba 180 derajat? Berarti selama ini bohong dong.

In data DQ 1, the question was directive, as it guided the informant to respond to the issue of PDIP's change of attitude toward the previous administration. The question compelled the informant to respond within a predetermined framework.

e) Alternative Question (AQ)

*Table 14. **Alternative Question Used by Andy F. Noya***

Data	Question
AQ 1	Sebelum saya kembali ke mas Arsyad, saya ke Pak Siogi dulu. Anda melihat persoalan HAM yang dipertanyakan oleh Mas Ganjar itu sangat relevan atau tidak?
AQ 2	Anda yakin bahwa ini akan satu putaran?

The question in data AQ 1 and 2 qualified as an alternative question because it presented two clear answer options, namely relevant or not. The host asked the informant to choose one response, preventing ambiguous or evasive answers. The function of an alternative question was to compel the informant to take a firm stance while also helping the audience directly understand the informant's position on the issue under discussion.

f) Closing Question

*Table 15. **Closing Question Used by Andy F. Noya***

Data	Question
CQ1	Jadi ini closing statement dari masing-masing berkaitan dengan keinginan kita semua agar pilpres 2024 ini bisa berlangsung fair, jujur, damai dan riang gembira. Kita urut dari satu, dua, tiga, apa yang ingin anda sampaikan kepada siapapun yang menonton acara ini agar tujuan itu bisa tercapai?

The question served as a closing question, providing the informant with the final opportunity to convey a message or key impression to the audience. Its primary purpose was to summarize the discussion while leaving a positive impression, ensuring that the audience captured the key points from each informant's statements. Additionally, a closing question helped the host conclude the debate in an orderly and coherent manner, marking the end of the discussion without leaving any significant issues unaddressed.

Based on the analysis of the types of questions used by Najwa Shihab in Mata Najwa and Andy F. Noya in Kick Andy, it was evident that the hosts employed various questioning strategies to guide the discussion, obtain information, and stimulate the informants' critical thinking. In Mata Najwa, Najwa Shihab began with opening questions to build rapport with the informants and guide the discussion toward the main issues, preparing the audience to follow the conversation, such as greeting them and reiterating their statements about the RKUHAP, then used informative questions to obtain factual explanations regarding the substance of the RKUHAP, law enforcement mechanisms, and the impact of new regulations on societal practices. Socratic questions encouraged the informants to think critically, analyze the legislative process, assess logical consistency, and reveal contradictions in the drafting of the RKUHAP, while controlling questions ensured clear and firm answers, and rhetorical questions delivered subtle critique or emphasized points in the informants' responses.

In the Kick Andy program, Andy F. Noya started with opening questions that linked the expectation of a peaceful presidential election with the reality of a debate filled with attacks, immediately focusing the discussion on campaign strategies. Informative questions explored the reasons behind raising particular issues, such as human rights and politicians' statements. Socratic questions promoted critical analysis of political logic, while directing questions framed the informants' answers to address topics within a predetermined framework. Alternative questions compelled the informants to choose one answer from two options to clarify their stance for the audience. Closing questions provided the informants with a last opportunity to convey key messages and leave a positive impression on the audience.

2. The Influence of Questioning Strategies on the Flow of Discussion, Issue Framing, and the Quality of Informants' Responses

The Flow of Discussion

The questioning strategies used by the hosts played a crucial role in shaping and directing the flow of discussion in a debate program. In this regard, Najwa Shihab and Andy F. Noya demonstrated their ability to keep the conversation focused, structured, and relevant to the issues being discussed through the use of various types of questions. Najwa Shihab tended to use informative and Socratic questions to obtain factual information while encouraging the informants to think critically about the issues. Meanwhile, Andy F. Noya emphasized the use of directing and alternative questions, which served to clarify the informants' statements and maintain a coherent discussion structure. Through the application of these strategies, both hosts effectively managed the rhythm of the discussion, prevented topic deviation, and created dynamic and meaningful interactions. Thus, questioning strategies functioned not only as a tool of communication but also as a discourse control mechanism that ensured the discussion remained effective and focused.

Issue Framing

The questions delivered by the hosts played a crucial role in framing issues and shaping how the audience interpreted the topics being discussed. Najwa Shihab often employed Socratic and rhetorical questions to highlight disparities in the legislative process and inconsistencies in legal policies. Through this approach, she encouraged the audience to view the issues from a more critical and reflective perspective. Meanwhile, Andy F. Noya employed informative and guiding questions to highlight political dynamics and campaign strategies during presidential debates, enabling sensitive topics such as human rights and shifts in political stance to be more clearly understood by the audience. Through careful word choice, measured tone, and strategic sequencing of questions, both hosts succeeded in constructing a discourse frame that not only drew attention to key aspects of the issues raised but also helped the audience grasp the social and political implications of the discussion.

The Quality of Informants Responses

Appropriate questioning strategies also had a direct impact on the quality of responses provided by the informants. Informative, reflective, or directing questions encouraged informants to deliver answers that were more argumentative, factual, and contextually relevant. In Mata Najwa, Najwa Shihab tended to guide informants to provide clear, measured, and data-based explanations, particularly when discussing issues such as the Draft Criminal Procedure Code (RKUHAP). Andy F. Noya, in Kick Andy directed informants to clarify their political stance or moral position on certain issues through explicit alternative and closing questions. These two styles demonstrated that questioning strategies not only determined the direction of discussion but also shaped the quality of the content produced in the debate. Structured and reflective answers indicated the host's success in fostering communicative interactions that were critical, informative, and easily understood by the public.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research, it can be concluded that Najwa Shihab and Andy F. Noya effectively used questioning strategies that shaped the direction and quality of debate interactions in their respective programs. Najwa Shihab used opening, informative, Socratic, controlling, and rhetorical questions to create clarity of responses and convey a subtle critique of the issues discussed. Andy F. Noya used opening, informative, Socratic, directing, alternative, and closing questions to guide the discussion, clarify viewpoints, and maintain a coherent and balanced discussion. The questioning strategies used by Najwa Shihab and Andy F. Noya significantly influence the flow of discussion, issue framing, and the quality of informants' responses. Through the use of various question types such as informative, Socratic, directing, alternative, and rhetorical questions, the hosts effectively maintain focused and structured discussions, influence how the audience understands the issues, and enhance the depth and clarity of informants' answers. These strategies function not only to structure and

direct the discourse but also to act as communicative and regulatory tools that keep the debates intellectually engaging, purposeful, and easily understood by the audience. This study was limited to selected episodes of Mata Najwa and Kick Andy and focused mainly on the types and functions of questioning strategies used by the hosts, without examining broader linguistic features such as intonation, non-verbal cues, or audience responses. Therefore, future research is recommended to include a wider range of episodes or debate programs, incorporate multimodal analysis, and consider audience or informant perspectives to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of questioning strategies in debate.

REFERENCES

Adhrianti, L., Alfarabi, & Yuliati. (2022). Komunikasi Debat Bagi Pembangunan Karakter Generasi Muda Bengkulu. *Artinara*, *02*(01), 32–38.

Armiah, S., Nur, K., Elliza, N., & Salsabila, P. (2024). Mengembangkan Keterampilan Bertanya pada Anak Usia Dini Mendorong Rasa Ingin Tahu dan Pemikiran Kritis. *Ta'rim: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Anak Usia Dini*, *6*(1), 108–117.

Astutik, W. (2021). Debate Methods to Improve Speaking Skills in Students of Grade X Language 1 MA Al Mahrusiyah Lirboyo. *Wacana : Jurnal Bahasa, Seni, Dan Pengajaran*, *5*(1), 14–31.

Azhari, A., Helmiyadi, H., & Rahayu, R. (2021). Analisis Strategi Bertanya Guru Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Di Smp Negeri 1 Seunudon Kabupaten Aceh Utara. *Jurnal Metamorfosa*, *9*(2), 252–269.

Ismalinda, S., Masita, E., Hidayat, M., & Ayu Wulandari, B. (2023). Teachers' Question Types and Questioning Strategies: A Classroom Interaction Analysis. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education*, *7*(2), 336.

Isnaini, R. N., Wuryaningrum, R., & Murti, F. N. (2022). Strategi Bertanya dalam Acara "Hotman Paris Show" dan Pemanfaatannya sebagai Materi Ajar Teks Diskusi. *Alinea: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajaran*, *11*(2), 119.

Kalsum, U., Chastanti, I., & Harahap, D. A. (2022). Analisis Keterampilan Bertanya Siswa pada Pembelajaran IPA di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, *6*(3), 3736–3746.

Maghfiroh, S. D., & Ahya, A. S. (2023). Retorika Pembawa Acara Najwa Shihab Pada Program Mata Najwa Edisi Debat RKUHP Merdeka Bersuara. *Peningkatan Kinerja Dosen Melalui Penelitian Dan Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 168–186.

Maulani, S., Rahmalia, N. A., Mubarok, M. D., & Susanti, E. (2024). Pemanfaatan Metode Debat terhadap Keterampilan Berbicara pada Mahasiswa. *REFEREN*, *3*(2), 139–148.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (Third). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Nafiza, I. (2021). Strategi Retorika Pembawa Acara Dalam Mata Najwa Di Trans7. *Jurnal PENEROKA*, *1*(2), 259.

Nurhayati, R., Dana, N. H., Oktavianty, N., Kadir, M., & Ningsih, D. A. (2023). Pendampingan Pengembangan Keterampilan Bertanya Siswa. *PENDIMAS: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, *2*(2), 1–7.

Patimah, S., Chan, F., & Alirmansyah. (2024). Strategi Guru dalam Meningkatkan Keberanian Bertanya Siswa di Sekolah Dasar. *Wahana Didaktika : Jurnal Ilmu Kependidikan*, *22*(2), 95–110.

Pradana, H. P., Mahfud, H., & Supianto, S. (2024). Penerapan Keterampilan Bertanya Guru untuk Meningkatkan Keaktifan Peserta Didik di Kelas V Sekolah Dasar. *Didaktika Dwija Indria*, *12*(1), 19–24.

Pratiwi, W. D., & Karim, A. A. (2022). Retorika Pembawa Acara X Factor Indonesia. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *8*(2), 953–971.

Rehanisafira, M., & Juita, N. (2022). Strategi Bertutur Pembawa Acara Pada Akun Media Sosial Youtube Vindes: Kajian Pragmatik. *MEDAN MAKNA: Jurnal Ilmu Kebahasaan Dan Kesastraan*, *20*(2), 164.

Rizqiyah, N., Yanto, M., & Sa'i, M. (2025). Menjadi Pembawa Acara yang Profesional: Memahami Peran, Teknik, dan Strategi Sukses dalam Berbagai Konteks Acara. *Jejak Digital: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, *1*(3), 114–122.

Sofwan, M. (2016). Meningkatkan Kemampuan Bertanya Dasar Siswa Dengan Menggunakan Model Discovery Learning Di Kelas III B Sdn 64/1 Muara Bulian. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tematik Dikdas Universitas Jambi*, *1*(1), 29–36.

Syafira, D., & Sa'i, M. (2025). Tekhnik dan Strategi MC dalam Mengelola Waktu dan Suasana yang Efektif. *Jejak Digital: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, *1*(4), 879–887.

Waruwu, A. N., Rahmadhanty, A., Hutagalung, A., Sari, I. P., & Almsy, Z. (2023). Keterampilan Bertanya dalam Proses Pembelajaran di Kelas. *Paedagogi: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan (e-Journal)*, *9*(1), 65.

Yudiyanto, M., Nurishlah, L., Ramdan Samadi, M., & Meiliawati, F. (2024). Strategi Pengembangan Keterampilan Bertanya Guru Di Sekolah Dasar. *TA'DIB: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, *2*(1), 10–17.