



**POLITENESS STRATEGY IN *FORUM*
INDONESIA (A Metro TV Program)**

A THESIS

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Sarjana Degree Majoring Linguistics in English Department
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

Submitted by:

ARDIS SEPTI EKA RACHMATIKA
NIM: 13020111120010

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY

SEMARANG

2015

PRONOUNCEMENT

The writer honestly confirms that she compiles this thesis by herself and without taking any results from other researchers in S-1, S-2, S-3 and in diploma degree of any university. The writere ascertains also that she does not quote any material from other publications or someone's paper except from the references mentioned.

Semarang, September 2015

Ardis Septi Eka Rachmatika

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

“The secret of life, though, is to fall seven times and to get up eight times.”

(Paulo Coelho, *The Alchemist*)

“We must be willing to let go of the life we planned so as to have the life that is waiting for us.”

(Joseph Campbell)

虎穴に入らずんば虎子を得ず。 (*Koketsu ni irazunba koji wo ezu*)

(Unknown, *Japanese Proverbs*)

فَإِنَّ مَعَ الْعُسْرِ يُسْرًا (٥) إِنَّ مَعَ الْعُسْرِ يُسْرًا (٦) فَإِذَا فَرَغْتَ فَانصَبْ (٧) وَإِلَىٰ رَبِّكَ

فَارْعَبْ (٨)

(Q.S Al-Insyirah: 6-8)

*The writer dedicates this study to
her parents, Bahkir Rochmanto and Yasin Kartikawati, S.pd.
her beloved sister, Vio,
and to everyone who helped her accomplished this study.
“Thank you for the endless pray, love, support, and inspiraton.”*

APPROVAL

Approved by,

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum.

NIP. 19661004 199001 2 001

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata I Thesis Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

On September 2015

Chair Person

First Member

Dr. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum.
NIP. 19611109 198703 2 001

Dr. Suharno, M.Ed
NIP. 19520508 198303 1 001

Second Member

Third Member

Dra. Cut A.P. Ellisafny, M.Ed
NIP. 19551003 197812 2 001

Drs. Siswo Harsono, M.Hum
NIP. 19640418 199001 1 001

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Praise is merely to Allah SWT, for the enormous mercy and blessings, so I could accomplish this thesis entitled “The Application of Politeness Strategy to Criticize the Performance of SBY as a President in *Forum Indonesia* (A Metro TV Program)”. This thesis was arranged in order to fulfill undergraduate program requirement of the Faculty of Humanities of Diponegoro University Semarang.

On this occasion, I would like to thank all those people who have supported and contributed to the completion of this thesis. I also would like to extend my deepest gratitude and appreciation to the following people.

1. Dr. Rediyanto M. Noor, M.Hum., as the Dean of Faculty of Humanities of Diponegoro University Semarang.
2. Sukarni Suryaningsih, S.S., M.Hum., the Head of English Department, Diponegoro University.
3. Ayu Ida Savitri, S.S., M.Hum, the writer’s academic supervisor;
4. Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum., the writer’s thesis advisor who had given her guidance, helpful corrections, moral, advices, and support to me in arranging this thesis. Without those, it is doubtful that this thesis came into completion.
5. All English Department’s lecturers who had shared and given their knowledge, experience, and dedication to me and all of academic staff of the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University in managing all formal needs at university.

6. My parents, Bapak Bahkir Rochmanto and Ibu Yasin Kartikawati for their endless pray, love, support, and care. I am proud to be your daughter.

7. My dearest sister, Luthfia Nabila Putri. Thank you so much for being my best partner-in-crime ever!

8. My Roaring 20s' Girls, Septian Herawati, Gloria Firmanti, Vinta Fatmawati, Yuyun Tiarawati, Margani Rahma Setyarini, Niesrin, and Winda Astuti. Let's soar and roar to the sky!

10. Luke, Cal, Ash, Mike, Bea, Chrissy, and Louis, thanks for being such a great mood booster!

I realize that this thesis is still far from perfect. I, therefore will be glad to receive any constructive criticism, recommendation, and suggestion to make this thesis better.

Finally, I hope that this thesis will be useful to the reader who wishes to learn something about face threatening acts and politeness strategy.

Semarang, September 2015

Ardis Septi Eka Rachmatika

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE.....	i
PRONOUNCEMENT	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION	iii
APPROVAL.....	iv
VALIDATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Research Problems	2
1.3 Objective of the Study.....	3
1.4 Previous Studies	3
1.5 Organization of the Writing	4
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
2.1 The Concept of Face and Face Threatening Act (FTA).....	6
2.2 Politeness Strategy	9
2.3 Political Discourse	20

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD.....	21
3.1 Research Type	21
3.2 Data and Population	22
3.3 Method of Collecting Data.....	22
3.4 Method of Analyzing Data.....	25
CHAPTER IV DATA ANALYSIS	27
4.1 Kinds of FTA(s) Found in the Data	27
4.2 Strategies Used By the Speakers in <i>Forum Indonesia</i>	32
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION	66
5.1 Conclusion	66
5.2 Suggestion	67
REFERENCES.....	64
APPENDIXES	

ABSTRACT

Dalam berkomunikasi, ada beberapa hal yang harus diperhatikan. Dua diantaranya adalah prinsip kesopanan dan tindakan mengancam muka. Prinsip kesantunan merupakan aturan dasar dalam berkomunikasi. Prinsip kesantunan memiliki empat strategi yang berguna untuk menghindari tindak mengancam muka terhadap muka lawan tutur. Dalam penelitian ini, penulis tertarik untuk jenis tindakan mengancam muka yang dilakukan dan strategi yang digunakan oleh penutur untuk mengatasi tindak mengancam muka dalam salah satu episode di acara *Forum Indonesia*. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menjelaskan tentang aplikasi dari strategi kesantunan guna menyelamatkan muka lawan tutur. Data yang digunakan adalah semua tuturan dari penutur yang berada pada sisi kontra dalam episode tersebut. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan metode simak bebas libat cakap. Untuk menganalisis data, penulis menggunakan metode padan (*pragmatic method* dan *reflective-introspective method*). Hasil menunjukkan bahwa para penutur lebih banyak melakukan tindak mengancam muka positif (melalui kritikan, sindiran, dan tuduhan) lawan tutur daripada negatif. Selain itu, penulis juga menemukan bahwa keempat strategi kesantunan digunakan oleh para penutur dengan penggunaan strategi yang terbanyak adalah strategi tidak langsung (*off-record strategy*) dan yang paling sedikit adalah strategi kesantunan negatif (*negative politeness strategy*).

Kata kunci: *kesantunan, strategi kesantunan, tindak mengancam muka*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Humans need to communicate to each other in order to fulfill their needs. In communicating through language, there are certain rules they need to follow. For example, they need to speak politely to their elder or people who have higher position in the society. The certain rules in verbal communication are one of the pragmatics issues. It relates to communication between people, including politeness and Face Threatening Acts (FTA). Politeness is a basic rule in communication through language in this universe. People have to make choices in using language expression to their hearer so that they do not harm their hearer's face. Although in reality many people are careless in doing their obligation to maintain politeness all the time, at least they still need to make an effort in order to save their hearer's face.

We could find the examples of people using politeness in their conversation easily in our surroundings as well as in television. Television has more programs nowadays. It provides not only entertainment and news programs, but also programs that provide a place to change opinion, views, or even stories such as debate, talk-show, forum, etc. In those programs, some people are usually invited by the host of the programs. They will talk about a

certain topic and exchange their views about it. While the speakers are delivering their ideas on that topic, we can observe that there are some applications of politeness and FTAs in their utterances that they may not realize in doing it.

Forum Indonesia is one of the television programs in Indonesia. It is led by a host that also acts as a moderator. This program invites seven till eight people that will talk about a hot issue in Indonesia that has been chosen before. The guests who come from different job backgrounds usually take different sides; the ones who support the topic and the ones who do not. The writer finds something interesting concerning their different views in seeing the topic. The people who do not support the topic tend to give their criticism and accusation in their utterances. These will result in harming the hearer's face. However, they do not leave their utterance hanging as a threat. There are some efforts to minimize their threats. The efforts in overcoming the threats contained in their utterances will be answered this study. Thus, this study is entitled, "Politeness Strategy in *Forum Indonesia* (A Metro TV Program)".

1.2 Research Problems

There are two problems related to the application of politeness strategy in *Forum Indonesia* program. They are as follows.

1. What kinds of Face Threatening Act that are delivered by the cons group in criticizing SBY's performance?

2. What politeness strategies do they use to overcome the threats in their utterance?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this research are:

1. to give explanation about kinds of Face Threatening Act that are delivered by the cons group in criticizing SBY's performance;
2. to explain about the application of politeness strategies in order to overcome the threats in the speakers' utterance.

1.4 Previous Studies

Studies of politeness strategy have been conducted by many researchers in the form of final project. In this study the writer takes three of them as her previous studies.

A study conducted by Siadari (2014) explored the use of politeness strategy in *Hitam Putih* talk-show. She found out that the speaker used all four of the politeness strategies. This finding is in line with Winerta's study (2007). She finds that although all four politeness strategies are found in Avatar movie, the most dominant one is negative politeness.

Erlina's study (2013) explores gender differences in the use of bald on record in Gossip Girl season1 script. Her study differs from the others' study because she focused only on sub categories bald on record. From her study she

found out that men focus more on using implication to express their need and thought while women tend to use implication and direct imperatives.

The previous studies mentioned earlier have explored politeness strategy in various situations. However, none of them talks about politeness strategy in political discourse. This gap is taken by the writer to conduct her study which analyzes utterances in a dialog forum which has participants from different job background. Another aspect that makes this study different from the previous ones is the data. Two of previous studies use fictional data which come from movie script. It means that all of utterances there are not natural because they have been made or created by the scriptwriter. It is different from the writer's data which are taken from a live dialog forum in television. All the utterances uttered by the speakers are real, natural and unpredictable. Although Siadari's data (2014) also came from a live talk-show program in television, the data seemed less natural because in that talk-show the questions and answers usually have been prepared and agreed by the participants. Moreover, the findings in the previous studies are mostly talking about what dominant strategies used in the data. It differs from this study that not only will describe the politeness strategies used by the speakers but also categorize and describe about the kinds of FTA in the data.

1.5 Organization of the Writing

This study will consist of:

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the writer describes the background of the study, research problems, objective of the study, previous studies, and organization of the writing.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter deals with the theories that are used to analyze the data.

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD

Research type, data, population, samples, and technique sampling, method of collecting data, and method of analyzing data are presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER IV DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the writer analyzes the data so that the objectives of the study can be fulfilled. It includes the analysis of kinds of FTA in the data and politeness strategies used in the data.

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION

The last chapter presents the conclusion and suggestion after conducting this study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter discusses theories that are used in this study. In order to analyze and support the data, the writer uses some pragmatic theories related to the chosen topic. They are Face Threatening Acts (FTA), politeness strategy, and political discourse.

2.1 The Concept of Face and Face Threatening Act (FTA)

Naturally, there are some inconvenient utterances that are uttered by the speaker to the hearer in a conversation. Those utterances may bring an impact or threat to the hearer. S/he may feel disappointed, sad, offended, etc. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:65), it is possible for the speaker to threaten the hearer's face because every utterance carries with it the potential to create a threat to either speaker's or hearer's negative or positive face and such comprises a FTA, e.g. request for information, help, advice, etc.

Face may be defined as an individual's respect for her/himself that s/he tried to maintain in public or private situations. Brown and Levinson's idea about faces was inspired by Goffman's article (1967). In his article, Goffman divided face into two: positive and negative (1967:33). By expanding Goffman's idea, Brown and Levinson in Watts (2003:104) define negative face as "the basic claim to non-distraction, i.e. freedom of action and freedom imposition..." and positive

face as “the positive consistent self-image or “personality” (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants”.

Brown and Levinson (1987:65-68) also categorize four kinds of FTAs. The first one is “acts that threaten negative face of hearer (H) because the speaker (S) doesn’t intend to avoid impeding freedom of action of H or an addressee”. There are three categories including in it. They are (a) acts that predicate some H’s future act by putting some pressure on H to do act and threaten the negative face of H. Those acts are order and request, suggestion and advice, reminding, threats, warnings and dares. (b) Acts that predicate some positive future act of S toward H. Therefore, the speaker puts some pressure on H to accept or reject them. Those acts are offers and promises. (c) Acts that predicate some S’s desire toward H or his goods. Therefore, it gives H reason to think that he may have to take action to protect the object of S’s desire, or give it to S. Those acts are compliment, expression of envy and admiration (S shows that he likes H’s possession) and expression of strong emotion to H (such as showing hatred, anger and lust).

The second kind of FTA according to Brown and Levinson is “acts that threaten the positive-face want by indicating that the speaker does not care about the hearer’s feelings, wants, etc.” They include (a) acts that show that S has a negative evaluation of some aspect of H’s positive face (expression of disapproval, criticism, contempt or ridicule, complaints and reprimands, accusations, insults, contradictions and challenges), (b) those that show S doesn’t care about H’s

positive face such as expressions of violent (out of control) emotions, irreverence, mention of taboo topics, including those that are inappropriate in the context, bringing bad news about H, or good news (boasting) about S, etc.

The next acts that are categorized as FTAs are “acts that offend S’s negative face” including expressing thanks, acceptance of H’s thanks or apology, excuses, acceptance of offers, response to H’s faux pas and unwilling promises and offers.

The last kind of FTAs is “acts that directly damage S’s positive face”. These acts include apologies, acceptance of a compliment, breakdown of physical control over body, bodily leakage, stumbling or falling down, etc.

Although people usually try to avoid embarrassing or making other people feels uncomfortable, in a conversation, positive and negative faces coexist in balance. For instance, when someone asks for information from a stranger, whose age is the same with her/him in a casual way, it may satisfy the positive face, yet it also threatens the negative face.

There are three social factors that influence the use of FTA: power, social distance, and ranking of imposition (Brown and Levinson, 1987:74-77). Power covers the authority of the speaker. Social distance covers about how well the speaker and the hearer know each other. Ranking of imposition covers relative status of speech act in a situation that is less threatening.

There are some strategies that can be used by the speakers in a conversation. Brown and Levinson’s concept of face (1987: 60) divided it into five: (1) do not perform FTA, (2) performing an FTA using off record politeness,

(3) performing an FTA using negative politeness, (4) performing an FTA using positive politeness, (5) performing an FTA using bald on record strategy.

2.2 Politeness Strategy

In order to avoid a broken line of communication, FTA needs a mitigating statement or some sort of politeness. Yule (1996:60) argues that politeness, in an interaction, can be defined as the means employed to show the awareness of another's person face. From this statement, we may say that politeness is made to avoid conflict in a conversation.

As has been mentioned above, speakers may threaten hearers' face in a conversation. To mitigate this situation, Brown and Levinson (1978:68) introduce four strategies of politeness: bald-on-record politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, positive politeness strategy, and off-record politeness strategy.

2.2.1 Bald-on-Record Politeness Strategy

Bald-on-record is a strategy to say things directly or straight to the point. This strategy is mostly used if the speaker and the hearer have a close relationship. The speaker who is going to use this strategy usually has two motives; the speaker may do FTA with no minimization or minimize face threats by using implication. Brown and Levinson (1978:69) claim that a sentence form that represents bald-on-record clearly is imperative sentences. Imperative sentences are used to give direct order, e.g. Sit down!

2.2.2 Negative Politeness Strategy

According to Yule (1996:62) negative politeness tends to show deference and even include an apology for the imposition or interruption. Here, the hearer wants to have his freedom unhindered and his attention unimpeded. There are some strategies that are mentioned by Brown and Levinson (1987:131) to show negative politeness strategy. Those are as follows.

a. Be conventionally indirect

By expressing an FTA indirectly, the speaker has shown her strategy in showing negative politeness. E.g. Can you lend me your pen, please?

b. By using question and hedge

We all know that expressing our sentence in a question is more polite than in a declarative or imperative sentence. Yet we still can make our statement becomes more polite by using hedges. Hedges (e.g. well, perhaps, sort of, regular, true, rather, probably, pretty, quite, etc.) will modify the level of predicate or noun phrase. For example: Perhaps I'm not a computer expert, but you might want to reinstall your OS so that it could perform better.

c. Be pessimistic

In negative politeness strategy, the speaker needs to be pessimistic or have a doubt whether the hearer is willing to do what s/he has asked for. For example: You couldn't possibly tell me your secret, could you?

d. Minimize the imposition

When the speaker asks the hearer to do or to give her/him something, it means the speaker imposes the hearer through her/his language. It is as if

the speaker gave her/him a burden to follow her/his utterance. This situation is considered hard to the hearer. Therefore, the speaker should use this strategy to be polite. For example: I just stopped by for a minute to ask if you could join us for dinner tonight or not. The speaker will give more burden to the hearer if s/he asks directly what s/he wants. The use of “I just stopped by for a minute to ask you if” in that sentence can lessen the burden of the hearer.

e. Give deference

It is related to the power difference between the speaker and the hearer. The speaker can show his/her respect to the hearer by his/her expression. For example: We look forward very much to having a talk with you, Madam. The use of “Madam” shows that the speaker respects the hearer. So, instead of calling her name directly, the speaker used term “Madam” to address the hearer.

f. Apologize

One of the ways to be polite is by making an apology to the hearer. For example:

- I hate to intrude, but...

- Please forgive me if...

g. Impersonalize speaker and hearer

It means making the person with whom we communicate unmentioned. The speaker usually avoids the use of “I” and “you” and s/he may change it by using “it” or by not mentioning him. For example: Fix it for me. In a complete form, that sentence will be “I ask you to fix it for me”. However,

the speaker doesn't want to harm the hearer by ordering him/her to do so. Therefore, s/he avoids omits the use of "I" and "you" in his/her sentence.

h. State the FTA as a general rule

This strategy can be used when the speaker actually doesn't want to disturb or intrude the hearer, but due to a certain situation s/he forces the hearer to listen to her/him.

For example:

1. Passengers will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train (from "you will please refrain from...").

i. Nominalize

By nominalizing the expression (use the form of nominal phrase), the speaker shows the negative politeness. For example:

1. Your good performance on the examinations impressed us favorably (compared to: you performed well on the examination and we were favorably impressed).

j. Go in record as incurring a debt, or not indebting hearer.

The speaker requests or offers something on record. If the request is done, the speaker should feel as if he received a debt from the hearer. Nonetheless, when the speaker does something to pay his/her 'debt' to the hearer, the hearer should not feel indebted. For example: It wouldn't be any trouble; I have to go right by there anyway.

2.2.3 Positive Politeness Strategy

Brown and Levinson (1987: 101-129) mention fifteen strategies that can be used to show positive politeness. They are:

- a. Notice and attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, and goods)

The speaker notices the condition (hearer's interest to something, physical change appearance, or possessions) of the hearer and gives specific expression. E.g. Goodness, you look so gorgeous today! By the way, I came here to borrow some flour.

- b. Exaggerate (interest, approval, and sympathy with hearer)

Showing a sign of enthusiasm by exaggerating expression, intonation, stress, etc. is one of the positive politeness strategies. E.g. What a fantastic car you have!

- c. Intensify interest to hearer

This strategy is done by making the hearer as if contributes to event happens at that time. For example: I came into my room, and what do you think I see? A complete mess all over the place, the books and clothes are scattered all over.

- d. Use in-group identity markers

The speaker tries to show that s/he and the hearer are in the same position by using group membership term. It is common to find address form, dialects, jargon, slang and elliptical form in this situation. In English, the address forms usually used are mac, mate, buddy, pal, honey, dear, luv, babe, mom, Blondie, brother, sister, cutie, sweetheart, guys, and fellas.

Mentioning the brand of a product is considered using slang. For example:

Lend us two bucks then, would 'a mac?

e. Seek agreement

There are two ways of seeking agreement: by seeking the safe topic, by repetition. For example:

A: My dad bought me a new Maserati yesterday.

B: Oh God, a new Maserati!

f. Avoid disagreement

There are four ways to avoid disagreement between the speaker and the hearer. First, it is by using false agreement. Second, speaker can express pseudo-agreement. Third, it is by unclear opinion using hedge. Fourth, speaker can make white lies, lying for the sake of goodness. For example:

A: And they haven't heard a word, huh?

B: No. Not at all.

g. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground

It is something which the speaker and the hearer have in common. For example: Don't you think this movie is very hilarious?

h. Joke

In certain occasion, making a joke in conversation is a way to minimize FTA. For example: Isn't it sad when I only get a small bite of pizza when I'm the one who order it?

i. Assert or Presuppose S's Knowledge of and Concern for H's Wants

The speaker uses his knowledge and concern to understand the hearer's wants. For example: I know you love roses but the florist didn't have any more, so I bought you geranium instead.

j. Offer and promise

The speaker shows his cooperation by offering and promising something to the hearer. For example: I'll pick you up after school.

k. Be optimistic

If negative politeness strategy makes the speaker be pessimistic, the speaker who uses positive politeness strategy, on the contrary, expresses what the speaker wants with optimistic voices. For example:

You'll lend me your lawnmower for the weekend, I hope.

l. Include both speaker and hearer in the activity

When the speaker and the hearer are in the same activity, it will be a good strategy to involve the hearer in a conversation. For example: Let's have a cookie, then.

m. Give (or ask for) Reasons

If we ask the others to join us in doing something, we can ask the reason by using the word "why" in the beginning of the talk. For example: Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend?

n. Assume or assert reciprocity

It is used when the speaker wants the hearer does something for her/him. In change, the speaker will also do a favor that the hearer asks. For example: I'll do X for you if you do Y for me.

- o. Give gifts to Hearer (in the form of goods, sympathy, understanding, and cooperation)

It is used when the hearer's wants are satisfied by the speaker. For example: For example: This dress is specially designed for you.

2.2.4 The Strategies to Show Off-Record Politeness Strategy

Off-record strategy is usually used when the speaker avoids being responsible for FTA that s/he has done (Brown and Levinson (1987:211-212). This action makes the hearer interpret the speaker's utterance more than what the speaker actually utters.

Fifteen strategies to show off-record politeness are mentioned by Brown and Levinson (1987:213-237).

- a. Give hints

It is a strategy when the speaker gives hints to the hearer so that the hearer does the speaker's favor. For example, instead of asking the hearer to close the window, the speaker can express it by giving hints like, "It's cold in here."

- b. Give association clues

The speaker uses this strategy when s/he wants to mention something by associating it with the hearer's mutual knowledge. For example, when the speaker says "My house, it is not very far away", it means the speaker implicitly wants to invite the hearer to her/his house.

- c. Presuppose

The speaker presupposes something which is relevant with the context of conversation. For instance, the speaker says, “I washed the dishes again last night” to her/his sister. By using the word again, it means the one who wash the dishes previously is the speaker, and now the speaker wants her/his sister to wash the dishes.

d. Understate

The speaker may choose one way of generating implicatures by saying less than is required. For example:

A: What a marvelous place you have here.

B: Oh, I don't know it's a place.

e. Overstate

The speaker makes her/his utterances more exaggerating than the real situation. For example: I tried to ring you nth times, but there was never any answer.

f. Use tautologies

The speaker tries to encourage the hearer to find the informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance. In this strategy the speaker usually uses repetitive words. For example, when the speaker utters, “War is war” it means that her/his sentence is only used for emphasizing the information.

g. Use contradictions

This strategy is done by stating two things that contradict each other. The speaker makes it as if s/he can't be telling the truth. It is a way to be polite.

For example:

A: Are you upset about that?

B: Well, yes and no (conveying a complaint or a criticism)

h. Be ironic

The speaker says her/his intended meaning indirectly by saying the opposite of what s/he means. For example: The speaker says "John's a real genius" after he got 35 in his two previous Math tests.

i. Use metaphor

This strategy is done by using a word that describes a first subject as being equal to a second subject. For example: If the speaker wants to say that her/his friend is really fast runner, s/he might say Michael is a real cheetah.

j. Use rhetorical questions

The speaker uses a linguistic expression or question that leaves its answer hanging in the air. For example: "What can I say?" (Nothing, it's so bad).

k. Be ambiguous

By saying something ambiguously, the speaker tries to minimize the threat of FTA. For example: "Lovely neighborhood, uh?"

l. Be vague

It is possible for the speaker to go off record with FTA by being vague about who the object of FTA. For example: "Perhaps someone did

something naughty”. The speaker uses “someone” instead of mentioning a name because s/he doesn’t want to tell true doer.

m. Overgeneralize

The next strategy is by not giving clear information by informing something general. For example, the speaker says “Mature people sometimes help do the dishes” to her/his friends. By saying this sentence s/he actually is asking help from them.

n. Displace H

The speaker may go off record as to who the target for his FTA is, or s/he may pretend to address the FTA to someone whom it wouldn’t threaten and hope that the real target will see that the FTA is aimed to him. For example, a secretary wants to ask another secretary to bring her a stapler though in fact there is a professor whose position is nearer to the stapler. She said, “Jane, could you run to the stock room and bring me a stapler?”. In this context the real H is actually the professor, but due to the professor’s higher position, the secretary displaces the real H to Jane. By saying this sentence, the secretary hopes that the professor will understand and bring her a stapler near to him.

o. Be incomplete (use ellipsis)

The speaker may be pretend to address the FTA to someone and hope the real target will see that the FTA is aimed at him/her. For example: A student can ask permission to leave the classroom from his teacher by “oh sir, a headache....” Though he expresses his sentence incompletely, the student hopes that the teacher will understand what he means and permit him to leave the classroom.

2.3 Political Discourse

Political discourse (PD) is one of the fields in discourse analysis. This study has existed as long as the existence of politic. It focuses on the analysis of discourse in political forums. Debates, hearings, and speeches are some kind of phenomena that are analyzed in it. Johnson and Johnson in his article (2000) define political discourse as the informal exchange of reasoned views as to which of several alternative courses of action should be taken to solve a societal problem.

Some people might have misconception about political discourse. They tend to assume that PD is the same as Critical Discourse Analysis. In fact, those two are not exactly the same.

Without collapsing *political* discourse analysis into *critical* discourse analysis, we would like to retain both aspects of the ambiguous designation: PDA is both about political discourse, and it is also a critical enterprise. In the spirit of contemporary approaches in CDA this would mean that critical-political discourse analysis deals especially with the reproduction of political *power*, *power abuse* or *domination* through political discourse, including the various forms of resistance or counter-power against such forms of discursive dominance. In particular such an analysis deals with the discursive conditions and consequences of social and political *inequality* that results from such domination (Fairclough 1995; van Dijk 1993b).

From the statement above, we may conclude that political discourse is part of the critical discourse analysis.

Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) adopted van Dijk's characterization of political discourse. They are *actors* – individuals (politicians, citizens), political institutions and organizations, engaged in political *processes* and *events* – and his emphasis that a notion of *context* is essential to the understanding of political discourse.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter involves several aspects of methodology including research type, data and population, method of collecting data, and method of analyzing data. These methods are employed in this study to examine types of face threatening acts (FTA) as well as the strategies used by speakers in responding the moderator's question.

3.1 Research Type

Based in the aim of the study which is to describe the kinds of FTA and strategies used by the speakers in *Forum Indonesia* on Metro TV, this study is categorized into descriptive study. It is also categorized as field research. Since this research is about FTA done by the speakers, all data were described deeply by using a qualitative research method. This method, according to Sandelowski (2000:334-340), is the methods of choice when straight descriptions of phenomena are desired. They also said that researchers conducting this kind of study must stay close to their data and the surface of words and events. Thus, the writer considers it as a proper method to use in analyzing and describing every utterance in the data. In short, this study is categorized as descriptive qualitative research.

3.2 Data and Population

The data in this research come from a dialog program on Metro TV, namely *Forum Indonesia*. The writer chose one episode of *Forum Indonesia* broadcasted on 2nd January 2014. Population is the whole research data. Therefore, the population of this research is all utterances between the moderator and guest speakers in *Forum Indonesia* dialog. The main data for this study is limited for all utterances spoken by the guest speakers on cons side. The writer does not take samples of the data because the data are all utterances produced by speakers on cons side.

3.3 Method of Collecting Data

This sub chapter will explain source of data, participants of data, and procedure in collecting data.

a) Data Source

The writer's data came from a transcription of a dialog program on television. This program's name is *Forum Indonesia*. It is aired on one of Indonesia private TV stations, Metro TV on Thursdays at 08.05-09.05 P.M. FI is led by a moderator namely Aviani Malik who gives a theme to discuss and lead the guest speakers in the discussion. In the discussion, the guest speakers usually are divided into two groups, the proponent group and opponent group. For the writer's data, she specifically took it from an episode entitled "*Panggung Terakhir SBY*" which was aired on 2nd January 2014.

b) Participants of Data

There are eight people that were involved in this episode. They are Aviani Malik as the moderator and seven guest speakers. The guest speakers are: Bahtiar Sinaga (the lawyer of SBY's family), Firmanzah (a presidential economic staff), Joni (a representative of Demokrat party), Budhiarto Shambazy (a senior journalist), Yudi Latif (an executive director of *Reform Institute*), Radhar Panca Dahana (an expert of culture), and Burhanudin Muhtadi (a researcher from *Lembaga Survei Indonesia (LSI)*).

From the way the speakers responded the moderator's question, the writer divided the speakers into two groups: first, guests who supported or gave positive comments about SBY's achievement and second, guests who criticized SBY's policy and achievement. The table below will show the division of the speakers according to their group.

Table 1. Group of Speakers

No.	Participants	Proponent Group	Opponent Group
1.	Bahtiar Sinaga	√	
2.	Firmanzah	√	
3.	Joni	√	
4.	Budhiarto Shambazy		√

5	Yudi Latif		√
6.	Radhar Panca Dahana		√
7.	Burhanudin Muhtadi		√

From the table, the writer sees that the speakers who worked for SBY or have correlation with SBY are included in proponent group and vice versa. For this study, the writer set a data limitation which is to take the data from opponent group's utterances.

c) Procedure in Collecting Data

Since the writer did not involve in the conversation directly and only paid attention through the recorded program, the writer called this study as a non-participant observation method. (Sudaryanto, 1993:134) The writer did this observation by using three steps: downloading, note taking, and transcribing.

The first step is downloading. The writer searched and downloaded this video from *YouTube*, a site that provides videos, on 20th March 2014. By downloading this video, the writer will be able to understand the verbal utterances and the non-verbal signs such as expression and gesture of the speakers.

After downloading the video, the writer watched and listened the whole video carefully. While watching the video, the writer also took some important notes from the video related to FTA and politeness strategy.

The last step is transcribing. The writer transcribed the whole conversations in the video. It is done so that the writer could classify and identify the phenomena related to FTA and politeness strategy in the video further.

3.4 Method of Analyzing Data

In analyzing linguistics phenomena, most of the researchers used identity method and so does the writer. This method, which is also known as *padan* method, will use the aspects that are out of the language studied to show the equivalence of the aspect that is studied. It means this method's aim is to find the meaning of speakers' utterances based on hearers' point of view. Considering this study concerns in analyzing the meaning of speakers' utterances, the writer decided to also use *Pragmatic* method which is included to a branch of *Padan* Method (Sudaryanto, 1993: 13-15) and reflective-introspective identity method which will use writer's knowledge and understanding to explain the FTA and strategies that were used by the speakers in their utterances.

Dari semua sektor, malah yang bagus dari semua compang-camping itu korupsi doang.(1)

Of all sectors, the good thing from all those ragged sectors is only corruption (1)

From the example above, the writer saw that the speaker threatened SBY's face by accusing that his government had done nothing good but corruption. However, the speaker still managed to lessen his threat by using metaphor strategy in his utterance.

“*Compang-camping*” was a term that is usually used for describing a ragged or worn out clothes. By assuming that SBY’s government was in a “*compang-camping*” condition, the speaker indicated that the government had many lacks. However, the speaker did not want to say it directly, therefore he used the word “*compang-camping*” in that utterance instead of mentioning all Indonesia’s problems one by one. Beside that phrase could sum up Indonesian situation, it also made the criticism become less threatening.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter covers the findings and the data analysis regarding to the research questions. It focuses on the analysis of FTAs done by the speakers in criticizing SBY's achievement in his two ruling periods. From this analysis, the writer found that the speakers on cons side mostly threatened the positive face of SBY in delivering their criticism. For the strategies, they often used off record strategy, bald on record strategy, and positive politeness strategy. Meanwhile, negative politeness strategy was used rarely during that talk-show.

4.1 Kinds of FTA(s) Found in the Data

As Brown and Levinson had stated, every utterance had a possibility in carrying a threat to the speakers' or hearers' negative and positive face even though the speaker did not intend to do it. The possibility of carrying a threat is even bigger to happen in a talk show, especially a talk show which theme is about criticizing something or someone.

This situation also happened in *Forum Indonesia* dialog in episode "Panggung Terakhir SBY". In this show, there were seven people who talked about SBY's achievement in his ruling periods. Those seven people seemed to be in two different sides: pros and cons. Based on the data taken from the cons side, the writer found 28 utterances which contained FTAs. Of 28 utterances, 25 of

them contained criticism, accusations, and insinuations that threatened SBY's face. The frequency of kinds of positive FTA used by the speakers can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Kinds of Positive FTA

No.	Kinds of Positive FTA	Frequency
1.	Criticism	7
2.	Accusation	11
3.	Insinuation	7
	Total	25

From the table above, the writer sees that most speakers used accusation in threatening the positive face of SBY. They also used criticism and insinuation in the same portion to conduct FTA.

Further explanation about the use of positive FTA can be seen in the example below:

(1)

Nggak, masalahnya gini. Sebentar, kenapa saya bilang korupsi baik, ya kan? Seperti yang dikatakan sama Firmanzah, saya mengakui kebenaran itu) Firman, bahwa dia tidak intervensi, bahwa sekarang korupsi menjadi issue nasional, dan itu menjadi persoalan yang sangat berat bagi kita. Diangkat dan ada muncullah KPK, itu hanya membuktikan bahwa korupsi itu sudah sangat mendalam. Dan dibutuhkan satu pemerintahan yang sangat tegas untuk mengatasi itu. Dan saya kira SBY melakukan itu. Kalau misalnya itu anak buahnya ikut korupsi, siapa yang tidak? Semua

1

5

melakukan korupsi. Yang penting ada pimpinan yang melakukan itu. Itu cuma soal korupsi, tapi hukum kan tidak hanya soal korupsi. Banyak lagi persoalan-persoalan hukum yang tidak diselesaikan dengan baik termasuk persoalan politik, ekonomi, apalagi sosial kemasyarakatan dan budaya. Hancur abis. 10

No, here's the problem. Wait, why did I say corruption is good, right? As it has been said by Firmanzah, I acknowledge that truth. Firman, that he did no intervention, that now corruption has been a national issue, and it becomes a very serious problem for us. The existence of KPK is a proof that corruption has been a serious problem. A strong government is needed to overcome it. And I think SBY does it. If his staffs did a corruption, who wouldn't? Everyone does a corruption. The important part is there is a leader who does it. It's only the corruption, however, law is not only about corruption problem. There are many other problems that are not finished well including politic, economic, and social culture problems. Very bad. 1

5

10

On the utterances above, Radhar clearly showed his criticism and accusation towards SBY's achievement. By stating that corruption is a good thing (utterance 2) he indirectly insinuated SBY. It is a common sense that corruption is a bad thing in government field, but Radhar said it as if corruption were a common thing to do. He also generalized that everyone in the government did a corruption (utterance 8). This meant he implicitly accused SBY and his staff did a corruption. His accusation did not stop there. He mentioned the chaos in many fields due to unsolved problems. The use of phrase "hancur abis" (utterance 12) in his last utterance somehow emphasized his accusation about the failure of SBY's government in handling the situation. These statements which contained many accusations and criticisms obviously harmed the positive face of SBY.

Radhar was not the only speaker who threatened the positive face of SBY. The other speakers, such as Burhanudin who was in cons side, also did the same thing.

(2)

Ehm, saya kira, ehm, ada hal yang menarik ya, Avi. (1) Kalau di periode pertama, itu yang menjadi titik atau rapor merah pemerintahan SBY periode 2004 dengan 2009 itu bidang ekonomi. (2) Waktu itu relatif kepuasan publik dalam soal ekonomi, itu lebih rendah dibanding soal hukum dan politik. (3) Sekarang terbalik, justru di 2009 sampai 2014, itu yang terjadi adalah kepuasan publik merosot drastis dalam soal politik dan hukum jadi pemerintah SBY terlalu sering membuang deposito kepercayaan, tapi dalam soal ekonomi ada kenaikan. (4)

1

5

Ehm, I think there's an interesting thing here, Avi. (1) In the first period, the bad sector of SBY's government in 2004-2009 is economic sector. (2) At that time, the public satisfaction rate in economic is lower than law and politic sector. (3) Now, the situation is reversed, in 2009-2014, the satisfaction rate on politic and law is decreasing because SBY government wasted too many public's trust, but there is an enhancement in economic sector. (4)

1

5

On Burhanudin's second statement above, the writer saw that he tried to accuse SBY that economics' field was the weakness in his first ruling period. In that statement, Burhanudin used off-record strategy in form of metaphor to mitigate the harshness of his accusation (utterance no. 2). He also gave further explanation why economics' field was the government's weakness at that time. (utterance no. 3). In his next statement (utterance no. 4), he threatened the positive face of SBY again. He criticized how the situation was in an opposite way. In SBY's second ruling period, according to Burhanudin, public satisfaction in politics and laws was decreased drastically (utterance no. 4). Though he criticized SBY's achievements, he still made an effort to lessen his threat by mentioning that public satisfaction in economic was increased.

Although most of speakers on cons side prefer threatening the positive face to the negative face of the hearer, there were three utterances that threatened the negative face of the hearer. For example:

- (3)
- | | |
|---|---|
| <i>...saya kira tidak banyak hal yang bisa dia lakukan kecuali di akhir masa jabatannya ini dia tergulung pada spiral kepentingan pribadi. Ada sebagian waktu yang disisakan untuk meratakan jalan bagi kebaikan demokrasi yang akan datang. Misalnya, DPT itu benarkan supaya tidak ada lagi manipulasi pemilu. Jangan ada lagi usaha-usaha atau motif-motif untuk kepentingan sendiri, tapi kasih kesempatan pada demokrasi kita lebih matang pada masa yang akan datang.</i> | 1 |
| <i>...I think there are no many things that SBY can do unless in his last period he is caught in his private interest. There are some times that should be used to reorder some things for the upcoming democracy. For example, to recheck the DPT so that there is no more manipulation in general elections. Don't let any efforts or motive for personal interest, give a chance to our democracy so that it can be more mature in the future.</i> | 5 |

The utterances above were a response for the moderator's question about what SBY should do in his remaining time as a president. The speaker said that there are no many things that SBY could do (utterance no. 1). He also gave some suggestions and advices that might be useful for SBY's last months (utterance no 2-4). The speaker's acts of giving suggestions and advices put some pressures on SBY. By pressuring SBY to do so, it showed that he was actually threatening the negative face of SBY.

Another example that showed the speakers in cons side threatened the negative face of the hearer could be seen below.

- (4)
- | | |
|---|---|
| <i>Artinya begini lho. Sekarang kalo kita bandingkan, tarik menarik dari Bung Karno dan Pak Harto ya, legacy atau warisan itu bisa dicatat oleh seorang SBY jika dia bisa mengkomparasi dirinya dengan Bung Karno dan Pak Harto. Kan Bung Karno itu disebut sebagai bapak bangsa, dan Pak Harto bapak pembangunan nasional. Nah, SBY masih ada kesempatan untuk menobatkan diri sebagai bapak anti korupsi.</i> | 1 |
| Here's what I mean. (1) Now, if we make a comparison started from Bung Karno and Pak Harto, SBY can write down his legacy as long as he is able to compare himself with Bung Karno and Pak Harto. (2) We all know that Bung Karno is called as "bapak bangsa", and Pak Harto is called as "bapak pembangunan nasional". (3) While for SBY, he still has a chance to make himself as "bapak anti korupsi". (4) | 5 |

The statement above was uttered by Mr. Shambazy as a response towards the moderator's question about what SBY should do in the rest of his last period. In his answer, he compared the legacy left by Pak Harto and Pak Karno as the previous presidents and the legacy that would be left by SBY (utterance no. 1-3). Then, he said that SBY still had a chance to be an important figure in fighting corruption (utterance no. 4). When Mr. Shambazy uttered his opinion, it seemed that he believed SBY had capability in fulfilling it. By believing SBY's capability, it means that he put some pressure to SBY to do what he wanted. Thus, it threatened the negative face of SBY.

4.2 Strategies Used By the Speakers

The speakers who performed FTA may need some sorts of politeness in order to avoid a broken line of communication. In her data, the writer found 28 FTAs done by the speakers. In order to mitigate the FTA, they employed 36 politeness strategies.

The following tables will show kinds of strategies used by the speakers.

Table 3. Types of Used Strategies

No	Strategies Used by the Speakers	Frequency
1.	Bald on Record	4
2.	Off Record: a. the use of metaphor	9

	b. be ironic	4
	c. overstate	2
	d. overgeneralize	2
	e. use rhetorical questions	4
	f. use contradiction	1
	Positive Politeness Strategy:	
	a. be optimistic	1
	b. notice and attend to Hearer	2
3.	c. give gifts to Hearer	2
	d. give or ask for reasons	1
	e. assert or presuppose S's knowledge and concern for H's wants	1
	Negative Politeness Strategy:	
4.	a. give deference	1
	b. using question and hedge	1
	c. be pessimistic	1
	Total	36

From the table above, we can see that the speakers tend to use off record strategy more frequently than other strategies. It is related to the benefit of this strategy in which the speakers can avoid being responsible for what they had said. This strategy also gives benefit to the hearer because this strategy can give a protection by offering the option to hide behind the literal meaning of the words uttered by the speakers. Negative politeness strategy is the least strategy that is

used by the speakers. It is probably because the speakers did not want to pay too much attention to SBY's feeling while criticizing him.

After having the table of types of strategies used by the speakers in general, the writer would like to present another table to show strategies used by each speaker.

Table 4. Strategies Used By Each Speaker

No	Speakers	Off Record						Positive Politeness					Bald on Record	Negative Politeness			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	
1.	Burhanudin M.	√		√		√		√						√			√
2.	Yudi Latif	√					√				√			√			
3.	Radhar Panca D.	√	√	√	√		√	√						√	√	√	
4.	Budhiarto S.	√	√	√	√	√				√					√		

Note:

Off Record:

1. the use of metaphor

2. be ironic

Positive Politeness:

1. give gifts to Hearer

2. notice and attend to Hearer

Negative Politeness:

1. give deference

2. question & hedge

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| 3. overstate | 3. be optimistic | 3. be pessimistic |
| 4. overgeneralize | 4. assert or presuppose | |
| 5. use rhetorical questions | 5. give or ask for reasons | |
| 6. use contradiction | | |

From the table above, the writer saw that all speakers used all four politeness strategies. The speaker who used strategies the most was Radhar Panca. It shows that although he sent many threats to SBY, he still managed some effort to lessen the damage on SBY's face. The table above also showed that off record strategy "the use of metaphor" was the strategy that was used by all speakers. It differs with other strategies that although they are used by the speakers, they are not used by all speakers.

For further explanation and example about strategies used by the speaker, the writer explained them in the sub chapters below.

4.2.1. Off-Record Strategy

The four speakers mostly used this strategy in their utterances. They chose this strategy because by using this strategy, the speakers usually could avoid being responsible for the FTAs they had done. Thus, this strategy gave more benefit to the speakers. While for the hearers, this strategy can give a protection by offering the option to hide behind the literal meaning of the words uttered by the speakers.

There were six off-record strategies that appeared in the data. They are the use of metaphor, use rhetorical questions, be ironic, overstate, overgeneralize, and contradiction. Each of them will be explained below.

a. Use Metaphor

From 6 off-record strategies, the most dominant one that appeared in the data is the use of metaphor. The use of metaphor is related to one of the social factors that influence the use of FTA, ranking of imposition. By using a metaphor, the speakers will be able to convey their criticism or judgment in a situation that is less threatening, especially when the one who is criticized has higher position than the speakers.

We can see it in the example below:

(5)

Kalau di periode pertama, itu yang menjadi titik atau rapor merah pemerintahan SBY periode 2004 dengan 2009 itu bidang ekonomi

In the first period, the bad sector of SBY's government in 2004-2009 is economic sector.

The utterance above was spoken by Burhanudin as a response towards the moderator question about whether the good achievement on economic field in 2009-2014 could be a tolerance for the lack achievement in other field such as in politics and laws. On his utterance, the speaker did not answer the moderator's question directly. Instead, he reviewed the economic situation in the past by implying an accusation that SBY failed in handling the economic field. By delivering an accusation, the speaker threatened the positive face of the hearer.

While doing an FTA, he employed a strategy to lessen the threat which was to use metaphor. In the utterance above, the metaphor that he used was "*titik atau rapor merah*". In our daily life, term "*titik atau rapor merah*" is usually used to refer the failure or bad marks of a student in his/her study. By mentioning that

SBY got “*titik atau rapor merah*” for his works, the speaker associated SBY’s works with a student’s bad mark or failure in his/her study. In other words, the speaker indicated that the performance or achievement of the government in that period was very bad. However due to social factors between the speaker and the hearer, he could not say it bluntly. That was why in his utterance, he used a metaphor “*titik atau rapor merah*” to express his judgment. Using a metaphor made the speaker to be able to judge and accuse SBY’s failure in handling the economic problems on that period.

As has been mentioned above, the use of metaphor is related to ranking of imposition. In this case, the writer could see that SBY who was a president had a higher position than the speaker who was a representation of a survey institute. In order to be able to criticize the president’s achievement, he used a metaphor instead of telling directly that SBY had accomplished worse achievement in his last period. His action showed that he still gave some respect towards SBY although at that moment SBY and the speaker were not on the same place. This also meant that although the speaker did threaten the positive face of SBY, he still concerned with SBY’s status so that he put an effort to make the situation became less threatening.

Another example about the use of metaphor could be seen below.

(6)

*Wah, luar negeri itu tidak hanya memberi respek yang sangat baik kepada SBY karena sekarang ini Indonesia tidak hanya dikenal karena dia punya tsunami dan Bali aja, tapi mereka tiba-tiba dikejutkan bahwa, “Oh, Indonesia udah masuk G-20”. Seneng banget ya? Menjadi inspirator bagi pergerakan-pergerakan politik dan ekonomi di tingkat regional maupun mancanegara. Dan itu positif buat mereka. Dia tidak peduli dengan kita-kita yang mengatakan, “itu **kemasan**, bu, pak.”. Anda mungkin peduli*

1

5

*dengan bagian luarnya, kami peduli dengan bagian dalamnya. Kenapa bagian dalamnya? **Compang-camping**, Pak. Nah kenapa compang-camping? Itu saya coba jelaskan. Dari semua sektor, malah yang bagus dari semua compang-camping itu korupsi doang.* 10

Well, other countries are not only respect SBY well because Indonesia is known to not only has tsunami and Bali, but they also are surprised to see that Indonesia has joined G-20. Very exciting, right? Being an inspirer for economic and politic movement in both regional and international. And it's very positive for them. He doesn't care with us who said "it's all just an act. Ma'am, Sir." You may care for the outside; however we do care with the inside. What's wrong with the inside? It's ragged, Sir. How come? That's what I'm going to explain. Of all the sectors, the good one from all that ragged sectors is only corruption. 1
5

In the utterance above, Radhar as the speaker accused SBY for being failed in bring satisfaction to his people and even disappoint them (utterance no. 5-8), the speaker even accused that the only good sector in SBY's government was corruption (utterance no. 11).

To make his FTA became less threatening, there were two metaphors that were used by the speaker, "*kemasan*" (utterance no. 5) and "*compang-camping*" (utterance no, 7). Those words were used to deliver his complaint in an implicit way.

SBY who got a very good appreciation from the people in other countries (1-4) for what he had done in making Indonesia to be a member of G-20 and be an inspirer country in politics and economic couldn't bring satisfaction to his people. It was proven by how they felt about all those things. They felt that SBY's acts and achievements were fake (utterance no. 5) because the real situation in Indonesia was not as good as what people in other countries thought (utterance no. 8). Economic problems like poverty and unemployment still existed in Indonesia in a high number. Human trafficking, the lack of public facilities in many areas,

and other social problems were also government's homework that had not been solved.

“*Compang-camping*” was a term that is usually used for describing a ragged or worn out clothes. By assuming that SBY's government was in a “*compang-camping*” condition, the speaker indicated that the government had many lacks. However, the speaker did not want to say it directly, therefore he used the word “*compang-camping*” in utterance no.8 instead of mentioning all Indonesia's problems one by one. Beside that phrase could sum up Indonesian situation, it also made the criticism become less threatening.

b. Use Rhetorical Questions

The next strategy that was used by the speakers was “use rhetorical questions”. In this strategy, the speakers use a linguistic expression or question that leaves its answer hanging in the air. The speakers do not expect a direct answer from the hearer or audience.

Example:

(7)

Saya bukan meniru Pak Presiden ya, suka prihatin. Prihatin karena memang warisan yang ditinggalkan itu memang minim sekali. Bahkan mungkin, apa sih warisan yang akan ditinggalkan?

No, I'm not trying to imitate Mr. President in saying his concern. I feel concerned because the legacy that is left is very minimal. Well, what legacy that actually will be left by SBY?

In the utterances above, the speaker tried to criticize SBY that he left only a little legacy for Indonesia. This criticism was implied in his second utterance. He also insinuated the president's habit in saying “*prihatin*”. The criticism and

insinuation contained in the speaker's utterance clearly threatened the positive face of SBY.

In order to lessen his threats, the speaker used a strategy which is "use a rhetorical question". The speaker's third utterance was in the form of a rhetorical question. He used it to include the people in his emotional statement. Instead of saying "*SBY tidak meninggalkan warisan apapun untuk Indonesia*", he preferred saying it in "*Bahkan mungkin, apa sih warisan yang akan ditinggalkan?*". This kind of sentence would trigger more effects from people yet it could lessen the damage on SBY's face because SBY would not hear the answer and the statement that could bring more damage to his face directly.

The other example of this strategy can be seen below.

(8)

Dan ini bukan hanya SBY lho, presiden-presiden yang lagi-lagi setelah reformasi, mereka tidak meninggalkan warisan apapun untuk kita. Setuju nggak?

And this happens to not only SBY, the after reformation era presidents do not leave any legacy to us. Don't you think so?

On the utterances above, the speaker threatened the positive face of SBY by accusing that SBY and the previous presidents after reformation era left nothing as legacy. This accusation showed that the speaker did not appreciate any good achievements that actually were achieved by those presidents. However, the speaker did not leave his FTA without any mitigation to lessen the threat. He employed a rhetorical question strategy to overcome it. In his last utterance, the speaker invited the people to agree with what he said by asking that question. The effect of that question is the people might agree silently to what he said. The silent

agreement of the people could save SBY's face from embarrassment that he might feel for the accusation that the speaker held to him.

c. Be Ironic

The third off-record strategy that the writer found in the data was "be ironic". This strategy allowed the speakers to say his intended meaning indirectly. The speaker usually expressed what he wanted to say in an opposite way so that the hearer would feel less intimidated.

(9)

Nah, nah ini yang presiden baru. Saya kira semua tahu dulu prestasi 2004-2009 karena ada the real presiden. Yang periode 2009-2014, ini Century memang sudah sangat, ya, mencengkeram, menjebak, menyandera sekali.

Well, this is about the new president. I believe that everybody knows that the achievements in 2004-2009 are because of the existence of a real president. For this 2009-2014 period, the Century case has been very firm, tricky, and suffocating.

Previously, they talked about SBY and the previous presidents who left no legacy. Then the moderator gave emphasizing about SBY who had been given two chances to rule Indonesia. Mr. Shambazy as the speaker responded it by comparing the performance of SBY between his first and second period. He said that in 2004-2009 periods everything was in good condition because there was a president who was capable in handling many problems (utterance no. 2). However, the situation turned into the opposite way when SBY ruled for the second period (utterance no, 3).

From statement no 2 and 3 on the example above, the writer assumed that the speaker felt unsatisfied with SBY's performance in his second period of ruling.

Expressing his dissatisfaction directly might threaten the hearer's face. Thus, he did it indirectly by employing "be ironic" strategy.

Phrase "the real president" on the second utterance was the form of irony that the speaker used to express how incapable SBY in overcoming bad situations such as Century case.

(10)

Nggak, masalahnya gini. Sebentar, kenapa saya bilang korupsi baik, ya kan? Seperti yang dikatakan sama Firmanzah, saya mengakui kebenaran itu. Firman, bahwa dia tidak intervensi, bahwa sekarang korupsi menjadi issue nasional, dan itu menjadi persoalan yang sangat berat bagi kita. Diangkat dan ada muncullah KPK, itu hanya membuktikan bahwa korupsi itu sudah sangat mendalam. Dan dibutuhkan satu pemerintahan yang sangat tegas untuk mengatasi itu. Dan saya kira SBY melakukan itu. 1
5

No, here's the problem. Wait, why did I say corruption is good, right? As it has been said by Firmanzah, I acknowledge that truth. Firman, that he did no intervention, that now corruption has been a national issue, and it becomes a very serious problem for us. The existence of KPK is a proof that corruption has been a serious problem. A strong government is needed to overcome it. And I think SBY does it. 1
5

The example above was Mr. Radar's response towards moderator's statement which reminded the speakers about *Demokrat* party's slogan. Its slogan was "say no to corruption" which contradicted the current situation.

In his response, Mr. Radhar showed how he thought about corruption in Indonesia. He explained that corruption was actually a good thing (utterance no. 2). He also talked about SBY's effort to fight against corruption by establishing an anti-corruption institute (utterance no. 4-5) and how he appreciated that effort (utterance no. 6).

Mr. Radhar's opinion that said corruption was a good thing was actually a form of FTA that could harm SBY's face. He criticized and insinuated SBY and

the government for letting a bad thing became something common to do. However, he did not deliver this insinuation directly. He used “be ironic” strategy by stating the opposite of what he actually meant. “Corruption is a bad thing” is what he should have said, yet he said it in the opposite way as what he had stated in his second utterance in the example above.

d. Overstate

The next strategy found in the data that was used to overcome FTA was “overstate”. The speaker who used this strategy tended to overstate his utterance so that it became more dramatic than the real situation. By using this strategy, the speaker also violated maxim of quantity.

Some “overstate” strategy could be found in the examples below:

(11)

Nah, tinggal kita bandingkan, bagaimana ketiga-tiganya menyelesaikan masalah-masalah yang rumit itu. Dan kita harus mengakui dalam sejarah, ketiga-tiganya tidak pernah berhasil. Tidak cukup berhasil dalam melakukan penataan politik, ekonomi, dan yang lain-lain.

Now, we just need to compare how those three overcome those complicated problems. And we have to acknowledge that those three never succeed. Not quite succeed in handling the arrangement for politic, economic, etc.

In the example above, the speaker, Mr. Shambazy, compared SBY’s career as a president with predecessor, Soekarno and Soeharto. After comparing those presidents, the speaker concluded that three of them failed in overcoming complicated problems in Indonesia such as economic, politic, and other problems (utterance no. 2). Although it did not appear clearly, the speaker actually implied

an accusation that SBY had failed as a president (utterance no. 2). By accusing about his failure, the speaker threatened the positive face of the hearer.

In delivering his FTA, he used “overstate” strategy. It could be seen from his fifth utterance in the example above. There he stated that the speaker and the hearer(s) should recognize the failure of the three presidents. He said as if the said presidents did not make any positive results in finishing problems though in reality it was possible for them to have made good results during their job as a president. The use of “*tidak pernah*” in that statement was a trigger that made the statement became exaggerating than the real condition.

(12)

Nah, nah ini yang presiden baru. Saya kira semua tahu dulu prestasi 2004-2009 karena ada the real presiden. Yang periode 2009-2014, ini Century memang sudah sangat, ya, mencengkeram, menjebak, menyandera sekali.

Well, this is about the new president. I believe that everybody knows that the achievements in 2004-2009 are because of the existence of a real president. For this 2009-2014 period, the Century case has been very firm, tricky, and suffocating.

In this example, the speaker tried to compare between SBY’s two ruling period. He said that in 2004-2009 periods, SBY’s performance was good (utterance no. 1). Unfortunately, SBY could not maintain that good achievement in his second period. According to the speaker, SBY’s performance in his last period was tainted by Century case which was complicated (utterance no. 2).

Although the speaker might not realize it, the speaker did FTA to SBY by uttering that utterance. The speaker implied an accusation and dissatisfaction expression as well about SBY’s failure in maintaining his good performance as a

president because of Century case (utterance no. 2). This accusation of course had a possibility in damaging SBY's positive face.

In delivering his FTA, the speaker used "overstate" strategy. He overstated the current situation by choosing three dramatic adjectives (*mencengkeram, menjebak, menyandera sekali*; utterance no. 2) to describe how bad Century case influenced the current government. Those three words actually had the same negative connotative meaning and he could use only one of them. However, he chose to use those words at all continuously to mitigate his statement so that it (utterance no. 2) became more exaggerating than it should.

e. Use Contradiction

The fifth strategy that the speakers used in the writer's data was "use contradiction". The speakers who used this strategy would state two things that contradict each other. They made the hearer tried to look an interpretation of what they had said. This strategy is a way to be polite in delivering criticism.

We could find the use of this strategy in the examples below.

(13)

Ya ini kan kalau dilukiskan secara singkat, ekonomi pemerintahan SBY itu ekonomi yang terbelah. (1) Satu sisi di panggung-panggung politik, ehm, rezim ekonomi selalu mengatakan pertumbuhan ekonomi kita naik, kemudian tadi, APBN kita naik, dan lain-lain. (2) Tetapi kita lihat di sisi lain kan kesenjangan ekonomi semakin lebar, baik dari SPDB, kepemilikan lahan, dan lain-lain (3). Ya, artinya angka kesenjangan tetap saja makin lebar. (4)

If we say it in short, the economic situation of SBY's government is like being torn apart. On one side, the people in politic stages said that our economic situation increases, our APBN and others are increasing. But when take a look from the other sife, we will see how economic gap is

getting bigger, whether it's from SPDB, land ownership, etc. My point is the economic gap is still getting bigger. 5

The speaker, Mr. Yudi, explained about the economic condition in Indonesia during SBY's second ruling period. There, he said that the economic situation was torn apart (utterance no. 1). Torn apart here meant there were two different opinions in viewing the situation. The first opinion said that economic situation in Indonesia was good, the economic growth increased, etc. (utterance no. 2). Meanwhile, the other opinion indicated that the situation was not so good because economic gap between people was getting bigger (utterance no. 3)

In his utterance above, the speaker implied an accusation toward SBY's government about their incapability in handling economic problems, especially economic gap. Though some people, especially the politician, assumed that economic situation in Indonesia was good, the reality showed the opposite (utterance no 2-3). The economic gap between Indonesian people was still getting bigger (utterance no 4). This implied accusation could bring a threat that threatened the positive face of the hearer. Therefore, he employed a "use contradiction" strategy in his utterance.

Showing two different opinions explaining the economic situation in Indonesia to contradict each other (utterance no. 2-3) was his application in using "use contradiction" strategy. By using contradiction, the speaker let the hearer to make an interpretation of what he had said. It means he did not express what he actually mean directly. Thus, his utterance that contained implied accusation and criticism sounded more polite to the hearer.

Another example of this strategy could be seen from Mr. Burhanudin's utterance below as a response for moderator's question whether the success in economic field was able to cover the lack achievement in laws and politics sector or not.

(14)

Ehm, saya kira, ehm, ada hal yang menarik ya, Avi. Kalau di periode pertama, itu yang menjadi titik atau rapor merah pemerintahan SBY periode 2004 dengan 2009 itu bidang ekonomi. Waktu itu relatif kepuasan publik dalam soal ekonomi, itu lebih rendah dibanding soal hukum dan politik. Sekarang terbalik, justru di 2009 sampai 2014, itu yang terjadi adalah kepuasan publik merosot drastis dalam soal politik dan hukum jadi pemerintah SBY terlalu sering membuang deposito kepercayaan, tapi dalam soal ekonomi ada kenaikan.

Ehm, I think there's an interesting thing here, Avi. In the first period, the bad sector of SBY's government in 2004-2009 is economic sector. At that time, the public satisfaction rate in economic is lower than law and politic sector. Now, the situation is reversed, in 2009-2014, the satisfaction rate on politic and law is decreasing because SBY government wasted too many public's trust, but there is an enhancement in economic sector.

In his utterances, Mr. Burhanudin implied a criticism that threatened the positive face of SBY about SBY's bad achievements in each period. He said that in the first period, economic sector was the weakness point of SBY and his government (utterance no. 2). Then, in the second period, the weakness points of SBY's government shifted to politic and law sector (utterance no. 4).

Using "use contradiction" as a strategy made him as if he couldn't be telling the truth, therefore he encouraged the hearer to find the interpretation from his contradictive statements. Thus, he was able to deliver his accusation and criticism about SBY's achievement while maintaining the politeness more comfortably.

f. Overgeneralize

The last off-record strategy found in the data is “overgeneralize” strategy. In this strategy, the speakers usually did not give clear information about what he actually meant. They would use words that could represent something in general so that the hearer would not guess easily the meaning of their utterances.

We could see how this strategy was employed in the example below:

(15)

Ya, yang pertama yang saya lihat di sini adalah, tadi istilah Mbak Avi bagus, rapor, merah atau biru? Kalau secara umum, setelah reformasi memang presiden-presiden kita umumnya, ya...antara 5 sampai 6, nilai rapornya. Setelah reformasi ya itu ada Pak Habibie, ada Gus Dur, ada Mega, dan SBY.

Well, the first thing that I see here is, the term that you used is good, “rapor merah atau biru”? Generally, after reformation our presidents’ score is between 5 and 6. After reformation’s presidents include Pak Habibie, Gus Dur, Mega, and SBY.

The utterances above were the response for the moderator’s question who asked the speaker’s evaluation about SBY’s performance during his two ruling period. However, the speaker’s answer did not answer that question directly.

In the example, the speaker started his response by appraising terms that the moderator used (utterance no. 1). He then gave his opinion about the score for presidents who ruled after reformation era (utterance no. 2). He also gave additional explanation about the name of presidents that he mentioned in his earlier utterance (utterance no. 3).

Though the speaker did not seem to answer the moderator’s question directly and clearly, those utterances still threatened the hearer’s face because

there was a criticism contained in them. He implied that the performance of SBY was not good by saying that the presidents' score was between 5 and 6 (utterance no. 3). However, due to the strategy that he used, it was possible for the hearer to feel less threatened.

The use of "overgeneralize" strategy in the utterances above was indicated by the phrase "*presiden-presiden*" (utterance no. 2). That phrase was a plural noun so that there was more than one possibility for the hearer to guess who the president that was actually meant by the speaker was. Although the speaker then gave more hints by mentioning that the presidents he talked about was the presidents after reformation era and even mentioned their names one by one, his real target was still too general. It is clear that he avoided appointing SBY personally because at that time he has lower social status than SBY so that he did not want to put too much damage on SBY's positive face.

The other example for the application of "overgeneralize" strategy could be seen below.

(16)

Diangkat dan ada muncullah KPK, itu hanya membuktikan bahwa korupsi itu sudah sangat mendalam. Dan dibutuhkan satu pemerintahan yang sangat tegas untuk mengatasi itu. Dan saya kira SBY melakukan itu. Kalau misalnya itu anak buahnya ikut korupsi, siapa yang tidak? Semua melakukan korupsi. Yang penting ada pimpinan yang melakukan itu. Itu cuma soal korupsi, tapi hukum kan tidak hanya soal korupsi. 1
5

The existence of KPK is a proof that corruption has been a serious problem. A strong government is needed to overcome it. And I think SBY does it. If his staffs did a corruption, who wouldn't? Everyone does a corruption. The important part is there is a leader who does it. It's only the corruption, however, law is not only about corruption problem. 1
5

In the example above, the speaker, Mr. Radhar, talked about corruption in Indonesia. He stated the existence of KPK, an institute that fought against corruption, was a proof that corruption had been a serious problem in Indonesia (utterance no. 1). He also said that SBY's government had made an effort to overcome it (utterance no 2-3). However, in his next utterance, he unintentionally accused everybody, including SBY, did a corruption (utterance no. 4-5). This accusation statement obviously threatened SBY's positive face because what the speaker accused actually had not been verified by valid proof.

The speaker's FTA was minimized by using "overgeneralize" strategy. This strategy could be seen from "*Semua melakukan korupsi.*" in the fifth utterance. The word "*semua*" in that statement indicated that he overgeneralized the subject who did corruption. The word "*semua*" also made his accusation for SBY's participation in corruption did not seem too much threatening.

4.2.2 Bald On-Record Strategy

Bald on-record is a strategy used to say things directly. This strategy usually does not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. The utterance that used this strategy generally was direct, short, and clear. Although bald on-record strategy is usually used for people with close relationship, it doesn't mean that this strategy cannot be found on people who barely know each other. In fact, it does appear in the writer's data. The speakers who were not close enough with SBY still felt free to use this strategy. It's even possible for the speakers to assume that because SBY and they were not on the same place, they did not need to worry about dealing with the effect if they offended SBY's feeling.

In the data, the writer found some utterances containing this strategy. One of the examples could be seen below.

(17)

Itu cuma soal korupsi, tapi hukum kan tidak hanya soal korupsi. Banyak lagi persoalan-persoalan hukum yang tidak diselesaikan dengan baik termasuk persoalan politik, ekonomi, apalagi sosial kemasyarakatan dan budaya. Hancur abis.

It's only the corruption; however, law is not only about corruption problem. There are many other problems that are not finished well including politic, economic, and social culture problems. Very bad.

On the example above, the speaker explained that corruption was not the only problem that existed in Indonesia (utterance no.1). He also said that there were many problems including laws, politics, economics, and socials that were not solved well (utterance no. 2).

The use of phrase “*tidak diselesaikan dengan baik*” in the second utterance was a form of accusation done by the speaker that threatened the hearer's face. He accused the government's incapability in solving the problems completely and only did it half-way. To make his accusation became more threatening; he used phrase “*hancur abis*” in the end of his utterance which emphasized the failure of the current government. By choosing that phrase, it also showed that, for the speaker, Indonesia was really in a complete mess and there was nothing the government could do to save this situation.

From the speaker's statement, the writer saw that the speaker had no intention in minimizing the FTA. He just expressed his criticism directly without considering SBY's feelings or wants. Therefore, this utterance obviously threatened the positive face of SBY. It accused SBY and his staff for being incapable in handling the situation. In uttering this utterance, the speaker seemed

ignoring the position of president and his staff which were higher than him. He also didn't have any mitigating utterance which could have lessen the threat. These actions might be caused by the speaker's job background which had nothing to do with the government so that he didn't have any responsibility in keeping the president's face.

The next example that used bald-on-record strategy was:

(18)

Yang jeblok, dari pemerintahan SBY itu terutama dalam soal politik dan hukum.

The bad thing of SBY's government is especially about politics and law matters.

Previously, the speaker was asked by the moderator to evaluate SBY's achievement in economic. Knowing that he was not an expert in that field, he excused himself in the beginning by saying that he was not an economist. After that he started to explain about the economic situation according his point of view as the writer showed in the example. He said that people should acknowledge that there was an improvement in economic field although there were still some arguments about it from microeconomic side. However, he then accused SBY's government that their politic and law field was extremely bad (utterance no. 1). The use of phrase "*Yang jeblok*" in that utterance was the trigger that emphasized the speaker did a FTA to SBY.

The speaker employed bald on-record strategy with no minimization on his utterance above (utterance no. 1). He said what he wanted to say. He even addressed SBY with his name directly when he should use SBY's title or simply put "*Pak/Bapak*" before SBY's name in behalf of giving respect to someone who

has higher position. His directness which was combined with the use of extreme phrase like “*yang jeblok*” was a proof that a speaker might use bald-on-record strategy to the hearer even though they did not have a close relationship and the hearer had higher social status than the speaker.

4.2.3 Positive Politeness Strategy

Positive politeness strategy is also used by the speakers to minimize the FTAs they had done to SBY. The speakers who used this strategy usually will avoid giving a threat by highlighting friendliness in their utterances. In that talk-show, the speakers used five of fifteen positive politeness strategies. They are “be optimistic”, “notice and attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, and goods)”, “give gifts to Hearer (in the form of goods, sympathy, understanding, and cooperation)”, “assert or presuppose S’s knowledge and concern for H’s wants”, and “give or ask for reasons”.

a. Be Optimistic

One of the strategies used by the speaker was to be optimistic. In this strategy, the speaker was supposed to be optimistic that the hearer was willing to do what the speaker had asked for. The speaker would express what he wanted with optimistic voices. For example:

(19)

Artinya begini lho. Sekarang kalo kita bandingkan, tarik menarik dari Bung Karno dan Pak Harto ya, legacy atau warisan itu bisa dicatat oleh seorang SBY jika dia bisa mengkomparasi dirinya dengan bung Karno dan pak Harto. Kan bung karno itu disebut sebagai bapak bangsa, dan Pak Harto bapak pembangunan nasional. Nah, SBY masih ada kesempatan untuk menobatkan diri sebagai bapak anti korupsi.

1

5

Here’s what I mean. Now, if we make a comparison started from Bung Karno and Pak Harto, SBY can write down his legacy as long as he is able

1

to compare himself with Bung Karno and Pak Harto. We all know that Bung Karno is called as “bapak bangsa”, and Pak Harto is called as “bapak pembangunan nasional”. While for SBY, he still has a chance to make himself as “bapak anti korupsi”. 5

Previously the moderator asked each speaker about what SBY should do in his remaining time. Each speaker, including Mr. Shambazy, then answered that question. In his answer, mas Bas explained that Presidents before SBY such as Bung Karno and Pak Harto were publicly known as “bapak bangsa” and “bapak pembangunan nasional” (utterance no. 3). For SBY, considering that he was known for his active action in eradicating corruption, the speaker said that SBY still had enough time to crown himself as “bapak anti korupsi” (utterance no. 4).

In the speaker’s utterance above, there was a threat that harmed SBY’s face. It was about SBY who had not proved yet to have a great achievement just like the previous presidents, Bung Karno and Pak Harto. However, that FTA was minimized by the speaker by using “be optimistic” strategy. Based on the speaker’s utterance in utterance no. 4, the writer assumed that the speaker somehow had faith in SBY that he would be able to leave a good impression as an anti-corruption father. He was optimistic about SBY’s ability and will. The speaker’s optimistic might relate to social factors that SBY had which was power. The speaker had less power than SBY who was a president. Therefore, he put his faith on SBY and his power to be able to fulfill the speaker’s hope.

By being optimistic, the speaker actually had more benefit. He could imply his criticism and doubts about SBY’s achievement without feeling worry that he might offend SBY’s feelings. The speaker masked his criticism and doubts with his optimistic words which sounded like encouragement words.

b. Notice and Attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, and goods)

Another strategy that was used by the speaker in order to minimize the FTA was to notice and attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, and goods). Here the speaker was supposed to notice the condition of the hearer and give specific expression. We could see it in the data below:

(20)

Yang membanggakan paling ya ada satu. Kita pernah punya Presiden yang besar badannya, rapi rambutnya, itu yang pertama. Ini yang pertama ya. Yang kedua, saya mendengar karena bergaul juga dengan teman-teman ya, di luar negeri, juga membaca banyak.

There is only one thing that we can be proud of. We ever had a president who has big body, neat hair, that's the first. This is the first. Secondly, I've ever heard that he maintains a good relationship with his friends from the other countries, and he reads a lot of books as well.

The example above was a response from the speaker for moderator's question about legacy left by SBY. He said that there was only one legacy of SBY that could make him proud (utterance no. 1). The legacy that he meant was SBY's physical appearance that he described in his next utterance. He said that SBY had well-build figure and neat hair (utterance no. 2). He also said that SBY had good relationship with his colleagues in foreign countries and loved reading (utterance no. 4)

Through his utterance, the speaker did an FTA by accusing and implying that SBY left only a little good legacy during his ruling periods. He even insinuated bluntly that there was only one thing from SBY that made him proud (utterance no. 1). This obviously offended the positive face of SBY.

The speaker realized that SBY who was a president had more power than him. Therefore, in order to lessen the threat he chose to use this strategy. He

noticed and appreciated SBY's physical appearance (utterance no. 2) and also described SBY's characteristics well (utterance no. 4).

- c. Give Gifts to Hearer (in the form of goods, sympathy, understanding, and cooperation)

The speakers who used this strategy will try to satisfy the hearer. They usually showed their sympathy, understanding, and cooperation in their utterances. It was also possible for the speakers to give gifts in the form of good to the hearer.

In the example below, the writer found the application of this strategy in the form understanding and cooperation.

(21)

Kalau di periode pertama, itu yang menjadi titik atau rapor merah pemerintahan SBY periode 2004 dengan 2009 itu bidang ekonomi. Waktu itu relatif kepuasan publik dalam soal ekonomi, itu lebih rendah dibanding soal hukum dan politik. Sekarang terbalik, justru di 2009 sampai 2014, itu yang terjadi adalah kepuasan publik merosot drastis dalam soal politik dan hukum jadi pemerintah SBY terlalu sering membuang deposito kepercayaan, tapi dalam soal ekonomi ada kenaikan.

In the first period, the bad sector of SBY's government in 2004-2009 is economic sector. At that time, the public satisfaction rate in economic is lower than law and politic sector. Now, the situation is reversed, in 2009-2014, the satisfaction rate on politic and law is decreasing because SBY government wasted too many public's trust, but there is an enhancement in economic sector.

The speaker on the example above was giving his evaluation for SBY's performance. He said that in the first period, the weakness point in SBY's government was economic field (utterance no. 1). According to him, public satisfaction for that field was lower than laws and politic (utterance no. 2). On the contrary, for the second period, the situation was reversed (utterance no. 3). Economic was SBY's government good point while politic and law were their weakness. It was caused by SBY's government who frequently lost people's trust.

From the statements above, the writer saw that the speaker was criticizing SBY's government achievement (utterance no. 1-3). He also exposed the bad points of SBY's government in his utterances which made the damage of his FTA getting worse. Fortunately, he considered using a mitigating statement to make his FTA less threatening. "*tapi dalam soal ekonomi ada kenaikan*" was his mitigating statement. He used give gifts to hearer strategy in that statement. Though he did criticize SBY's achievement, he still showed his understanding and cooperation by pointing a good point of SBY's government. This effort would satisfy the hearer, so the effect of FTA that was felt by the hearer before would slightly decrease.

d. Assert or Presuppose S's Knowledge of Concern for H's Wants

Another positive politeness strategy found in the data was "assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants" strategy. Here the speakers were supposed to use their knowledge and concern to understand the hearer's wants. They might give their ideas or solutions to the hearer's need so that the FTA they did would be less threatening.

We could see it from this example:

(22)

<i>...saya kira tidak banyak hal yang bisa dia lakukan kecuali di akhir masa jabatannya ini dia tergulung pada spiral kepentingan pribadi. Ada sebagian waktu yang disisakan untuk meratakan jalan bagi kebaikan demokrasi yang akan datang. Misalnya, DPT itu benarkan supaya tidak ada lagi manipulasi pemilu. Jangan ada lagi usaha-usaha atau motif-motif untuk kepentingan sendiri, tapi kasih kesempatan pada demokrasi kita lebih matang pada masa yang akan datang.</i>	1
<i>...I think there is no much thing that SBY can do unless in his last period he is caught in his private interest. There are some times that should be used to reorder some things for the upcoming democracy. For example, to recheck the DPT so that there is no more manipulation in general elections.</i>	5
<i>...I think there is no much thing that SBY can do unless in his last period he is caught in his private interest. There are some times that should be used to reorder some things for the upcoming democracy. For example, to recheck the DPT so that there is no more manipulation in general elections.</i>	1

Don't let any efforts or motive for personal interest, give a chance to our democracy so that it can be more mature in the future. 5

The utterances above were a response for the moderator's question about what SBY should do in his remaining time as a president. The speaker said that there are no many things that SBY could do (utterance no. 1). He also gave some suggestions and advices that might be useful for SBY's last months (utterance no 2-4). The speaker's acts of giving suggestions and advices put some pressures on SBY. By pressuring SBY to do so, it showed that he was actually threatening the negative face of SBY.

Fortunately, the speaker did do something to minimize the FTA he had done. He employed an "assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants" in form of some mitigating utterances (utterance no. 4-6). In those utterances, he gave some suggestions for SBY to do in his last days, such as solving the problems of DPT so that there was no more manipulation in the upcoming election (utterance no. 5).

e. Give (or ask) For Reasons

Another strategy that could be employed by the speakers in minimizing FTA(s) was "give or ask for reasons". They will use the word "why" in the beginning if their utterance to ask the reason of the participants' act. "Why" also used as an aid for the speakers in giving explanation or reason of their statement.

Here is the data that used this strategy.

(23)

Seneng banget ya? Menjadi inspirator bagi pergerakan ekonomi dan politik di tingkat regional maupun mancanegara. Dan itu positif buat mereka. Dia tidak peduli dengan kita-kita yang mengatakan, itu kemas, bu, pak,”. Anda mungkin peduli dengan bagian luarnya, kami peduli dengan bagian dalamnya. Kenapa bagian dalamnya? Compang-camping, pak. Nah kenapa compang-camping? Itu saya coba jelaskan. Dari semua sektor, malah yang bagus dari semua compang-camping itu korupsi doang.

Very exciting, right? Being an inspirer for economic and politic movement in both regional and international. And it's very positive for them. He doesn't care with us who said "it's all just an act. Ma'am, Sir." You may care for the outside; however we do care with the inside. What's wrong with the inside? It's ragged, Sir. How come? That's what I'm going to explain. Of all the sectors, the good one from all that ragged sectors is only corruption.

In that example, the speaker expressed his complaint about SBY's achievement that looked so good in foreign people's eyes when the situation in Indonesia was not so good (utterance no. 1-3). He accused that all that good achievement was only for show (utterance no. 4) and explained how bad the real situation in Indonesia was (utterance no. 5-9).

His complaint and accusation (utterance no 1-4) in the example above showed that he didn't care for SBY's face. He still delivered his threat even though he knew clearly that SBY's power was higher than him. Even so he didn't care for SBY's feeling; he managed to use a strategy in his utterance in order to lessen the threat. The use of "kenapa" in fifth utterance was intended to be an aid for him so that he could give his reason or explanation in accusing so.

4.2.4 Negative Politeness Strategy

The last and least strategy that was used in this talk-show was negative politeness strategy. This strategy was used when the speaker realized that the

relationship between them was not close enough. It is also usually used to mitigate the threats that threatened the negative face of the hearer. Though the speakers in this talk-show mostly ignored it, there were some speakers that still took some consideration about this matter. There are three negative politeness strategy found in the data. They are “give deference”, “be pessimistic”, and “by using question and hedge” strategy.

a. Give Deference

In using this strategy, the speakers will give more attention to the power difference between the speakers and the hearer. The speakers who have lower power in society show their respect to the hearer through their utterance so that the hearer will feel less threatened.

We can see the use of this strategy in the writer’s data below.

(24)

Nah ini, sekarang masalahnya waktu tinggal sempit sekali, apakah tadi pertanyaan warisan yang ditinggalkan oleh seorang SBY? Nah, kalau saya sebagai warga memang cukup prihatin. Saya bukan meniru Pak Presiden ya, suka prihatin. Prihatin karena memang warisan yang ditinggalkan itu memang minim sekali.

1

5

Well, now the time is very limited, and the question is what kind of legacy that is left by SBY? As a citizen, I feel concerned with this situation. No, I’m not trying to imitate Mr. President in saying his concern. I feel concerned because the legacy that is left is very minimal.

1

In that utterance, the speaker was questioning the legacy left by SBY (utterance no. 1). He said that as a citizen, he felt concerned about SBY who left only a little legacy during his service (utterance no. 2). By showing his concern, he actually threatened the negative face of SBY. Furthermore, he indirectly insinuated SBY about his habit in saying the word “prihatin” (utterance no. 3).

This kind of utterance might damage SBY's face because the speaker showed that he did not care with SBY feeling.

To lessen that threat, the speaker then used give deference strategy. It was clear that at the moment, the speaker has lower power and social status than SBY. He was only a citizen while SBY was a president. Therefore, in delivering his FTA, he managed to insert his deference for SBY. On the example above, the writer noticed that the speaker used term "Pak Presiden" to address SBY (utterance no. 3). Though it actually was possible for the speaker called SBY by his name just like what he did in his previous utterance (utterance no 1), he chose to address him with his title. By doing this simple action, he had reduced the tension that appeared because of his threat and at the same time showed that he respected SBY as a president.

b. Be Pessimistic

This strategy was the opposite of "be optimistic" strategy. If in "be optimistic" strategy the speaker feels optimistic that the hearer will do what he has asked, then in this strategy the speaker will show his doubt about it. He will use his pessimistic voice in his utterance to lessen the threat that he gave.

In the data below, we could see how the speaker employed this strategy to lessen his FTA.

(25)

Bukan hanya survey, bahkan ini di tahun 2014, ANU ya, Australian National University mau bikin Indonesia Update temanya legacy SBY, sampai sekarang juga bingung, legacynya apa? Jadi ini menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada satu legacy yang sifatnya top of mind yang monumental.

1

Nah, misalnya sampai 9 bulan kedepan dia gagal juga untuk memenuhi itu, saya khawatir dia hanya sekedar menjadi presiden mediocre. 5

Not only a survey, even in this 2014, ANU, Australian National University is confused in making Indonesia Update about SBY's legacy. This shows that there is no monumental and top of mind legacy of SBY. If in the next 9 months he fails in achieving it, I'm afraid that he'll only be a mediocre president. 1 5

The utterances above were a response for moderator's question who asked about legacy left by SBY. He exposed that SBY left no monumental legacy (utterance no. 2). Even a university in Australia who usually wrote articles about Indonesia felt confused to write an article about SBY's legacy (utterance no. 1). Lastly, he said that he was pessimistic with what SBY would do in his last nine months. He was worried that SBY will only be a mediocre president (utterance no. 3). From those utterances, the writer saw that the speaker was not satisfied with many things SBY had done. He also reminded SBY, that till that day, there was no SBY's effort and achievement that could be categorized as a legacy (utterance no. 2). Through his last utterance, implicitly he suggested SBY to do something so that he could leave a monumental legacy that could be remembered by people in a long time. The speaker's acts of reminding, warning, and suggesting to SBY obviously threatened the negative face of SBY.

Knowing that his acts caused harm to SBY's face, the speaker tried to employ a strategy to lessen it. The use of "*saya khawatir dia hanya sekedar menjadi presiden mediocre*" was the application of "be pessimistic" strategy. By showing his worry and concern, he could minimize the effect of FTA he had done to SBY.

c. By Using Question and Hedges

In doing FTA, the speakers might use this strategy to lessen their threat. This strategy is done by uttering the utterance in form of interrogative utterance so that the utterance sounds more polite. Besides using interrogative utterance, the speakers may use hedges in their utterance. Hedges' function is to modify the level of predicate or noun phrase in the utterance. The example of "using question and hedges" strategy can be seen below.

(26)

Dibandingkan dengan Soekarno dan Soeharto, SBY itu mengalami suatu masa yang sama ketika dia mulai kekuasaannya dari sebuah kekisruhan. Soekarno dari revolusi, Soeharto dari komunisme PKI, dan dia dari reformasi. Jadi dari situasi yang chaotic, yang ricuh, kisruh, dan dari segi ekonomi politik mengalami titik yang agak nadir di bawah itu. Nah, tinggal kita bandingkan, bagaimana ketiga-tiganya menyelesaikan masalah-masalah yang rumit itu. Dan kita harus mengakui dalam sejarah, ketiga-tiganya tidak pernah berhasil. Tidak cukup berhasil dalam melakukan penataan politik, ekonomi, dan yang lain-lain.

Being compared to Soekarno and Soeharto, SBY is facing the same situation where he started his authority from a chaos. Soekarno was from a revolution, Soeharto was from communism, and SBY was from reformation. So, from that chaotic situation, economic and politic conditions are on a low stage. Now, we just need to compare how those three overcome those complicated problems. And we have to acknowledge that those three never succeed. Not quite succeed in handling the arrangement for politic, economic, etc.

In the example, the speaker compared SBY to the first and second president, Soekarno and Soeharto. He said that those three presidents basically shared the same condition in the beginning of their ruling period; they faced chaotic situation in economic and politic (utterance no. 1-3). Next, he compared them for their effort in solving complicated problems in their era (utterance no. 4). Based on the comparison, he stated those presidents were not succeed in solving the existing problems (utterance no. 5)

His statement on the fifth utterance might bring a threat to the hearer's face. He accused SBY for not being able in handling Indonesia's problems. Although he did not mention SBY's name directly in that utterance, it was obvious that the target of his FTA was SBY. Furthermore, since the beginning of this talk-show, the object of discussion was SBY. Thus, it was reasonable that the target of FTA was him.

Though he threatened SBY's face, he managed an effort to minimize it by employing a strategy in his mitigating statement (utterance no. 6). The word "cukup" (utterance no. 6) was a hedge that modified phrase "tidak berhasil" that he used in his fifth statement. By using that hedge, the degree of tension in his threat (utterance no. 5) decreased well.

Another data that used this strategy was:

(27)

Diangkat dan ada muncullah KPK, itu hanya membuktikan bahwa korupsi itu sudah sangat mendalam. Dan dibutuhkan satu pemerintahan yang sangat tegas untuk mengatasi itu. Dan saya kira SBY melakukan itu. Kalau misalnya itu anak buahnya ikut korupsi, siapa yang tidak? Semua melakukan korupsi. Yang penting ada pimpinan yang melakukan itu. 1
5

The existence of KPK is a proof that corruption has been a serious problem. A strong government is needed to overcome it. And I think SBY does it. If his staffs did a corruption, who wouldn't? Everyone does a corruption. The important part is there is a leader who does it. 1

In the example above, the speaker talked about corruption in Indonesia. He stated that the establishment of KPK showed how corruption had been a serious problem (utterance no.1) However, KPK was not the only solution for overcoming corruption problem; a resolute government was also needed to cope with it (utterance no. 2). From these two utterances it was obvious that he showed

his appreciation on SBY's effort and achievement in handling corruption. Nevertheless, in his next utterance, he unintentionally accused everybody, including SBY, did a corruption (utterance no. 4-5). This accusation statement obviously threatened SBY's positive face because there was no concrete proof to validate it.

To overcome the damage of his FTA, he employed this "using question and hedges" strategy in form of a question (utterance no. 4). He made his accusation as if it was not directed to SBY though his real target was him. By not aiming his object of FTA directly, he could lessen the threat contained in his accusing utterance.

After analyzing the whole data in *Forum Indonesia* episode *Panggung Terakhir SBY*, the writer concluded that the social factors appeared in the data are as follows. The power of the speaker and the hearer's social relationship was negative because the hearer who was a president had more power than the speakers. The social distance between them was positive because the speakers on cons side did not have close relationship with the hearer. Perhaps they knew each other, but their relationship was not close. The ranking of imposition of the speakers' utterances was positive. It is related to their social distance relationship. Thus, the speakers' utterances might be categorized as a heavy statement that could threaten the hearer's face.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the writer presents a conclusion based on the results that she found in the study that she conducted. The writer also adds some suggestions that might be useful for the next researchers in conducting their study.

5.1 Conclusion

This study concerns with the application of politeness strategy in criticizing SBY's performance as a president in *Forum Indonesia*. It was intended to reveal the kinds of FTA used by the speaker and the strategies that the speakers used to overcome the threats contained in their utterances when they criticized SBY.

The findings revealed that the speakers on cons side threatened both the negative and positive face of SBY. The speakers threatened the negative face of SBY by showing his admiration toward SBY's possession and putting some pressure on SBY by saying that he believed SBY's ability in handling problems. Though in reality SBY had more power, ranking of imposition, and influence, the speakers did not feel reluctant in harming the positive face of SBY. The speakers put aside those social factors and gave their criticism, accusation, and even insinuation towards SBY's performance and achievements in the last ten years

freely. In the data, the positive face threatening acts occurred more frequent than the negative face threatening acts.

Although the speakers threatened SBY's face, they still considered to use a strategy in order to minimize their threats. The findings showed that all Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy (1987) namely "bald on record", "positive politeness", "negative politeness", and off-record strategy were found in the data. The speakers used "bald on record" strategy to say things directly. "Positive politeness strategy" was employed by the speakers to minimize the FTA by highlighting friendliness in their utterances. Of all fifteen positive politeness strategies, the speakers used "be optimistic", "notice and attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, and goods)", "give gifts to Hearer (in the form of goods, sympathy, understanding, and cooperation)", "assert or presuppose S's knowledge and concern for H's wants", and "give or ask for reasons". The speakers rarely used "negative politeness strategy"; however the writer was able to notice the use of this strategy. The strategies they used were "give deference", "be pessimistic", and "by using question and hedge" strategy. The last and the most used strategy in the data was "off-record strategy". When the speakers applied this strategy, they got a benefit which was to avoid being responsible for the FTAs they had done. Due to this benefit, they frequently used this strategy. The "off-record strategy" that they used to criticized SBY were "metaphor", "be vague", "be ironic", "overstate", "overgeneralize", and "contradiction".

5.2 Suggestion

The study of FTA and politeness strategy, especially in the political debate, forum, and dialog, needs various kinds of discussion. Since the writer only focused on kind of FTAs and strategies the speakers used to mitigate the FTA, there are still many gaps that can be filled by the next researchers. The writer suggests the next researchers to use a longer object of research. The next researchers may also combine politeness theories with impoliteness theory that lately has been discussed by many linguists.

REFERENCES

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erlina, Yolanda. (2013). "Gender Differences in the Use of Bald on Record Politeness Strategy Found in Gossip Girl Season I MovieScript : (A Pragmatic Study). Unpublished Final Project. Indonesian Computer University. 26th February 2015 <Accessed from <http://elib.unikom.ac.id/gdl.php?mod=browse&op=read&id=jbptunikomp-gdl-yolandaerl-32378>>
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis (A Method for Advanced Students)*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1967). On Face-work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interactions. In B.G. Blounts (Ed), *Language, Culture, and Society*, (2nd ed., pp. 222-247). Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc. 26th February 2015 <Accessed from <http://hplinguistics.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/38289359/Goffman,%20Erving%20'On%20Face-work'.pdf>>
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2000). "Civil Political Discourse In A Democracy: The Contribution Of Psychology". 27th February 2015 <Accessed from <http://www.co-operation.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Controversy-Political-Discourse.pdf>>
- Pariera, K. (2006). The Use of Politeness Strategies in Email Discussions About Taboo Topics. *PSU McNair Scholars Online Journal*, 2 (29) (pp. 320-341) 29th June 2015 <Accessed from <http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1099&context=mcnair>>
- Pishghadam, R., & Navari, S. (2012). A Study into Politeness Strategies and Politeness Markers in Advertisements as Persuasive Tools. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 3 (3) (pp. 161-171) 13th August 2015 <Accessed from <http://profdoc.um.ac.ir/articles/a/1023382.pdf>>
- Roberts, Jo. (1992). Face Threatening Acts and Politeness Theory: Contrasting Speeches From Supervisory Conferences. *Journal of Curriculum and*

Supervision, 7 (3) (pp. 287-301). 29th June 2015 <Accessed from http://ascd.asia/ASCD/pdf/journals/jcs/jcs_1992spring_roberts.pdf>

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Focus on Research Methods: What Happened to Qualitative Description. *Research in Nursing & Health*, (pp. 334-340) 20th June 2015 <Accessed from [http://www.researchgate.net/publications.PublicPostFileLoader.html?id=55e74d655cd9e3af7f8b4581&key=72904b30-c50f-4a07-9aa1-48d9e84edb99](http://www.researchgate.net/publications/PublicPostFileLoader.html?id=55e74d655cd9e3af7f8b4581&key=72904b30-c50f-4a07-9aa1-48d9e84edb99)>

Siadari, Lidiawati. (2014). "Politeness Strategies of the Host Utterance in Hitam Putih Talk Show, September 13th, 2013". Unpublished Final Project. Diponegoro University.

Sudaryanto. (2013) *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

Watts, R. J. (2013). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winerta, Viollen. (2012). "An Analysis of Politeness Strategy in Requesting Used in Real Human and Non-Human Conversation on "Avatar" Movie". Unpublished Final Project. State University of Padang. 23rd February 2015 <Accessed from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/ell/article/viewFile/1836/1573>>

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIXES

Table of Data

No.	Utterances	Explanation
1.	...itu yang menjadi titik atau rapor merah pemerintahan SBY periode 2004 dengan 2009 itu bidang ekonomi	<p>FTA: positive face (accusing)</p> <p>Use metaphor “titik atau rapor merah” to accuse SBY’s government’s failure in economic.</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record use (metaphor)</p>
2	Sekarang terbalik, justru di 2009 sampai 2014, itu yang terjadi adalah kepuasan publik merosot drastis dalam soal politik dan hukum jadi pemerintah SBY terlalu sering membuang deposito kepercayaan tapi dalam soal ekonomi ada kenaikan.	<p>FTA: positive face (accusing)</p> <p>Use a declarative sentence to accuse SBY’s performance.</p> <p>Strategi:</p> <p>(i) bald on record (kepuasan publik merosot drastis}</p> <p>(ii) positive politeness strategy: give gifts to hearer (tapi dalam soal ekonomi ada kenaikan)</p>
3.	Saya bukan meniru Pak Presiden ya, suka prihatin.	<p>FTA: positive face (insinuating)</p> <p>Insinuating SBY’s habit</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) negative politeness strategy: give deference (Pak Presiden)</p>
4.	Prihatin karena memang warisan yang ditinggalkan itu memang minim sekali, bahkan	FTA: positive face (accusing)

	<p> mungkin, apa sih warisan yang akan ditinggalkan?</p>	<p>Accuse that SBY left no legacy.</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off-record strategy: use metaphor (warisan)</p> <p>(ii) off record strategy: use rhetorical questions (bahkan mungkin, apa sih warisan yang akan ditinggalkan?)</p>
5.	<p>Saya kira semua tahu dulu prestasi 2004-2009 karena ada the real presiden</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (insinuating)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) Off-record strategy: be ironic (the real presiden)</p>
6.	<p>Yang periode 2009-2014, ini Century memang sudah sangat, ya, mencengkeram, menjebak— Menyandera sekali</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (accusing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: overstate (mencengkeram, menjebak— Menyandera sekali)</p>
7.	<p>Sebentar, kenapa saya bilang korupsi baik, ya kan?</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (insinuating)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: be ironic (saya bilang korupsi baik)</p>
8.	<p>Kalau misalnya itu anak buahnya ikut korupsi, siapa yang tidak? Semua melakukan korupsi.</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (accusing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: overgeneralize (semua melakukan korupsi)</p>
9.	<p>Banyak lagi persoalan-persoalan hukum yang</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (accusing)</p>

	tidak diselesaikan dengan baik termasuk persoalan politik, ekonomi, apalagi sosial kemasyarakatan dan budaya. Hancur abis.	Strategy: (i) bald on record strategy (hancur abis)
10.	Ya, dia lahir dengan satu gelembung citra.	FTA: positive face (accusing) Strategy: (i) off record strategy: use metaphor (lahir dengan gelembung citra)
11.	Sebenarnya sebagai satu bangsa yang katakanlah kita akui atau diakui dunia kebesarannya, kita harus memberikan respek ya, apresiasi kepada seorang presiden yang sudah dua periode dipercaya oleh publik. Selain dia secara fisik dan penampilan besar, dan tampan seperti yang dikatakan oleh— Kalem. Kita tahu lah, bahwa SBY ini orang yang sebenarnya hatinya baik. Itu saya akui. Dan santun. Tapi itu kan tidak memperlihatkan kinerjanya	FTA: positive face (criticizing) Strategy: (i) positive politeness strategy: notice and attend to H (Sebenarnya sebagai satu bangsa yang katakanlah kita akui atau diakui dunia kebesarannya, kita harus memberikan respek ya, apresiasi kepada seorang presiden yang sudah dua periode dipercaya oleh publik. Selain dia secara fisik dan penampilan besar, dan tampan seperti yang dikatakan oleh— Kalem. Kita tahu lah, bahwa SBY ini orang yang sebenarnya hatinya baik. Itu saya akui. Dan santun.)
12.	Dan kita harus mengakui dalam sejarah, ketiga-tiganya tidak pernah berhasil. Tidak cukup berhasil dalam melakukan penataan politik, ekonomi, dan yang lain-lain.	FTA: positive face (accusing) Strategy: (i) negative politeness strategy: using question and hedge (tidak cukup berhasil) (ii) off record strategy: overstate (tidak pernah

		berhasil)
13.	Artinya begini lho. Sekarang kalo kita bandingkan, tarik menarik dari bung karno dan pak harto ya, legacy atau warisan itu bisa dicatat oleh seorang SBY jika dia bisa mengkomparasi dirinya dengan bung karno dan pak harto. Kan bung karno itu disebut sebagai bapak bangsa, dan pak harto bapak pembangunan nasional. Nah, sby masih ada kesempatan untuk menobatkan diri sebagai bapak anti korupsi.	<p>FTA: negative face (showing strong emotion (trust) to the hearer)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: use metaphor (legacy/warisan)</p> <p>(ii) positive politeness strategy: be optimistic (Nah, sby masih ada kesempatan untuk menobatkan diri sebagai bapak anti korupsi)</p>
14.	Nah jadi, oleh karena itu saya kira tidak banyak hal yang bisa dia lakukan kecuali di akhir masa jabatannya ini dia tergulung pada spiral kepentingan pribadi. Ada sebagian waktu yang disisakan untuk meratakan jalan bagi kebaikan demokrasi yang akan datang. Misalnya, DPT itu benarkan supaya tidak ada lagi manipulasi pemilu. Jangan ada lagi usaha-usaha atau motif-motif untuk kepentingan sendiri, tapi kasih kesempatan pada demokrasi kita lebih matang pada masa yang akan datang.	<p>FTA: negative face (putting pressure on H to do what S wants)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) positive politeness strategy: assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants (Ada sebagian waktu yang disisakan untuk meratakan jalan bagi kebaikan demokrasi yang akan datang. Misalnya, DPT itu benarkan supaya tidak ada lagi manipulasi pemilu. Jangan ada lagi usaha-usaha atau motif-motif untuk kepentingan sendiri, tapi kasih kesempatan pada demokrasi kita lebih matang pada masa yang akan datang.)</p>
15.	Jangan sampai SBY tidak menjadi bapak anti korupsi, tidak menjadi bapak demokrasi, kecuali menjadi bapak dari anak-anaknya sendiri. Ini masalah.	<p>FTA: positive face (criticizing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) bald on record (ini</p>

		masalah)
16.	Ya ini kan kalau dilukiskan secara singkat, ekonomi pemerintahan SBY itu ekonomi yang terbelah. Satu sisi di panggung-panggung politik, ehm, rezim ekonomi selalu mengatakan pertumbuhan ekonomi kita naik, kemudian tadi, APBN kita naik, dan lain-lain. Tetapi kita lihat di sisi lain kan kesenjangan ekonomi semakin lebar, baik dari SPDB, kepemilikan lahan, dan lain-lain.	FTA: positive face (criticizing) Strategy: (i) off record strategy: use metaphor (ekonomi yang terbelah) (ii) off record strategy: use contradiction (Tetapi kita lihat di sisi lain kan kesenjangan ekonomi semakin lebar, baik dari SPDB, kepemilikan lahan, dan lain-lain)
17.	Nah, yang bingung di kita, saat ini adalah ketika muncul nama SBY, apa yang muncul secara top of mind?	FTA: positive face (insinuating) Strategy: (i) off-record strategy: use rhetorical questions (ketika muncul nama SBY, apa yang muncul secara top of mind?)
18.	Bukan hanya survey, bahkan ini di tahun 2014, ANU ya, Australian national university mau bikin Indonesia update temanya legacy SBY, sampai sekarang juga bingung, legacynya apa?	FTA: positive face (insinuating) Strategy: (i) off-record strategy: use rhetorical questions (legacynya apa?)
19.	Nah, misalnya sampai 9 bulan kedepan dia gagal juga untuk memenuhi itu, saya khawatir dia hanya sekedar menjadi presiden mediocre.	FTA: negative face (reminding, warning, and showing worry) Strategy: (i) negative politeness strategy: be pessimistic (saya khawatir dia hanya sekedar menjadi presiden mediocre)

20.	<p>Dalam bidang ekonomi ada peningkatan, itu harus kita akui. Dua tahun terakhir ada peningkatan kepuasan publik dalam hal ekonomi, terutama dari sisi makro ya. Dari sisi mikro kita banyak berdebat soal itu. Tapi dalam soal makro, memang ada peningkatan kepuasan. Yang jeblok, dari pemerintahan SBY itu terutama dalam soal politik dan hukum.</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (criticizing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) bald on record (yang jeblok...)</p> <p>(ii) positive politeness strategy: give gifts to hearer (Dalam bidang ekonomi ada peningkatan, itu harus kita akui...)</p>
21.	<p>Berarti ada sekitar 54%, ehm, devisit ya, kepercayaan publik terhadap upaya pemerintah (overlapping) dalam upaya memberantas korupsi</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (criticizing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: use metaphor (devisit kepercayaan)</p>
22.	<p>Ya, yang pertama yang saya lihat di sini adalah, tadi istilah Mbak Avi bagus, rapor, merah atau biru? Kalau secara umum, setelah reformasi memang presiden-presiden kita umumnya, ya...antara 5 sampai 6, nilai rapornya.</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (criticizing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: use metaphor (rapor merah atau biru)</p> <p>(ii) off record strategy: overgeneralize (presiden-presiden)</p>
23.	<p>Dia tidak peduli dengan kita-kita yang mengatakan, "itu kemas, bu, pak."</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (accusing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: use metaphor (itu kemas)</p>
24.	<p>Dari semua sektor, malah yang bagus dari semua compang-camping itu korupsi doang.</p>	<p>FTA: positive face (insinuating)</p> <p>Strategy:</p>

		<p>(i) off record strategy: use metaphor (compang-camping)</p> <p>(ii) off-record strategy: be ironic (yang bagus dari semua compang-camping itu korupsi doing)</p>
25.	Semua melakukan korupsi.	<p>FTA: positive face (accusing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: overgeneralize (semua)</p>
26.	Dan ini bukan hanya SBY lho, presiden-presiden yang lagi-lagi setelah reformasi, mereka tidak meninggalkan warisan apapun untuk kita. Setuju nggak?	<p>FTA: positive face (accusing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) off record strategy: use rhetorical questions (setuju nggak?)</p>
27.	“Yang membanggakan paling ya ada satu. Kita pernah punya Presiden yang besar badannya, rapi rambutnya, itu yang pertama. Ini yang pertama ya.	<p>FTA: positive face (insinuating)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) positive politeness strategy: Notice and Attend to H (Kita pernah punya Presiden yang besar badannya, rapi rambutnya)</p>
28.	Dia tidak peduli dengan kita-kita yang mengatakan, itu kemas, bu, pak,”. Anda mungkin peduli dengan bagian luarnya, kami peduli dengan bagian dalamnya. Kenapa bagian dalamnya? Compang-camping, pak. Nah kenapa compang-camping? Itu saya coba jelaskan.	<p>FTA: positive face (criticizing)</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <p>(i) positive politeness strategy: give (or ask) for reasons (kenapa bagian dalamnya? Nah, kenapa compang-camping?)</p>

Data Source: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qRvScfwwWj8> <Accessed on 20 March 2014>