

Pragmatic Politeness in the Local Election: An Analysis of the Defeat of Agus-Sylvi in 2017 DKI Jakarta Governorl Elections

Aldila Arin Aini Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

Sumarlam Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

Dwi Purnanto Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

Abstract

This research aims to analyze factors caused Agus-Sylvi's losing in 2017 DKI Jakarta Governor election. This research analyzes Agus-Sylvi's losing not only from politic sides, but also from pragmatics' politeness. Pragmatic politeness in this research is according to Brown & Levinson's theory (1987) which is based on the speakers and hearers' faces. In collecting the data, the reseacher chooses considerably free method and note taking technique. Pragmatic based approach and contextual method are used to analyze the data. From all the data, the researcher had found 83 forms of politeness strategies which showed the form of politeness strategy used by Agus-Sylvi. Those politeness strategies are positive, negative, bald-off record, and across politeness strategies. The use of the most positive politeness strategy, offer and promise, revealed the way of Agus'Sylvi got lost in 2017 governor election of DKI Jakarta. It means that it is not good to use positive politeness too much because the hearers will judge the speakers as a person who loves to boast. The lack of negative politeness and bald-off politeness also revealed that Agus-Sylvi did not respect other participants of Jakarta's2017 governor election. The non-dominant across politeness strategy proved that Agus-Sylvi could not compete in confessing their meaning pragmatically.

Keywords:

Politeness Strategy; Positive Politeness Strategy; 2017 Governor Elections of DKI Jakarta; Agus-Sylvi

INTRODUCTION

Besides voting factor, the winning or

Aldila Arin Aini is a master student at Department of Bahasa Indonesia, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia. Her research focus about Language and Politics. (arinaini92@gmail.com)

Sumarlam is a lecturer at Department of Bahasa Indonesia, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia. (sumarlamwd@gmail.com)

Dwi Purnanto a lecturer at Department of Bahasa Indonesia, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia. (dwi.purnanto@yahoo.com)

We would like to thanks to colleague at Department of Bahasa Indonesia, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia for their support and discussion on earlier version of this article. We also thanks to anonymous reviewers for their comments.

losing of a governor/vice governor candidate in local leader election (*pemilihan kepala daerah/pilkada*) can be affected by politeness factor when viewed from pragmatic perspective. Agus-Sylvi, as a pair of candidates in 2017 Jakarta province pilkada with their number 1 as their candidature number, were never holding the first place in any polling nor prediction in voting system. Ahok-Djarot, as the candidate number 2, were

supported by major political parties such as PDIP (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan), Partai Golkar (Golongan Karya), and Partai Nasdem (Nasional Demokrat) and were always occupying the top position in voting system. However, the 2017 Jakarta pilkada winner were Anies-Sandi pair. In general, the political parties' elites play a political drama in supporting their respective candidates by using the media to attract people's sympathy in the escalating democracy competition (Nurprojo, 2016). Therefore, the mass media has a role in influencing the people by providing perspective on the future Jakarta leader. Another critical factor in pilkada is money politics where it can determine the winning or losing a pilkada participant (Chaniago, 2016).

From pragmatic review, the inability of each candidate in conveying their speech effectively can hamper the communication between candidates in pilkada debate. Syah (2016) mentioned that the directive speech act efficacy can contribute to the running of *Satu Jam Lebih Dekat* talk show from the aspects of receiver, content, punctuality, media, format, source, cognition, and affection. If the speech act politeness in 2017 Jakarta pilkada debate can run effectively, then

the people can be more objective in deciding their future leader. Politeness representation such as humbleness, sincerity, asking for apologize, and uttering religious terms (for example religious greeting/*salam*, *Insyah Allah*, *bismillah*, gratitude/*syukur*, etc.) can help to weave a harmonious relationship between the speakers and their counterparts (Sulissusiawan, 2016). The politeness representation can minimize the potential conflict between candidates in pilkada debate.

Political factors did dominate the pilkada debate process, however, ultimately it is the people who will decide the winner in the debate. Therefore, the politeness speech represented by each candidate will affect the people's subjectivity as voters. Further, the low and high of their speech intonation also reflects someone's politeness (Pranowo, 2015). This also valid for the directness of a speech. Metaphor, contradiction, rhetoric, sign language, ambiguous expression, and any other indirect acts also contribute the speaker to obtain a polite image in social life (Djarmika, 2016). Thus, the politer a person is, the more power he/she will have in earning respect from his/her social circle. In business or public service world, the

polite speech or behavior of the employee could increase the income of an institution (Hei, et.al., 2013).

Besides politeness principles based on maxim violation or compliance such as wisdom maxim, sympathy maxim, agreement maxim, humbleness maxim, and acceptance maxim, politeness also based on its strategy forms. Politeness strategy has two faces; negative and positive (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Positive face means a speaker wishes to keep positive image of his/herself to be acceptable by the public. On the other hand, negative face is a wish from each speaker partner to be free in expressing his/herself. Hence, a speaker should respect and appreciate the freedom of speaker partner. Conversely, speaker partner also must observe his/her freedom accordingly to the society's values and norms.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), there are five politeness strategies: positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, indirect politeness strategy, silent strategy (*do not do the FTA*), and direct strategy (*bold on record*). Each positive and negative faces are referring to the positive and negative politeness strategy. The positive strategy covers actions as follows; *notice the*

hearer, exaggerate sympathy the hearer, intensify interest to hearer, use in-group identity makers, seek agreement, avoid disagreement, presuppose, joke, concern the hearer's wants, offer and promise, be optimistic, include both speaker and the hearer in the activity give reasons, give gifts to hearers. This positive politeness strategy helps the speaker in gaining recognition from the people and to be accepted in his/her surrounding environment.

Negative politeness strategy comprises actions to *state the FTA as a general rule, nominalize, hedging, be conventionally indirect, be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, give deference, apologize, impersonalize speaker and hearer, go on record as incurring a debt.*

A speaker is not always using the positive nor negative politeness strategy when speaking. The speaker and the hearer in certain situation must convey their speech implicitly to avoid face-threatening acts. This avoidance of face-threatening acts aims to protect the hearer identity so that the speaker's dignity is acceptable. Therefore, the indirect politeness strategy should be applied when either the speaker and/or the hearer must convey their speech indirectly. Direct or blatant statement is feared will

offend the hearer's feeling. Indirect politeness strategy includes *give hints, use metaphor, tautologies, rethorical questions, ambiguity, contradiction, irony, elipsis, be vague, give assosication clues, presuppose, understate, overstate, be overgeneralized, displace hearer.*

Politeness demonstration is not only observable from ways of speaking but also from gestures such as smile, nod, hand wave, and other forms. This gestural politeness is also called as silent strategy where a hearer only answers or responds a speech from a speaker by shaking his/her head, giving thumb up, and many other gestures. This politeness strategy is applied when a hearer must preserve the third person's dignity that is being talked by the speaker.

Direct strategy politeness reflects how a speaker and a hearer are involved in a conversation without any other party's dignity to preserve. Direct politeness strategy is often used among close friends because they are accustomed to interact to each other.

Cross-strategy politeness is the usage of two or more politeness sub-strategies in one speech, for example, the usage of positive politeness strategy in giving or asking for statement by employing the metaphor indirect politeness strategy as

shown in the context and form below. The following part is an example of context and speech form from the initial debate of 2017 Jakarta local executive election, as retrieved from www.youtube.com.

Context: Agus responded criticism from Djarot on which fund should be taken and at which cost should be deducted from in creating two hundred thousand of new entrepreneurs.

Ira: "Next, for the pair number 1 I give you time to respond. You may to give a criticism one more time or an argument to explain why your program is superior compared to other candidates'. Candidate number 2 and 3 in this issue?"

Agus: "There will be no cash transfer program. How can someone hold a fish hook when he/she is unable to catch the fish?"

The clause "*there will be no cash transfer program*" showed positive politeness strategy in giving or asking for statement. Agus gave statement that he will not run cash transfer program in creating two hundred thousand new entrepreneurs. While the clause "*How can someone hold a fish hook when he/she is unable to catch the fish*" showed indirect politeness strategy by using metaphor. The metaphor itself means that in creating new entrepreneurs that is not small in its

number, a proper fund is indeed required. Agus wanted to affirm that he would not to give cash freely. Agus did have a measurable budget draft to implement one of his work programs. The calculation is as follow, Rp 400,000 per month that equals to Rp. 5,000,000 per year and multiplied by Rp. 128,000 which yields Rp. 650 billion. If the final number is compared to Jakarta's annual budget that reaches Rp. 70 trillions, this means 650 billion rupiahs is sufficient to create two hundred thousand new entrepreneurs. The usage of positive politeness strategy was used in his speech in order to convince Jakarta people of his promises for him to implement. Here, Agus was observable that he maintained his positive image. Meanwhile, the indirect politeness strategy usage by using metaphor represented Agus' explanation on creating new entrepreneur program. The metaphor could prevent face-threatening act towards Djarot. In this speech context, Djarot doubted Agus on his work program in creating two hundred thousand new entrepreneurs that will require a large sum of budget. Agus' metaphor speech functioned to defy Djarot's opinion that doubted Agus' speech and explanation. This made Agus could save Djarot's face.

Based on politeness theory developed by Brown and Levinson (1987), this research aims to analyze the Agus-Sylvi defeat in 2017 Jakarta *pilkada* debate. The researcher focuses research object on the first debate that was held on January 13, 2017. The researcher wishes to know and to analyze how the Agus-Sylvi initial performance as governor election candidates. The researcher then focuses Agus-Sylvi defeat factor as the candidate pair who always got the lowest rank in voting prediction. The researcher analyzes the defeat factor from pragmatic politeness perspective.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Research Method

This research is a descriptive qualitative research. As Sutopo (2002: 11) mentioned, qualitative research is a research that describes in detail on how an incident happens. This research uses purposive sampling because the researcher focuses data collection on the initial debate of 2017 Jakarta governor election debate. As Arikunto (2010: 183) explained, purposive sampling data collection is intended for certain goals.

Sudaryanto (2015: 212) affirmed that a researcher must be thoughtful in choosing data collection method to avoid

difficulty in data analysis. Data collection in this research is utilizing uninvolved conversation observation technique because the researcher only observes the first 2017 Jakarta governor election debate uploaded on www.youtube.com. Sudaryanto (2015) explained that uninvolved conversation observation technique is a data collection method where a researcher is only observing an occasion without getting involved in. The researcher is not involved in the first 2017 Jakarta governor election debate. In addition, the researcher also uses recording technique in data collection. The researcher records every governor and vice governor candidates' speeches. After that, the researcher sorts out the findings into two categories, data and non-data. The collected data then are analyzed by utilizing contextual method because every governor and vice governor candidates' speeches are inherently attached within the context where the speeches take place. Pragmatic context method (*padan pragmatis*) is also used to support data analysis process because the data is rich in pragmatic features (Sudaryanto, 2015). Besides context and pragmatic review, means-add technique is also uses because in data analysis there is explanation on the goals of speeches from

certain related speech context (Leech, 2015).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research finds 83 politeness strategy from Agus-Sylvi speech in first debate of 2017 Jakarta governor election. The strategy comprised of positive, negative, indirect, and cross-strategies forms. Silent and direct strategies are not found. Agus-Sylvi were not using both strategies because they are too risky to threaten the faces and to show uncompetitiveness of each candidate. If Agus-Sylvi used direct strategy, it would threaten the hearers' faces namely Ahok-Djarot and Anies-Sandi. Furthermore, if Agus-Sylvi used silent strategy, they would be considered incompetent. It would be unproductive if they were silent in a debate within which lots of questions and criticisms were being asked, and talked in direct manner that could ignited conflict.

a. Positive Politeness Strategy

The research finds there are 39 data in positive politeness strategy.

[1] Context: Agus explained main vision and mission related to the debate theme; to build social-economic life of Jakarta.

Ira: "First question, within two minutes. Explain your main vision and vision if you are elected to be Jakarta governor and vice governor. I provide the time for the candidate number 1. The time will start right after you speak. Is there any technical difficulty, Mrs. Sylvi? No? The time? The time will start when Mr. Agus speak. Let us begin. Please, let us keep order, keep order. Please start, Mr. Agus."

Agus: "*My vision for the next five years* is to make Jakarta be more advanced, safe, just, and prosperous." [01]

Agus: "*To be able to realize* them all, *my commitment*, and of course *my mission* is *to overcome* every problems in Jakarta, *to increase* the development process so that Jakarta will move forward even further." [02]

Agus: "The methods are, first, *increasing* local economy, *increasing* purchasing power of the people, and *creating* new employment." [03]

Agus: "Second, *increasing* the quality of education, services, health, and also public transportation." [04]

Agus' four speeches above use positive politeness strategy in forms of offer and promise. The evidence is in the utilization of lingual signifier unit; *my*

vision for the next five years, to be able to realize, my commitment, my mission, to overcome, increasing, creating. In the speech context [I.01] Agus committed to make Jakarta as a city that would be more advanced, safe, just, and prosperous. Those are his vision in the next five years as the number 1 candidate. The lingual signifier unit in the speech context [I.01] was affirmed in the clause *my vision for the next five years.*

After that, in the speech context [I.02], Agus mentioned his mission as the governor candidate is to overcome every problems and to increase development in Jakarta. Speech context [I.02] is an application of offer and promise positive politeness with the lingual signifier unit *to be able to realize, my commitment, my mission, to overcome, and to increase.*

Agus must be committed in realizing the aforementioned missions for Jakarta. In the speech [I.03], Agus described programs he would do if he was elected as governor. The programs were increasing local economy, increasing purchasing power and new employment. Lingual unit *increasing* signified the offer and promise positive politeness strategy in the speech context [I.3].

[II] Context: Agus explained key work program related to the aforementioned

vision and mission, and convinced the potential voters why those programs are important for the people.

Ira: "Very well, next session is the third question. Okay, I repeat. Number 1 candidate has not been receiving any turn. Within 1.5-minute term, please explain what program that you will make as the key work program related to the previously described of your vision and mission. Convince the potential voters why those programs are important to implement for the common people."

Agus: "We do have 10 key programs. The first is *to give* direct temporary assistance to the poor families and the disadvantaged people, 5 million rupiahs per family per year. This aims *to help* their daily life." [05]

Agus: "The second is community *empowerment* in our society." [06]

Agus: "The third is *to decrease unemployment* and *to create* employment through direct assistance and rolling funds, business capital assistance, 50 million rupiahs per one business unit *to decrease unemployment*." [07]

Agus: "We also want *to increase* education and teacher welfare." [08]

Agus: "The fourth is *to increase* health service for the people." [09]

Agus: "The fifth is *to increase* economic growth, investment, and price stability." [10]

Agus: "The sixth is we want *to develop without evicting*." [11]

Agus: "*To increase* housing programs for the people and infrastructures in Jakarta." [12]

All eight Agus' speeches in context II also reflected offer and promise positive politeness strategy. The lingual signifier unit such as *to give, to help, to decrease unemployment, to create, to increase, to develop without evicting* affirmed the offer and promise positive politeness strategy. Agus explained that he had ten key programs such as temporary direct assistance to the poor family and the disadvantaged people with allocated fund 5 million rupiahs per year, to empower communities, and to decrease unemployment accompanied with new employment creation. To support the new employment program, Agus needed rolling direct fund and business fund amounted to 50 million rupiahs per one business unit. Besides, Agus did not neglect education and teacher wealth improvement, as he also paid attention to social services as well. On economy field, Agus would try to improve the economy growth rate, investment, and price

stability. Agus wanted to develop without evicting slum area in Jakarta as the strategy in implementing people housing program and infrastructure.

The following section describes Agus' positive politeness strategy in optimistic category.

[III] Context: Agus explained the steps he would take as solutions over problem of gap ration between the rich and the poor which was increasing and was not showing any indication it would decrease, especially in employment creation, and unequal asset domination.

Ira: "Inequality ratio gap between the rich and the poor in Jakarta is among the highest in Indonesia. The poverty rate itself is relatively not going down. The question is, to the number 1 candidate. In two minutes, please explain the steps you you will take as solution for such problem, especially in creating employment and decreasing asset domination so that inequality and poverty can be concretely reduced. Please."

Agus: "Exactly on that matter we *can* absorb the open unemployment today and decrease unemployment." [13]

Agus: "We also *hope that we can* decrease the unemployment significantly in the next five years." [14]

Agus: "The hope is it can improve workforce absorption." [15]

The lingual signifier units in the three speeches above are *can absorb, hope that we can, hope is it can improve* indicate that Agus explained the solution for poverty inequality by using positive politeness strategy that fell into optimistic category. Agus was optimistic that unemployment rate could be lowered significantly so that the workforce number could increase. As for social inequality solution, Agus would implement small-medium enterprise (SME) program by awarding capital lending without interest, temporary direct assistance, or rolling fund scheme, and short-term infrastructure program namely housing black lock as much as 300 thousand units in Jakarta as the solution for poverty inequality. From those three programs, at least 114 items of business unit should roll.

Next positive politeness strategy involves speaker and hearer that is observable from the following speech context.

[IV] Context: Agus explained very well on how far his vision, mission, and key work programs would collide with his personal, party and its campaign team against Jakarta people in general.

Ira: "I shall ask a question to the first candidate to answer in one minute. Please tell us how you will overcome integrity issue, especially when your personal, party, and campaign team interests collide with Jakarta people's interest in general."

Agus: "It is very important, then, we can *invite our bureaucracy, invite our people, and stakeholder in Jakarta* to truly keep their integrity, to advance Jakarta, to improve people's welfare, and everything returns for Jakarta." [16]

Lingual signifier unit *invite our bureaucracy, invite our people, stakeholder in Jakarta*, affirmed Agus' speech that made use of positive politeness strategy that involved both the speaker and the hearer. Agus involved bureaucracy and stakeholder as the hearer to participate in realizing his vision and mission. Agus also explained that in order that his vision and mission would not collide against his personal, party, and campaign team interests, he would to cooperate with bureaucracy and Jakarta people to advance Jakarta and to make its people prosperous.

b. Negative Politeness Strategy

Negative politeness strategy that Agus-Sylvi used was FTA (Face Threatening

Acts) a face-threatening act that generally applied. There were four of negative politeness strategy in total. This research finds that Agus-Sylvi used negative politeness strategy the least. The negative politeness strategy can be seen on the context and speeches below.

[V] Context: Agus explained the slum area arrangement, river normalization, dam building, and flood management in Jakarta that face opposition from the people because they were not willing to be evicted from their land nor to be relocated to flats.

Ira: "Yes, the time is up. Next session is for the first candidate, please answer within two minutes. Are you going to do any eviction strategy in dealing with slum area arrangement, and how about the flood? Will you also take relocation of the people to the flat as a part of your policy? Your decisiveness is expected from the candidates."

Agus: "Without any forethought of their future fate, how about *their children*, I met *them* personally, *they* are still crying to this day, their hearts are still sad, when they are evicted without any compensation, nor any indemnity, and no attention given at all. For all those reasons, we convinced the *eviction victims* who are still suffering the trauma

until this day, especially *the elders, mothers, and their children.*" [17]

On the context and speech above, negative politeness strategy states FTA as face-threatening act that generally applies contributes in speech. It is proven from the lingual signifier units *their children, them, they, eviction victims, elders, mothers, and children.* Agus did not mention the complete identities of the victims. For that reason, Agus had saved the intended hearers' faces in his speech. Agus would not evict the slum area people because Agus had considered the fate of those slum area inhabitants. Agus will not evict without any indemnity. Other context and speech that reflected negative politeness strategy of generally applies face-threatening act is observable from the context and speech below.

[VI] Context: Sylvi criticized and responded to other candidate's statement and showed key program that was superior to other candidate's.

Ira: "Now I will provide the space, from the number 2 candidate, now I open the space for the candidates to respond to the answer from other candidate of the question within this session. Once again, I underline that you can criticize or argue or show clearly why your program is superior compared to other candidate's.

The provided time is one and a half minute, starts from the first candidate responding to the second and third candidates. We start from the first candidate. Please."

Sylvi: "The commitment from the *Jakarta government* is the thing that *we* must restore." [18]

The lingual signifier unit *Jakarta government* and *we* affirmed Sylvi who used negative politeness strategy that stated face-threatening act (FTA) as the generally applied. Sylvi emphasized that she, as a vice governor candidate, insisted to not to carry out eviction over the slum area. This statement clearly opposed the second candidate's argument, Ahok-Djarot, who agreed to carry out slum area eviction and relocation of the inhabitants to flats. Sylvi affirmed other work program to improve the life condition of slum area. This statement aimed to prove that their work program in avoiding eviction and improving its condition was superior to other candidate programs, including the third candidate, Anies-Sandi, who shared opinion with the first candidate in avoiding slum area eviction in Jakarta. Therefore, *Jakarta government* who agrees to evict slum area in Jakarta must be warned to avoid eviction policy. *DKI government* in Sylvi speech referred to

2017 Jakarta governor and its components. While the pronoun *we* referred to every Jakarta citizen who agreed for the eviction not to be carried out. Hence, Sylvi had cared for her hearer, by conveying face-threatening act as the generally applied requirement.

c. Indirect Politeness Strategy

This research discovers nine indirect politeness strategies. Indirect politeness strategy usually takes form in exaggerating a statement, using contradiction, metaphor, ambiguous statements, using hints, asking rhetoric question, and giving signals. The next section will describe the context and speeches of indirect politeness strategy that Agus-Sylvi used.

[VII] Konteks: Agus menanggapi dan mengkritik pernyataan dari Ahok tentang peraturan keuangan.

Ira: "The time is up. First candidate, please to the point. First candidate, you can respond back for one minute."

Agus: "Here is the problem. A leader who is always suspicious of his own people. The first question was, how to convince so that people will not get into jail. Always the brain thinks, how to make people not go into prison, *the question is what if they had succeeded?* The question has never been asked." [19]

The context and speech above reflect indirect politeness strategy using rhetorical question. The clause "*what if they had succeeded*" was not really showing a question that Ahok should have answered as his hearer. The clause was more affirming Agus' opinion itself that the economic program he would implement should be working. On the other hand, Ahok did not agree with Agus. Thus, Agus affirmed his opinion by focusing on a promising result instead of focusin on his failure as Ahok had thought. Agus successfully defied Ahok criticism that doubted him to bear responsibility on economic program so he would have not ended in prison punishment, by using rhetorical question of indirect politeness strategy.

[VIII] Context: Agus explained how his vision, mission, and key work programs will be implemented well when facing personal, party, and campaign team interests.

Ira: "I ask the question to first candidate. In one minute, please tell us how can you overcome integrity issue especially when you face a condition where your interest, as well as your party and your campaign team interests are at cross against Jakarta people in general?"

Agus: "Myself personally, as a military personnel for 16 years is accustomed and is required to preserve integrity in leading. Especially when you must lead Jakarta with its *extraordinary complexity*." [20]

Agus speech on the speech context above reflects the use of indirect politeness strategy in exaggeration form as indicated by lingual unit *extraordinary complexity*. On that context and speech, Agus described that he was trained as military personnel for 16 years to preserve integrity as a leader. With the statement, Agus was convinced that he could be the Jakarta leader for 2017-2022 period. Agus exaggerated his statement on Jakarta with its extraordinary complexity.

[IX] Context: Agus responded, asked, and criticized question from candidate number 2.

Ira: "All candidates and viewers, we are now entering the fourth session and this should be a very interesting once because the questions are not from the panelist team but from each other candidates. There is an open space to argue against each other. To sell your best ideas. What I must underline is the questions theme must be in tonight's theme corridor, which is to develop socio-economic life in Jakarta that is

operationalizable into socio-economic issues such as transportation, environment, security, and education. The moderator has the right to require any candidate's question if regarded not in accordance with or outside the theme set by Jakarta General Election Commission (KPU). The session starts with a candidate pair ask a question to other candidate within one minute. Then, the candidate who receives the question will have time to answer for one and a half minute. The answer will be responded back by the questioning candidate for one minute, and finally will be responded back again by the answering candidate for a minute as well. Let us begin so it is easier to understand. First opportunity I give to the candidate one to ask to the candidate two. Your time is one minute. Please."

Agus: "We wish this city to be beautiful, but not because of the beauty then there is a prolonged cry within this city." [21]

Agus speech form above used indirect politeness strategy by employing contradiction. Agus denied candidate number 2 statement on evicting slum area for the sake of Jakarta's order. Agus gave his detailed opinion that to establish order in Jakarta did not have to forsake the

people by uprooting them from their dwelling. To euphemize his speech to make it politer, Agus used indirect politeness strategy in contradiction form as indicated with clause lingual unit "*We wish this city to be beautiful, but not because of the beauty then there is a prolonged cry within this city.*" Personally, Agus wanted Jakarta to be a beautiful city without people suffering as the cost.

d. Cross Strategy

This research detects 18 cross politeness strategies. The cross-politeness strategies are as follow;

1. Offer and promise positive politeness strategy by using nominalization negative politeness strategy;
2. Optimistic positive strategy politeness by using nominalization negative politeness strategy;
3. Offer and promise positive politeness strategy by using negative politeness strategy of conveying FTA as face-threatening acts that generally applies;
4. Indirect politeness strategy by using statement exaggeration and offer and promise positive politeness strategy and negative politeness strategy conveying face-threatening act as general requirement;
5. Indirect politeness strategy by using metaphor and positive politeness strategy by giving or asking for statement;
6. Indirect politeness strategy by using contradiction and negative politeness strategy by using FTA as face-threatening act that generally applies;
7. Negative politeness strategy that conveys face-threatening act that generally applies and optimistic positive politeness strategy;
8. Indirect politeness strategy by using ambiguous statement and offer and promise positive politeness strategy;
9. Negative politeness strategy that conveys FTA as face-threatening act that generally applies and offer and promise positive politeness strategy.

[X] Context: Agus answered and explained question from Ira Kusno as moderator on offer or temptation to be a candidate for president or vice president in 2019 within thirty seconds.

Ira: "The time is up Mr. Anis and Mr. Sandi. Very well, the same question for candidate number 1. If you are elected to have the mandate for the next five years, will you be ready not be tempted by offer or temptation to be a president or vice

president candidate for 2019 election. Please.”

Agus: “And *we are truly wishing to be listened to* by the people that *programs we offer* will be truly *as solution* for *whole Jakarta people*.” [22]

The context and speech above happened in the last session of first debate of 2017 Jakarta governor election. In the session, every candidate must take a vow not to be tempted by offer to be a president nor vice president candidate in 2019 general election. Agus promised he would fight for Jakarta people. It would the greatest opportunity for Agus in demonstrating that he was capable to be the governor of Jakarta for 2017-2022 period. Agus also offered programs that could be solution for Jakarta people. Speech [22] reflects the cross-strategy politeness form namely offer and promise politeness strategy with negative politeness strategy conveying FTA as face-threatening act that generally applies. “*We are truly wishing to be listened to*” and “*programs we offer*” and “*as solution*” are the lingual signifier units of offer and promise positive politeness strategy while the lingual signifier unit *people, Jakarta people* reflect the use of negative politeness strategy conveying FTA as face-threatening act that generally applies. The

programs that Agus intended were more aimed for the needy Jakarta people, such as the dwellers of slum area. However, to preserve the faces of intended hearer, Agus then used negative politeness strategy conveying face-threatening act as the general requirement also offer and promise positive politeness strategy. The positive politeness strategy functioned to demonstrate candidate number 1 commitment if they were elected to be the Jakarta governor and vice governor of 2017-2022 period.

[XI] Context: Sylvi explained on how the society empowerment program will be done and how to provide job opportunity by allocating 1 billion rupiahs for each hamlet.

Ira: “Very well, we wait the time counting. Yes, it seems we can begin. First candidate, Mr. Agus and Mrs. Sylvi, please, you have one and half minute to answer the question.”

Sylvi: “Therefore, *I am almost certain* that *Jakarta people jobs will be more widely open and be more innovative*, especially *street vendors*, we will utilize Saturday and Sunday market then *they* will move and the economic growth will steadily improve. [23]

Speech [23] reflects cross-strategy politeness usage namely optimistic

politeness strategy and negative politeness strategy with face-threatening act as generally applied requirement. Optimistic positive politeness strategy is noticeable from lingual signifier unit *I am almost certain, jobs will be more widely open, be more innovative*. While the negative politeness strategy that conveying face-threatening act as generally applied requirement is perceivable from the lingual signifier units *Jakarta people, street vendors*. After receiving criticism from Anies on how to optimize Foreigner Monitoring Team (*timpora*) so that the native citizens of Jakarta will not losing the competition against the newcomer or immigrant in Jakarta, Sylvi argued that the problem was solvable by implementing community empowerment. The community empowerment would took form in awarding rolling capital as much as 50 million rupiahs per business unit with 0% interest. Through that intervention, Sylvi was convinced to be able to provide jobs and 1 billion rupiahs fund for hamlet as well. Weekend market exercise also useful for the street vendor to develop their capital. To preserve her hearer, Sylvi simply said *Jakarta people* and *street vendor* as her work program target without mentioning a more detailed identity.

[XII] Konteks: Agus explained steps to take in order to cope with social inequality in Jakarta.

Ira: "Inequality ration between the rich and the poor in Jakarta is one of the highest in Indonesia. The poverty rate also relatively has not been decreasing. The question is to the first candidate. In two minutes, please explain your step to overcome the problem, especially in creating jobs and abating the asset domination so that the inequality and poverty shall be reducible in a concrete way. Please."

Agus: "*We must overcome* this situation by drawing sympathy from those who are already living *extraordinary life* to help their *disadvantaged fellow*." [24]

Speech [24] shows that Agus used cross-strategy politeness namely, offer and promise positive politeness strategy, statement exaggeration indirect politeness strategy and negative politeness strategy conveying face-threatening act as applicable general requirement. Offer and promise positive politeness strategy is apparent from lingual unit *we must overcome*. Then, statement exaggeration indirect politeness strategy is detectable from lingual unit *extraordinary life*. Meanwhile, face-threatening act negative politeness strategy as applicable general

requirement is recognizable from lingual unit *disadvantaged fellow*. To answer the question from Ira Kusno as the moderator, Agus explained that he would run rolling fund assistance scheme and business capital by which the SME could develop. From the program, Agus predicted there would be 114 rolling business units that should indirectly reduce the unemployment rate. Therefore, social inequality solution should be resolved. Another way Agus would do was to ask for assistance from the upper level class to help the disadvantaged people. The upper class that Agus inferred in this speech context was replaced by *who are already living extraordinary life*. Agus had preserved the intended hearer face because he did not mention the personal name and identity of the intended hearer, yet it was suffice to say *who are already living extraordinary life*. That was one of the functions of face-threatening act negative politeness strategy as applicable general requirement, which helped Agus in preserving or conserving his hearer. The unfortunate people referred to *disadvantaged fellow*. In his speech, Agus exaggerated his speech because Agus wanted to convey his intention implicitly without having to hurt the hearer. Lingual unit *disadvantaged fellow* sounds to more

polite than unfortunate people or economically incapable people. By using the lingual unit, statement exaggeration indirect politeness strategy had helped Agus to euphemize his speech. Agus-Sylvi must implement the work program as solution for Jakarta social inequality. The commitment was observable from lingual unit *we must overcome* that indicated offer and promise positive politeness strategy. The offer and promise positive politeness strategy had a function to demonstrate Agus' commitment in front of the public so that Agus' positive image as 2017 governor candidate could be raised.

Agus-Sylvi Defeat Analysis from Pragmatic Politeness Perspective

From the data collection, Agus-Sylvi were too frequent in using positive politeness strategy in their speeches compared to two other candidate pairs. Ahok-Djarot used 36 times of positive politeness strategy, while Anies-Sandi 54 times. Agus-Sylvi themselves had used 59 times of positive politeness strategy that had become one of the factors of this pair's defeat in 2017 Jakarta local election.

Of the three candidates' performances in the first debate of 2017 Jakarta local election, Anies who won the 2017 local

election frequently used indirect statements such as metaphor, contradiction, over-generalization, associative hint, rhetoric question, and ambiguous statement. On the other hand, in the first debate of 2017 Jakarta local election, Ahok was the candidate who were using abundant indirect statement compared to other two candidate pairs. The number of indirect statements came from Ahok was the highest among the other two candidate pairs, which was 15 times, meanwhile, Anies was 12 times, and Agus was 5 times. Ahok-Djarot as the candidate number two, and Anies-Sandi as candidate number three, had the same number of indirect politeness strategy, which was 16 times. The fact was supported by indirect statement usage by Sandi for four times, and Djarot only did once. Sylvi contributed two times in indirect statement usage. Ahok used various indirect statements such as euphemism, contradiction, rhetoric question, tautology, giving hint, ambiguous statement. While the only indirect politeness strategy used by Djarot was presupposition.

Based on the research finding, Ahok-Djarot was the candidate pair who employed negative politeness strategy most frequently. That was one of the

elimination inhibitor factors of Ahok-Djarot from the 2017 Jakarta local election. As for Anies-Sandi case, the candidate number three, they were dominating in indirect politeness strategy usage which was one of the contributing factors of their winning in 2017 Jakarta local election. On contrary, excessive usage of positive politeness strategy by Agus exactly as the contributing factor of Agus-Sylvi defeat in 2017 Jakarta local election. Positive politeness strategy is indeed useful to preserve positive image of the speaker, but if used excessively, the speaker is at risk to be considered as a person who likes to exaggerate him/herself and to condescend others. Besides, most of the positive politeness strategy that Agus-Sylvi used was offer and promise that could automatically be regarded as nonsense if they had failed to prove those by demonstrating commitment and concrete result. Lack of other kinds of politeness strategy usage such as negative politeness strategy, indirect politeness strategy, and cross-strategy politeness reflected that Agus-Sylvi were not appreciative enough toward other candidates, and were lacking of competence in conveying their intention implicitly. Although Agus-Sylvi personal deliverance speech was adequately polite and competent, but when compared to

other candidates, the speech of this particular candidate pair still needed improvement.

CONCLUSION

It is conclusive that excessive usage of positive politeness strategy will undermine the positive image of the speaker instead. Even more, the excessive usage of offer and promise politeness strategy in local election debate. Each local leader candidates should convey promise, offer, vow, assurance, commitment, vision, and mission sparingly. Other than excessive positive politeness strategy especially offers and promise, lack of indirect politeness strategy also served as defeat factor of Agus-Sylvi in 2017 Jakarta local election debate. The more indirect a speech is, the more the speech would be polite (Jauhari, 2017; Sukarno, 2018). Negative politeness strategy that focused on the hearer was also rarely used by Agus-Sylvi. This implied that Agus-Sylvi paid too much attention to themselves and lacked respect toward the hearer, the other two candidate pairs, Ahok-Djarot and Anies-Sandi. Besides, there were many positive politeness strategies not accompanied with cross-strategy politeness that eventually degraded Agus-Sylvi positive

image because it showed their uncompetitiveness in conveying speeches such as criticism, suggestion, argument, refutation, and other.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik (Edisi Revisi)*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, Penelope & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness some Universals in Language Usage*. New York: Cambriedge University Press.
- Chaniago, P. S. (2016). Evaluasi Pilkada Serentak Tahun 2015. *Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review*, 1(2).
- Djatmika. (2016). *Mengenal Pragmatik Yuk*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Hei, C. H., David, M. K., & Kia, L. S. (2013). Politeness of Front Counter Staff of Malaysian Private Hospital. *Gema Online Journal of Language Studies*, 13(1).
- Jauhari, E. (2017). Strategi Kesantunan Respon terhadap Kritik dalam Masyarakat Budaya Jawa Mataraman. *Language Maintenance and Shift (LAMAS)*, 7.
- Leech, G. (2015). *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik (Terjemahan Oka, M.D.D)*. Jakarta: UI Press.

- Nurprojo, I. S. (2016). Bagongan, Pilkada Serentak dan Demokrasi yang Cedera: Belajar dari Purbalingga. *Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review*, 1(2).
- Pranowo. (2015). Unsur Intralingual dan Ekstralingual sebagai Penanda Daya Bahasa dan Nilai Rasa Bahasa dalam Kesantunan Berkomunikasi. *Addabiyat*, 15(2).
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University.
- Sukarno. (2018). Politeness Strategies, Linguistics Markers and Social Context in Delivering Request in Javanese. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 659–667.
- Sulissusiawan, A. (2016). Peran Muhakam dalam Adat Perkawinan sebagai Representasi Adab dan Etika Melayu Sambas. *Litera Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa, Sasta, Dan Pengajarannya*, 15(2).
- Sutopo, H. (2002). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif Dasar dan Terapannya dalam Penelitian*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Syah, N. A. (2016). Kesantunan Tindak Tutur Direktif dalam Talkshow Satu Jam Lebih Dekat di TV One (Tinjauan Pragmatik). *Adabiyat Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 15(1).