

IDEOLOGY BEHIND POLITENESS

I Gusti Ayu Gde Sosiowati
 Faculty of Letters, University of Udayana
 E-mail: sosiowati@yahoo.com

Made Budiarsa
 e-mail: made_budiarsa.yahoo.com
 Doctorate Program in Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, Udayana University
 I Made Suastra
 e-mail: imadesuastra@yahoo.com
 Doctorate Program in Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, Udayana University
 I Wayan Simpen
 e-mail: -
 Doctorate Program in Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, Udayana University

ABSTRAK

Politisi adalah kelompok elit yang diragukan kejujurannya dan kesantunannya oleh sebagian besar masyarakat yang dibuktikan dengan banyaknya persepsi negatif tentang mereka. Sebagian besar masyarakat juga mengetahui bahwa ideologi mereka adalah kekuasaan. Dalam perbincangan di media mereka seringkali melanggar atau mengaplikasikan kesantunan berbahasa dengan tujuan memperoleh kekuasaan sebesar-besarnya. Seberapa santun mereka menggunakan bahasa untuk merealisasikan ideologi mereka akan diukur dengan menggabungkan prinsip kerja sama (Grice, 1975) dan prinsip kesantunan Leech (1983) melalui maksim-maksim mereka. Melalui analisis bahasa yang digunakan oleh para politisi dalam *Talk Show Today's Dialogue* akan dijumpai adanya pelanggaran atau aplikasi kesantunan dalam usaha mereka merealisasikan ideologi mereka, yaitu kekuasaan.

ABSTRACT

Politicians are considered to be the ones whose honesty is doubtful. This is proven by the fact that there are a lot of negative perception about them. Most of the people know that their ideology is power. In public discussion they often violate or apply politeness with the purpose to get as much power as possible. How polite they are in using the language will be measured by the combination of Grice's maxims of cooperative principles (1975) and Leech's mxims of politeness principle. Through analysing the language used by politicians in the talk show *Today;s Dialogue*, it was found that there were violation and application of politeness in their effort to realize their ideology, which is power.

1 Introduction

Politicians are defined as the people who work in politics or the ones who are interested in politics (Hornby, 1973) however Webster's (1956) states that politicians are those who are good at government affairs or the ones who are active in parties. In relation to this article, the definition given to the politician is the combination of both definition above, that is, politicians are those who work in politics or those who are active in politics. For this article, the definition of politicians in Indonesia are those who work in politics, who are active in any political parties. As active people in political parties, they tend to be known by people and therefore they have access to any media. These politicians will often be invited to be participants in various kinds of talk shows to introduce what their parties have done and what they will do for the society with the hope that they can win the next election. They are marketing themselves as well as their parties. Behind the good things that they say about their parties is their ideology that they have to achieve. According to Thompson (1984) ideology is the system of thought, the system of beliefs, symbolic practices that have relationships to politics and social actions. He also says that ideology is the thought that basically has relationship to asymmetrical power, and the approval of domination. Since there is an ideology behind whatever is said by the politicians, it is important to understand what is meant by political ideologi.

Political ideology is a certain ethical set of ideals, principles, doctrines, myths, or symbols of a social movement, institution, class or large group that explains how society should work, and offers some political and cultural blueprint for a certain social order. A political ideology largely concerns itself with how to allocate power and to what ends it should be used. Political ideology has two dimension:

- a. Goals : how society should be organised.
- b. Methods: the most appropriate way to achieve this goal. List of Political Ideologies.(www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_political_ideologies)

The quotation above shows that ideology concerns with power and using the power the ruling power will decide about what kind of society they would like to form. This is quite true in

the Indonesian politics. Formally Indonesia has its own ideology namely “Pancasila” consisting of (1) Believe in one Supreme God, (2) Humanitarianism, (3) Nationalism expressed in the unity of Indonesia, (4) Consultative Democracy, and (5) Social justice. If the ideology is well practised, Indonesia must be able to become prosperous country. However practically all the parties do something to gain power and after gaining the power it is not quite sure what they would like to do for the society except they are busy doing things to make themselves richer or to make their position stronger. It is true that they promise that they will increase the people’s welfare but in practice, it is power that they decide as their goal to dominate others. In achieving their goal, they should use certain methods and the methods that are considered to be used are lying and violating politeness. This is in accordance with what people say. They say that politicians

1. Should have strong ambition, an ability to compromise (including with one’s own principles), being able to think on your feet, a quick handshake and smile, a good memory, good grooming, public speaking skills, and an ability to ask for campaign donations without being shy about it.
2. A politician must have the characteristics of a fox and a lion. S/he should be smart and cunning like a fox and brave and strong like a lion. A fixed character limits your operation. A politician should change according to the circumstances. Switch between different characters and move ahead.
3. Should have greed, narcissism, lack of ethics, morals and values. The ability to keep a straight face while lying through your teeth. The ability to pander to people to get their vote.
4. Are not humans, but a collection of traits formed by society that they’ve chosen and organized to help further their career in the name of six figure paychecks and vanity.
5. Are dirty, rotten, scoundrels.
6. Are greedy, liars.

The ideas above were taken from the answers given by people upon the question “What are the characteristics of politicians?” on the website “Characteristics of Politicians” ([www.answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid...-United States](http://www.answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid...-United+States)) cited on 12 October 2012. Those answers show that none of them tells the good thing about politician. Most people know that when politicians say something, they may mean something else.

Since in achieving the goal the politicians use language, this article will look at how the language is used by the politicians to achieve their goal namely power.

2. Theoretical Framework

As it has been mentioned in the introduction, the politicians tend to lie to the people to achieve their goal. However, whether or not someone is lying it cannot be seen straight away. People have to wait for sometimes before they find out that the politicians they have elected are true liars. Actually lying is not the only method they use because besides lying, there is another way that can be used by the politicians to try to win the heart of the people and the way is called politeness. Through the violation of politeness, they want to show that their opponents are not worth being elected and it is through the application of politeness as well, they want to gain more votes.

When politicians say something, actually they are communicating something and they do the communication to achieve the goal. In this communication, politeness is kept or violated depending on their purposes. Through this article, the use of polite/impolite language used by the politicians will be looked at. To decide whether or not the utterances are polite, Grice's maxims (1975) and Leech's maxims (1983) will be used. Grice's maxims which deal with cooperative principle consist of:

1. Maxim of quality: the speaker must be honest.
2. Maxim of quantity : the speaker must be as informative as possible; do not be too long nor too short
3. Maxim of relevance: what is said must be relevant to the goal of communication.

4. Maxim of manner: what is said must be clear, understandable and must avoid ambiguity.

Leech's maxims (1983) which deal with politeness principle consist of

1. Tact maxim : maximize benefit to others; minimize cost to others.
2. Generosity maxim: minimize benefit to oneself; maximize benefit to oneself.
3. Approbation maxim: minimize disrespect to others; maximize respect to others.
4. Modesty maxim: minimize respect to oneself; maximize disrespect to oneself.
5. Agreement maxim: minimize disagreement to others; maximize agreement to others.
6. Sympathy maxim: minimize antipathy to others; maximize sympathy to others.

The reason for combining the two maxims is the idea that conversation can only take place where the felicity condition occurs and the face threatening act does not take place. Grice's maxims (1975) lead to felicity condition carried by being honest, simple and relevant. Turn taking can also take place in this condition and it can create good atmosphere when in a communication, everybody involved has the opportunity to be listened to. Leech's maxims (1983) lead to avoidance of face threatening act, both positive and negative. Brown & Levinson (1978) state that positive face is the want to be liked, acknowledged and appreciated by others, while negative face is the want to have freedom in doing whatever wanted. Maximising cost, disrespect, disagreement and antipathy are the acts that can threaten someone else's face.

To avoid face threatening act, some must choose the language used and according to Holmes (2001) the language choice must depend on:

1. Social distance : how well the participants know each other.
2. Status: the relationship between speaker – hearer.

3. Formality: situation and participants.
4. Function : the goal of communication.

3 Methodology

The data that is used in this article is the oral data which has been transcribed to be the written one. It was taken from one session of a weekly talk show called Today's Dialogue in Metro TV in Indonesia. It uses Indonesian language and in this session there are a lady host whose name is Kania and four politicians from four biggest political parties in Indonesia of which one of them is now the ruling party. Those four politicians will be labelled as P1, P2, P3 and P4. P1 is the politician from the ruling party which is also the party of SBY, the president of the Republic of Indonesia, P2 dan P3 are from two biggest parties that are the coalition of the ruling party, and P4 is from the opposition party. The topic of the talk show is about the unhappiness of the President towards the coalition. Since the data is in Indonesian Language, to show whether or not their utterances are polite, as well as to show what they do to express their ideology, the procedures taken are as follow.

- 1) The utterances under discussion are quoted.
- 2) The quoted data will be translated (the translated version is between brackets)
- 3) Discuss whether or not the statement polite.
- 4) Discuss why those utterances are considered polite/impolite.
- 5) Discuss the ideology behind those utterance

4 Analysis

In this *talk show*, the host and the four politicians are talking about the President's idea to evaluate the work of the coalition since he thinks that the coalition parties do not support the government, instead they have done something that caused disadvantage on the government

side. The evaluation will lead to the situation of excluding the parties that are considered to have betrayed the coalition or disloyal to it.

Politisi 1 (Politician 1)

Pembawa acara (Host)

Dan partai mana yang dimaksud oleh presiden begitu ya. Pak P1 bagaimana? Mengapa tadi tidak secara eksplisit kemudian tadi dinyatakan oleh Presiden siapa sebenarnya partai-partai yang dianggap telah melanggar?

(Which party was meant by the President? Mr P1 what do you think? Why didn't the president say explicitly which parties have been considered to violate the agreement?)

Politisi 1 (Politician 1) Data 1

Aa..masalah yang disampaikan Pak SBY. Masalah...evaluasi itu menurut saya itu hal yang wajar-wajar saja. Ya..disampaikan oleh seorang pimpinan kepada...koalisi. karena apa? Menejemen apapun baik di perusahaan,diorganiasi, apalagi menejemen koalisi yang menentukan baik buruknya nasib bangsa ini. Ya harus ada evaluasi. Itu hal yang wajar. Siapa yang kena, lah kan itu urusan Pak SBY. Kami dari fraksi partai demokrat kalau diminta masukan, Inshaallah..kita buat masukan yang terukur. Karena apa? Tadi seperti kata Pak P2 itu kok seolah-olah ada apa ini?, masalah angket?...Tidak ada kaitannya dengan masalah angket...century dan masalah.... angket yang kemaren. Karena sudah ...

(Aa..the case conveyed by Mr. SBY. The case...the evaluation to me is a usual thing. Yes, conveyed by a leader to...the coalition. Why? Any management, either in a company, moreover the management of coalition that decides the good or bad fate of this country must have that evaluation. That is a usual thing. Who will be evaluated, that's Mr. SBY's business. If we are from Democrate Party, are asked to provide input, we will provide input that can be measured. Why? Just like has been said by P1, it seems that there is something happening. The case of the right of inquiry,...it has nothing to do with it...the case of Century and the case.....last time of inquiry. Because they have)

Politisi 2 (Menyela) – Politician 2 (interrupts)

Bener nih??..bener??...(tertawa)

(Is that right?? Right?? (laughing))

Politisi 1 (Politician 1) – Data 2

Tunggu dulu...tunggu dulu..ini saya sampaikan angket kemarin kan rata-rata... semua sudah dikatakan. Siapa yang mendukung angket, yang mema...memakai instrumen angket, kalau menurut saya itu bom.

(Wait a minute...wait a minute..I say this the last inquiry the average ...all have been said. Who support the inquiry, those who use the instrument of inquiry, to me that is a bomb.)

In data 1, P1 says that evaluation on the work of the coalition is a usual thing to do just as usual as the evaluation conducted on other kinds of organization. The phrase “usual thing” is mentioned twice to stress that what has been done by the President (SBY) is nothing wrong. He, as the leader of the coalition” has the right to do it. He also said that it is up to SBY as who will be evaluated and who will be excluded is SBY’s responsibility. In the utterances said by P1 in data 1 he actually wants to say that SBY who is the president of Indonesia is the leader of the coalition; as the leader of coalition SBY has all the right to do evaluation on a party/parties he considers deviating from the agreement they have set before. In saying it he maximizes the praise to SBY which means that he is violating the Approbation maxim because he maximizes praise to SBY who is a person on his side. When he said that he would let SBY decide who will be evaluated and who will be excluded from coalition, he has done two things. First he has been impolite by putting all the burden to decide on SBY’s shoulders so that if anything goes wrong it will be SBY’s fault. In this case he is violating the Tact maxim. However at the same time, he maximizes the praises to SBY for saying that SBY is a capable person who can make his own decision. P1 is the politician of SBY’s side, therefore he will do anything to make SBY still hold the power which make him able to keep his position as well. His desire to keep the power is done through violating Tact maxim and Approbation maxim.

In data 2, P1 says that who supports the inquiry is a bomb. This utterance is said in relation to the fact that SBY does not agree with the inquiry of tax mafia while some members of coalition support the inquiry. In saying the statement, P1 is violating the maxim

of Manner for not clearly mentioning who supports the inquiry. He cannot be said to have applied the negative politeness to save the negative face of the ones supporting the inquiry since it is already known by the people from the electronic media or newspaper. P1 wants to tell people that those supporting the inquiry are not the loyal parties, so they are not worth elected. In this case P1 is violating Tact maxim because his statement saying that those supporting the inquiry of tax mavia is a bom minimizes the benefit for the hearer and those on the same side as the hearer.

Politisi 2 (Politician 2)

Pembawa acara (Host)

(Pembawa acara bertanya apa yang sebenarnya menyebabkan kegaduhan di DPR)

(The host asks what is the cause of the chaos in the Parliament)

Politisi 2 (Politician 2) – Data 1

Jadi sebetulnya gini, kegaduhan ini karena ketidakmampuan Demokrat sebagai partai yang berkuasa mengelola perbedaan pendapat di DPR dan kesalahan itu ditimpakan kepada partai-partai yang menolak diajak untuk berkongsi untuk diajak melakukan suatu yang tidak benar misalnya menutup-nutupi kejahatan pajak.

(Look, this chaos is caused by the incapability of the Democate Party as the ruling party to manage the differences in Parliament and the parties that refuse to join to do wrong things like covering tax crime are blamed)

Pembawa acara (Host)

Gimana Pak P2? Kalau kemudian dari partai Golkar sendiri memutuskan untuk keluar dari koalisi atau dikeluarkan begitu ya dikedepannya. Kan dalam tradisinya kan Partai Golkar ini selalu dalam lingkaran kekuasaan. Apakah siap untuk berposisi?

(What do you think Mr P2, if Golkar party makes its own decision to quit from coalition or being excluded in the future? Isn't it in tradition, Golkar is usually inside the government. Are you ready to be the opposition?)

Politisi 2 (Politician 2) – Data 2

Ya. Enggak juga. Bagi partai Golkar, ada atau tidaknya menteri di kabinet ini atau bersama atau tidaknya di dalam koalisi tidak terlalu penting karena bagi kami adalah ketika kita mengambil jargon "suara Golkar, suara rakyat" Kita lebih mengedepankan apa yang diinginkan dalam masyarakat. Makanya ketika kita harus berhadapan dengan kawan-kawan yang tidak sejalan, ketika kita memperjuangkan kepentingan masyarakat ya... sorry saja kan begitu? Nah, bagi kita adalah kepentingan...kan

pemerintahan kita tidak lama lagi 3,5 tahun. Yang kita harus perjuangkan bagaimana kita memperjuangkan hati rakyat agar 2014 bisa menang kembali.

(Not really. For Golkar Party, whether or not there is a minister in the Cabinet or whether or not we can still work together in coalition, is not that important for us because when we say “Golkar’s voice is People’s voice” we think that what people want is more important. That is why when we are facing friends who are not on the same path, when we are struggling for people’s needs well... sorry, isn’t it? For us is the need...isn’t it? . Our government will last in a short time, in the next 3,5 years. We have to fight how to win people’s hearts so that in 2014 we can win again)

In data 1, P2 is being impolite by saying that The Democrat Party is not capable of managing the differences in the Parliament and blaming the parties who actually refuse to do a wrong thing. By saying those sentences, P2 wants to say that the Democrat party is not capable of becoming the ruling party. This violates the Tact Maxim. P2 also wants to say that his party is a good party that stands on the people’s side, unlike the Democrat Party who wants to do wrong thing, that is covering tax mafia. He maximizes his own benefit, thus he violates Generosity maxim. He does all this impoliteness to be able to win the next election so that his party can be the ruling party as before. The impoliteness or the degree of the face threatening act can actually be reduced if P2 says his statement in different way. For instance he might say “I think If the Democrat Party was a bit wiser in managing the coalition in the parliament, this chaos wouldn’t happen.”. By using the word “think” P1 puts more pressure on himself for being not sure about the weakness of others, thus he can be said to have applied the Modesty Maxim. By using the word “wiser” he wants to imply that Democrat Party has been wise but the wisdom must be increased to deal with the coalition. This lexical choice reduces the threat on the positive face of the Democrat Party.

In data 2, P2, in his effort to gain power, maximizes the praise for the people by saying that the important thing for his party is what the people want without mentioning what they want. In this case P2 is applying the Approbation maxim. However this also violates the maxim of Manner because it is clearly stated what the people want. This statement is expected to be able to make people elect his party to be the winner in the next election thus it

becomes the ruling party. Thus, based on the analysis, it can be said that P2 tries to obtain power by being polite as well as impolite. There is also a bit lying when he says that “Golkar’s Voice is People’s voice” since it is known that since his party joins the ruling party in the government, the welfare of people is not increasing, instead, to some extent its getting worse. Corruption, crimes of any kinds, unfinished cases are increasing in numbers and cannot be completely taken care of.

Politisi 3 (Politician 3)

Pembawa acara (Host)

Hahaha..oke. Pak P3, bagaimana posisinya? Sekjen PKS Pak Andismata sudah menyatakan siap untuk menjadi partai oposisi. Kenapa tidak keluar saja bahwa memang sudah tidak...tidak sama aspirasi dan pendapatnya?

(Hahaha...okay. P3, what is the position? The secretary general of PKS Mr. Andismata has stated that PKS is ready to be the opposition. Why don't you just quit, if there in no more similarity in aspiration and ideas)

Politisi 3 (Politician 3) – Data 1

Jadi begini. PKS sudah menjelaskan apa argumentasinya ya....ketika mendukung usul angket mafia pajak dan itu sudah clear. Nah, kalau sekarang PKS dengan sikap politiknya dinilai telah melanggar code of conduct berkoalisi dan Presiden akan segera mengambil keputusan politik terkait dengan hal ini, ya, kita tunggu saja apa keputusan yang akan diambil oleh presiden SBY. Bagi PKS secara politik, kami diluar atau didalam pemerintahan, diresuffle atau tidak, itu bukan masalah yang besar karena masalah yang besar bagi kami ini adalah bagaimana terus menjaga konsistensi perjuangan untuk kepentingan masyarakat dan bangsa ini. Satu catatan lain, kenapa kok...Saya ditanya beberapa orang ; lalu kok PKS tidak mengambil inisiatif saja ya....Mundur saja dari koalisi. Saya katakan begini: masuknya PKS dalam koalisi itu karena diminta oleh Pak SBY. Bahkan 1 tahun sebelum pemilu 2009, Pak SBY meminta kepada kami melalui ketua Majelis Syuro kami agar PKS melanjutkan koalisi dengan partai Demokrat. Nah, bahasa gampangya begini. Ada satu judul lagu ”kau yang mulai, kau yang mengakhiri”

(PKS has explained their argumentation when supporting the idea of tax mafia and it has been clear. If now, the polical action of PKS has been considered to have violated the code of conduct of the coalition and president SBY will take the political decision related to the case, well, we just wait for what decision will be taken by president SBY. For PKS, politically, we are inside our outside the government, reshuffled or not, is not a big deal for us because what the big deal is how to keep the consistency of our fight for the sake of the welfare of the people and the nation. Another note is, some people ask me why PKS doesn't just take the initiative to quit from coalition. I said:”the entrance of PKS into coalition was on SBY’s request. Even a year before

2009 election, SBY asked us through our *Majelis Syuro* to sustain the coalition with Democate party. The easy way to say it is there is a song lyric “you start, you end it”)

Pembawa acara (Host)

Pak P3 bagaimana? Artinya ketika kemudian koalisi ini tetap dipertahankan, ada konsekuensi, ada sanksi jatah menteri yang dikurangi. Itu bagaimana PKS?

(Mr. P3, what do you think. If later the coalition is kept, there is a consequence that the number of minister from PKS is reduced. What will PKS do?)

Politisi 3 (Polician 3) – Data 2

Tadi saya sudah sampaikan ya. Bagi PKS mau reshuffle 1,2,4,9 menteri itu bukan persoalan yang prinsipil kok..ya...Dan opsi-opsi yang disampaikan...[ehem] apa namanya narasumber tadi, Apakah opsi 1, opsi 2, opsi 3, kalau itu diambil oleh presiden, apakah besok lusa atau kapan begitu ya..mudah-mudahan gak sampai tahun depan [narasumber lain tertawa] tetapi kalau akar masalah kisruh beda pendapat koalisi ini tidak bisa diidentifikasi dan dicarikan solusi yang tepat, ini akan selalu muncul..akan selalu muncul dan kalau kita ingat munculnya ini dimana? Munculnya ini bukan di eksekutif lo...munculnya ini bukan di kabinet. Tapi munculnya itu di DPR, di parlemen. Nah, sekarang siapa koordinator koalisi di parlemen, di DPR? Partai Demokrat. Nah, apakah tidak pantas kita bertanya apakah tidak pantas Pak SBY mengevaluasi, ada yang salah apa sih Demokrat ini dalam mengelola koalisi di parlemen. Ini kan pertanyaan yang tidak pernah diangkat karena sudah digiring pada area, ini ada kode etik yang dilanggar, ini ada kesetiaan yang dilanggar, tapi substansi masalahnya tidak pernah diangkat. 2004-2009 relatif tidak ada gejolak yang sangat tajam dalam koalisi di DPR karena dipimpin Pak P1 waktu itu. Sekarang tidak dipimpin Pak P1 gitu. Nah, mungkin Pak P1 bisa menjawab tapi ini pura-pura gak tau aja Pak P1 ini.

(I have just said that for PKS, 1,2,4,9 ministers want to be reshuffled, is not a principle matter and the options that have just mentioned, whether option 1, option2, option 3, that will be taken by the president, whether today, tomorrow or whenever...expectedly it won't up to next year, but if the cause of this chaos cannot be identified and given a proper solution, this problem will keep on appearing and do you remember where it occurs?. It occurs not in executive nor in the cabinet. It occurs in the parliament. Well, who is the coordinator of the coalition in the parliament? It's Democate Party. So, is it improper to ask whether it is improper for SBY to evaluate, what is wrong with the Democate Party in managing the coalition in the Parliament? This question has never been raised because we are driven to the area, there is violation in ethical conduct, there violation in loyalty but the substantial problem has never been raised. In 2004 – 2009, relatively there was no sharp problem in the coalition in Parliament because at that time coalition was led by P1. Now it is chaotic since it not led by P1 anymore. Maybe P1 can answer the question but Pi is pretending to know nothing.)

P3 says that it does not matter if PKS is inside or outside the government, whether or not there will be reshuffel, PKS does not think much about it because the more important thing is that the party will struggle for the welfare of the people and the nation. When the host suggest

that PKS should make its own initiative to quit from the colition if there is no more compatibility in terms of aspiration and ideas, P3 says that let SBY decides because he was the one who invites PKS to join coalition. By saying this, P3 seems to say that putting its member as the ministers in the cabinet is not that important compared to the welfare of people and the nation. This statement violate Approbation maxim since there is a sense of challenging SBY to do what he wants, without causing too much trouble for PKS. He speaks as if the decision of SBY is not that important for his party. However, the fact that PKS does not want to take the initiative shows that the party is actually reluctant to give up the power it gets of being the member of coalition that makes it have the portion of the minister positions in the cabinet. There is a kind of hypocracy here. Thus, based on the discussion that is conducted over P3's statements it can be sai that in keeping the power and in trying to gain more power, P3 has violating Approbation maxim which is threatening the negative face of SBY and also violating the maxim of quality by being hypocrite.

Politisi 4 (Politician 4)

Pembawa acara (Host)

Kalau di PDI-P seperti apa?

(Pembawa acara bertanya kepada P4 bagaimana menafsirkan perkembangan koalisi sekarang setelah SBY membetuk Sekretariat Gabungan)

(What about PDI-P?)

(The host is asking P4 about what to say about the development of the coalition after SBY creates the Joint Secretariat (Setgab)– the institution that manages the coalition)

Politisi 4 (Polician 4) – Data 1

Ya, kalau kami melihat memang...setgab ya....ini ..tidak ada gunanya bagi negara. Dan juga keliatan sekali temen-temen ini juga tanpa berkoordinasi dengan baik, dan terlalu banyak.....habis waktu mengurus soal kekuasaan.

(Well, if we see, this *Setgab* is useless for the country. And it can be clearly seen that our friends do not make good coordination, and they waste too much time on dealing with power.)

Pembawa acara (Host)

Mmm..tapi yang anda katakan tidak ada gunanya itu apa pak?

(Mmm...what did you say to be useless?)

Politisi 4 (Polician 4)– Data 2

Ya saya gak pernah denger...mungkin itu banyak masalah bangsa. Apakah setgab pernah....berbicara dan memperjuangkan supaya aa..harga gabah itu bisa ditingkatkan dan dibeli oleh pemerintah, oleh BULOG? Gak pernah saya dengar apakah pernah bagaimana caranya supaya impor beras itu dilawan dengan cara yang lebih konkret gitu kan? Bagaimana memperbaiki petani-petani kita? Gak pernah. Jadi ini saya lihat bahwa ini lebih kepada bagi-bagi kekuasaan. Jadi...menurut kami rakyat sudah...selesailah kegaduhan ini. Masing-masing partai ini sikapnya....

(Yes, I have never heard...maybe there are too many national problems. Has *Setgab* ever talked about increasing the price of rice grain, bought by the government by BULOG (The governmental institution dealing with logistic)? I Haven't heard how to fight against the importing rice in a more concrete way. How to improve the life of our farmers. I Haven't heard about it. I see that this is more about sharing power. So for us..end this chaos. The attitude of each of the parties...)

When P4 says that the *Setgab* is useless for the country, he is violating Approbation maxim which threatens the positive face of those who join the coalition since what they have done is not appreciated. He also accused that the members of coalition are busy sharing power and this violates Approbation maxim because he does not appreciate what the coalition has done thus violating the negative face of the coalition. He also violates the Sympathy maxim since his statement makes people antipathy to the coalition which has been said to be busy with power sharing instead of improving the people's life. When he says that the government has done nothing for the farmers, he actually violate the Tact Maxim that is causing disadvantage to the coalition. He says this with the purpose to win the heart of the people so that his party can win in the next election which make him share the power to be the member of the winning party.

5 Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that to express their ideology there are some things that the politician can use. They can attack their opponents through the violation of maxims, and based on the data used here, the maxims that have been violated are Maxim of Manner, Tact Maxim, Modesty Maxim, Generosity Maxim and Approbation Maxim; the ideology can be expressed by being hypocrite; and it can be expressed by applying maxims such as Approbation Maxim. Of course there will be some disagreement with the result of this research, especially in terms of politeness since the language of politicians is commonly known as impolite. It is important to be put forward that face-threatening act cannot be completely eliminated but it can be reduced by using better lexical choice. The politicians should know better about it.

6 Bibliography

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1978. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, Janet. 2001. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hornby, S, et al (1973) *Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. 1956. Springfield, Mass, USA: G&C Merriam Co. Publishers. to understand what is meant by political ideology.
- Characteristics of Politicians (www.answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid...-United States)
12 October 2012
- "List of Political Ideologies". (www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_political_ideologies) Cited
15 October 2012

