STRATEGI KESOPANAN YANG OFF-RECORD DI KOMISI III DPR RI TENTANG PEMBUNUHAN BERENCANA BRIGADIR J

AN OFF-RECORD POLITENESS STRATEGY IN COMMISSION III OF THE DPR RI ON PREMEDITATED MURDER OF BRIGADIER J

Dwi Santoso[1], Ratu Shafira Nurfitria[2]

[1,2] English Department, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan Yogyakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: dwi@pbi.uad.id[1], ratushafira2712@gmail.com[2]

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	This paper aims to find out the kind of off-record strategies uttered by the participants in The Hearing Meeting (RDP), with a focus on Brown and Levinson's (1978) theory. This study's data analysis techniques include watching the video, transcribing, translating, categorizing, and classifying the data into a politeness strategy. The researchers are interested on the murder case of Brigadier Novriansyah Yosua Hutabarat or Brigadate J at Inspector General Ferdy Sambo's official residence. The video transcripts from the meeting were analyzed, and the researchers found 10 out of 15 techniques off record politeness strategies uttered by the participants of the hearing meeting and forms of politely.

INTRODUCTION

Language plays a very important role in a government, especially when parliament holds meetings involving certain cases. The use of language in the parliamentary meeting room is based on a code of ethics that requires politeness and courtesy during the meeting. To be polite, people usually say something other than what they mean. They are used to say something indirectly in order to keep someone's feelings in the conversation; this means that they want to keep their image or face. Brown and Levinson proposed the concept of the face. It refers to the feeling of being embarrassed, humiliated, or "losing face" (Brown & Levinson, 1978). It refers to an individual's emotional and social tenseness of self (Yule, 1996). Lakoff (1975) defined politeness as a strategy for reducing conflict in social interactions. While Fraser &

Nolen (1981) claimed politeness as a communication contract used by the speakers and hearers to maintain congenial communication without causing conflict.

Previous research indicates that the study of politeness strategies has been widely discussed in a variety of texts, including films, novels, advertisements, criminal trials, political speeches/campaigns, academic, and humour genres, among others. Although there has been a lot of research on politeness strategies in various aspects, it is still a relevant topic to discuss, especially in the language of law and government. This is because, there has not been much research on politeness strategies in legal language that are focused specifically on parliamentary meetings in global.

Cashion's (1985) courtroom politeness strategies study was one of the earliest studies of politeness strategies in relation to law and government. It focused on the politeness techniques used by male and female judges during the trial of two civil cases in the Beverly Hills (California) Municipal Court.(Cashion, 1985) discovered that female judges use more super polite forms than male judges, but a male judge uses the most politeness strategies. This study concluded that while there were a few significant differences based on gender, there was no difference in the use of politeness strategies based on judge status.

Liao (2019) examined courtroom language in civil and criminal trials in China using the same theory of politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This study also used Leech's (1983) politeness model to analyze the illocutionary functions involved in the trials, as well as Gu Yueguo's (1998) Politeness Principle for Modern Chinese to study the courtroom trial in the Chinese context. According to the findings, the participants in the courtroom trial used a variety of strategies and forms of politeness. According to the studies, the judge used politeness strategies throughout the trial process, particularly during the court sentencing of the defendant and opposing lawyers.

This politeness phenomenon occurs in every conversation, in any language, and in any aspect. The phenomenon of what is literally said and what is conveyed can always be observed. In this paper, the researchers are interested on the murder case of Brigadier Novriansyah Yosua Hutabarat or Brigadier J at Inspector General Ferdy Sambo's official residence. Commission III of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia (DPR RI) held a hearing meeting with Komnas HAM, Kompolnas, LPSK, and Menko Polhukam on August 22th 2022 at the Meeting Room of Commission III DPR RI to obtain an explanation for handling the death of Brigadier J.

According to Brown & Levinson (1987) politeness have four strategies: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. This paper only looks at off-record strategies from those strategies. It demonstrates the use of language in an indirect way. Another three strategies do not discuss the form of these strategies. The literature on off-record strategies is reviewed for this purpose, with a focus on (Brown & Levinson, 1978) theory. So, this paper aims to find out the kind of off-record strategies uttered by the meeting participants and to find out the reason why the participants used off-record strategies in The Hearing Meeting (RDP).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was completed as a qualitative study. This study's research object is politeness strategy focuses on off-record regarding the existence of information that accompanies the development of the murder of Brigadier J. The video of The Hearing Meeting (RDP) entitled "Jawaban Mahfud MD Soal Ucapan Kerajaan Sambo" is the research subject of this study. The Hearing Meeting held by Commission III of DPR RI at the DPR Building, Senayan, Jakarta, on Monday, August 22 2022. This study's data analysis techniques include watching the video, transcribing, translating, categorizing, and classifying the data into a politeness strategy. Then, the data analysis results are concluded.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pragmatics

The term pragmatics refers to the communicative competence of speakers (Traugott & Pratt, 1980). Pragmatics is an area of language that concerns rules regarding the use of language in a particular social context, namely about what should be said, how to say it, when it is permissible to say it, and how to make the language used acceptable to others (Bowen, 2001). In other words, this field includes the social competence of a language speaker. In order to be accepted in a language society, a speaker needs to fully understand the rules that apply in that society, including an understanding of the proper and appropriate use of certain language functions or speech acts.

There is a close relationship between pragmatics and the concept of politeness. The most influential theory of politeness is the theory formulated by Brown & Levinson (1987) which states that politeness is a fundamental matter in pragmatics because politeness is a universal phenomenon in the use of language in social contexts.

Politeness Strategies

In general, politeness is defined as social propriety, which is an act where a person shows regular behavior and respects others in accordance with the norms prevailing in society. The concept of politeness is widely discussed by experts in the field of sociolinguistics, including Lakoff (1975) who states that being polite is saying something related to society correctly. With a more general approach Fraser & Nolen (1981) argue that to be polite one must obey the rules that apply in every social bond. A speaker will be considered ill-mannered when he violates the applicable rules.

The most influential approach to politeness is the theory formulated by Brown & Levinson (1987) which is associated with the concept of saving face. These experts define politeness as taking actions that consider the feelings of others in which they pay attention to the positive face, namely the desire to be acknowledged and the negative face, namely the desire not to be disturbed and free from burdens. Brown & Levinson (1987) identify four politeness strategies or general behavior patterns that speakers can apply, namely (1) Bald-on Record Strategy (without strategy), (2) Positive politeness strategy (positive politeness/familiarity strategy), (3) Negative politeness strategy (negative/formal politeness strategy), (4) Off-record politeness strategy (indirect or covert strategy). This paper only examines off-record strategies from those strategies. It demonstrates the use of language in an indirect manner. Another three strategies do not discuss the form of these strategies.

Off-record Politeness Strategy

The off-record strategy is used when the speaker asks an indirect question that the listener must interpret. In other words, the speaker does not impose himself on the listener. As a result, there is no direct threat to the face, because basically the off record strategy is found in indirect speech acts. This strategy frequently requires the listener to interpret what the speaker is saying. An indirect off-record strategy relieves some of the pressure while avoiding FTAs (Sukarno, 2018). Brown & Levinson (1987) define this strategy, which uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the possibility of being oppressive. Some off-the-record substrategies include:

a) Give hints: the speaker utters something that is not related to the actual meaning, he hopes the other person can interpret the utterance that is conveyed.

b) Give association clues: the speaker says something related to the expected action of the interlocutor because the speaker and the interlocutor have previously experienced the same experience.

c) Presuppose: speakers utter utterances that are almost entirely relevant to the context by providing presuppositions.

d) Understate: the speaker gives more value to something with the intention of softening his speech or by not giving (hiding) the truth.

e) Overstate: speakers say more utterances that are far from the truth.

f) Use tautologies: speakers say utterances with taulogy (repetition of words without explanation) in the hope that the interlocutor can interpret the uninformative utterance.

g) Use contradiction: speakers utter contradictory utterances. By saying two contradictory things, the speaker shows that he cannot tell the truth and hopes that the other person can find an interpretation of the utterance.

h) Be ironic: speakers tell utterances by using irony.

i) Use metaphors: speakers tell utterances by using metaphors or figures of speech.

j) Use rhetorical questions: the speaker utters his utterances rhetorically.

k) Be ambiguous: speakers utter utterances whose meaning is not clear between literal and implicature meanings.

l) Be vague: speakers say utterances that are not clear (disguise) who the object is or what it means.

m) Over generalize: The speaker conveys the utterance of an object in general or not specifically.

n) Displace hearer: speakers convey their speech not to the original object but to other people. This is intended so that the real target can know that the real target of the FTA is himself.

o) Be incomplete, use ellipsis: the speaker utters an utterance whose meaning is still hanging or does not finish the utterance so that the meaning is not clear.

A. The Kind of Off-Record Strategies

Off-record can be found in everyday life where speakers give codes to speech partners, and usually the speaker's speech also does not convey his meaning directly. The following are the ten off-record politeness methods discovered in the research, from the 15 techniques in Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy.

1. Give Hints

Table 1. Give Hints

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
S. Sudding	Nggak, informasinya dia ingin mengundurkan diri terkait masalah Bapak.	No, the information is that he wants to resign due to a problem, Sir.
Mahfud MD	Saya berhak tidak menjawab soal ini, *kan sudah jelas ada di TV.*	I have the right not to answer this question, *it's obvious on TV.*

In the conversation above, Mr. Sudding ask Mr. Mahfud to provide an explanation regarding the 3 star general who resigned regarding the Sambo issue. In the context, Pak Mahfud did not want to answer the question and gave the code that the news about the General's resignation was already on TV. instead of giving the answer directly, Mr. Mahfud chose to use give hints by saying "it's obvious on TV". This utterance can be said to be give hints because the speaker utters something that is not related to the actual meaning. The speaker utter the sentence is to give the code to the hearer that he should find the answer himself by watching news on TV because Mr. Mahfud as a speaker don't want to give an explanation.

2. Presuppose

Table 2. Purposive

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
Arteria Dahlan	Tapi memang saya bingung Pak ada pernyataan Bapak nanti mudah-mudahan di klarifikasi. pertama mengenai *Sambo rancang skenario yang menghubungi anggota Kompolnas hingga DPR.*	But I'm really confused Sir, your statement will hopefully be clarified later... first regarding *Sambo designing the scenario to contact Kompolnas until DPR members.*

Seen from the bold sentence above, Mr. Arteria said "Sambo designing the scenario to contact Kompolnas until DPR members". This sentence called presuppose because the speaker has the presupposition that there is a person named Sambo, there is a scenario planned, there are institutions called Kompolnas and DPR, and the planned of scenario is to contact these institutions. These presuppositions can be identified by tracing the references spoken in the speech. Presuppositions are used to underlie statements so that they become a condition for whether an utterance is true or not. So, the presuppositions in the sentence above are conjectures, beliefs, or assumptions about other people or something that the speaker already has before uttering an utterance.

3. Understate

Table 3. Understate

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
Mahfud MD [Desmond Junaidi Mahesa]	Saya menganggap itu penting [ya] karena kadangkala orang ga punya X [kalau ini betul Pak, saya apresiasi Bapak]. Lah iya. [Terimakasih Pak]. @@	I consider its important [yes] because sometimes people don't have X [if this is true sir, I appreciate you]. Oh yeah. [Thank you sir]. @@
Ahmad Sahroni	Nah sebentar ini *cukup menarik* karena tadi Pak Desmond marah-marah tiba-tiba sekarang apresiasi.	Wait a minute, this is *quite interesting* because Mr. Desmond was angry, suddenly now he appreciates it.

According to the table, Mr. Ahmad Sahroni said "quite interesting". This phrase show his expression of lesser strength than what he actually means. The change of Mr. Desmond's expression from angry to apreciation is an interesting situation for Mr. Ahmad. The bold phrase above can be conclude as understate because the speaker gives more value to something with the intention of softening his speech or by not giving (hiding) the truth.

4. Use tautologies

Table 4. Use tautologies

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
Arteria Dahlan	Prof ini luar biasa, Prof mengatakan anggota LPSK terima amplop 1 cm ya Prof? kalau anggotanya terima apa ketuanya ngga terima?	Prof you are amazing, you said LPSK members received 1 cm envelopes, right Prof? If the members accept, does the chairman not?
Anonymous	@@ *petugas itu petugas*	@@ *officer it's officer*

The sample in the last line shows there are someone said "officer it's officer". The speaker say utterances with repetition of words without explanation so it can be conclude as tautology. Seen from the context, Mr. Arteria cited Prof. Mahfud said that LPSK members received 1 cm envelopes, and if the members accept, does the chairman not? So the anonymous confirms that the recipient is the officer by repeating the word 'officer'. The speaker utters the sentence is to confirmed by using tautologies in the hope that the interlocutor can interpret the uninformative utterances.

5. Be ironic

Table 5. Be ironic

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
Arteria Dahlan	Orang bener nggak jadi bener Pak, *Orang-orang yang antik malah dapat previlege*, itu loh.	Real people don't become right Sir, *but antique people even get privileges*, that's it.

From the bold sentence on the table above Mr. Arteria said that "real people don't become right, but antique people get privileges". Antique people referred to unrighteous people, and by saying that he is being ironic. Seen from the context, the irony that Mr. Arteria uses is intended to release negative emotions in speech, to make someone addressed feel bad and said that without thinking about someone's feeling.

6. Use metaphor

Table 6. Use metaphor

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
Arteria Dahlan	Nah, sekarang juga kami ingin Prof sampaikan kalau memang ini harus kita bahas, jangan sampai ini jadi *kanker stadium 4* kita nggak bisa lagi menyelamatkan Polri kesayangan kita semua Prof, terimakasih Prof.	So, now we want Prof to say that we really have to discuss this, don't let this turn into *stage 4 cancer*, we can no longer save all of our beloved Polri Prof, thank you Prof.

Seen from the conversation on the table, Mr. Arteria as a speaker said that "don't let this turn into stage 4 cancer". In this context, stage 4 cancer is called a metaphor because it includes the transfer of meaning with a beautiful language style for an expression. Stage 4 cancer also meant for a situation that can no longer be saved. The speaker reminded that the police institution must be saved. The transfer of meaning used by Mr. Arteria is a form of implicit comparison of two things. The "stage 4 cancer" is used to better understand a language or situation and that phrase is understood not only as a figure of speech or figurative language but also the meaning contained in it.

7. Be ambiguous

Table 7. Be ambiguous

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
Arteria Dahlan	Pak bagi saya itu menyakitkan… menyakitkan tatkala dikatakan *DPR terima amplop coklat* Prof.. dari kasusnya Ferdy Sambo.	Sir, for me it was painful… painful when it was said that the *DPR received brown envelope* Prof. from the case of Ferdy Sambo.

In the table 7, Mr. Arteria being ambiguous by saying "DPR received brown envelopes". This expression can be interpreted in more than one meaning. The hearer are expected to understand what is meant by "received a brown envelope", however lot of meanings can be interpreted from this phrase such as accepting a bribe, receiving a letter or document, or other things. Because the speakers utter utterances whose meaning is not clear between literal and implicature meanings and it can be conclude as being ambiguous. Ambiguity can be caused by the unclear pronunciation of people, but in this case the ambiguity intended to hide the truth and aims to look more polite by not telling the truth directly.

8. Be vague

Table 8. Be Vague

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
Ahmad Sahroni	Terimakasih Pak Arteria. *Mungkin siapa pun nanti silakan dikomentari,* tapi izin Pak Mahfud ee kita bangga lah bahwa Pak Mahfud menjelaskan ke publik terdahulu.. lagi lagi ke masyarakat…	Thank you Mr. Arteria. *Perhaps anybody can give a comment later,* but Mr. Mahfud, we are proud that Mr. Mahfud explained this to the public earlier... again and again to the public...

According to the bold sentence on the table, Mr. Ahmad said "perhaps anybody can give a comment later". The speaker be vague because speakers say utterances that are not clear who the object is and what it means. In this context, the speaker asks anyone to comment. This becomes obscure when the listener does not clearly understand who is meant to comment and what the comment is about. From the sentence in table 8, it seems that the speaker aims to invites anyone to comment without intimidating certain people.

9. **Over generalize**

Table 9. Over generalize

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
S. Sudding	Dan itu kan memunculkan spekulasi, itu berarti bahwa di *internal kepolisian tidak solid dalam penanganan kasus ini.*	And that raises speculation, it means that *the internal police are not solid in handling this case.*

S. Sudding as a speaker said that "the internal police are not solid in handling this case". This sentence become over generalize because the speaker conveys the utterance of an object in general or not specifically. This means that actually not all internal police are not solid in handling this case, and maybe there are solidity on several other sides of internal police. The speaker said the over generalize sentence is that there are 3 star general who will resign regarding the handling of this case and improper handling of cases, so Mr. Sudding concluded that the entire internal police was not solid.

10. **Be incomplete, use ellipsis**

Table 10. Be Incomplete, Use Ellipsis

Speaker	Indonesian (Original)	English (Translated)
Ahmad Sahroni	[Pimpinan] [Pak Ketua saya bertanya] [Pimpinan] [Interupsi] Sebentar sebentar sebentar.. sebentar sebentar, sabar sabar dulu sabar, sebentar [saya mau nanya] [Terimakasih Pak Ketua] Sebentar <@sebentar@> *sabar Pak Arteria jangan..* ee ini nafsunya agak berat nih @@	[Chief] [Mr. I want to ask] [Chief] [interrupt] Wait, wait, wait.. wait, wait, be patient please, wait [I want to ask] [Thank you, Chief] Just a moment <@wait@> please *be patient, Mr. Arteria, don't..* er, his appetite is a bit heavy @@

The bold ones on the table 10 above shows be incomplete, use ellipsis because the speaker utters an utterance whose meaning is still hanging or does not finish the utterance so that the meaning is not clear. Mr. Ahmad said "be patient, Mr. Arteria, don't..". After saying the inclomplete sentence, Mr. Ahmad chage the utterances into other sentences. Mr. Ahmad seems does not finish the utterance because he wanted to change the sentence to be more appropriate and polite.

B. The Reason Why the Participants used Off-Record Strategies

Off record strategy is realized in a disguised way and does not reflect a clear communicative intent. With this strategy the speaker takes himself out of the action by letting the interlocutor interpret an action himself. This strategy is used if the speaker wants to perform a face-threatening action but does not want to be responsible for that action.

Brown & Levinson (1987) add that the more serious an action is, the more strategies speakers choose. The number of strategies used shows that the action is more polite than those using a few politeness strategies. But of course it is not correct to say that one politeness strategy is better than another. A strategy will be said to be polite if it is used properly adapted to a particular interaction context.

In the hearing meeting, the participants from DPR RI, Komnas HAM, Kompolnas, LPSK, and Menko Polhukam discuss in formal situations. Based on the analyzing the types of off record strategies, meeting participants became more careful in their speech because they were discussing a sensitive issue, its about the murder case, so they behaved as politely as possible, especially since the hearing meeting was broadcast live on TV and the video was re-uploaded on YouTube. Many people pay attention to them so this off record strategy is widely used to hide the intended meaning.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result, the researchers found 10 out of 15 techniques off record politeness strategies uttered by the participants of the hearing meeting, there are: give hints, presuppose, understate, use tautologies, be ironic, use metaphor, be ambiguous, be vague, over generalize, and be incomplete, use ellipsis. The result of off-record politeness strategies were found with analyzing the YouTube video transcripts from the meeting.

The reason for implementing the off-record strategies used by participants at the hearing meeting through 10 techniques of off-record politeness strategies that have been found may be caused each participants understands the meeting situation, the sensitive topic, and people's attention. Besides that, the participants who attended were members of several institutions so they also upheld the good name of their respective institutions.

REFERENCES

Bowen, C. (2001). Semantic and Pragmatic Problems.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals of Language Usages: Politeness Phenomena; in: Esther Goody (ed.), Questions and Politeness Strategies in Social Interaction. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.

Cashion, J. L. (1985). Politeness in Courtroom Language.

Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The Association of Deference With Linguistic Form. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 27:93-109.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and Woman's Place. Basic Books: Harper Row.

.