

NEGATIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES OF AHOK'S STATEMENTS IN MATA NAJWA TALK SHOW

Sri Hartati
Universitas Gunadarma, Depok
08176632750
srihartati0958@gmail.com

Received June 13, 2020, Revised June 20, 2020, Approved June 28, 2020

ABSTRACT

As one of politeness strategy, negative politeness expressed about how the speaker raises the addressee by paying him positive face of a particular kind which satisfies the addressee's want to be treated as superior and also the speaker try humbles and abases himself. The aim of this research is to find out Ahok's negative politeness in Mata Najwa Talk Show. The method used in this research is qualitative method. The results showed that the strategies are used by Ahok mostly are hedges or hedging, pluralization of you and I pronouns, and question. He used using this negative politeness strategy Ahok tried not to take the responsibility directly and Ahok also maintained to save the adreesee face.

Keywords: *negative politeness, positive politeness, face, hedge, saving face*

ABSTRAK

Sebagai salah satu strategi kesopanan, kesantunan negatif merupakan suatu strategi yang digunakan oleh penutur yang meninggikan mitra tuturnya dengan menjaga muka positifnya. Penutur berusaha memperlakukan mitra tuturnya dengan cara meninggikan posisi mitra tutur dan penutur juga merendahkan posisinya guna menjaga muka mitra tutur. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui strategi kesantunan negatif yang digunakan oleh Ahok dalam Talk Show Mata Najwa. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah metode kualitatif. Hasil yang diperoleh dalam penulisan ini menunjukkan bahwa strategi kesantunan negative yang sering digunakan oleh Ahok dalam Mata Najwa Talk show berupa hedging, penggunaan pronomina bentuk jamak untuk menggantikan saya dan kamu, dan penggunaan bentuk kalimat tanya. Dia menggunakan strategi kesopanan negatif dengan tujuan agar terhindar tanggung jawab secara langsung dari apa yang diujarkannya dan dia juga berusaha menyelamatkan muka mitra tutur.

Kata kunci: *kesantunan negatif, kesantunan positif, muka, pemagaran*

INTRODUCTION

Background

Politeness strategy is one of the phenomenons which are often to be analyzed and to be discusses. The best or useful strategy in order to avoid the hearer or the listener to feel embarrassed and uncomfortable in interaction and also often used to safe the speaker face is politeness strategy. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:65), certain kinds of acts intrinsically threaten face, namely those acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of

the hearer and / or of the speaker. Indonesian people are known for their politeness. The people of Indonesia are very concern with it. There are many aspects that relates to politeness ethics. The aspect are; to whom do you speak, where do you speak, when do you speaks. It is stated by Holmes (2001). Th reflections of these aspects are very important. Why it is important because by knowing those aspects people are able to respect other people in interaction or communication not only can save the hearer's face but also the speaker's dignity. When we discuss about politeness, then it will come to one name that oftenly cited by reaserchers, they are Brown and Levinson with their theories about politeness. Politeness according to Brown & Levinson (1987) are classified into four. The classifications are bold on record, negative politeness, positive politeness and on record. These theories will be used to analyze what Ahok said in Mata Najwa Talk Show. The writer will only use negative politeness strategy in this paper. Negative politeness as one of strategies to safe the hearer face have their own forms which might have their speciality in maintaining the communication in positif environment. Based on this asumption the writer tries analyzes Ahok's statements in Mata Najwa talk show.

Formulation of the Problem

What kinds of negative politeness strategies are used by Ahok in Mata Najwa Talk Shows?

Purposes of the Research

To find out what kinds of negative politeness strategies are used by Ahok in Mata Najwa Talk Show.

Theoretical Review

Negative Politeness

Negative politeness is about paying respect to other people but avoiding intruding them. It is redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face in which his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded (Brown and Levinson: 1978). The kernel of negative politeness is about respect behavior, whereas positive politeness's kernel is about joking and being familiar. The outputs of negative politeness are generally social distancing. It does not minimize the social distance like positive politeness. Negative politeness is rather expanding the social distance yet still showing respect behavior towards the addressee. The strategies in negative politeness seem to be used whenever a speaker wants to put a social brake on to the course of his interaction (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 129 - 130).

1. Be direct

Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect

The speaker is faced with opposing tensions that are the desire to give the addressee an 'out' by being indirect and the desire to go on record. If the speaker conveys something by using phrases and sentences that contextually have unambiguous meaning, it means that the speaker goes on record. However, if the speaker conveys something indirectly, it means that the speaker indicates his desire to go off record (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 132). Speaker should modify the direct utterance with particular words and hedges so that the utterance may not appear to be exactly direct.

a. Politeness and the universality of indirect speech acts

A systematic way of making indirect speech acts in English is by stating or questioning a felicity condition (Gordon and Lakoff: 1971). Felicity condition in this case means that both of the speaker and the addressee must meet the aspects of the communication so that such particular speech acts will come off as intended. When requesting a favor, the speaker must consider if the addressee is capable to do the favor (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

b. Degrees of politeness in the expression of indirect speech acts

Some simple compounding of hedges and indirectness increases the relative politeness of expression. Intimacy plays a distinct role in determining the degree of politeness. Generally, the closer the relationship between the speaker and the addressee is, the more impolite expression will be used between both of them (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

2. Don't presume/assume

Strategy 2: Question, hedge

This strategy derives from the want not to presume and the want not to coerce the addressee. Such hedges may be analyzed as adverbs on performative verbs such as, may, perhaps, and maybe. 'If' clauses are often used in indicating hedges as well. Heringer (1972) stated that felicity conditions may be suspended by putting such expressions in 'if' clauses. Another characteristic in indicating hedges is by addressing it to Grice Maxims. This may suggest that the speaker is not taking full responsibility for the truth of his

6. Communicate S's want to not impinge on H

Strategy 6: Apologize

The speaker indicates his reluctance to impinge on the addressee's negative face and thereby partially redress that impingement. There are four ways to communicate regret or reluctance to do a face threatening act (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

a. Admit the impingement

The speaker can simply admit that he is impinging on the addressee's face.

For example:

- 1) I'm sure you must be very busy, but... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) I know this is a bore, but... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

b. Indicate reluctance

The speaker can attempt to show that he is reluctant to impinge on the addressee with the usage of hedges. For example: Bother

- 1) Look, I've probably come to the wrong person, but... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

c. Give overwhelming reasons

The speaker can claim that he has compelling reasons for doing the face threatening acts, thereby implying that normally he would not dream of infringing the addressee's negative face.

For example:

- 1) I can think of nobody else who could... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) I simply can't manage to... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

d. Beg forgiveness

The speaker may beg forgiveness to the addressee, or at least ask for acquittal that the addressee should cancel the debt implicit in the face threatening acts.

For example:

- 1) Excuse me, but... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
 - 2) I'm sorry to bother you ... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
-

Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H

It is phrasing the face threatening acts as if the agent were other than the speaker, or at least possibly not the speaker or not the speaker alone, and the addressee were other than the addressee, or only inclusive of the addressee. This results in variety ways of avoiding the pronouns “I” and “you”. Three ways of those ways are performatives, imperatives, and impersonal verbs (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

a. Performatives

This avoidance of the ‘I’ and ‘you’ pronouns may be such a basic desire that it helps to explain the very general loss of overt reference to the subject and indirect object of the highest performative verb (Brown and Levinson, 1987). For example:

- 1) It is so. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) Do this for me. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

b. Imperatives

In the direct expression of one of the most intrinsically face-threatening speech acts — commanding — most languages omit the ‘you’ of the subject of the complement of the performative (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

For example:

- 1) Take that out! (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

c. Impersonal verbs

In many languages, agent deletion is allowed not only in imperatives but also in other verb forms that encode acts which are intrinsically FTAs (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

For example:

- 1) It looks (to me) like ... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) It would be desirable (for me) ... (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

d. Passive and circumstantial voices

The passive coupled with a rule of agent deletion is perhaps the means par excellence in English of avoiding reference to persons involved in FTAs (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

For example:

- 1) I regret that
It is regretted that (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) I would appreciate if
It would be appreciated if (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 3) I expect
It is expected (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

e. Replacement of the pronouns 'I' and 'you' by indefinites

Many languages have some standardized impersonal versions of pronouns which may serve FTA purposes to good effect (Brown and Levinson, 1987). For example:

- 1) One shouldn't do things like that, (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) One might think ... (Brown and Levinson, 1987).
- 3)

f. Pluralization of the 'you' and 'I' pronouns

It seems to be very general in "unrelated languages and cultures that the 'you' (plural) pronoun, when used to refer to a single addressee, is understood as indicating deference (P) or distance (D) (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

For example:

- 1) We regret to inform you ... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) We feel obliged to warn you that... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 3) We at Lockheed are not excessively concerned. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

g. Address terms as 'you' avoidance

Note the rudeness of 'you' as an address form in a hail or attention-getting phrase (Brown and Levinson, 1987):

- 1) Excuse me, {_{Miss}^{Sir}}. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

h. Reference terms as 'I' avoidance

In the English of kings, his majesty might say:

- 1) His Majesty is not amused. and in the English of presidents, Nixon does say (New York Times 1973 :87):
- 2) But the President should not become involved in any part of this case

i. Point-of-view distancing

One set of mechanisms involves manipulating-the- expression of tense to provide distancing in time. As the tense is switched from present into past, the speaker moves as if into the future, so he distances himself from the here and now (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

For example:

- 1) I was kind of interested in knowing if... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) I did wonder whether you might... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule

One way of dissociating the speaker and the addressee from the particular imposition of the face threatening acts, and hence a way of communicating that the speaker does not want to impinge but is merely forced by circumstances, is to state the face threatening acts as an instance of some general social rule, regulation, or obligation (Brown and Levinson, 1987). For example:

- 1) Passengers will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) International regulations require that the fuselage be sprayed with DDT. (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Strategy 9: Nominalize

The more nouny an expression, the more removed an actor is from doing or feeling or being something. Instead of the predicate being something attributed to an actor, the actor becomes an attribute of the action. As the subject is being nominalized, the sentence gets more formal (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

For example:

- 1) We urgently request your cooperation. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) Your cooperation is urgently requested. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 3) An urgent request is made for your cooperation. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

7. Redress other wants of H's

Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not incurring H

The speaker can redress a face threatening acts by explicitly claiming his indebtedness to the addressee, or by disclaiming any indebtedness of the addressee (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

For example:

- 1) I'd be eternally grateful if you would ... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) I'll never be able to repay you if you ... (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

The method that is used in this research is a qualitative descriptive research in which the data were discussed descriptively. According to Cresswell (2009), "qualitative study is defined as an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting." Then, Brown and Rodgers, (2002) define qualitative method as a descriptive method in which all data are in the form of words and sentences, not in the form of number, and focus on the process rather than the result. Santosa (2017, p. 52) gives a definition of the source of the data as the source from which the data was obtained. The source of the data in this research is Mata Najwa Talk show. Meanwhile, data is the object of research, the reality of which is the focus of the study, which includes places, participants, and events (Santosa, 2014, p. 52). The data in this research is Ahok's statements. In collecting the data, the writer used purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is a non-random sampling technique where the researcher determines sampling by determining specific characteristics that are appropriate to the purpose of the study so that it is expected to answer the research problem Goetz dan LeComte (dalam Sutopo, 2006, p. 66). Activities in the analysis include data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing and verification (Miles dan Hubermen, 1994).

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The results of this research show kinds of negative politeness strategies used by Ahok in Mata Najwa Talk show. The strategies are used mostly are hedges or hedging, pluralization of you and I pronouns, and question.

Example 1

*Nah kami sangat yakin, tidak mungkin program kami bisa jalan **kalau** tidak memiliki PNS yang bersih, transparan, professional tadi.*

The example number 1 can be categorized as a negative politeness strategy because when Najwa asked about Ahok's priority in his program during the campaign. It was shown that Ahok used negative politeness to convinced Najwa and his voters about his program by using if clause. If clause in this example can be categorized as one of the hedging device. "*Nah kami sangat*

yakin, tidak mungkin program kami bisa jalan kalau tidak memiliki PNS yang bersih, transparan, professional tadi.” The statement of Ahok can also be understood as a possibility about his program that would work properly if he had capable staffs to help him in running his programs. By using this strategy and the use of the word *kalau* Ahok tries to explain to Najwa and the audience that He is not absolutely responsible if his programs are not working very well. The word *kalau* can be categorized as hedging. As one of strategy in negative politeness hedging indicate that the speaker is not taking full responsibility for what he or she express (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Example 2

Kita mulai sadar nih, gak bisa mengandalkan uang operasional saya. Maka kita tentu harus luncurkan. Tentu, namanya apa, mereka bilang? Udah ada KJP, ada KJL. Ya kita ikutin aja, KJL.

The example in number 2 is a Negative Politeness Strategy because the context was occurred when Najwa asked why Ahok had just released KJL program recently. Ahok explained that he had started the program before his candidature as the next governor, but it had not been systematically worked. He still used his own operational money. Ahok used negative politeness strategy by using the word “*kita* (we)” instead of “*saya*” which point out PNS as the executor of the program. The term “*Kita mulai sadar nih, gak bisa mengandalkan uang operasional saya. Maka kita tentu harus luncurkan*” indicates that Ahok respects his employees by not demanding them directly. By replacing the word *saya* with the word *kita*. Ahok succeed avoiding face threatening act (FTA). By using the word *kita*, Ahok managed to avoid personal responsibility for the policies he expressed.

Example 3

Kalau dia hemat, uang pada akhir tahun itu langsung menjadi hak dia buat si anak naik kelas.

The example number 3 is a Negative Politeness Strategy. Ahok statement about *KJP* “*Kalau dia hemat, uang pada akhir tahun itu langsung menjadi hak dia buat si anak naik kelas*”. Using if clause means that Ahok try to safe the face of the addressee by using the word *kalau*. The word *kalau* it self expressing a possibility. Ahok did not threthening the addressee face on the other side Ahok respect the adreesee (students and their parents) who cappable in managing KJP. The word *kalau* is also a hedging device which functions to mitigate the statements.

Example 4

Saya masih mesti berdiri atau duduk, nih?

The example in number 4 is also a negative politeness because as can be seen in the example number 4 "Saya **masih mesti berdiri atau duduk, nih?**" there are several word that can be categorized as negative politeness, such as phrase and the word **masih mesti, nih?** Context of the sentece is, that Ahok asking indirectly to Najwa and the audience whether he was permitted to have a sit or not. The phrase *masih mesti* expressing Ahok's hesitation whether he was allowed to have sit or not. By doing this Ahok asking permission to Najwa and the audience implicitly. The word **nih?** On the other side eksplicitly asking permission but by lowering the intonation of his speech using the word **nih?**. It is very clear that Ahok really pay attention to Najwa and the audience face by lowering his position and respecting more to Najwa and the audience by asking their permission for his act (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Example 5

*Nah terakhir **kita** perkirakan **mungkin** Rp.600.000 – Rp.1.000.000.*

In example number 5 Ahok used two strategies of negative politeness. They are pluralization of pronoun I and the used of hedging device. Pluralization of pronoun saya become **kita** is used to avoid of being fully responsible of the statement (Brown and Levinson, 1987). There also a hedging device which is used by Ahok. The hedging device is the word **mungkin** which express a limitation of the exact amount of number. By using this hedging device the speaker showing his limitation about the exact number and manage of being fully responsible if his statement is inaccurate (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Example 6

*Maka **kami** anggap KJP Plus itu, bagi **kami** itu adalah menambah nilai.*

The word **kami** in example 6 can be categorized as negative politeness because the word **kami** is a pluralization of the pronoun I. This strategy is used by the speaker in order to avoid of being fully responsible for the statement (Brown and Levinson, 1987). By using this strategy, the speaker hopes that this can save the speaker face (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

CONCLUSION

Negative politeness is an act that the speaker chooses in order to make his or her listener not loosing his or her face when they communicate each other. A lot of ways that might the speaker choose in expressing negative politeness, such as; be conventionally indirect, question

(asking for permission), pluralization of pronoun I, hedge, be pessimistic (showing hesitation), minimize the imposition, give deference (being humble), apologize, impersonalize S and H, state the FTA as a general rule, nominalize, go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H. By using those expressions in the utterances. It might be concluded that: The first is the speaker humbles and abases himself. The second is where the speaker raises the addressee by paying him positive face of a particular kind which satisfies the addressee's want to be treated as superior. Consider having sympathy from the voter, Ahok manage his utterance by using negative politeness.

REFERENCES

- Cresswell, J.W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 3rd Edition. Los Angeles: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Brown, J. D., & Rodgers, T. S. 2002. *Doing second language research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, Janet. 2001. *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. (Ed. Kedua). Harlow, Essex: Longman
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London : Sage Publishers.
- Santosa, Riyadi. 2017. *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
-