STRATEGI MENKRITIK MAHFUD MD DALAM ACARA INDONESIA LAWYERS CLUB

Lastri Wahyuni Manurung
Universitas HKBP Nommensen
Medan, Sumatera Utara

lastri.manurung@uhn.ac.id; lastrimanurung@student.uns.ac.id

Abstrak

Kritik, di satu sisi digunakan untuk mengontrol dan mengarahkan agar seseorang terhindar dari kesalahan, dengan menggunakan kata-kata verbal. Di sisi lain, kritik adalah tindakan linguistik yang mungkin dapat menyebabkan konflik dan kecenderungan mengancam citra seseorang. 'Citra' meliputi keinginan agar citra diri ini dihargai dan disetujui oleh lawan bicara. Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengetahui, strategi kritik Mahfud MD ketika memberikan kritik. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian kualitatif deskriptif. Data penelitian ini adalah tuturan kritik oleh Mahfud MD di acara Indonesia Lawyers Club. Tuturan-tuturan itu ditranskripsi dan diklasifikasikan secara ortografis berdasarkan klasifikasi Nguyen tentang strategi kritik langsung dan tidak langsung. Ditemukan bahwa apa pun kritik yang diberikan oleh Mahfud MD, ia melakukannya dengan memberikan koreksi.

Kata Kunci: Kritik, Strategi Kritik Langsung/Tidak Langsung

Criticism Strategy by Mahfud MD in Indonesia Lawyers Club

Abstract

Criticism, in one hand was used as to control and to direct someone from mistake by using verbal words. On the other hand, critics were a linguistic action that possibly caused conflict and tendency to threaten someone's face. It was the face that crucially including the desire to be appreciated and approved by interlocutors. This research was conducted to find out, the criticism strategy of Mahfud MD in giving critics. This was a descriptive qualitative study. The data of this research was the utterances of critics by Mahfud MD in Indonesia Lawyers' Club. The utterances were orthographically transcribed and classified based on the classification of Nguyen about direct and indirect criticism strategies. It was found that whatever the critics that Mahfud MD gave, he must accomplish it by giving correction.

Keywords: Criticism, Direct/Indirect Criticism Strategy

INTRODUCTION

Critics are tool of communication given by someone towards ideas, actions, or works of another person which can affect negative or positive (Hoa, 2007). Nguyen (2005) for example, defined criticism as an act which is used by speakers to evaluate negatively what the hearer has said or done with an intention to improve the hearers' words and actions. Kaye (2019) concluded that criticism is used by the speaker to provide negative feedback to the hearer with intention to improve the addressee's actions, behavior, words, attitudes, works, etc. (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p.190) stated that to criticize someone or something is to assert that a certain state of affairs that has to do

with him or it is bad expressing disapproval of him or it.

Politicians have many opportunities to criticize and being criticized. Because they have responsibility to make policies related to the government's problems such as corruption, gratification, constitution, etc. Such policies can lead to pro and contra. And in line with that, there can occur critics to the pro-and-contra situation. Politician has a responsibility to nations' development and prosperity, and when it talks about nation's cases, many things need to be reviewed. It may about the policy, controversial economic problem where there are many things to criticize.

Politician, as seen from Indonesian Standard Dictionary, is defined as the expert of the state, they are considered educated and are not common society, and they are people who were expected to make policies that benefit the whole society in Indonesia. Politician is expected to generously respond the advice, critic or disapproval to their idea, the works or performance in their communication. Politician, are considered as an educated people, in which they give critics, they are required polite. Tracy, et al., (2006) stated that a good criticism should contain a positive message, and the critic needs to use a positive manner and positive language. Tracy also suggests that a critic should not violate the relationship with the hearer.

The speech act of threatening someone's face is a speech act that may naturally affects as to threat other's face. Referring to (Goffman, 1967) notion of face, as the public self-image, reputation, or self-esteem of a person, they argued that it is in the mutual interest of interlocutors to save, maintain, or support each other's face. The so-called face threatening acts are either avoided (if possible), or different strategies are employed to counteract or soften them. That is why; being polite is an effective alternative way to minimize conflict from threatening someone's face (p.7).

The way politician gives their critics has been a great interest to be noticed and observed. In one hand, from sociology's perspective, critics are viewed as a social control. (Jauhari, 2018) stated that as a social control, criticism is persuasive and retrospective, which is to improve, to control, and to direct someone from mistake by using verbal words. But on the other hand, critics are also a linguistic action that possibly causes conflict (p.1). That is why, every person, moreover politician should criticize someone politely in order to minimize conflict. Critics can easily threat other's face that it can cause conflict. Nadar (2009 p.32) also stated the same idea that critics speech act will threat the positive face of the interlocutors;

positive face concerns to the need of someone to be accepted or liked by another speaker, desires to be recognized).

Mahfud MD is a well-known politician who concerns greatly to government's policy. If something is not for society's improvement, he will criticize. His critics are very much taken into account that help society to understand what is happening to the government. Society needs to know that because government is working for society's goodness. It is interesting to observe the way Mahfud MD gives critics to other politician and lawyers and many other parties that related to Indonesian's problem such as corruption. Mahfud MD has given many critics towards many issues that happen in Indonesia since he was once a chairman of the constitutional court that made him experienced many cases on law (Wink, 2017). His critics are logic, based on the truth and fact-oriented. This makes the way Mahfud MD gives critics has become the model because his critics brings a big impact to how other politician or lawyer or other people create rules and decide what to do related to law (cited from mojok.co by Amin, 2020).

One of his phenomenal critics given by Mahfud MD in Indonesia Lawyer's Club aired 21st of November 2017 on TVOne, was about the corruption case of Setya Novanto (The former chairman of House of Representatives: *Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat*) of Indonesia. He was appointed as a suspected who corrupted money of providing facility of electronic machine to make an electronic Indonesian Identity card. Two of his lawyers, who defended for Setya Novanto, had made a dramatic process of trial (according to Mahfud MD). Mahfud MD made a 'straight-to-the-point' critic about this case that finally considered true by the judge and made one of the lawyers was jailed.

The researcher was interested to conduct a research that focus and aimed at finding out the criticism strategy applied by Mahfud MD while giving his critics to the interlocutors related to governmental issue,

corruption and five basic principle of Indonesia (*Pancasila*). It was needed to find out the dominant strategy used by Mahfud MD and to find out the reason of why using that certain strategy dominantly. The findings of this research practically showed about how an experienced people conveyed order delivered a criticism. This can be used as a reference when other interlocutors are in the same domain of circumstance.

Some researchers have done a lot of research on criticism speech act strategies. (Handayani, 2017) conducted a research on the speech act strategy of criticizing by students in Surakarta, and found that students criticized by using *requires change requests* 31% and *negative evaluation*. Handayani had students as the subject, while this recent research examined the strategies used by politicians in political and governmental circumstance. (Asih, 2014) found that speakers in *Sentilan Sentilun* TV program were more dominant using a direct criticism strategy by giving a negative evaluation of governance. During the conversation, when the speaker uttered his criticism, the hearer to whom the criticism was given, did not get along face-to-face with the speaker while the criticism was spoken. In contrast to this research, when Mahfud MD provided criticism, he was face-to-face with the hearer who were criticized. This situation might cause differences in the criticism strategies used by the speaker. The difference between the previous researches to this current research, becomes a proper reason to study this research, to see the criticism strategies on a governance policy's contexts. As stated by (Himmawati, 2016: p. 9) that different speech events and context of speech act can produce different variations of speech or utterances.

THEORY

Based on the classification system brought forward by (Searle, 1969), there were five types of general functions performed by speech acts: declarations, representatives, expressives, directives and commissives. As far as criticism is concerned, it contains the

types of declarations, representatives and expressives, excluding directives and commissives" (in Farnia & Sattar, 2015: p. 315).

Defining Criticism

Nguyen (2005) defined criticizing as "an illocutionary act whose illocutionary point is to give negative evaluation of the hearer's (H) actions, choice, words, and products for which he or she may be held responsible (p. 7). This act is performed in the hope of influencing H's future actions for H's betterment as viewed by the speaker (S) or to communicate S's dissatisfaction with or dislike regarding what H has done but without the implicature that what Hearer has done brings undesirable consequences to Speaker (Wierzbicka, 1987).

(Hyland, 2000) defined that criticism as "an expression of dissatisfaction or negative comment" (p. 44). (Min, 2008) indicated that criticism is an important and indispensable speech act in our daily communication, which is just as important as the compliment, apology, and request (p. 73). (Hoa, 2007) stated that criticizing is sometimes performed to vent the speaker's negative feeling or attitude to the hearer or hearer's work, choice, behavior, etc. (p. 144). Criticism is defined as an act of speech which contains a negative evaluation of the behavior of an individual. The intention of this negative evaluation is that the person concerned will engage in introspection or self-correction so that his or her behavior becomes better in future (Mulac, et al., 2000).

Direct/Indirect Criticisms

Min (2008: 74) states that, "Criticism is an intrinsically face-threatening act in Brown and Levinson's terms. It belongs to the group of speech acts that threatens the hearer's positive face. In order to make the criticism more acceptable to the hearer, the speaker tends to reduce the imposition of criticism, which means the increase of degree of politeness". Direct criticism means

explicitly pointing out the problem with Hearer's choice/actions/work/products, etc.

A direct criticism is the direct expression of negative evaluation without reservation. It means that the interlocutor directly points out the hearer's mistakes and demands correction directly instead of beating around the bush, including insulting, threatening, and so on. Nguyen (2005) classified direct and indirect critics strategy as this following:

Table 1
Direct Criticism Strategy

No	Type	Characteristics
1	Negative evaluation	Usually expressed via evaluative adjectives with negative meaning or evaluative adjective with positive meaning plus negation
2	Disapproval	Describing S's attitude towards H's choice, etc.
3	Expression of disagreement	Usually realized by means of negation word "No" or performatives "I don't agree" or "I disagree" (with or

		without modal) or via arguments against H.
4	Identification of problem	Stating errors or problems found with H's choice, etc
5	Statement of difficulties	Usually expressed by means of such structures as "I find it difficult to understand...", "It's difficult to understand..."
6	Consequences	Warning about negative consequences or negative effects of H's choice, etc for H himself or herself or for the public.

Nguyen's (2005: p.47-48) speech act of criticism

Farnia&Sattar (2015) stated that indirect criticism, in other words, means that the illocutionary force of criticism is uttered by means of the performance of other speech acts, so the interlocutor's real intention can be partially concealed. This is always thought of as an effective and acceptable means with positive results (p.307). Indirect Criticism means simplifying the problems with hearer's choice/actions/work/products, etc.

Table 2
Indirect Criticism Strategy

No	Types	Characteristics
1	Correction	Including all utterances which have the purpose of fixing errors by asserting specific alternatives to H's choice, etc.
2	Indicating standard	Usually stated as a collective obligation rather than an obligation for H personally or as a rule which S thinks is commonly agreed upon and applied to all.
3	Preaching	Usually stated as guidelines to H, with an implicature that H is incapable of making correct choices otherwise.
4	Demand for change	Usually expressed via such structures as "you have to", "you must", "it is obligatory that" or "you are required" or "you need", "it is necessary".
5	Request for change	Usually expressed via such structures as "will you ...?", "can you ...?", "would you ...?" or imperatives (with or without politeness markers), or want statement.
6	Advice about change	Usually expressed via the performative "I advise you ...", or structures with "should" with or without modality
7	Suggestion for change	Usually expressed via the performative "I suggest that ..." or such structures as "you can", "you could", "it would be better if" or "why don't you" etc.

8	Expression of uncertainty	Utterances expressing S's uncertainty to raise H's awareness of the inappropriateness of H's choice, etc.
9	Asking/presupposing	Rhetorical questions to raise H's awareness of the inappropriateness of H's choice, etc.
10	Other hints	Including other kinds of hints that did not belong to (8) and (9). May include sarcasm.

METHODOLOGY

This was a descriptive qualitative research in which the conclusions of this research were formulated based on the data. The data of this research was the utterances of critics by Mahfud MD with criticism in Indonesia Lawyers' Club.

The subject of this research was Mahfud MD who gave the criticism about the issues that have been explained earlier. While the object of this research was the criticism speech strategy act used by Mahfud MD in giving his critics.

The source of data was taken from the recorded show on the Indonesia Lawyer's Club program which was from *YouTube*. Indonesia Lawyer's Club in TV One was a 210-minute talk show at 19:30 WIB

Tuesdays, hosted by Karni Ilyas, based on the latest issues happening in Indonesia, with a congregation of lawyers and parliament members from Indonesia sharing their opinions and analysis. The ILC talk show as the leading talk show program was awarded Panasonic Gobel Awards in 2013 and 2014.

The researcher downloaded some videos and chose three videos because this can represent the way Mahfud MD gave critics, with different issues and three different people of being criticized. These followings were the source of data completed with the link and the brief information about the topic. Table 3 on the next page presented the information about the source of the data.

Table 3
The Source of Data

Uploaded	Title	Source (the link)	Brief Description to the Issue
Nov, 21 st 2017 Coded: e-ID (case about: electronic Identity Card)	"Dahsyat! Prof. Mahfud MD Bungkam Kedua Pengacara Setya Novanto". (Awesome! Prof. Mahfud MD Made speechless both Lawyers of Setya Novanto)	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xPFyjuo12TA	In 2017, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) announced for the second time, named House of Representatives speaker Setya Novanto a suspect in the multi-trillion-rupiah graft case surrounding the national electronic ID program; his case in court was caused much controversy. Controversy in the case of: Two Times of Pre-trial, The Presumption of Innocent, Setya Novanto Suddenly Sick, suddenly healed, etc.
February, 20 th 2018/ coded UUD.	Cerdas!! Prof. Mahfud MD Patahkan Argumen Fahri Hamzah Soal 'Panggil Paksa Anggota DPR' (Incredible!! Prof. Mahfud MD Breaks Fahri Hamzah's	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1dBVASKGEE	Article 122 of the law is believed to have the potential to infringe the freedom of expression, because it grants the House's ethics council (MKD) the power to press criminal charges against people accused of disrespecting the House as a state institution or its lawmakers. It is believed that the article can be used to criminalize people who are critical of the House or lawmakers. The law is also believed to give legal impunity to lawmakers, because Article 245 states that House members

	Argument on Forced Calling of DPR Members)		cannot be investigated by law enforcement officials without approval from the President and consideration of the MKD, said FahriHamzah.
Desember, 6 th 2017/ Coded Pancasila.	“ILC TVOne; KritikPedas Prof Mahfud MD KepadaEggiSudj ana” (ILC TVOne; Strong Criticism of Prof. Mahfud MD To EggiSudjana)	https://w ww.youtu be.com/w atch?v=1 dBVASK KGEE	Mahfud MD also commented on the statement of EggiSudjana who said that the state of Indonesia is based on the Allah, there is no other interpretation except Islamic law. According to Mahfud MD, such an interpretation is not only against grammatically, but also against the historical facts of <i>Pancasila</i> (Five basic Principle of Indonesia). Mahfud MD states that it is true, it was agreed upon by the state based on the Islamic Shari'a for its adherents. It is then transformed into the Belief in the One and only God.

Observation and preliminary study were conducted by watching and observing the videos which were streamed from *Youtube* on “Indonesia Lawyers Club” program. From the many videos, the researcher chose three video that represent how Mahfud MD gave his critics. The utterances were orthographically transcribed and classified the utterances to its strategy of criticism (Nguyen, 2005). It was first needed to be determine the critics strategy of Mahfud MD (whether it was direct or indirect) which is consulted to the theory of Nguyen (2005, p. 65) about kinds of critics’ strategy with some division element of direct and indirect critics strategy. After classifying the criticism strategies, it was needed to find out the dominant strategy was used by Mahfud MD and to find out the reason of why using that certain strategy dominantly.

FINDING AND DISCUSSIONS

As it has been explained earlier that when criticism speech act can threat someone’s positive face, in this analysis, the politeness used by Mahfud MD was discussed when he criticized other’s idea about different topic of talking.

Indirect Criticism Strategy by Giving Correction

Utterances 1 and 2 below, are classified as criticism with indirect strategy, which is the strategy by giving correction.

- (1) *“Begini bukti petunjuknya ini. Satu, di dalam setiap sidang, selalu disebut Setnov ini berperan. Itu bukti bukan? Bukan, tapi ini bukti petunjuk untuk sampai pada bukti yang sebenarnya nanti. Karena bukti yang sebenarnya itu hanya keyakinan hakim”.*

(This is the fact. One, in every hearing session on the court, it was always mentioned that Setnov played role. Is this a chief-evidence? No, but this is a corroborative evidence in order to find out the chief evidence later. Because the chief evidence is only on the judges’ belief). Minute 6:48/E-KTP

- (2) *“Lalu soal pemanggilan paksa, oh itu tidak bias disamaratakan, tidak bisa. Begini, itu orang bias dipanggil paksa kalau dia merupakan saksi dari sebuah peristiwa. Ini dipanggil, bias dipaksa. Tapi kalau dipanggil saksi sebagai ahli untuk bicara menurut ilmunya, bias menolak. Saya sering menolak, gak bisa dong, wong keahlian kok. Kenapa gak mau? Ya gak ada yang bias maksa saya kalau soal keahlian. Tapi kalau saya tahu suatu peristiwa, dipanggil, bias dipaksa. Nah itu harus dibedakan saksi fakta dengan saksi ahli.”*

(and then about the forced-calling, it cannot be generalized to all cases. Someone can be forcedly called if he is the witness of a case. He can be forced to come. But when called as a expert witness, it is true that someone can refuse to come. No one can force someone to share his expertise. But when I know how a case happened and be called as a witness, I can be forced. That's why I say about the forced-calling should be differed from whether as a fact witness or an expert witness.”). Minute 9:40/UUD

The two critics above are used by Mahfud MD in accordance to these contexts. Context of utterance 1: There are so many corroborative evidences that can bring to the real evidence of proving that SetyaNovanto sentenced guilty for the criminal case of corruptions towards the multi-trillion-rupiah graft case surrounding the national electronic ID program. But the evidence is just corroborative not yet considered as the chief evidence which can bring to the decision SetyaNovanto is clearly guilty. Context of utterance 2: Mahfud MD criticize the statement of FahriHamzah (the vise chairman of House of Representative) about the immunity of the deputy in House of Representative since it can interfere the quality of the deputy.

Related to the case of electronic Identity card, Mahfud MD was criticizing Otto and Friedrich (lawyer of SetyaNovanto) about the difference between corroborative evidence and the chief evidence. The corroborative evidence is just the evidence used to guide the judge to the real evidence called the chief evidence that this can be used to prove whether someone is guilty or not. He was giving correction to the misperception of ‘evidence’. The example of ‘in every hearing session on the court, it was always mentioned that Setnov (SetyaNovanto) played role’ was used as the corroborative evidence not the chief one, means that the statement cannot directly prove that Setnov is guilty. Similarly, Mahfud MD corrected his interlocutors’

understanding someone as a witness is forcedly called to a court or not, as Fahri said that a witness cannot be forcedly called. If it was as an expert witness, then someone cannot be forced to come to a court. But as a fact expert, someone can be forced. Mahfud MD directly corrected that this belongs to the bald-on-record politeness strategy. Mahfud MD seemed not be long-winded or pleonastic or try to use other politeness strategy, because he wanted to be straight-to the point, not trying to create an ambiguous interpretation, he believed that the participant of the conversation (Otto and Friedrich) would not offense since Mahfud MD was the former of chairman of the Constitutional Court(Adhy, 2018)who has experience about law and moreover know a lot about the term ‘evidence’. He straightly corrected in order to make the participant understand. Criticism therefore requires special discernment: the ability to stand simultaneously in the midst of and apart from the events experienced (Hart, 2016).(Setiawan, 2020) stated that someone who provides criticism must be someone who has sufficient experience in the material being criticized, and has relevant knowledge.

Direct Criticism Strategy by Giving Negative Evaluation

This data below showed that Mahfud MD at once gave negative evaluation with the correction.

(1) *“Otto itu orang nya bagus, logikanya terstruktur orangnya professional. Sayang pak Otto itu bukan ahli hukum pidana. Di marai kalau bukan ahli hukum pidana ngomong pidana.”*

(Otto is a good lawyer, he is a structured-logical person, and professional as well. Unfortunately, Otto is not an expert of criminal procedural law. It is not allowed a non-criminal expert, talks about criminal). Minute 1:26/E-KTP (e-ID card)

Mahfud MD gave criticism to Otto Hasibuan who is the lawyer of SetyaNovanto, that a non-expert of the criminal-procedural-law should not defend criminal cases. And SetyaNovanto's case has actually been included in a criminal case. How is it possible that Otto Hasibuan became a lawyer of Setya Novanto. He said that "unfortunately, Otto is not a criminal-law expert and someone who is not in that expert are not allowed to handle criminal case". Mahfud MD evaluated the capability of Otto about becoming the lawyer of SetyaNovanto.

Of being polite, Mahfud MD intensified his interest about Otto by telling his good opinion about who Otto is. This strategy used by Mahfud MD in order not to make Otto loses his face. Mahfud was actually wanted to criticize that to handle a criminal law; there must be someone who was the expert of that case. In fact, Otto was not the expert of criminal-law. Otto, however, has won many cases about criminal cases, even though Otto was not the expert about criminal-law.

Direct Criticism Strategy by Telling Consequences

When SetyaNovanto was called for a hearing related to the case of corruptions towards the multi-trillion-rupiah graft case surrounding the national electronic ID program, suddenly there was a news told that SetyaNovanto was injured in an accident. The information was gotten from the doctors who stated that SetyaNovanto was in bad injured. This made SetyaNovanto could not attend the hearing due to sudden the accident.

(1) *"Logika awam aja, soal tabrakan soal ini, apalagi konon ada videonya, tapi nanti lahya, biar polisi yang mengungkap itu. Nah ini semua kalau benar itu terjadi, nah bahaya loh untuk kedepannya nanti kalau ada dokter dibeli, suruh buat surat keterangan ini surat keterangan itu. ID (Ikatan Dokter)*

harus turun tangan hal-hal yang begini ini dan polisi tentu saja."

(Let's think logically, about the accident, there was a video, but let the policemen finish that. So, when it was in fact true, it is a dangerous in future if there is doctor who paid to make a faked information about a patient. The ID (Doctor's Association) must soon intervene to solve the problem."

"There must be something bad will happen in future" was the consequences given by Mahfud MD if there is no avoidance or punishment to a doctor when they give the faked or inaccurate information about a patient just because they are paid. This critic was given by telling consequences, telling consequences is one strategy of giving criticism in order to give chance to the interlocutor not to do the same mistake because that something bad will happen in future if there is no anticipation for the bad thing from happening.

Again, Mahfud MD was applying the bald-on record strategy in telling his critics about a sudden tragedy happened to Setya Novanto in time when SetyaNovanto was called for a hearing in court.

Direct Criticism Strategy by Telling Disapproval

SetyaNovanto (SN) chose to ask for a protection from President, Policemen and Indonesia Army. Mahfud MD criticized it by saying that in fact, SN had been protected well, moreover Mahfud MD teased that SetyaNovanto had been given the orange dress (when someone is wearing the orange dress during the hearing, means that he is recognized as a suspected.). This is according to Mahfud MD funny, because he assumes that SN has been given protection. Like when he was escorted by police officers, (Mahfud gave example to other case) in contrast to thieves of amplifier that burned by the mass and was not given protection. Mahfud MD questioned, what other protection needed by SN, because

according to him that SN has been protected by the government by being treated according to existing laws.

- (3) “*Kemudian, minta perlindungan, ‘setya novanto minta perlindungan kepresiden, kepolri, kekejaksaan agung, bahkan wartawan Tanya, ‘ke TNI’. Lalu saya bilang, loh Setya Novanto itu sudah mendapat perlindungan, polisi sudah ngawal dengan bagus. Dikasih baju oranye, bagus sekali, ganteng.*”

(And then you ask for a protection from the president, policemen institution and from the Indonesian Army. SetyaNovanto has been given protection, policemen protected him during the trial. He is given the ‘orange dress’ which is very fit to him, makes him look handsome”.)
Minute 9:52/E-KTP(e-ID card)

This part showed that Mahfud MD thought that Setya Novanto, through his two lawyers, very much unreasonable when they ask for a protection from various parties that made Mahfud MD openly and directly said that Setya Novanto has been actually protected well. This statement showed that Mahfud MD disapproved the opinion of the two lawyers about asking for protection to SetyaNovanto. Mahfud MD used the bald on record politeness strategy to express his disapproval. He often used this strategy because he knew that he has an appropriate reason to show that SetyaNovanto, as the suspected, has been given protection. He blatantly giving disapproval without any worry that his interlocutor will lose their face, because Mahfud MD has strong argument to show that he was telling the truth. Mahfud MD was trying to be direct as to minimize assumptions about the hearer’s wants, don’t presume or assume, as Brown (1987) stated that if a speaker chose to use the bald-on-record strategy is just to minimize the possibility of hearer to assume or presume what speaker says.

Direct Criticism Strategy by Giving Expression of Disagreement and Correction

This data explained that Mahfud MD used a direct criticism strategy which was performed by giving expression of disagreement and correction.

- (4) “*saya berbeda pendapat dengan bapak tentang ‘asas praduga tak bersalah’. Pak, asas praduga tak bersalah itu bukan berarti kita tidak boleh menduga orang bersalah. (diam 3 detik) kalau ada situasi kondisi di mana orang kelihatan bersalah kita bilang ‘oh itu salah tuh.’ ‘itu koruptor itu’ boleh. Kenapa tidak, setiap hari kita ngomong koruptor. Praduga tak bersalah itu artinya seseorang yang belum divonis jangan dulu diperlakukan seperti divonis. Jangan disebut terpidana, hartanya jangan disita dulu, jangan dilelang dulu.*”

“I disagree with your understanding about ‘presumption of innocence’. Sir (Otto and Fredrich), ‘presumption of innocence’ doesn’t mean that we are not allowed to presume that someone is guilty. (Silent for 3 second) if there is a situation where someone seems guilty and then we say “he is guilty” “he is a corruptor” it is allowed. What is meant by ‘presumption of innocence’ is that if someone is not yet sentenced in jailed, don’t treat him that way. Don’t name him a suspected. Don’t execute his belonging. Don’t pledge. Minute 4:51 (e-ID card)

The context of utterance 6 was that Mahfud criticizes the lawyer of SetyaNovanto about the terminology of ‘presumption of innocence’. He thinks that Otto and Fredrich (two SetyaNovanto’s lawyers) got misunderstanding about what is meant by that terminology. The other example can be seen in utterance 7 by Mahfud MD about the topic when FahriHamzah said that if the deputy of the House of representative, are subjected to a

criminal offence, they cannot be directly arrested but should be firstly fired.

(5) *“Ndak bisa, ndak bisa. DPR agar terhormat dipecat dulu baru diadili, ndak bisa. Itu hanya presiden yang bias dibegitukan, diberhentikan dulu baru diadili. Presiden itu atasan Jaksa Agung, dia harus di-impeachment dulu baru diadili pidananya. Tapi kalau DPR tidak. Intinya, tidak boleh ada pembangkangan oleh rakyat atau siapapun atas vonis atau kerja-kerja proses pengadilan.”*

(“No, it can’t, it can’t be like that. Members of *DPR* (House of Representative) “as to be honorable, members of *DPR* is firstly fired to be arrested” no, it can’t. Only president can be treated that way, fired than arrested. President has authority to the General Attorney, there must be an impeachment first then prosecuted, but not the *DPR*. The point is, there is no disobedience from society or members of the representative (people who work in the House of Representative: *DPR*) to the processes of the court. Minute 3:50/ UUD

First, from the data, it was displayed that Mahfud MD criticized Otto and Fredrich by telling disagreement about the meaning of ‘presumption of innocence’. Second, after telling the disagreement point, Mahfud MD then correct what is meant by ‘presumption of innocence’. He gave explanation of his disagreement then giving correction to tell the correct understanding about ‘presumption of innocence’. The same strategy was also used by Mahfud MD when he wanted to criticize the procedure treated to the member of the House of Representative when they were subjected a criminal-law cases. Mahfud showed that he disagrees while further, giving the correction to the appropriate treatment.

Second, from the critics uttered by Mahfud MD, it was concluded that he used the bald-on-record strategy since he directly

straight to the point of what he disagrees with. He explicitly used “*I disagree with your understanding about ‘presumption of innocence’*”. The benefit of using the bald-on-record strategy is that someone can avoid the danger of being misunderstood (Yule, 1996: 38). Mahfud MD was giving a correction in order to clarify the misunderstanding about the concept of ‘presumption of innocence’. So it has been a right strategy to choose the bald-on-record strategy because it was in line with the benefit of applying the strategy.

Direct Criticism Strategy by Telling Disapproval and Correction

Showing disapproval and giving correction were the strategies that Mahfud MD used to give his critic. Mahfud MD criticized FahriHamzah, the vice chairman of House of Representative, about that all members who work in the House of Representative should not be present when they are called as a witness for a law cases (known as immune to the law). They can make a report to the court when defamation happens to the members of House of Representative. As in this following utterance:

(6) *“dalam konteks immunitas, DPR telah mengambil alih wewenang secara sepihak. Itu tidak boleh dilakukan. Kemudian, Penghinaan pencemaran nama baik tentang pejabat dan jabatan itu, tidak ada, itu tidak ada. Gimana kalau saya katakana ‘DPR bobrok’ gitu, ndakapaapa. Tapi kalau ‘Mahfud anggota DPR itu brengsek’ nah saya yang mengadu. Pencemaran itu personal bukan institusinya”*. (In context of immunity, DPR (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat: House of Representative) has taken their authority unilaterally. It is not allowed. And then about the defamation whether it is to the officials or the job they employ, it is not that way, not that way. When I say “DPR is bad” no problem with that.

But if someone says “shit is Mahfud”, then I make a report for defamation about me, then it is clearly allowed. Defamation is personal not institutional.) Minute 8:12/UUD

He was giving a correction to what was actually that an institution cannot make a report about defamation case, but it is personal that someone can make a report to defamation. Mahfud MD also talked about the nature of law, moreover the nature of law in Indonesia. Indonesia cannot run the law with the Islamic law, since Indonesia is not an Islamic country. Indonesia was a country with multi religion lives within it that make Indonesia lives with the Islamic rules used as the basic law.

The choice of applying the bald-on-record strategy to give the criticism was appropriate and reasonable. In order to avoid the danger of being misunderstood, using this politeness strategy is reasonably correct. Mahfud MD was the lecturer of law, he was an expert of law, he was also the chairman of the Constitutional Court in Indonesia, and this capability made him has power to give the critics because he was a right person to talk about the right understanding of Indonesian law. This felicity condition, made the interlocutor or the hearer did not lose their face eventhough Mahfud MD criticized with the bald-on-record politeness strategy.

Criticism Strategy by Identifying a Problem (Direct) and Correction (Indirect)

When SetyaNovanto thought that it was still not enough protected by policemen and Indonesian army, he then decides to ask for protection from the International court. Mahfudcritisize this decision becasseMahfud thought that there was no business with the International Court.

(7) “*mau lindungi, pengadilan internasional? waduh! Badan internasional lagi. Nanti kalau dibawa kesana, diusir oleh satpamnya. ‘ngapain kamu kesini’, Pengadilan internasional itu ndak ngurus Setya*

Novanto, yang diurus itu sengketa antar Negara atau kejahatan kemanusiaan. Atau kalau suatu kejahatan yang besar dan negaranya tidak maumengadili, boleh dibawa keperadilan internasional. Itu kalau kejahatan besar, bukan kejahatan orang per orang.” (Protection from International court?? What he thinks he is doing! The international court? If Setya Novanto comes to the International Court asking for a protection, the security will directly expel him. Because, International court is not dealing with Setya Novanto, what it deals with is the problem between country and humanity. Or if there’s a big problem and the country does not want to finish it, then International court can take it over. It deals with big criminal, not with personal business.) Minute 17:18/E-KTP.

Mahfud MD said that there will be a problem if SetyaNovanto comes to the International court. It was that SetyaNovanto will directly be expelled. This critic “*If SetyaNovanto comes to the International Court asking for a protection, the security will directly expel him*”, in fact was made by Mahfud MD as he was an expert of law (Wink, 2017). Mahfud MD is a lawyer and already have a lot of experience about law, Mahfud MD blatantly criticized the policies made by SetyaNovanto regarding his case in court. Mahfud MD, in criticizing, repeatedly used the bald-on-record politeness strategy.

CONCLUSIONS

The following table showed the percentage and the frequencies as to show which type of critics’ strategy used by Mahfud MD dominantly. The calculations of the utterances were taken from some topics from different source of topics in the program of ‘*Indonesia Lawyer’s Club*. The conclusions of this research consisted of two different strategies, which were the critics speech act with direct criticism strategy and indirect criticism strategy. Table 4 and 5were put

below to show the strategies of Mahfud MD on critics' speech act and their frequencies.

Table 4
Number of Utterances with Indirect Criticism Strategy

No	Type	Frequency	%
1	Correction	35	50 %
2	Indicating standard	-	
3	Preaching	-	
4	Demand for change	-	
5	Request for change	-	
6	Advice about change	-	
7	Suggestion for change	-	
8	Expression of uncertainty	-	
9	Asking/pre supposing	-	
10	Other hints	-	

Nguyen, 2005, p. 47-48

Table 5
Number of Utterances with Direct Criticism Strategy

No	Type	Frequency	%
1	Negative evaluation	9	13 %
2	Disapproval	12	17 %
3	Expression of disagreement	7	11 %
4	Identification of problem	6	8 %
5	Statement of difficulties	-	-
6	Consequences	1	1 %
	Total	70	100 %
	indirect+direct		

Nguyen, 2005, p. 47-48

From the data analysis, it was found that whatever the critics that Mahfud MD gives,

he must accomplish it by giving correction. The indirect criticism strategy was dominantly used by Mahfud MD. This way of criticizing has become the model of about how a good critic should be given. For example, when someone is showing a disagreement or even disapproval towards a statement, someone should give correction as to show which one is the correct one in order to show of why someone is disagreed to a statement. The table shows that 50% of the criticisms are dominated by giving correction. And all the utterances were uttered by using the bald-on-record politeness strategy. There was no wonder, because in the case of giving criticizes Mahfud MD was in the felicitous condition. He was invited to the show (Indonesia Lawyer's Club) because he was an expert of Indonesian law, and was considered felicitous to give critics towards law issue. As he was also a lecturer, he got used to give explanation about a certain material, proved by the correction that Mahfud MD repeatedly given during his critics. Mahfud MD was blatantly giving negative evaluation, identifying problem, telling disapproval and expressing disagreement, but he always accompanied and completed his critics by giving correction. It was very helpful to show critics by giving correction in order to give reasonable critics to someone's statement or idea. This made the way Mahfud MD gives critics became a good model of how to give critics.

The bald-on-record politeness strategy was applied by Mahfud MD as to give clear explanation and avoid the interlocutors from assuming what Mahfud MD said. Brown and Levinson (1987, in Nadar, 2009, p. 38) stated the benefits or advantages of using the bald-on-record strategy, they are as this following:

1. He can enlist public pressure against the addressee or in support of himself.
2. He can get credit for honesty, for indicating that he trusts the addressee.
3. He can get credit for outspokenness.
4. Avoiding the danger of being seen to be a manipulator.

5. He can avoid the danger of being misunderstood.
6. He can have opportunity to pay back in face whatever he potentially takes away by FTA (Face Threatening Act).

Bald on-record politeness strategy was used when threat to the hearer's face is very small (e.g., in phrases such as come in and sit down) or in a situation when the speaker was more powerful than the hearer. Results of this study indicated that the choice of a criticism strategy and the directness level were highly influenced by the relative power of the speaker, social distance between interlocutors, and rank (degree of imposition). Mahfud MD had many experiences in law cases, he was once appointed as the chairman of the Constitutional Court in 2008, which was the highest court in Indonesia, whether or not all suspected were sentenced jailed are decided in the Constitutional Court. Mahfud MD was considered as someone who experienced many law cases.

The analysis demonstrated that there was a relatively low preference for indirect strategies (it was only correction criticism strategy that Mahfud applied during the critic), when criticism was directed towards hearer, there were many direct criticisms employed by Mahfud MD who hold higher power status than the addressees. It was just like the situation where a professor has the right to criticize the students because he has a felicitous condition to do so. The same situation happens when Mahfud MD gave his critics, it was just like criticizing his junior, or his students, and he has the right to do so. It can be concluded that the assessment of the amount of face threat, according to (Brown & Levinson, 1987), depends predominantly on the relative power of the speaker, the social distance between interlocutors, and rank (the degree of imposition).

The findings of this study showed that Mahfud MD did not use any other types in the indirect criticism but correction. Correction was used as the strategy and was used most frequent or dominantly. In other

words, Mahfud MD chose to express his critics with direct criticism strategy, and accompanied with correction as the indirect criticism strategy. Almost all the critics were in this pattern. Such of this pattern is called as a well-given criticism is a criticism that can help clear up a problem, lessen an irritation, and help someone else reach a goal or overcome a problem. Stating a problem clearly and giving correction at the same time remaining attentive to the relational implication (Tracy, et al. 2006, p. 46).

REFERENCES

- Adhy, B. (2018). *Profil MAhfud MD, Pengalaman di Bidang Politik serta Sederet Riwayat Pendidikannya*. Retrieved from <https://jogja.tribunnews.com/2018/08/09/profil-mahfud-md-pengalaman-di-bidang-politik-serta-sederet-riwayat-pendidikannya?page=4>.
- Amin, Ang Rijal. (2020). Mengkritik Omnibus Law Memakai Teori Mahfud MD, Sang Menkopolkam Sendiri. Mojok.co. <https://mojok.co/ara/esai/mengkritik-omnibus-law-memakai-teori-mahfud-md-sang-menko-polhukam-sendiri/>
- Asih, I. N. (2014). Tindak Tutur Mengkritik Dan Strategi Kesantunan Dalam Acara Sentilan Sentilun Di Metro Tv. *Universitas Sebelas Maret*. Retrieved from <https://digilib.uns.ac.id/dokumen/detail/42533/Tindak-Tutur-Mengkritik-Dan-Strategi-Kesantunan-Dalam-Acara-Sentilan-Sentilun-Di-Metro-Tv>
- Brown & Levinson. (1987). *Politeness Some Universals Language Usage* (first). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Farnia, H. Q. A. S. and S. (2015). A Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Act of Suggestion among Iranian Native Speakers of Farsi. *JELTA*, 2(2), 48-61.
- Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face to Face Behavior. In *Pantheon Books*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO97811074>

- 15324.004
- Handayani, K. W. (2017). The Politeness Strategies of Criticizing Utterance by The Students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta. *Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta*, 2. Retrieved from <http://eprints.ums.ac.id/49372/>
- Hart, R. P. (2016). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. USA: Routledge.
- Himmawati, L. A. and D. R. (2016). Respon Dosen Terhadap Ketidaksantunan Bertutur Mahasiswa. *Prosiding Seminar PPM*. Retrieved from www.unesa.ac.id
- Hoa, H. T. X. (2007). Criticizing behaviors by the Vietnamese and the American: Topics, Social Factors and Frequency. *VNU Journal of Science, Foreign Languages*, (Department of English-American Language and Culture, College of Foreign Languages,).
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. London: Longman.
- Jauhari, E. (2018). *Kritik dalam Masyarakat Jawa: Sebuah Kajian Pemberdayaan Fungsi Bahasa sebagai Sarana Kontrol Sosial*. 2(Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242617251_kritik_dalam_masyarakat_jawa_sebuah_kajian_pemberdayaan_fungsi_bahasa_sebagai_sarana_kontrol_sosial).
- Kayed, Al Murad. (2019). A Socio-Pragmatic Study of Speech Act of Criticism in Jordanian Arabic. *European Journal of Scientific Research* ISSN 1450-216X / 1450-202X Vol. 153 No 1 May, 2019, pp. 105-117 <http://www.europeanjournalofscientificresearch.com>
- Min, S.-C. (2008). Study on the Differences of Speech Act of Criticism in Chinese and English. In *US-China Foreign Language*, March 2008.
- Mulac, A., Seibold, D. R., & Farris, J. L. (2000). Female and male Managers' and Professionals' Criticism Giving: Differences in Language Use and Effects. *Journal of Language & Social Psychology*, 19(4), 389-415.
- Nadar, F. . (2009). *Pragmatik dan Penelitian Pragmatik* (1st ed.). Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Nguyen, T.-M. (2005). Criticizing and Responding to Criticism in a Foreign Language: A study of Vietnamese learners of English. *National Institute of Education (NIE): Singapore*.
- Nofrita, M. (2016). *No Title*. *Jurnal Pen*(ISSN. 2527-6018).
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Act: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Setiawan, S. (2020). *Kritik Seni – Pengertian, Fungsi, Jenis, Bentuk, Metode, Tahapan, Para Ahli*. (Guru Pendidikan.com). Retrieved from <https://www.gurupendidikan.co.id/>
- Tracy, Karen. Susan Robinson, D. V. D. (2006). "Good" and "Bad" Criticism: A Descriptive Analysis. *Journal of Communication*, Volume 37, Pages 46-59.
- Vanderveken, S. &. (1985). *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic* (p. 237). p. 237. Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English Speech Act Verbs*. A Semantic Dictionary. Marrickville: Academic Press Australia.
- Wink. (2017). Biografi Mahfud MD, Profil Beserta Biodata Lengkap. Posted on 22th of January 2017, edited on 23th of October 2019. <https://www.biografiku.com/biografi-mahfud-md/>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics* (First Edit). New York: Oxford University Press.