TYPES AND FUNCTIONS OF POLITENESS VIOLATION IN THE COURT SESSION "KOPI SIANIDA"

(Tipe dan Fungsi Pelanggaran Kesantunan pada Pengadilan Kasus "KOPI SIANIDA")

Inestie Printa Elisya

Pascasarjana Program Studi Ilmu Linguistik FIB Universitas Andalas, Padang ineselisya16@gmail.com

(Naskah diterima: 28 Januari 2018, Disetujui: 12 April 2018)

Abstract

The court session is a formal legal meeting in which evidence about crimes. In session process, all of need is cooperation from all participants in order to make clear the case. This writing is aimed at identifying the types of politeness violated by the participant in the court session "KOPI SIANIDA". The data are all the linguistic aspects involved in these sessions. In collecting the data, observational method with note-taking, recording and taking picture. The analysis is done by referential method related to the concept proposed by Oktavianus and Revita (2013). Having analyzed the data, it is found that there are four types and four functions indicated as politeness violation. The types are (1) politeness in expressing; (2) politeness in being emotional; (3) politeness in asking; and (4) politeness in refusal. The functions are (1) expressive; (2) informative; (3) descriptive; and (4) argumentative.

Key words: crimes, language, politeness, the court session, violation

Abstrak

Pengadilan merupakan pertemuan hukum formal tempat suatu kejahatan dibuktikan. Dalam proses mengadili tersebut, kerjasama semua pihak dibutuhkan agar ditemukanya titik terang suatu perkara. Dalam tulisan ini dideskripsikan tipe tipe pelanggaran yang tercermin dari bentuk-bentuk kebahasaan dalam sidang kasus "KOPI SIANIDA". Data adalah semua bentuk kebahasaan yang dituturkan oleh partisipan. Pengambilan data dilakukan dengan metode simak, teknik catat, rekam dan interview. Analisis data dilakukan dengan metode padan pragmatik dan padan referensial yang dihubungkan dengan konsep yang dikemukakan Oktavianus dan Revita (2013). Hasil analisis dipaparkan secara deskriptif. Dari hasil analisis ditemukan empat tipe dan empat fungsi yang termasuk dalam pelanggaran kesantunan. Tipe pelanggaran kesantunan yang ditemukan, yaitu: (1) kesantunan berekspresi; (2) kesantunan saat emosi; (3) kesantunan meminta; dan (4) kesantunan menolak. Fungsi bahasa dari pelanggaran kesantunannya adalah: (1) ekspresif; (2) informatif; (3) deskriptif; dan (4) argumentatif.

Kata Kunci: kejahatan, bahasa, kesantunan, pengadilan, pelanggaran

1. Introduction

One of the main functions of language is a tool of communication (Thomas and Wareign, 1999). As a tool of communication, language is used not only to utter something, but also to do something. In communication, people usually use some strategies in order to make their intention and their communication goal achieved.

Communication is a very complicated process. In formal occasions, people tend to use formal expressions to show politeness. It shows especially, between new acquaintances. The strategy is one of the topics in pragmatics which discusses about language use. One of the topics in pragmatics is politeness.

Politeness can be at once understood as a social phenomenon, a mean to achieve good interpersonal relationships, and a norm imposed by social conventions. In many ways, politeness is universal. Speaker of different languages use it as a final resort, and it is recognized as a norm in all societies.

Human have the potential to apply threat to someone's face. In linguistics, it is known as face threatening act (FTA). So, people have their own way to avoid it. Mostly, people tend to use politeness strategy. Unfortunately, people still do it. They do some violations for some reasons. The violations can be found in people's conversation. Many speakers expect the hearers to give their contribution in speaking. The contribution should informative and relevant to the conversation. Unfortunately, many speakers did not give their contribution as it is required. Many speakers speak unclear. If the speakers do it intentionally, it means politeness violation. This unclear is often found in special place. One of the places is in the court.

According to Oktavianus (2008:98), politeness can be seen as a sincere desire to do good to others. Sincere desire here means it can be in a form of verbal language and non verbal language. Polite means we do not offend others. Polite in one community is not necessarily considered polite in other communities.

In the Court session "KOPI SIANIDA", some of the participants do not always observe politeness principle. Participants do violation for some reasons. It is also influenced by some contextual factors. The problems in this research are politeness violations committed by participants (judges, defendant, public prosecutors, advocates, experts and eyewitnesses), especially the types and functions of each utterance.

Politeness of an utterance could be marked by segmental and suprasegmental form (Oktavianus and Revita, 2013). Segmental form consist of the words that the existence influences the politeness. These words could increase or decrease the level of meaning. The choice of words, utterances including diction reflect much to their politeness (Oktavianus and Revita, 2013).

There are four segmental aspects of politeness. They are the use of word, the use of particles, the use of greetings, and the use of hedges. Suprasegmental form refers to external factors (non linguistics) such as intonation and gestures. Although the utterance uttered with long sentences but he/she denies the other factors such as intonation and gestures, so it will change the meaning of utterance.

2. Methods

A method is a kind of systematical work plan in order to make the research work become easier, so it can achieved its main purpose (Sudaryanto, 1993). There are several steps in conducting this research. They are design of the research, source of data, the method and technique of collecting data, the method and technique of analyzing data and the method and technique of presenting the result of analysis.

2.1. Design of the Research

In order to make well organized research, the research used qualitative-descriptive research. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993), qualitative investigates the quality of relationship, activities, situation or materials. The researcher analyzed politeness violation in the court session "KOPI SIANIDA". According to Sudaryanto (1993), qualitative is based on the data which are words not about the number.

The descriptive approach was used because it involves the collection of data for describing existing condition. This research is conducted descriptively-qualitatively. According to Sudaryanto (1993), descriptive research is based on the fact toward language phenomena of the speaker's speech in certain area. Descriptive analysis is based on speaker's utterance. Pragmatics is a study that explores how the unsaid is recognized as a part of what is communicated.

2.2 Source of Data

Data in this research are verbal language. This utterance can be found in many spheres. In this research, the writer takes court session. The writer focuses on Politeness Violation used by participants in the court session of "KOPI SIANIDA". Then, the writer takes all conversation from the participants. Every person has many ways to make a good communication. Politeness strategy is a good choice to prevent the conflict, but there are still politeness violations.

2.3. Methods and Techniques of Collecting Data

This is a descriptive research by using qualitative approach. In the process of gathering data, writer uses observational method with non participant observational technique. According to Sudaryanto (1993), observational method is observing the language used in the research. The writer watches "live" on television and records it. The writer watches the video several times and makes some notes. The writer is interested in analyzing this session because it was an interesting topic and hot issue now. The session is a face-to face conversation which is full of politeness violation phenomena. Politeness violation is the essential element to

be investigated in this session because this is related to law sphere.

2.4. Methods and Techniques of Analyzing Data

The second step is analyzing the data. The writer uses referential and translational identity method which is related to the types of politeness proposed by Oktavianus and Revita (2013). Referential method is used to figure out the reference of the data by describing the situational context of the data to determine the types in politeness violation.

Firstly, the writer described the text based on its context, and then identified the part of conversation that violates the politeness. After the data are transcribed, they are classified based on categories of politeness which is violated.

2.5. Methods and Techniques of Presenting the Result of Analysis

In presenting the result of the analysis, the writer applied both formal and informal method. The technique which is used in informal method is verbal statement where the analysis will be presented by using ordinary words or natural language. Then, the technique which is used in formal method is symbol or sign (Sudaryanto, 1993).

In the court, all of the participants of that session have to keep quiet and obey the rules. In many sessions, all of the personnels run their job in order to make the decision. The personnel are The Judges (MH), Public Prosecutors (*JPU*), Advocates or lawyers (PH), Clerks (PP), and defendant. But this session was different. The session didn't run well. Most of participant there felt angry, sad, and hectic.

In this study, the writer analyses the politeness violation of all the participants in the court. The utterance will be classified into the politeness principle by Oktavianus and Revita. This research aims to describe the spoken used in hearing kopi sianida session which is shows politeness violation and the cause. The object of this study is the utterance from eye witness

and expert. Those data are in the forms of video which contain the recording of the hearing "KOPI BERSIANIDA" live on television and records it.

3. Results and Discussions

The court session is illustrated as a hot and very tensed situation. Each public prosecutor argument with the other side (advocates) by using strong arguments. This case happened because they (the participants) want to prove their arguments and they want the judges to believe them.

Example:

Datum 1

Description: Pengacara menghadirkan seorang saksi yang pernah tidak sadarkan diri akibat minum kopi. 'The lawyer brought in a witness who had once lost consciousness due to drinking coffee'.

JPU: Pada waktu saksi meminum kopi, usia saksi waktu itu berapa tahun? 'When you were drinking coffee, how old were you?'

S: Saya menikah umur a...25 tahun, tahun 1991, saya lahir 10 nov 1965 jadi saya 25 'I am married when I was 25 years old, I was born on November,10 1965 so I was 25'

JPU: Tahun?'So, you were 25 years old?'

S: 25 tahun menikah'I have been married for 25 years'

JPU: Usia pada saat minum kopi?'How old were you dranking the coffee?'

S : Saya tadi kan bilang saya waktu itu sudah 25 tahun artinya saya kawin 25 tahun saya jugak disitu bekerja. 'I told you that I have already been 25 years, it means that I have been married and I was working there'.

This conversation involved public prosecutor and witness. The witness was from lawyer's side. This interaction occurred at the 3th session. On that day, Public Prosecutor 2

asked about witness's age. JPU asked it because the witness had same experience with Mirna. Witness did not answer JPU's question by saying "Saya menikah umur a...25 tahun, tahun 1991 saya lahir 10 nov 1965 jadi saya 25". Although she mentioned a number, but that number was not the witness's age. In these dialogues, it could be seen that the witness was acting as if she hide the number of her age.

Based on the datum, the utterances belonged to politeness violation. The politeness that was violated was expressive politeness. According to Oktavianus and Revita (2013) expressive politeness was related to the way people spoke. Many people talked what was based on their mind. They should watch what they talked about. They must talk politely.

Then, JPU asked again to the eyewitness. JPU asked it in order to gain the information about the age of witness. The clue of this problem is the age. JPU started his question by saying "tahun". JPU repeated the question because the eyewitness's statement was unclear at the time. Eyewitnes' testimony "Saya menikah umur a...25 tahun, tahun 1991 saya lahir 10 Nov 1965 jadi saya 25" was unclear because its ambiguity.

The statement "Jadi saya 25" showed a liberate intention from the eyewitness to confuse the judges. The eyewitness deliberately prolonged the statement or the clause of her testimony without clear meaning construction. This is an indicator of confusing the judges. It was confirmed and proven by the lawyer at the end of the session. The lawyer concluded that mirna's death concealing something else. One of other factors as the cause of the death was pregnancy.

Factor in this utterance was ends. The witness covered her age by telling her marriage date and irrelevant information to the question. The eyewitness covered by saying "Saya menikah umur a... 25 tahun tahun 1991 saya lahir 10 november 1965 jadi saya 25". The eyewitnes' testimony was about her marriage date. She told that she had been

married for 25 years. She was married when she was 25 years old in 1991. JPU realized that the eyewitness hid the information. JPU asked it three times. The eyewitness kept on her statement. If the judge knew the witness's age at the time when she drank coffee and got ill, the judge could see clearly the difference between her cases to Mirna's.

Function in this utterance was informative. According to Leech (1993), informative function is using language to convey the information about others internal condition. The witness used language to convey the information to others about her condition. Her condition was not the real condition. She tried to cover her age by saying her other information. The meaning of other information was unrelated information about her condition at the time.

Datum 2

Description: Pengacara menghadirkan seorang saksi (RS) yang pernah tidak sadarkan diri

akibat minum kopi. 'The Lawyer brought in a witness (RS) who had once

lost consciousness due to

drinking coffee'.

PH: Pengadilan ini dan khususnya kami juga mengalami kesulitan ataukurang pengalaman mengenai orang-orang yang mati karena minum kopi. Dan sangat mengherankan memang, seorang minum kopi langsung itu langsung terlentang dan mati. Apakah sodara punya pengalaman yang sama pernah meminum kopi lantas terlentang dan jatuh dan sebagainya. 'This court, especially for us, are also having difficulties or lack of experience about the death of people caused by drinking coffee. And it is really confusing; a person who drank coffee immediately fell on her back and died'. Do you have the same experience of drinking coffee and falling down, etc'

S:Diam (bengong) 'Silent" (Confused expression)

PH: Apakah sodara punya pengalaman, meminum kopi setelah itu jatuh? 'Have you had any experience of drinking coffee and falling down?'

S: Benar, saya bisa menceritakan apa yang terjadi 'Right, I can explain it'.

This conversation involved a lawyer and a witness. This interaction occurred at the 3th session. The lawyer brought the witness (RS) to give information about her experience in drinking coffee that resulted in her unconsciousness. The witness recalled that her heart was pounding, her mouthed foamed and she lost consciousness after drinking coffee. Then, she was brought to the hospital and she was diagnosed with hepatitis C.

On that day, the lawyer asked about witness's experience. In the beginning of conversation, the lawyer started by stating their lack of experience on cases of died because of drinking coffee. Then, the lawyer continued by saying "Dan sangat mengherankan memang, seorang minum kopi langsung itu langsung terlentang dan mati". The utterance from lawyer 1 is considered as politeness violation. The speaker violated the internal aspect. Conforming to Oktavianus and Revita (2013), internal aspect can be seen from linguistics aspect. We can see it from the choice of utterance including the diction selection. The word someone (human) who died did not fulfill the collocating meaning between the word someone (human) and the word die.

The word *die* has 2 components meaning and it is more appropriate to be used in broader context; for animals and plants. Someone (human), would be more appropriate to be used with the words passed away. The word die has 2 components and it is suitable with larger contexts like the animate (animals) and not animates (plants). This is related to emotive meaning. According to Kridalaksana (1999),

the difference of value caused the differences in used.

Based on the explanation above, it could be said that the dialogue belonged to politeness violation. The speaker violated politeness in being emotional. According to Oktavianus and Revita (2013), in politeness in being emotional, there is an overflow of emotion. The form can be seen from happy, sad, love, brave, and anger sentences. Sentence "Dan sangat mengherankan memang, seorang minum kopi langsung itu langsung terlentang dan mati" is a form of emotional fluctuation from the lawyer. The lawyer expressed his emotion and stated his surprise about a person who fell and died after drinking coffee.

After the lawyer expressed his emotion, the eyewitness just kept silent with confused expression. She did not response the lawyer's statement. The lawyer continued it by saying "Apakah sodara punya pengalaman, meminum kopi setelah itu jatuh". The lawyer asked that question to the eyewitness, if she had some experiences of drinking coffee and falling down.

Then, the eyewitness conveyed her experience. She took long time to tell it. At the end of her session, she made a statement. She stated her result from different hospital that she was pregnant. The lawyer closed his chance by saying Ini kan perlu kami. kesaksian sodara, ini karena Mirna kan juga baru kawin mungkin juga kan. Kita juga gak tau karena belum diperiksa apakah dia hamil dan sebagainya atau ada kaitan dan sebagainya. Ya jadi inilah untuk menyakinkan kepada pengadilan karena ada peristiwa seperti itu, yang sampai sekarang kita gak tau kenapa, yang kita selalu bertanya-tanya kenapa.

There were 2 factors that influenced the witness to violate politeness: Setting and Key. Setting means in the court. The lawyer utilized the place and situation as the place for stating his feeling. He got the first chance to explain or ask his eyewitness. The factor of the lawyer's statement "Dan sangat mengherankan"

memang, seorang minum kopi langsung itu langsung terlentang dan mati" occured because in the previous trial, there was no the witness yet.

Eyewitness here means the lack of information about the victim of coffee. Therefore, the lawyer tried to present the witness to convince the judge (key) that there is such an incident which always became a question. The lawyer tried to conclude that there was another possibility which causes mirna's death. One of the similar possibilities with the witness accident was pregnancy. The lawyer was brave to conclude that case because there was no investigation yet.

The function was expressive. According to Leech (1993), expressive is one of functions which uses language to express the condition of individual internal. The lawyer tried to present the eyewitness in order to show that there was a same case like Mirna. RS as the eyewitness had a same condition like mirna. Mirna who drank coffee immediately fell on her back and passed away like the eyewitness (RS) who had once lost consciousness due to drinking coffee. Eyewitness confessed that her age same with Mirna at the time. These similarities became the key for the lawyer to convince the judges.

The speaker (lawyer) used language to utter his individual thought. He tried to lead the witness by saying his astonishment. The lawyer expressed his astonishment by saying "Dan sangat mengherankan memang, seorang minum kopi langsung itu langsung terlentang dan mati". The lawyer could do it because there was no autopsy yet. If there was no autopsy yet, so the defendant's team could give another possibility

Datum 3

Description: Pengacara menanyakan beberapa pertanyaan kepada saksi ahli. Ia menanyakan tentang salah satu topik di Psikologi. 'The lawyer asked some questions to the expert. He

asked about one of topics in psychology'.

- PH: Baik...Saya mau bertanya tentang rasionalitas kejahatan. Coba sodara jelaskan bagaimana! 'Well, so I want to ask about rationality of crime. Can you explain how?'
- SA: Maksud dari pertanyaan bapak apa?'What do you mean Sir?'
- PH: Pertanyaannya adalah... kan ada yang dimaksud dalam psikologi bahwa rasional kejahatan artinya berapa alasan-alasan rasional yang dimilliki seorang individu ketika dia melakukan kejahatan. 'The question is... there is a term in psychology that rational crime, it means that there are some rational reasons that person have in doing criminal case'
- SA: Saya tidak dalam kapasitas untuk menjawab pertanyaan itu pak, saya psikolog klinis pak. 'It is not my capacity, Sir. I am psychologist Sir'
- PH: Anda tidak bisa menjawab? 'You cannot answer it?'
- SA: Bukan psikolog forensik, bukan psikolog kejahatan bukan psikolog criminal'I am not forensic psychologist, criminal psychologist, or crime Psychologist'
- PH: Klinis ... (mengangguk-angguk) 'Clinic..... (nodding)'
- SA: Saya psikolog klinis pak, tadi sudah saya jelaskan profesi saya, lingkup kerjanya bagaimana. 'Iam psychologist, Sir.. I have told you about my profession and the scope'.
- PH: Baik..sayang sekali ini karena kita harapkan sebenarnya ini kan kasus hukum bukan soal klinis. Kita bukan mencari penyakit si Jesica tetapi apakah kaitan hubungannya dengan kasus hukum'Well, what a pity! It is not what we want. This is the law case not about clinical. We do not look at Jesicca's disease but we want to find the relation to the law case'

SA: Saya pikir itu ada pakar lainya yang akan menjawab....yang kompeten...'I think that there is other experts who will answer it'

This conversation involved the lawyer and expert (psychologist). Psychologist was from JPU's side. This interaction occurred at the 12th session. On that day, the lawyer asked some questions. He asked about one of topics in psychology. He asked about rationality of crime. The lawyer started his question by saying "Baik... Saya mau bertanya tentang rasionalitas kejahatan. Coba sodara jelaskan bagaimana!". The expert did not answer the lawyer's question by saying "Maksud dari pertanyaan bapak apa?".

The lawyer repeated his question by saying "Pertanyaanya adalah ... kan ada yang dimaksud dalam psikologi bahwa rasional kejahatan artinya berapa alasan-alasan rasional yang dimilliki seorang individu ketika dia melakukan kejahatan". The expert did not answer it because the question was not her capacity. She mentioned that she is a psychologist. The lawyer kept asking by saying "Anda tidak bisa menjawab?". The expert confirmed that she is a psychologist by saying "Bukan psikolog forensik, bukan psikolog kejahatan bukan psikolog kriminal. Then, the lawyer continued by saying "Klinis". He said it while nodding her head.

The expert looked at the lawyer. The lawyer did not satisfy with the expert's explanation. The expert continued her explanation by saying "Saya psikolog klinis pak, tadi sudah saya jelaskan profesi saya, lingkup kerjanya bagaimana". The Lawyer kept asking the question although the expert mentioned that the question asked by its lawyer was more appropriate to be asked to a psychologist of crime.

Finally, the lawyer said "Baik...sayang sekali ini karena kita harapkan sebenarnya ini kan kasus hukum bukan soal klinis. Kita bukan mencari penyakit si jessica tetapi

apakah kaitan hubunganya dengan kasus hukum". Statements of the lawyer make face of expert changing. Face here meant it was included to Face Threatening Act (FTA). This case belonged to politeness violation because the lawyer said that the clinic was not related to this case.

In this case, the lawyer thought that the presence of psychologist here was not crucial. It could be seen from statement which was said by the lawyer. It belonged to politeness violation. The politeness that was violated was politeness in refusal. According to Oktavianus and Revita (2013), there were differences like social, culture and psychological background and physical environment that lead the rejection. Rejection could emerge and cause offense. It could be seen from lawyer reduce the expert's existence.

The factor was Speech Topic. According to Oktavianus and Revita (2013), speech topic is the main topic in a speech event. The lawyer asked about rationality of crime. That question was not the expert's field. The expert did not answer it. She stated that it was not her capacity to answer the question. The lawyer's request was risky for the expert. The lawyer forced the expert to answer his question. He stated that the expert could not answer his question. At the end of his session, he closed with his previous topic. He mocked the expert's existence.

The function of this utterance was argumentative. Lawyer used language to judge expert's explanation. At the beginning of the session, he started his session with the term in psychology. He asked about rationality of crime. The expert was little bit surprise by his questions. She asked what the lawyer means by his question. He explained that his question was the term in psychology. He assumed that the expert could answer it. He kept arguing until the expert answered his question. At the end of his session, he made the statement. He mocked the expert's existences. The expert heard the lawyer's statement. The expert looked annoyed with the lawyer. She did not want to

respond the lawyer. She just saying "Saya pikir itu ada pakar lain yang akan menjawab..yang kompeten".

Datum 4

Description: Jaksa Penuntut Umum 1 m e l a n j u t k a n pertanyaanya.

'Public Prosecutor 1 continued his questions'.

JPU 1: Oke... tadi sodara katakan kalau gejala-gejala tergantung racun. Kalau orang meninggal karena sianida?

'ok... You said that the symptoms depend on the poison. How about the symptoms of people who die because of cyanide?

SA: Gejala keracunan ada yang kronis dan akut. Kalau meninggal berati akut. Kalau kronis, si orang perokok itu dimaksukkan sianida dalam tubuh. Hennya tinggi dan dalam rokok itu ada 300 bahan berbahaya salah satunva sianida. Makanya dokterdokter senang kalau orang merokok bikin dia laku pak.

'The symptoms are chronic and critical. If someone died it is means that critical. If it is chronic, smoker by smoking like put cyanide into their body'.

This conversation involved JPU 1 and the expert. JPU asked the expert's statement before. The expert told that the symptoms depended on the poison. JPU replied it by asking how about the symptoms of people who died because o cyanide. The expert answered and mentioned the two symptoms. Then, the expert stated something by saying "Makanya dokter- dokter senang kalau orang

merokok bikin dia laku pak". It was included as politeness violation. The politeness that was violated was politeness in expressing. The expert spoke at will. The way he proclaimed "doctors" showed that he thought that all doctors are the same.

The factor that influenced the speaker to violate the politeness was participant. He is proud of his profession as a doctor. He was too happy to tell about his explanation. He forgot the important thing about what should be answered. He just spent the time. He told about his peers. He as a doctor, described to the audiences that all doctors were the same. The doctors like if their patients smoke because it will profit them. The other factor was speech norm. The doctor should not mention that all doctors were the same. He mentioned that all doctors like their patients smoking. He gave an illustration that it will profit them. The statement was not true at all. Many doctors did not like their patients smoking. They warned their patients with their own way. The function of this utterance was informative. He conveyed to the audience that all the doctors were happy if the patients smoke. Indirectly, the expert showed that he was that type of doctor.

Datum 5

Description: Pengacara 2 menanyakan kesimpulan dari saksi ahli.

'Lawyer 2 asked about the expert's conclusion'

PH: Anda bukan saksi fakta, anda itu menilai berkas yang sudah basi testimonium de auditu artinya

'You are not a fact witness, You judge a stale file, it means testimonium de auditu" and....

PH: Istilah hukum...Sarjana Hukum tak mengerti, kok ndak mengerti itu.. Profesor lagi .

> 'It is a law saying... a law Legal scholar do not

understand, why do not you understand that.. moreover a Professor'

The conversation involved the lawyer and the expert. This interaction occurred at 16th session. The lawyer uttered his feeling by asking "Sodara ahli saya lanjutkan, berhubungan dengan angka 11 tadi yang dibacakan. Sodara selalu dari sisi yang jelek saja Jessica dinilai, Saya ingin tanya apakah tidak ada sisi yang bagus untuk dinilai?".

Then, the lawyer continued his statement. The lawyer started with the statement stated by the expert before. The lawyer stated it by saying "Kan anda seorang ahli harusnya dependent. Anda kan tidak dihadirkan disini kan harusnya independent ini yang jelek saja sodara ungkapkan yang negatif yang sisi baiknya gak diungkapkan".

The lawyer accused the expert as being bias. The expert just mentioned the negative side. It was included as politeness violation. The politeness that was violated was politeness in being emotional. The lawyer was angry to the expert and thought that the expert was not professional. He also added that he should be independent here, not dependent. The lawyer asked it because the expert was one of the team which checked Jessica too. So, the lawyer's hope was for the expert to forget it.

The expert should answer the question and explain both of Jessica's characteristic. The expert answered by saying "Buat apa saya mengungkapkan sisi baiknya, tentu saja ada sisi baiknya". The expert questioned why should he mention the good side, of course Jessica had a good side. The lawyer wanted the expert to tell the good side of Jessica. He had the intention to profit the Jessica. It was proven, because of emotion the lawyer accidentally mentioned that he wanted the expert to profit Jessica. The lawyer stated by saying "menguntungkan dia". If the expert told Jessica's good side, it would ease Jessica's punishment.

The expert explained that he just stated the all chronology side. All the chronology side that the lawyer stated were ugly but supportive. The expert stated it clearly in front of the judges by saying "Dalam sisi kronologis ini semuanya..sisi-sisi yang bapak bilang jelek itu mendukung". But, the lawyer persisted. Then, saying "Selalu yang negatif saja diungkap". It was included as politeness violation. The politeness that was violated was politeness in being emotional. The lawyer was emotional, so he cannot control it.

The lawyer also related it to the way expert's work. The lawyer did not like the expert conveying about Jessica's gesture. The lawyer forgot that the expert was a criminologist. Criminologist would check all possibilities including gesture.

Then, the lawyer stated again by saying "Sodara tidak melihat langsung, mendengar dan mengalamipun bisa menyimpulkan angka 11". It was included as politeness violation. The lawyer showed his disagreement about the expert's conclusion. The politeness that was violated was politeness in expressing. The lawyer did not believe that expert could conclude the point number 11.

The lawyer was free to express and speak in front of the judges. He tried to state his disagreement with expert's conclusion. The speaker was very emotional at that time. Then, the expert explained that number 11 was the combination. The lawyer did not stop yet. He explained about the term in law. He stated it by saying "Anda bukan saksi fakta, anda itu menilai berkas yang sudah basi testimonium de auditu artinya" and "istilah hukum... Sarjana hukum tak mengerti, kok ndak mengerti itu.. profesor lagi". The lawyer stated it explicitly. The implicit utterance is more polite than explicit one (Pranowo, 2012).

Testimonium de auditu meant testimony or in complete sentence, the information based on what he listened. Testimonium de auditu in law was not legal evidence. The lawyer stated it because the expert worked based on BAP's result and the evidence. It was included as

politeness violation. The politeness that was violated was politeness in expressing. The lawyer was free to speak but he forgot that expert did some observation to Jessica. The expert did interview to Jessica, so it was fair if the expert conclude that conclusion. The lawyer spoke based on what was on his mind.

Those utterances were included as politeness violation too. The lawyer expressed his feeling rudely. He takes on the case personally. The politeness that was violated was politeness in expressing. JPU tried to mediate them by saying "Keberatan yang mulia, ini penasehat hukum sudah emosi ini". Then, the expert gave his comment by saying "Ini gabenar ini". The expert realized that the lawyer got emotion. The expert knew that it is not right.

JPU suggested the lawyer to calm down by saying "Coba dong tenang..tenang". The chief of judges mediated them by saying "Coba saya ingatkan penasehat hukum agar jangan melontarkan yang sifatnya pribadi.". That statement occurred when the lawyer gave his critique to the expert. The lawyer stated it by saying "Istilah hukum... Sarjana hukum tak mengerti, kok ndak mengerti itu.. Profesor lagi". After that, the lawyer took the chance. He continued it by saying "Baik saya lanjutkan aja ya..ya prof ..kalau kita enakenak aja". The expert did not accept the lawyer's statement. He conveyed it by saying "Penasehat Hukum itu harus masuk kursus saya".

The factor of the two data was end. The lawyer persisted in order to provoke the expert. The lawyer wanted the expert to tell Jessica's good side. In fact, the expert still on his statement. This was triggered the lawyer's emotion. The lawyer cannot control his emotion. At the end, he insulted the expert. The following factor was participants and speech norm. The topic was about the judge's testimony. As an educated person, the lawyer should not speak and accuse the expert. All the participants in interaction should consider the ethics.

The function of the five data was Argumentative. The lawyer used language to

give his view about the way expert's work. He argued the expert's statement. He stated about the position of the expert. The expert should be independent. He conveyed that the expert only mentioned the negative side of Jessica. The expert explained that it was the way of his work. The sides that the lawyer's said were supportive in the case.

4. Conclusion

At the end of the analysis, the writer concluded that not all of types and function of politeness were violated by some participants in the court session "KOPI SIANIDA". Those violations were politeness in requesting, refusal, asking, directing, expressing, and politeness in being emotional. In violating the politeness, some participants were influenced by some contextual factors.

Among the six types of politeness, politeness in expressive is the most frequently violated. It appears in 21 utterances. The participants violate them by intentionally being insincere and untruth. The hearer can be mislead by their utterance. Most of participants violate this politeness to cover the truth, hide information and their secret. The speakers also violate this politeness to protect her/his self, protect someone else (their client; Jessica), to prove to Judges, to cover the truth, to hide the real feeling, and to hide real intention. Politeness in expressing was violated because the speaker did not give the hearer information that they need. It is also can by giving too much information or less information.

In conclusion, this study shows that in court session "KOPI SIANIDA" some participants create the utterance contain politeness violation. The writer has seen that it is necessary for some side to make the hearer flare up and emotion. This way applied in order to answer the question which they did not feel comfortable to answer. By violating those politeness, the problem of this session become long, almost one year to finish this case. The judges proved that Jessica is the murderer. The public prosecutors and Judges try to find the

fact about Jessica's utterances. Jessica said that she was worse off by the police. In fact, all of Jessica's statement about her life in prison was not true at all.

5. Suggestion

In this research, all the research questions had been answered. This research of politeness violation investigated how people understood the nuances of communication which was not only helpful in avoiding misinterpretation, but could also reveal information about social and personal values and how to portray these to the people we communicate with.

Through this research, it was found that pragmatics research could be applied not only in linguistics but also in law sphere. The writer hopes that readers can underlie the importance of the proper choice of words to present politeness in court session, and examine the effects towards communication if people do not care about politeness violation. This article is expected to help readers to know about politeness. Politeness theory enables the researcher to identify, describe and measure when and where all participants should consider Hearer's face needs to create a good interaction with each other.

REFERENCES

Brown, Penelope & Stephen Levinson. 1987.

*Politeness: Some Universal of Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fraenkel, Jack, R. and Wallen, Norman E. 1993. *How to design and Evaluate Research in education. Second Edition.* New Jersey: McGraw Hill inc.

Kridalaksana, H. 1999. *Kelas Kata dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Gramedia Kridalaksana, H. 1984. *Kamus Linguistik*, edisi kedua. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Pranowo.2012. Berbahasa Secara Santun. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

Oktavianus, Revita. 2013. *Kesantunan dalam bahasa Minangkabau*. Padang: Minangkabau Press.

Revita, Ike. 2008. "Kesantunan dalam bahasa Minangkabau (Disertasi). Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Revita, Ike. 2009. "Faktor - Faktor Penanda Kesantunan dalam Permintaan Berbahasa Minangkabau (Kajian Pragmatik). Jurnal Bahasa, Bil 15, 74-92.

Sudaryanto.1993. *Metode dan Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Thomas, Linda dan Shan Wareing. (1999). Language, Society and Power. New York: Routledge