1. Introduction

Language, in its function, is a communication tool. Language is a good tool for delivering messages from speaker to hearer. In the context of public communication, oral and written languages have a broad and full interpretation. Especially in the political year, the candidate leaders will use language that can get a positive perception from the public. In this case, language can be politicized as political actors want (Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015). Positive perception is certainly present from the chosen diction, the intonation used, the accuracy of the momentum chosen and understanding the condition of the audience. A leader’s speech will be in the public spotlight. As simple as any language will result in multiple interpretations and provide a variety of perceptions in various interests. The main interest in political communication carried out by a leader is a positive perception of constituents and negative perceptions of political opponents.

The communication language used by a public leader must meet the rules of polite public language. Under any circumstances, a leader is still required to use good language. A good language is certainly when the seven aspects of language as mentioned by Beugrande, namely; cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situational and intertextuality (Robert de Beaugrande, 1981). From
several characteristics of linguistic aspects, it can be seen that language is analyzed not only as mere formal structural linguistics, but also language as seen in a broader realm of meaning and social context. Thus, language in this context is understood more deeply using discourse analysis.

Van Dijk classified the three elements for analyzing the text, those are language use, communication, and interaction. Whereas Fairclough had different terms for explaining in this analysis, they are description (text), interpretation (pragmatics) and explanation (the social and cultural context) (Rahimi & Riasati, 2011). Discourse analysis is not only explained in linguistics perspective but in social science and philosophy as well. Discourse studies that focus on "language" as an object become very important to understand by learners and language instructors. Discourse studies have concepts related to the relationship between language and social context, specific culture-ways of speaking and writing, and how to compile text in certain social and cultural situations (Brian Paltridge, 2012). According to Stef Slembrouck, discourse analysis is at least classified into 8 approaches used in constructing theories or methods of discourse analysis. These approaches include philosophical, linguistic, linguistic anthropological approaches, cultural studies, post-structuralism, social theory, and sociology (Purbani, 2009). According to Foucault discourse is all thought or writing that uses the same language to talk about a particular topic. Discourse includes the concepts used to understand it and the method used to examine it. Discourse can be found in the practice of everyday life when a group of people talk about the topic, for example in conversations, interviews, comments, speeches, writings, articles, announcements, parts of books and so on. But discourse is not just a collection of statements that are not stated openly, but rather a collection of utterances, sentences or statements that exist or occur and are determined by the social context as things that contribute to the sustainability of the social context.

Discourse Analysis has many branches in purposed analysis, i.e. Critical Discourse Analysis. In this case, Fairclough argued CDA related to systematic trans disciplinary analysis. It took place discourse and another element. Secondly, CDA is a systematic analysis of the text. Thirdly, CDA analyses the wrong social communication in discursive aspects (Norman Fairclough, n.d.). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a field that is used to analyze the written and spoken texts to explore the discursive sources of power, dominance inequality, and bias. It critically evaluates how these discursive sources are maintained and reproduced within specific social, political, and historical contexts (Sriwimon & Zilli, 2017). CDA is also as combination theories and methods in the case of discourse, social and cultural development in different social domain (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). CDA is a “ discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events, and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and process; to investigate how such practices, events, and texts arise out of and are ideologically shape the relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society itself a factor securing power and hegemony”. CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in social and political contexts (Sriwimon & Zilli, 2017; Gunawan & Sumarlam (2018).
CDA states about the connections discourse practices (Bukhari & Xiaoyang, 2013). Discourse practices include text, talk and visual. Discourse practice is always non-neutral and embedded in a social context. Hence, three interpretations of the term critical are found in the literature of CDA. First, the intention of the analyst what he wants to explore that actually decides the theoretical framework of CDA. For example, if one wants to uncover the hidden power relations, inequality, injustice, discrimination, bias, etc. embedded in the society through discourse, one has to apply the socio-cognitive approach and related framework to deal with the problem at hand. In CDA, ‘critical’ is usually taken to mean studying and taking issue with how dominance and inequality are reproduced through language use (Hussain, 2017). The Fairclough approach in CDA has attained the status of nucleus in CDA. In his earlier work Fairclough called his earlier approach to language and discourse critical language study. He described the aim of this approach as “a contribution to the general raising of consciousness of exploitative social relations through focusing upon language”. In his works, Fairclough sees the importance of CDA as a method to use alongside others in research on social and cultural change, and as a resource in struggles against exploitation and domination. He is mainly concerned with the study of power and institutional discourse, stressing the intertextuality of different forces of social practices. Fairclough model for CDA consists of three inter related processes of analysis tied to three inter related dimensions of discourse; a) The object of analysis (verbal, visual or verbal, and visual texts), b) The processes by means of which the object is produced and received (writing/speaking/designing and reading/listening/viewing) by human subjects, c) The socio-historical conditions which governs these processes.

He emphasizes that each of these discourse needs a different kind of analysis. He suggests text analysis (description), processing analysis (interpretation), and social analysis (explanation). Chouliaraki & Fairclough find that CDA of a communicative interaction sets out to show that the semiotic and linguistic features of the interaction are systematically connected with what is going on socially, and what is going on socially is indeed going on partly or completely semiotically or linguistically. This approach is beneficial to use as research methodology not only in the field of linguistics, Semiotics but also in Social Sciences at higher education level. It enables research to focus on the signifiers that make up the text, the specific signified linguistics selections, their juxtapositioning, their sequencing, and their layout and so on (Bukhari & Xiaoyang, 2013). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has been used as a basic discipline in education to provide answers to questions about the relationships between language, society, power, identity, ideology, politics, and culture (Rahimi & Riasati, 2011).

This research talks about Jokowi’s utterance in several moments of meeting with society. Joko Widodo or Jokowi is a president of the Indonesian Republic and one of the candidates in presidential election in 2019, against Prabowo, as another contestant. Some statements of Jokowi in Media, are genderuwo and sontoloyo. Both terminologies occur to satirize the other competitors in politic. Jokowi’s utterance is raised with some media viewed his statement. In the political year, media, as Krefting said, is a big role in constructing identity (Zulkifli, 2015). Identity here can be understood as an important issue many people concern to know and discus it.
Tuckman had a perspective that media can give another perception to lead social situation (Maghvira, 2017). Media, not only gives information but gives an explanation about the social problem as well (Kamasa, 2013), Likeker mentioned media as a tool in shaping and framing political communication (Xie & Ding, 2016), McLuhan stated media as extension of human’s mind (Susanti, 2015). Media gives information that leads to political and ideology interest (Jones, 2007). Media gives many interpretations and different hegemony in public perception. The problem of that statement stands to the position of Jokowi as a top leader in this state and country. His statements will show as a top figure to be followed by public. Moreover, the effect of media publishing and spreading the current information has been the main agenda to criticize the incumbent.

‘Sontoloyo’ and ‘Genderuwo’ are familiar words. Many people in many tribes of Indonesian Country have known the meaning. The focus of this study is the utterance of the leading person that can influence the different perception. Of course, the public will easily catch bad perception. The word expressed is not only as a meaning of the word itself but it has broader meaning to give many perspectives in political view. In some previous studies related with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Kusumawati states on his research that a language used by SBY (Soesilo Bambang Yudhoyono)-as a president of the Indonesian Republic from 2004-2014-is a symbol of national character. SBY speech reflected the smooth communication to engage the big cooperation of other countries. In this case, SBY tried to construct the social view, public opinion and public trust by means of expertise of language use. This research uses Systemic Functional Linguistics Halliday, ideational and textual function. This study indicated that SBY had high expertise in language to build public trust (Kusumawati, 2011). In addition, (Amin, 2014) indicated that language is not only as a message deliverer but it is as a social construct as well. Van Dijk model was used for analyzing the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This model focused on text, context, social cognition and social context (Amin, 2014). The different findings of this study compared to the previous studies laid down the use of regional language in the statement. The first, Jokowi-in political communication uses non Indonesian language. Whereas, the previous studies tend to the public language like Indonesian or English. The second, the previous study uses Van Dijk approach to analyze CDA but this study uses Fairclough approach.

2. Method

This research is included in the ranks of qualitative research. Qualitative research is descriptive research and tends to use analysis with an inductive approach. Richard classified this research as a group of discourse analysis, a part of content analysis. The procedure includes reviewing the transcripts, take note of a major feature, analyzing how the interaction is constructed and developing the analysis (Mackey & Gass, 2012). Process and meaning (subject perspective) are more highlighted in qualitative research. The theoretical foundation is used as a guide so that the research focus is in accordance with the facts in the field. In addition, the theoretical basis is also useful to provide an overview of the background of the research and as a material for discussing the results of the study. Fairclough offers a discourse model that contains three dimensions, namely text, discursive practice, and social practice (Elya Munfarida, 2014). Based on the partiality of the existing discourse
studies, Norman Fairclough seeks to anesthetize the concept of discourse that seeks to combine several traditions, namely linguistics, interpretive traditions, and sociology. In his theory, Fairclough offers a model of discourse that contains three dimensions, namely text, discursive practice, and social practice.

Each of these dimensions has its own territory and process and all three are dialectically related. The first dimension is text which is the result of the production process. The second is discursive practices related to the interaction of texts with individuals or communities in the form of production processes and interpretations. The third dimension is social practice or context which includes sociocultural practices in which the production process and interpretation takes place. These three dimensions are then analyzed with three different analysis models. Description is used to analyze text. Interpretation is used to analyze the production process and interpretation of the text. The explanation is used to analyze sociocultural practices that include situational, institutional, and social levels (Norman Fairclough, 1992).

The source of the data comes from the Jakarta Post online newspaper published on Jakarta / Fri, November 9, 2018 / 08:25 pm. The data analyzed are thirteen expressions containing the word ‘genderuwo’ and ‘sontoloyo’. Those words are expressed by Jokowi in a comment of some political moment and response of current issues from opposites.

3. Result and Discussion

The writer uses the Jakarta Post as the main source of research. The article relates to the Jokowi’s utterance in public communication. Jokowi is the president of Indonesia who will compete in the general election in 2019. The election is the second competition with Prabowo. Jokowi, as the presidents and candidate, has given some speech many people give multi-interpretation. Text and context of Jokowi’s utterance give some perception in political view.

3.1. Text analysis (description)

| Content of text                                                                 | Text analysis                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1-President Joko “Jokowi” Widodo straps on his helmet before test riding an electric motorbike called Gesits in the front yard of the Presidential Palace in Jakarta on Wednesday, following a meeting to discuss the mass production of the bike. | The text uses simple sentences and simple tense. It relates to reporting news characteristic. But it has many supporting phrases to continue from the simple sentence. |
| 2-In remarks that have ruffled political fathers, President Joko “Jokowi” Widodo has used an Indonesian folklore reference to describe politicians who spread the propaganda of fear in their political campaigns, referring to them as “genderuwo” politicians. | This text starts with the present perfect tense. This kind of tense indicates the text will start by the story like the introduction of an idea. The popular diction, in this case, is ‘genderuwo’. The reader or listener are led to know about the story of ‘genderuwo’ in the mythology of Indonesian people. |
| 3-Speaking at an event held to distribute land certificates in Tegal, Central Java, the | The text uses ‘speaking’ as a gerund in the front. It indicates the speaker is doing |
President criticized politicians who campaigned with fear-mongering messages that caused people to worry and become anxious.

4-Jokowi, who is running for reelection, said politicians who attempted to influence public opinion by creating worry and fear did not have good political ethics and manners. “Such politics is unethical; how can [the politicians] frighten their own people? This is called genderuwo politics, [because it] spreads fear.” Genderuwo is part of Javanese mythology, which according to the official Indonesian dictionary is about a ghost in muscular human form with thick hair all over the body.

5-In The Religion of Java (1976) book, American anthropologist Clifford Geertz considers genderuwo a memedi type, which consists of spirits who are rather harmless although still terrifying to humans.

6-The President later asserted that genderuwo politics “must be stopped”, as he said politicians must be able to assist the public in developing their political maturity so that they vote with a clear head.

7-Jokowi, however, refused to answer when asked about whom he was specifically referring to when he mentioned genderuwo politicians. The President’s usage of the term genderuwo comes following his use of the word “sontoloyo” (foolish) late last month to comment on the backlash against his administration’s subdistrict fund program, which the opposition called a political stunt.

8-At the time, Jokowi warned people of politicians who tried to influence them with their remarks. "Be careful, there are many good politicians but there are also many ‘sontoloyo’ politicians." Executives of political parties backing Jokowi’s reelection bid have related the
incumbent’s speech to political campaigns ahead of the 2019 election, where Jokowi and his running mate Ma’ruf Amin will go head-to-head with rival Prabowo Subianto-Sandiaga Uno.

9-Golkar Party executive Ace Hasan Syadzily said genderuwo politics was a symbolic term for those who spread pessimistic views about the nation in their campaigns. “They talk as if we are facing an economic crisis by saying that the prices of commodities have surged in the markets, driving people to feel anxious about economic conditions, while in fact, conditions have improved,” Ace said.

10-The opposition camp has been using economic issues in its campaign. For instance, vice presidential candidate Sandiaga has been criticizing the prices of staple foods, such as by claiming that tempeh was being sold in portions "as thin as credit cards" because of rising prices.

11-Abdul Kadir Karding, the National Awakening Party (PKB) secretary-general, took a direct jab at presidential contender Prabowo, saying “If Pak Prabowo conveys pessimism frequently and uses the propaganda of fear, maybe one of [the politicians] referred to [by Jokowi] is Pak Prabowo.”

12-The Prabowo-Sandiaga camp said it was not offended by Jokowi’s remarks, with Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) politician Mardani Ali Sera saying that Jokowi appeared as if he wanted to compete with Sandiaga’s popularity. “We are not [offended],” Mardani said, “We should not be happy in politics.”
Another PKS politician, Suhud Aliyudin, said the term genderuwo politicians would be better used to refer to the incumbent’s administration because “there were many campaign promises that had not been fulfilled.”

The writer uses reported speech, quotation mark to strengthen the statement.

### 3.2. Processing Analysis (interpretation)

| Content of text                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Processing analysis (interpretation)                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4-Jokowi, who is running for reelection, said politicians who attempted to influence public opinion by creating worry and fear did not have good political ethics and manners. “Such politics is unethical; how can [the politicians] frighten their own people? This is called genderuwo politics, [because it] spreads fear.” | The direct sentence of Jokowi states that political practice will be unethical if there is a part of a community of people or political opposite. Jokowi, as incumbent today, hopes the opposite doesn’t give the wrong statement and make people fear in seeing the future life. Spreading the wrong information about government management (political or economic condition) will influence bad condition to the people. |
| 6-The President later asserted that genderuwo politics “must be stopped”, as he said politicians must be able to assist the public in developing their political maturity so that they vote with a clear head.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | In this statement, Jokowi strengthened that someone or a part of community who always spreads fear, they can be called as ‘genderuwo’. Genderuwo is like a ghost that makes people fear. This term implies that the frightening created is not good for people who do not understand the condition of government actually. So, this issue must be stopped as Jokowi’s statement. |
| 7-Jokowi, however, refused to answer when asked about whom he was specifically referring to when he mentioned genderuwo politicians. The President’s usage of the term genderuwo comes following his use of the word “sontoloyo” (foolish) late last month to comment on the backlash against his administration’s subdistrict fund program, which the opposition called a political stunt. | Jokowi, on the other occasion, told the term ‘sontoloyo’. Sontoloyo and genderuwo are both terms that state the political condition today. Sontoloyo is a bad character of some politicians who always think and act without any academic based consideration. The politician that is called as sontoloyo is one who always blames and seeks the weaknesses and fault of government only. |
| 8-At the time, Jokowi warned people of politicians who tried to influence them with their remarks. "Be careful, there are many good politicians but there are also many ‘sontoloyo’ politicians."                                                                                                                                            | Jokowi’s statement divided the characteristic of sontoloyo. Jokowi stated that not all politicians are sontoloyo but part of them. As explained before, sontoloyo as a characteristic symbolized                                                                                                                                 |
As a foolish politician. Speaking, conveying, stating, acting without any clear thinking.

As the party coalition of government, Golkar Party emphasized the Jokowi’s statement about genderuwo. He looks at the economic condition is growing better. It’s a different perception with the opposition statement that declares the bad economic condition, overseas debt improving and social condition unstablizing. Of course, the different perspective to look at the economic condition rises different statements in countering the issues.

In the other coalition party functionary, Abdul Kadir Karding sees that spreading fear is the only propaganda of opposition. It can be clear that the only two contestants in this political competition, Jokowi and Prabowo, so Jokowi’s statement indicates to Prabowo himself or Prabowo’s constituents.

On the other hand, the opposite party functionary (PKS), has a different response to Jokowi’s utterance. He views that it is usual in a political contestant. Mardani gave the adult one in responding to the political issue. Everything in political issue will be understood in many interests. Everyone can interpret the situation as their political interest. And the justification of the real issue is the only in one perspective not to be generalized.

Also, in this case, the opposition exactly states that the term of genderuwo suits with the condition of government management today. This term will be as the satire for government itself.

3.3. Social Analysis (explanation).

Text as elements of social events (Fairclough, 2003). The content of the text will give the effect to the society. Including the statements politician or political actors in Indonesian today. 2019 is the political year. Two contestants will compete to engage
the people heart. The text states some statements that can be seen from a political perspective. Genderuwo and sontoloyo are the terms arising from Jokowi’s utterance. Sontoloyo, in Indonesian dictionary, is mentioned as foolish, mad, stupid. This word is used to abuse someone else who acts unusual. Genderuwo is a ghost in muscular human form with thick hair all over the body. Genderuwo analogizes the mental of people who always spread fear to others related with the condition today. Genderuwo gives some terminologies as man’s character that doesn’t want to the condition runs well. So the opposition perspective gives some concerning to the bad situation. Whereas, the government is still doing efforts to recover the complicated cases. Sontoloyo indicates to politicians who do not have any commitment to conducting their duty and function as legislative. In Jokowi’s perspective, politicians should give a good example to the public not to lead the public to the bad condition, moreover give the hoax news or information. Genderuwo and sontoloyo are local (Javanese) terms to represent the condition and situation of politic in Indonesia, either an opposition group or politician as personal.

On the other hand, the opposition has a different perception in the condition of the Indonesian Republic. Economic crisis, unstable politic condition, raising intolerance social life, lack of trust to some religious people to be discredited as non-pancasilais or non NKRI are some issues rising in every media and information, printed or online. The issues have been influencing the mind set of people and making a big doubt to the regime. #2019gantipresiden or 2019changepresident is a popular symbol nowadays. In a political view, this case appears as unsatisfied people from the government today.

Regarding the genderuwo and sontoloyo addressed by Jokowi to the part of people is not suitable, as the opposition people stated. Whatever the problem Jokowi faces on, as incumbent, he is not appropriate to say the wrong words representing anger in public. The top leader of the state, Jokowi should be better to relax responding to all dynamic condition. Focusing on programs of society is the main action. As a top leader, everything Jokowi says is the justification for the situation today. Not only in political effect but in many aspects of life as well. This case is in political context. Political actors will exert their agency and empower their authority to influence on matters of common concern (I. F. and N. Fairclough, 2012). This the reason that word is not a word established itself, but more than it, the meaning will flow many interpretations. Genderuwo and Sontoloyo are not words expressed only. They give the influence to mental of people in expressing language in accordance with linguistics perspective and having an attitude in daily life. The good action derives from a good diction or word before. Arranging suitable words or expressions in a suitable moment and public mental is the best choice of a top leader. Because the simple sentence of leader will appear many interpretations of the people.

4. Conclusion

The study of discourse in various disciplines produces a variety of discourse theorizing according to each perspective and is often partial. Linguistic discipline, for example, only examines discourse or discourse from its linguistic aspects only. The social science scholars emphasize the role of discourse in the social constitution inherent in power relations and give less attention to linguistic aspects. In addition, critical linguistics tries to combine linguistic and social traditions, but they are still
trapped in seeing the text as a product and ignoring the productive and interpretative aspects of the text. Based on the partiality of the existing discourse studies, Norman Fairclough seeks to anesthetize the concept of discourse that seeks to combine several traditions, namely linguistics, interpretive traditions, and sociology.

In his theory, Fairclough offers a model of discourse that contains three dimensions, namely text, discursive practice, and social practice. Each of these dimensions has its own territory and process and all three are dialectically related. The first dimension is text which is the result of the production process. The second is discursive practices related to the interaction of texts with individuals or communities in the form of production processes and interpretations. The third dimension is social practice or context which includes sociocultural practices in which the production process and interpretation takes place. These three dimensions are then analyzed with three different analysis models. Description is used to analyze text. Interpretation is used to analyze the production process and interpretation of the text. The explanation is used to analyze sociocultural practices that include situational, institutional, and social levels.

This research analyzes Jokowi’s utterance. There are two words analyzed, they are ‘genderuwo’ and ‘sontoloyo’. Both words are the Javanese words representing the condition of political dynamic today. As Jokowi said that genderuwo is a character that always gives frightening to others meanwhile sontoloyo is a stupid politician who doesn’t understand what to do, what to criticize, what to solve. The main point of this research is the researcher criticizes the top leader’s utterance should be right diction on the right moment, the right expression on the right discussion, right words on the right public. Both genderuwo and sontoloyo are not suitable in the case of political or economic problems. The representations of the condition should be represented by means of a good term and language. The top leader should give a good example in attitude, conduct, and expression of language. Justification of the truth in language can appear from someone who has a big influence in the public.
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