

Posters Containing the Rejection Toward the RKUHP in 2019: The Demonstration Held by University Students

M. Rinzat Iriyansah¹, Syahyuri²

^{1,2}Universitas Indraprasta PGRI

¹Rinzat@gmail.com, ²yuri.syahyuri@gmail.com

Abstract: At the end of 2014-2019 legislative periods, members of the House of Representatives made controversial constitutions, in which if passed, it will threaten civil liberties, among other things, especially the amendment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) Law. This situation makes students conduct a demonstration against RKUHP in front of the Parliament Building. There are several posters that attract attention in this demonstration. This study aims to describe the level of communicative students and pragmatic functions that are reflected in posters during demonstration made by students. This study uses qualitative methods with content analysis techniques. The data are observed from a number of banners and posters containing the rejection of the RKUHP and the KPK Law. The results of the analysis showed communicative level of the posters made by the participants were very high. Only a few posters are not communicative.

Keywords: *poster, communicative, pragmatics*

Introduction

Language has an important role in human life. As a means of communication, language makes it easy for someone to get the information they want to know both oral and written information. In addition, language can be used to convey information and opinions from a speaker to the interlocutor. Communication can run effectively if the interlocutor knows the meaning of the language contained in utterances during communication takes place.

In interpreting an utterance, many aspects must be considered by the interlocutor to interpret the purpose of the utterance. Semantic aspects are always related to pragmatic aspects. The grammatical aspect of perfective (PFV) is divided into two general perspectives on semantics, namely the culmination perspective and the Quantization perspective (Filip, 2017). The culmination perspective is oriented towards end points and results while the Quantization perspective is rearranged with regard to the idea of events as a whole. In this case semantic has a very big role in interpreting an utterance. Upon pragmatic integration of contextual information, three main classes of meaning effects associated with the imperfect are assumed to emerge: a narrative effect, an evidential effect and an effect of activation of a preliminary phase in relation to the event (Baranzini & Ricci, 2015). Therefore mapping is not pragmatic and semantic needs to be studied in tandem

Humans communicate based on mutually agreed rules. They use lingual units that are adapted to the context to convey ideas, feelings, and various kinds of information they perceive. The study of language relating to the use of language as a means of communication never breaks from pragmatic rules. Pragmatic is a branch of linguistics that concentrates on the use of language according to the context. Pragmatic relates to social factors that influence the use of language in society. The context of language communication is used to limit the naturalness of language.

A speech uttered by a speaker can have an effect on the speech partner, namely by the existence of verbal acts as a result of the utterance spoken (Suryatmoko, 2019). Speech is not an utterance that comes out in vain, but these utterances contain certain intentions that are fully

visible explicitly and also implicitly or referred to as Implicature, as stated by Searle (dalam Nadar, 2009) which develops a hypothesis regarding speech acts that "In essence all speeches contain the meaning of actions, and not only speeches which have performative verbs"

Pragmatic approach is very relevant to study the problem of using language as a means of communication for various reasons, including: (1) pragmatic study of the use of language as a tool of communication between people in certain contexts. Pragmatic explains the content or message expressed differently in different cultures, religions, and professions. (2) The pragmatic analysis unit is the function of language rather than meaning or sentence (Mey, 2000). The function of language in question is that language as a means of communication can convey messages or information that is not only in the form of symbols but also social facilities. (3) The pragmatic approach is able to reveal the true meaning of an utterance. This is determined from the context of the utterance. The results of research conducted by Al Ghamdi revealed that pragmatic failure is highly evident in the learners' L2 production. L1 negative pragmatic transfer occurred in the response strategies of 'Comment Acceptance', 'Comment History', 'Praise Upgrade', 'Return', 'No Acknowledgement', 'Offer', 'Promise' and 'Wish'. They nearly represent 50% of the learners' response utterances. The learners also showed a tendency of positively assimilating their L2 norms in the realization of compliment responses in half of their response utterances (Ahmad Al-ghamdi, Taher Almansoob, & Alrefae, 2019).

One interesting phenomenon of language use to be studied is the use of language on posters. Lately, Indonesia is being shocked by the house representative members in revising the Criminal Code (KUHP) and UUKPK. The matter attracts public attention and considers the substance in the RUKUHP and RUUKPK to have disability in law, such as (1) UUKPK article 1 paragraph 3 which contains "Corruption Eradication Commission is a state institution in the executive power group that carries out the task of preventing and eradicating criminal acts of corruption in accordance with the law ". Through this article, anti-corruption activists consider this rule to be in conflict with the principle theory of an independent state institution that separates law enforcement agencies from other branches of power. (2) UUKPK article 37 B paragraph (1) letter b "The Supervisory Board is tasked with giving permission or not giving permission for wiretapping, search and confiscation". Such pro justice authority should not be given to special organs that should work at the level of administrative oversight. Even though the Supervisory Board is not needed by the KPK at this time, with such great authority, it is apparent that the legislators do not understand that in the Criminal Procedure Code only the Court institution has the authority to issue permits. While the Supervisory Board itself is not part of law enforcement. Therefore there was a student movement to demand that the government cancel the passage of the law. Demonstrations were held simultaneously by students in various regions in Indonesia to demand that the government cancel the law by issuing a Perpu. Students in a demonstration in expressing their aspirations by giving speeches in front of the council building and carrying their respective posters.

Based on preliminary observations, the poster brought by students in the demonstration was less communicative when examined using a syntactic or semantic approach. There are several kinds of causes of the non-communicative poster in terms of semantic or syntax, namely the message conveyed in the poster is unclear because the text uses pronouns of people with unclear references.

Methodology

This research uses a qualitative method with content analysis. This method prioritizes the depth of appreciation of interactions between concepts that will be examined empirically

(Endaraswara, 2004). This research focuses on the pragmatic aspects used in student posters during the demonstration in 2019. Data collection was carried out using tapping, recording, and note taking techniques. In analyzing data, researchers used content analysis techniques. The data collected amounted to 30 posters.

Discussion

Text is a reading both in writing and verbally (Halliday, 1976). Text is not limited in length and short size. Text is a series of linguistic units that form a unity of meaning expressed by humans to communicate. Posters are one type of text. Each poster has a discourse purpose or pragmatic function discourse. The pragmatic function of discourse can be known by analyzing the meaning of discourse illocution. When someone speaks in a language, the person displays three actions at once, namely: the act of saying something called acts of locution, the act of conveying a particular purpose called illocution, and the act of conveying something has a certain effect called perlocution. The speech act theory taxonomy consists of: (1) assertive or representative covering statement giver, giving advice, complaint, reporting, and so on, (2) directive intends to produce an effect through an action by the listener or reader, such as: promise, swear, propose, and so on, (3) expressive states of psychological attitude, such as: thanking, praising, sad statements, forgiving, and so on, (4) declarations, such as: dismiss, give names, punish, establish, exclude, and so on (Searle, 1969).

Textuality is not only a matter of language but it deals with the problem of human activity and predisposition empirically (Beaugrande, 1995). The text is said to be communicative if it has seven conditions for textuality, namely cohesion, coherence, situationality, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, and intertextuality. If related to the communication component of the seven communicative requirements, the text is classified as follows: (1) the textuality requirements for the signal component are cohesion, coherence, informativeness, and intertextuality, (2) the textuality requirement for the encoder component is intentionality, (3) the textuality requirement for the component component decoder is acceptability, and (4) the textuality requirement for the reality component is situationality.

Based on 30 university students poster data taken during the demonstration, there were 23 posters or 76.7% that met the criteria of communicability and 7 posters or 23.3% did not meet the criteria of communicative. The realization of communicative or non-communicative in the poster is grouped based on seven indicators namely cohesion, coherence, situationality, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, and intertextuality. The following is the distribution of communicative data based on the seven indicators.

Table 1: Informative indicator distribution table

No	Indicator of informativeness	Data	%	Sesuai		Tidak	
				data	%	Data	%
1	Cohesion	14	10,7%	14	46,7%	16	53,3%
2	Coherence	14	10,7%	14	46,7%	16	53,3%
3	Situational	24	18,4%	24	80%	6	20%
4	acceptability	20	15,3%	20	66,7%	10	33,3%
5	intentionality	20	15,3%	20	66,7%	10	33,3%
6	informativeness	18	13,8%	18	60%	12	40%
7	intertextuality	20	15,3%	20	66,7%	10	33,3%
Total		130	100%				

Table 2: Table of text informativeness

No	Category	Total	
		Data	%
1	Fulfill Communicative Criteria	23	76,7
2	Does not Meet The Communicative Criteria	7	23,3
	Total	30	100%

Fulfill Communicative Criteria



This discourse was conveyed by students at a time when demonstrations simultaneously rejected the collapsing throughout Indonesia. The target of this poster is members of the House of Representatives (DPR). This poster has the purpose of providing information to members of the council that academics, especially university students are more in favor of the KPK than board members who have passed the RUUKPK. The discourse of this poster is very relevant to the demands made by university students during a demonstration, namely the rejection of the RUUKPK and RUKUHP which are considered to have legal defects. The pragmatic function in this poster is to inform the board members that their decision to ratify the RUUKPK and RUKUHP is a wrong decision and the people especially students protest with a demonstration. In terms of intertextuality, the poster is related to other posters. From the encoder side, the intentionality of the poster discourse, namely the poster maker informs that students reject RUUKUHP and RUKPK. The meaning contains illocution. This discourse is very suitable in terms of acceptability because it meets the quality maxim and quantity maxim in accordance with the Grice principle. Some people reject RUKPK because it is considered to slow down the performance of the KPK and weaken the KPK in eradicating corruption in Indonesia. Thus, the poster discourse above fulfills several communicative criterias so that the poster has a communicative nature.



This discourse was conveyed by students at a time when demonstrations simultaneously rejected the collapsing throughout Indonesia. The target of the poster is the President of the Republic of Indonesia, Ir. H. Joko Widodo. This poster aims to provide information to the president that there are still many campaign promises that have not been realized by him at the time he served as president. The discourse is very relevant to the demands of students at the demonstration that is rejecting RUKPK and RUUKUHP. From the encoder side, the intentionality of the poster discourse is one of Mr Joko Widodo's promises when campaigning is his desire to strengthen the KPK so that corruptors in this country can be eradicated. The appearance of RUKPK is very contradictory to his promise. The sentence is entered into the meaning of locution. The meaning reflects the people's dissatisfaction with the DPR's decision to ratify the RUKPK and the president allows the decision. The text also supports the existing situational namely not fulfilling the promises of the president at the time of the campaign. The text is very comprehensive so it has high acceptability. Therefore, the text fulfills the seven elements of communicative

Does not meet the communicative criteria



This discourse was conveyed by one of the students during a demonstration in front of the DPR building. The target of this poster is students. This poster discourse has the aim of inviting students who have problems in completing the thesis to have an instant solution. The discourse is very relevant to students but has no relevance to the objectives of the action which has an emphasis on rejection of the RUKPK and RUUKUHP that have been approved by the DPR. The elements that build this poster discourse are (1) *Skripsi*, (2) *Bantu Skripsi* (3) *Semua jurusan*. The discourse has three utterances as forming the discourse. These three utterances are much related. This can be seen with cohesive markers repetitive to the discourse. In terms of intertextuality, the discourse is very far from its relevance. Most posters brought by university students related to the demands of action, namely the rejection of the RUKPK and RUUKUHP. In terms of intentionality, the discourse invites final semester students who are constrained in completing the final project (thesis) to contact the poster maker. In terms of acceptability, the poster violated the maxim of quality and quantity because it delivered something out of place. Thus, the discourse of the poster does not meet the criteria of communicative because it does not meet the seven criteria of communicative discourse.



This discourse was conveyed by students at the same time demonstrations were taking place in Indonesia. The target poster is a member of the House of Representatives (DPR). This poster discourse has the aim of providing information to the public that currently sexuality relations between husband and wife are regulated by the state. This is stated in article 480, paragraph 1, which reads "every person who violently or threatens to force someone to have sex with him is sentenced to 12 years in prison." paragraph 2 reads "coercion in conjugal relations and vice versa, also categorized as a rape crime". The poster discourse is very relevant to the existing regulatory conditions. The elements that build the discourse are (1) *Buat undang-undang suami istri dilarang wik wik*, and (2) *tapi DPR-nya sendiri Uh Ah Uh*. The discourse has two utterances as forming and interconnected. This can be seen from the conjunction markers used by poster makers. From the intertextuality side, the posters have no relevance to each other. In terms of intentionality, the poster invited the protesters to reject the article about rape committed by husband and wife for violating religious norms, especially Islam. In terms of acceptability, the poster violates the maxim of relevance and quality. Thus, the poster is included in the category of non-communicative.

Conclusions

The communicative form on the poster brought by students during the demonstration rejected RUUKPK and RKUHP consisting of seven indicators namely cohesion, coherence, situationality, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, and intertextuality. From the results of data analysis, it shows that the communicativeness of the student posters during the demonstration has a high percentage of 76.7% while those who are not communicative is 23.3%. This indicates that the demands of aspirations by students reflected in their posters have high relevance to political dynamics and promises that have not been realized by the leadership.

References

- Ahmad Al-ghamdi, N., Taher Almansoob, N., & Alrefae, Y. (2019). Pragmatic Failure in the Realization of the Speech act of Responding to Compliments among Yemeni EFL Undergraduates. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(4), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2504>
- Alrefae, Y. Alghamdi, N. Almansoob, N. (2019). A Sociolinguistic Study of the Realization of Refusals among Yemeni EFL Learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. 9(5), 172-185. doi:10.5539/ijel.v9n6p172
- Baranzini, L., & Ricci, C. (2015). Semantic and pragmatic values of the Italian imperfetto: Towards a common interpretive procedure. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 14, 33–58. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/catjl.161>
- Beaugrande, R. de. (1995). *Handbook of Pragmatic Manual*. Philadelphia: John Benyamins Publishing Company.

- Engel, Dulcie & Ritz, Marie-Eve. 2000. The use of the Present Perfect in Australian English.' *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 20(2): 119-140.
- Filip, H. (2017). The semantics of perfectivity. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 29(1), 167–199. <https://doi.org/10.26346/1120-2726-107>
- Filip, Hana & Rothstein, Susn 2005. Telicity as a Semantic Parameter. In Lavine, James; Franks, Steven; Filip, Hana & Tasseva-Kurktchieva, Mila (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Slavic Publications. 139-156.
- Halliday, H. and. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. England: Longman.
- Mey, J. L. (2000). *Pragmatics*. Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Michaelis, Laura A. 1994. The ambiguity of the English present perfect. *Journal of Linguistics* 30: 111-157.
- Molina, L., & Albir, A. (2002). 'Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach'. *Meta: Translators' journal*, Vol. 47, No. 4, 499-512.
- Nadar, F. . (2009). *Pragmatik dan Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Patard, Adeline (2010). "L'emploi préludique de l'imparfait entre temporalité et modalité : Éléments d'analyse à partir d'une étude de cas". *Journal of French Language Studies* 20.2: 189-211.
- Ritz, Marie-Eve. 2010. The perfect crime? Illicit uses of the present perfect in Australian police media releases. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 3400-3417.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cumbridge University Press.
- Saussure, Louis de and Sthioul, Bertrand (2005). "Imparfait et enrichissement pragmatique". In: Labeau, Emmanuelle and Larrivée, Pierre (eds.). *Nouveaux développements de l'imparfait*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, pp. 103-120.
- Sobhani, Arezou and Ali Saghebi. (2014). The Violation of Cooperative Principles Four Maxims in Iranian Psychological Consultation. *Journal of Scientific Research*.vol 4 (2), 91-99.
- Suryatmoko, A. (2019). Kesantunan Tindak Tuter Direktif dalam Novel Terjemahan Harry Potter Tahun 1 dan 2 serta Relevansinya sebagai Bahan Ajar di SMP. *Basastra*, 6(April 2019), 10–21.