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Abstract

In 2011, the Australian government suspended live cattle exports to Indonesia, following footage of brutal slaughter of animals in some of Indonesian slaughter houses. The two countries give their statements relating to this case. These statements are certainly meant to bring about a certain purpose and expectation. It can be said that there are diplomatic activities, in the form of those statements, which have been done by both countries. The object of this research is utterances coming from the representative from Indonesia and Australia. And the aim of this research is to know what face concept and politeness strategies committed by Australian and Indonesian representatives on their statements. The research method used in the research is descriptive qualitative by applying Brown and Levinson (1987) politeness strategies. Another supporting theory is context theory by McManis, et al. (1987). The contexts that influence the utterance are physical, linguistic, epistemic and social contexts.
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Introduction

The live cattle exporting incident that Australia applied to Indonesia some time ago is an event that has had multiple impacts on both sides. Within a period of time, there were various statements from both the Australian and Indonesian parties. These statements are certainly meant to bring about a certain purpose and expectation. It can be said that there are diplomatic activities, in the form of those statements, which have been done by both countries.

This case has given some impacts to bilateral relationship between Indonesia and Australia. Some impacts are Indonesian government is “unconcerned by the suspension”, Indonesian government took a consideration to import live cattle from other countries, Australia's cattle export industry suffered a huge economic impact and a report by Australian butcher stated that beef sales was reduced by several percent.
Literature Review

Public Diplomacy

Sharp in Melissen (2005, p. 11) discusses public diplomacy as the strategy of achieving direct relation involving people in particular country to advance nation's interests and to extend nation’s values. According to Melissen (2005, p. 13), public diplomacy is directed to foreign nations, thus the strategy should be distinguished from the common domestic diplomacy. Such strategy is applied by the government of Indonesia in developing their foreign diplomacy. The strategy includes their aims to engage with other nation’s domestic constituency and to build nation’s external identity (Melissen, 2005, p. 13).

Face Concept and Politeness Strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest that politeness is an act of preventing and dealing with speech acts that threaten the self-image or face (face) of others as well as themselves (Face Threatening Acts). Face can be simply interpreted as a person's self-image. In speaking of decency, the concept of face will always arise because decency is done to respect one's face. Yule (1996, p. 60) states "Face means the public self-image of a person." Face means self-image or self-image of a person in public. Self-image is an emotional thing and has a social impression that everyone wants others to respect or respect each other's self-image.

Brown and Levinson in Stockwell (2002, p. 23) divide concept of Face into Negative Face and Positive Face. Negative face is regarding to the want of every 'competent adult member' that his/her actions be unimpeded by others. Negative Face means a desire of a person not to be disturbed by others, to be independent and have freedom in acting, for example at a meeting, a leader believes that his/her decision is the best and he does not want the decision denied by others. On the other side, Positive Face concerns to the want of every member that is desirable to at least some others. Positive Face means a person's desire to be appreciated and accepted by others, for example in dress, when someone is wearing certain clothes and asking others opinions, he/she wants that person to be happy to see him/her wearing the clothes even want him/her to praise him/her.

Yule (1996, p. 61) argues "If a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual's expectation of self-image, it is described as a face threatening act." When speakers do speech acts that threaten the self-image of others then this called face threatening acts. This is where the strategy of decency is important to be done so that self-image of others and themselves are respected and not lost. For example in a meeting, an employee does not agree with the opinion of the leader then the employee must conduct FTA. Negative Politeness, in the form of I think your idea of dismissing the workers is not effective to avoid the bankruptcy. This is different from the speech I do not agree with that who conducts direct speech acts and blatantly that provides a greater threat to the leadership.

Brown and Levinson (1987: 92) proposed four politeness strategies, namely bald on record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, and off record strategy. This classification is formulated based on three scales of politeness, such as social distance, social status, and speech act.

In the bald on-record strategy, speakers do nothing to minimize threats to the speaker's self-image. Speakers make direct and clear speech acts. According to Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 95), "The prime reason for bald on-record usage may be stated only: in general, whenever I have a face, even to any degree, he will choose the bald on-record strategy." Based on that opinion, it is known that in using this strategy, the speaker's desire to maximize the efficiency of speech acts under any circumstances is greater than the speaker's desire to respect the speaker's self-
image. An example of speech acts on this strategy is Bring me my book. In the speech act, speakers say it directly and clearly without minimizing the threat and regardless of the self-image of the speaker.

In a positive courtesy strategy, the speaker gives a positive self-image to the speaker. Brown and Levinson (1987, pp. 101-103) argue that positive politeness occurs in a group or environment whose participants have the same goals, desires, or background knowledge. This strategy is raised because the speaker wants to show a good impression on the speaker and indicates that the speaker wants to strengthen his social relationship with the hearers through the same desires and views between the speaker and the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987, pp. 101-129) divide this positive politeness strategy into the following 15 types:
- Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods)
- Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)
- Intensify interest to H
- Use in-group identity markers,
- Seek agreement
- Avoid disagreement
- Presuppose/raise/assert common ground
- Joke
- Assert or presuppose S’s knowledge of and concern for H’s wants
- Offer, promise
- Be optimistic
- Include both S and H in the activity
- Give (or ask for) reasons
- Assume or assert reciprocity
- Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation).

According to Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 129), "Negative politeness is repressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face: it can be seen that a negative propriety strategy is an act prevent or minimize the threat to the negative face of the speaker when the speaker wants something from the speaker, the freedom and the desire of the speaker will be burdened or disturbed. Just as with positive politeness, negative politeness also has some kind of strategy. Ten strategies that fall into negative politeness based on Brown and Levinson's (1987, pp. 129-211) opinion are:
- Be in conventionally indirect
- Question, hedge
- Be pessimistic
- Minimize the imposition
- Give deference
- Apologize
- Impersonalize S and H: Avoid the pronouns ‘I’ and ‘you’,
- State the FTA as a general rule
- Nominalize
- Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H.

In off-record indirect strategies the main purpose is to take some of the pressure off of you. You are trying to avoid the direct Face Threatening Act of asking something. This is a politeness strategy that relies upon implication. This strategy is very indirect, and involves the breaking of conversational norms to imply a particular recommended course of action. Here, the speaker is relying upon the hearer's ability to decipher and interpret the speaker's intended meaning, although it is indirectly suggested.
**Context**

Context is one aspect of a speech situation. A different context can create a different meaning for the same speech act. Understanding the context will help us in getting the right meaning from the speech. According to Yule, "context is the physical environment in which a word is used" (1996, p. 128). Showing agreement with what is taught by some linguists in defining context, McManis, et al. (1998, p. 197) have defined several different aspects of context:

1. **Physical context**
   - This includes where the conversation takes place, what objects are present, and what actions are taking place.
2. **Epistemic context**
   - This tells us about the background knowledge shared by the speaker(s) and the listener(s).
3. **Linguistic context**
   - This relates to utterances previous to the utterance under consideration.
4. **Social context**
   - This relates to the social relationship and setting of the speaker and the listener(s).

**Research Method**

The research uses a descriptive analysis method in qualitative research. According to Djadjasudarma (1993, p. 1), descriptive analysis method is a method that can descriptively provide characteristics, properties and image data through data selection, after the data is collected. In this research, there are the three stages to be done, namely: data provision, data analysis, and presentation or formulation of the analysis result. The data later analyzes through its indicator relating to face concept and politeness strategies committed in each statement. Researchers use a variety of literature related to the research topic. And the research data was taken from various Australian news sites.

**Results and Discussion**

**Politeness Strategies used in the Statements Regarding to the Case of Live cattle exports to Indonesia**

Data 1

Prime Minister Julia Gillard:

*In light of the evidence presented to us, we have resolved to put a total suspension in place," Ms Gillard said. "This suspension will remain until we can make sure cattle from Australia are treated properly at every step of the supply chain.”*

Context: Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard responded to the issue of a ban on cattle exports by Australian federal agriculture minister Joe Ludwig earlier today.

Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard as a speaker uses a bald on-record strategy. Mrs. Gillard do nothing to minimize threats to the speaker's self-image. She makes direct and clear speech acts. She plainly and vividly and implicitly express their opinion as representatives of the Australians to prohibit the export of cattle to Indonesia until certain conditions are met. In terms of diplomacy, this is not in accordance with the principle of international cooperation because Australia decided unilaterally its needs without considering the rejection by the second party (Indonesia). The Australian decision on this context is not based on the principle of mutual need that violates the principle of international cooperation. The use of Bald on-record strategy by the Australian side in this context can be said to be less appropriate according to the principle of international cooperation because in
deciding something that concerns the bilateral interests of both countries should be based on the principle of mutual understanding and common goals.

Data 2
Prime Minister Julia Gillard:

We will be working closely with Indonesia, and with the industry, to make sure we can bring about these things.

The speaker shows a positive courtesy strategy by generating a perceptual equation which is shown by involving both parties as well as the optimistic impression shown by the '... to make sure we can bring about major change ...' section. Different from the preceding speech, this speech is not straightforward and unilaterally decides an opinion that should be approved first by both parties. In this case, the speaker seems to be trying to get both the Indonesian and the industrial parties together to carry out one goal of bringing winds of change to the cattle slaughtering industry. Positive courtesy strategy by positioning the Indonesian side as actors in the objective to achieve ideal industrial conditions can be perceived as a decision in accordance with the conditions of international cooperation that need each other.

The strategy used through her statement is giving gifts as understanding and cooperation to Indonesia relating to this case. Although in previous statement she does not try to keep or maintain her face but in this statement she tries to give good impression to Indonesia.

Data 3
Senator Joe Ludwig:

I know this decision will impact on the industry, but a sustainable live cattle export industry must be built on the ability to safeguard the welfare of the animals

Analysis: Senator Joe Ludwig expressed his opinion on the issue of banning cattle exports. The Ludwig minister as a speaker pointed to the bald on-record strategy in a straightforward and implied manner and regardless of the faculty's face, stating that although the decisions he made would have an impact on the industry, Ludwig would retain his opinion by holding the ban. In this case the speaker can be said to violate the principle of international cooperation because he makes decisions that affect both parties without first equating perception with the partner. In this statement, firstly he does not want to use negative face. It proves by the beginning of the sentence, I know..., later on the second sentence he emphasize his country statement by saying the safeguard purpose of the welfare of the animals.

Data 4
Indonesia's agriculture minister Bayu Krisnamurthi:

We hope this is not a special policy for Indonesia.

Analysis: Indonesia's agriculture minister Bayu Krisnamurthi expressed his opinion on the issue of banning exports on the media. He uses a positive politeness strategy by optimistically declaring that he hopes this case is not a case specifically applied to Indonesia. He tries to give his positive self-image to the hearer. He uses one of politeness strategy as intensify interest to hearer. This strategy is raised because he wants to show a good impression on the speaker and indicates that Mr. Krisnamurthi wants to strengthen his social relationship with the hearer through the same desires and views between the speaker and the hearer. In this context speakers do not
violate the principle of international cooperation because speakers attempt to equate perceptions between his party and the partner.

Data 5
Mr. Norman Hunt:

Clearly from the outrage, our nation thinks it should stop and perhaps there should be some alleviation to the people who will be hurt as consequence

Analysis: The statement is coming from Norman Hunt, a solicitor and rural affairs advocate in Australia. He said the ban must be considered because the ban will give some impacts for the income and the industry. He commits with the off record strategy because his statement is very indirect involves the breaking of conversational norm. He does not want to say directly that the ban will give bad effect to both countries, Australia and Indonesia. Here, Mr. Hunt is relying upon the hearer's ability to decipher and interpret the speaker's intended meaning. The strategy through implicatures and vague or ambiguous can be found in this statement. Strategies here are to give hints, give clues of association and presuppose.

From the data above, Australia consider using bald on record strategies for statements coming from Prime Minister Julia Gilliard and Senator Joe Ludwig. Another statement coming from Mrs. Gilliard uses positive politeness strategy and another one is coming from Mr. Norman Hunt which applies off record strategy. One statement from Indonesia applies positive politeness strategy.

Conclusion
In arguing, from Australian side, for some time, they had not disregarded the principle of international co-operation with a unilateral and straightforward (deciding on bald on-record strategy) deciding on a decision that actually affects both parties and therefore needs a common perception and purpose. From the data it can be found that the Australian representatives also still consider about bilateral relationship between the countries. They also use positive strategy and off record strategy to balance their government positive face.

From Indonesian side, in this case, tries to create the same perception and does not directly make the decision or the straightforward opinion threaten the face of the partner (Australia). It can be said that there are differences in the way of diplomacy where the Australian side tends to be more straightforward than the Indonesian side in the case of banning the export of live cattle.
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