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ABSTRACT
The main objective of this study was to determine the model of political communication in the Indonesian parliament. The phenomenon of political communication by using “violence,” occurred in the House of Representatives of Indonesia period 1999-2004. This research was conducted by qualitative analysis, by developing interactionist theory, constructive, symbolic interaction in the political sphere. The results found that political communication in Parliament cannot be conceived as direct communication because the communication is interactional and transactional. Therefore, every political message is ultimately between interests and disagreements. It can build a conceptual model in which ‘violence’ in the delivery of political messages physically or psychologically occurs on the ‘front stage,’ middle stage’ and ‘backstage.’
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INTRODUCTION
In 1997-1998, reforms took place in Indonesia, which created a different situation for politicians at both National and Regional levels. It causes concern in the community and the effect of antipathy on politicians. Allegedly, according to the author’s observation, it can be assumed that the figures and politicians have used “violence” in political communication e.g. differences in political views and attitudes.
This distinction is manifested in communal violence, which includes inter-or inter-party-political conflict. The author's observations found two reasons why violence used. First, ‘violence’ to protect its existence from the opposition political threat. Second, ‘violence’ to be acknowledged and feared by political opponents. It was followed by clashes between their respective supporters. The difference in political views using violence is an exciting new development to be observed. It’s because Indonesia (at that time) is in a historical transition in experiencing three major changes. First, is the transition of political and governmental systems (autocratic to democratic). Second, is the transition of economic system that is patron-client and crony capitalist system to rules-based market economy system. Third, is the transition of socio-political and economic centralist systems towards decentralization. Furthermore, the combination of crisis and political, economic and social transition, resulted in a turbulence situation. A great and potentially violent social blast. This situation also causes two new developments: (1) economic growth with distribution (the term "development cake") is getting smaller; (2) There is a significant distribution of power.

This dispute involves politicians with different parties; it has become an integral part of securing the politicians’ existence and role. And this became the political communication phenomenon using violence occurred in the Indonesian Parliament 1999-2004. In fact, most of Member Parliaments (MPs) have served since 1997, its mean they have experienced a transition period. They should be wiser in communicating well without resorting to violence. Furthermore, political violence is a form of communication by acting on the minds of the people through fear and intimidation (Castells, 2013). For example, in the Taiwan parliament, differences in political views by defending arguments (for groups or supporting rulers) lead to physical violence (Ibrahim, Liman & Uke, 2013; Martin, 2015). In Nigeria, political violence and media Coverage by two newspapers in the Osun Election in 2011 (Awofadeju, et. al, 2015; Bello, 2015; Oyesomi & Oyero, 2012).

Previous research and theories of political communication have developed by scholars, i.e., Kurt Lewin, Paul Lazarsfeld and Carl Hovland and Harold D. Laswell.

---

1 Four scholars can be regarded as the founding fathers of the study of political communication in America. They actually have a psychology education background (see Reese, & Ballinger, 2001; Eid & Paré, 2008; Simonson, et al., 2013; Pickard, 2015).
In Europe, several political communication studies have developed in connection with the study of public opinion, the study of socio-cultural developments, the study of the relationship between the media and the government as well as the information system which takes place in bureaucratic institutions, the phenomenon has a dominant relevance in the research of political communication in Indonesia.

Politicians as communicators use violence in sending their political messages because they have a strategic position to play a role in a particular political situation. It is a randomized manifestation strategy addressed their target to induce the state of insecurity. This is important because it is a process of political communication between the people and representatives (Kriesi, 2013). The community should be able to sort out the implicit meaning of the politicians in conveying political messages.

Therefore, the research question is how the Indonesian Parliament model of political communication in the era 1999-2004? In addition, how is the ideal model of communication in delivering political messages to avoid violence? It is to minimize the behavior of 'thugs' from politicians, because they in communication involve 'talks' (e.g. images, movements, gestures) and parliamentary forms of symbolism (e.g. clothing, pin).

The purpose of this study is meant to examine the history of Indonesia, the violent episodes in communicating associated with certain historical changes. For example, the impact is personal and collective/social violence. Personal violence is rooted in personal conflicts, while social violence is generally rooted in social conflict, which has broader economic and socio-political implications than personal violence. This means that political interests need to be exposed based on the categories and symptoms of violence in political communication by developing

---

2 Most of the communications research that touches the political field are generally more present in the form of research on voting and research on the effect of communication on the audience response about the campaign. "The research on voting in elections was conducted by Paul L. Lazarsfeld in; The People’s Choice with McPhee and Berelson even Lazarfel B. research on Voting: a Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign. Together with Elihu Katz, Lazarsfeld also researched on "Personal Influence; the Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications. "As well as Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes researched on The Voters Decides."
theoretical concepts, models, and approaches. Therefore, it is necessary to do the examination of political communication, by checking when the language communicator is used, speech, gesture, and the communication exchange. Thus, it is necessary to meant a model of political communication that can be applied to communicators, in order to minimize the violence messages.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Political Communication

Regardless of the reformers expectations, the elite politicians do not use new communication to empowering citizens, greater democratic considerations, or other normative objectives. Whereas, Caballero and Gravante (2018), state that in modern political communication promotes created the new identity and political participation through various forms of interaction and information exchange. In political communications conducted by politicians and other political actors addressed to such voters and newspaper columnists as to their activities to achieve certain goals (McNair, 2011). In addition, by emphasizing the function of political communication to analyze the problems that develop in the overall process and the politics of a nation's change. It arises from the involvement of politicians in image development, the focus of journalists on the dramatic events (e.g., scandals, internal party strife, and politician misconduct). Likewise, the tactical supremacy struggles. (Blumler and Kavanagh, 1999).

If the impact of political communication has consequences for human behavior, then become an integral part of the political communicator behavior. And if the context changes, then not all campaigns or parties or politicians conform to the same wisdom (Bimber, 2014). Thus, the real object of political communication is the political impact or outcome as one of the functions that is a requirement for the functioning of the political system. If political communication is seen as a methodological bridge between communication and politics, then the formal object is the process of creating commonalities in political facts and events.
A significant relationship between communication to achieve political goals is recognized by Edelman (2013), "it is language that evokes most of the political “realities” people experience … shaping their meaning and helping to shape the political roles officials." This means that communication politicians can gain power (political goal) due to persuasive language to voters and political elites. In addition, the effectiveness of communication in carrying out daily activities.

**Political Symbolic Interaction**

Policy as an example of organizational directives relating to specific universal human nature of human behavior such as the domain of group life or the direction of the relevant organization (Prus, 2003). The organization “emphasizes the recursive relationships between cultural ideals that exist in the institutional environment, and the interactions (Hallett and Meanwell, 2016)” in which people are within and throughout the organization and in turn form it.

In Parliament Indonesia as an organization, every action, and interaction of politicians using language, gestures and parliamentary symbols. The symbolic code in politics has several characteristics that determine its usefulness and its limitations. First, there is a dualism of feelings and inseparable thoughts (Loseke & Kusenbach, 2008), this means that dualism cannot separate in their rhetorical formations. Secondly, some variations in symbolic content and emotion codes are perceived (Loseke, 2016). Symbolic interaction theory uses the individual paradigm as the main subject in social science, putting individuals as active and proactive actors. The uniqueness of symbolic interaction, that there is freedom and limitations. This meaning of all actions even as well as construct collective life together with the community through its action and communicative interaction.
Consequently, the interaction politicians are always filled with symbols in daily and social life. Thus the symbolic interaction theory is the perspective of the individual and social. According to Loseke (2016), the symbolic code is a system of thought that can be used to construct narrative, plot, character and moral scenes that have the potential to convince through the appeal of logic. The root of symbolic interaction theory is presupposed social reality as a process and not as something static-dogmatic. Therefore, the communication behavior of politicians is seen as a symbolic interaction for the individuals in it. Briefly, the theory of symbolic interactions can be characterized as follows (Prus, 2003:15):

1. The life of human groups is intersubjective (human knowledge depends on community-based exchange and language);
2. Consciously problematic (regarding ‘known and unknown,’ as in distinguishing between things encountered, defined, tested and objectified with humans vs. ambiguous, inexperienced, hidden, and inaccessible);
3. Object-oriented (where the things that are known to be human is the contextual and operational essence of community life);
4. Multi-perspective (as in variable viewpoint, conceptual framework, or idea of reality);
5. Reflective (think, self-conscious, purposive, deliberative); Sensory (recognizing human ability for stimulation and activity, as well as capacity, material limitations, practical limitations, and practical abilities) (Prus, 2003: 15).
6. Sensory (recognizing human ability for stimulation and activity, as well as capacity, material limitations, practical limitations, and practical abilities).

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted using qualitative analysis, by developing interactionist theory, constructive, symbolic interaction (Dalal and Priya, 2016) in the political sphere. The symbolic interactionism as the epistemological and ontological foundations of evolved grounded theory.
In addition, meaning and the concepts of self, action, and interaction are key interweaving themes that feature in the various interpretations of symbolic interactionism (Chamberlain-Salaun, et al., 2013: 5). This research using phenomenology approach, symbolic interaction and dramaturgy with qualitative analysis. The social establishment of symbolic interactions e.g. based on technical perspectives (seeing the institution's efficiency), political perspective (seeing from its demands), structural perspective (status) and cultural perspectives (institutional models). The research approach with social establishment of symbolic interaction is to see the institution from the perspective of dramaturgy (its role). The research focus is on the political communication model in Indonesia MPs 1999-2004. This model is intended to examine the dynamics of symbolic interaction MPs. This research will observe and examine the politicians' behavior, talking, interacting, gestures, in every place to be classified in the model. According to Corbin and Strauss (2008), the meaning and concepts of action, interaction, self, and perspective are the themes of symbolic interactionism contained.

Data Collection

The research was conducted at the House of Representatives of Indonesia (Parliament) in Jakarta. Data collection in this research through several stages, i.e:

a. Observation

This method uses a systematic observation and recording of the MPs activity as a research subject. In addition, the use of language and symbols in the political messages exchange between politicians, such as in parliament, factions or public places. Eaves dropping and tracking procedures will be used in addition to figuring out what is symbolized and disguised as a role difference, politicians’ appearance and impression management. This is because the process of observation in the location and the same time.
b. Interview

Interview method in this research is unstructured but in-depth interview in openness situation. The purpose of openness is an interview with a friendly atmosphere with interview guidelines made specific for information received maximally. Informants in the interview is MPs 1999 to 2004. However, in scientific ethics, researchers only use the initials of informants.

c. Focus Group Discussion

Data collection methods invite students, party cadres and political activists who have an interest in political dynamics in parliament. It is intended to know the observations of the public about the characteristics, functions, interactions of politicians and their activities in the delivery of political messages in Parliament.

d. Network

This information searches through the communication network to determine the politicians in understanding and experience. The networks used are NGOs such as Parliament Watch, Kontras, and Humanika.

e. Recording Tape

This method is used to view historical activities of MPs. Records are made through live images owned by electronic media (private television and TVRI), for example, photos, interviews from the media to be edited in accordance with the research object.

RESULTS

Communications in Parliament

The Association of Indonesian Parliaments (2001) states that,

...the phenomenon seen from the many demands of the community submitted to the council is inseparable from the initial step of democratization in Indonesia. The 1999 election, considered relatively the most fair election in the history of Indonesian politics after the 1955 election, is considered to have produced the most legitimate government institution (p. 476).
The result of the observation in parliament that it does not yet have a model of political communication is applied because it is dominated by the leadership, and the political situation at that time with intrigue and random communication. It because of the leadership model in the parliament is interactive and transactional. This is one of the reasons why there is no theoretical compatibility because it creates multi-perception when doing political communication.

However, it seems that the effect of political communication is shifting slightly because politicians as communicators give different meanings received by the communicant. If interpreted, then in the party can have different meanings and opinions, but can have had the same opinion.

In addition, the political communication model can be developed by adjusting the function of politicians (political education, cadre recruitment, the interests of society and the rights of others), this can provide learning for politicians as communicators in conveying political messages with symbols (contents). Thereafter, we can find out political communicators (politicians, professionals, and activists) in identifying the message of the conversation and its context.

The findings of observation from the daily activities of politicians can be seen in Figure 1 as an illustration or model of MPs convey political messages. In this model is divided into three stages, as a place for politicians to communicate related to the political messages exchange. In addition, in this model, the capacity and ability of politicians who use role and symbols are classified as political stages. Each part of the stage represents the role that politicians play in conveying their political message.
The first classification is the front stage, this is the territory of MPs must be considered, enjoyed and appreciated by the community directly or indirectly. In this place politicians will manage the impression or self-image, this means they must be able to make impression management that can have a dazzling or irritating effect on the audiences.

The second classification is the middle stage, this is a neutral or gray area, can be seen or not. Finally, the third classification is the backstage. This place is an invisible area for the audience, but a place in initiating their ideas and political intuitions. It is a place in providing many perspectives between communicators and communicants in conveying political messages.

Findings show that politicians play some substantial roles as follows. First, violence in political communication is individual and un-institutional, although the phenomenon has occurred that involves the exchange of political messages in parliament. Secondly, there is no dichotomy between party politicians exchanging violent political messages. These results are consistent with statements from:
“In fact, the background of a party is not related to the behavior of communication with ‘violence’ on the ‘political stage,’ but rather to the personal capacity of the individual and their political experience.” (Interview result. Informant ‘L’ - Parliamentary Politician, July 2003)

Third, the characteristics of politicians are more dominant in influencing their political behavior in parliament than the characteristics of the represented political parties.

“I see every MP in both the House of Representative and the Assembly at Provincial has a background. It determines the political stance when s/he plays her/is political behavior. Whether he/r comes from a party that has an adequate cadre system with moral standards and political ethics. If there is a deviation, means it’s a driving factor that affects.” (Interview result. Informant ‘D’ - Parliamentary Politician, July 2003)

Fourth, clothing is an important attribute for politicians, especially on the front stage, it becomes an obsession to pack it to the fullest. Fifth, there is a confusion of conceptions about the political stage, any event occurring on the back stage can be the front stage or vice versa (eg, fractional meetings can be the front stage of the commission meeting). Sixth, formal events can be backstage rather than informally. Seventh, politicians without going through the process of meritocracy experience a “cultural shock” in its role on the political stage (see table 1).

Table 1. Party Recruitment Process to the House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Process</th>
<th>Politicians (%)</th>
<th>Professional (%)</th>
<th>Activist (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment with adequate cadre</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Instantly</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment is identical with corruption, collusion,</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nepotism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eighth, higher education does not affect politicians especially in communicating their political messages. Informed by the informant that politicians who communicate with violence, generally have high education background and politics. This can be proven, with various cases of political communication violence in parliament, with physical and psychological tensions, which have higher levels of education (bachelor and master degree). It shows an imbalance in the process of conveying political messages and causing conflict in the name of his party.

Ninth, political communication in parliament is not conceived as linear communication, although popular. This is because all political communications actors in parliament are interactional and transactional. Tenth, there is still a distance of communication between politicians with party’s constituents and others. Eleventh, violence in political communication is felt physically and psychologically. Twelfth, violence in political communication is synonymous with ‘political thuggery.’

“...it could be a reflection of our social and political culture but it could be because there is a political structure we are indeed precisely the potential to be an ad that is conducive to the birth of the ‘political thuggery’ through discourse, in fact there has been a ‘violent’ political, it is not only by physical violence but can be psychologically via discourse can also occur. Thuggery was once a symptom not a problem but lately it appears because we do not have a standard political culture but usually do something that is something repressive as well.” (Interview Result, Informant “F” - Parliamentary Politician, September 2003)

Physical and psychological violence in messages conveyed by communicators will have an impact on the communication of politicians. Some politicians do not experience physical violence, but psychologically they are very depressed. Then resigned formally or absent despite their status as MPs.
This means that there is physical and psychological violence in communicating to MPs at that time. It is derived from politicians who revealed the following.

“There are some members of parliament whose political literacy is not very mature, indicated by harsh behavior in expressing opinions. It will cause the ‘opposite’ or ‘fellow’ of the politician to be offended. In making decisions, s/he is manifest in a sarcastic, verbal and physical form. The violence occurs, it because the political culture is not mature, and the elegant politics level. When he loses in making decisions and it becomes upset, then he/r resentment wreaked out by provoking the masses. In politics there must be interest, competition and they manage it differently. It is not in the party’s background, but rather the individual politicians (how s/he was recruited? -what the track record is? -). It because there are some fractions appear to be sarcastic. However, generalizations not allowed, for example, the rude party X and vice versa the Y party is subtle, but individual politicians behavior itself. If it can be conveyed in a polite manner why should it be rude? the important is aspirations can be absorbed and realized.” (Interview Result: Informant ‘S’ - Parliamentary Politician, July 2003)

In response to the above interview, it seems that almost all politicians agree that any physical or psychological form in a message containing violence will have an impact on political communication in parliament. Physical and psychological violence should not happen on the political stage. Although political processes and systems are in a situation of continuous interest then political communication will be related to those two things

**Political Communication Model**

The activities of politicians involving political communication processes in the process of ‘hearings’ between the commis-
sion and the government as partners. This moment observed as a process of political communication, which is the exchange of political messages. For example, meetings in parliament about ‘hearings,’ the communication does not focus on the main points but more to the political. It is because of the substance of the information discussed; this is considered to violate the rules for other MPs and trigger a dispute among fellow politicians who conduct ‘hearings.’

Politicians in parliament partly a cleric and statesman, who can deal with their limitations. It means that the ability to communicate must pack with a capable political ability. Therefore, the ability to communicate politics is the ‘identity’ of every politician. It can lead politicians to communicate politics without conflict.

Furthermore, regardless of the party’s background MPs, it does not affect the capacity of politicians to communicate politically well. The informants (AM – Political Observer) states that: “Indonesian politics still exists ‘violence,’ because politics in Indonesia is still traditional, for example, the reasons for voting and supporting the party are still public, primordial, charismatic and patron clients.” (Interview Result, February 2004)

Some of these things, which led to ‘violence’ in the exchange of political messages. When the public sees ‘violence’ in political communication, then they will connect with the figure of the politician. However, this is not an excuse if political parties are recruiting politicians by existing standardization, to produce politicians with high credibility on the ‘political stage.’

Therefore, the process of party recruitment of politicians can contribute to a ‘violence.’ It is necessary to consider a party to provide an opportunity for MPs. The individual factors of politicians will have different motives, although they will engage in ‘violence’ in communicating for the delivery of political messages on the ‘stage.’

Based on the results, the individual characteristic (positive or negative) are more dominant in influencing political behavior
in parliament rather than the party characteristics represented. That is, the ambition of ‘personal gain’ is the dominant motive of politicians to become MPs. The informant reveals that there is still a distance of communication between politicians with their party’s constituents as well as to the community. Thus, if simplified, the preposition series shows that the more dominant characteristic of the individual influences the politician’s behavior rather than the characteristics of their party, this can be simplified into the following model.

**FIG. 2. COMMUNICATION MODEL IN PARLIAMENT (SOURCE: AUTHOR’S OBSERVATION)**

**DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION**

In the findings, the authors are faced with evidence that the type of political communication model in parliament has not found a suitable theoretical model, because the political communications (especially in Indonesia) dominated by leaders (e.g. communication model of President Joko Widodo using Komunikasi Bera which studied by Wijaya, 2016).
It is contrary to Lasswell’s communication model (see, for instance, Sapienza et al., 2015; Eadie, 2011; Jansen, 2010; Malin, 2011), with the components of the Who says What to Whom in What Channel with What Effects model (5W model).

“Lasswell’s construct has a long history filled with many theoretical twists and turns. It has seen a variety of labels, uses, and manifestations over the course of its conceptual evolution, which has undoubtedly contributed to confusion about it in the scholarly literature (Sapienza et al., 2015: 617).”

The previous study political communication models have resulted in legitimacy process, communication and political knowledge in complex societies (see, for instance, Habermas, 2006; Eveland et al., 2005; Mcleod et al., 1999; Scheufele, 2000; Blumler, and Kavanagh, 1999; Shah, et al., 2017).

Political communication through ads before the election, tends to be populist, very communicative, but the critical mass it is just a hoax. Packaging political promises to attract voters. The packaging as dramaturgical perspective Goffman (1948) that the routines in the ‘stage’ is not alone but with the team, they cooperate perform a routine in ‘politics’. Team involvement sometimes does not act as a supporter but a ‘thorn in the meat’ that undermines the team’s cohesiveness. “Dramaturgy in the sense understood by theatre criticism (and via interactionist analysis as understood by Goffman) counts in policy practice and political life” (Anderson, 2014: 22). Dramaturgy’s Goffman see how people work together in protecting the various demands of each other, is related to the social reality for ‘pentaskan’ and identity are shown. The fact that on a ‘political stage’ is easily designed, but not easy on the ‘political stage’. Politicians interpret the symbols (words, speech, conversation, phone, meetings, documentation, etc.) are used creativity.

The interaction of politicians will affect many people, as they perform ‘shows’ and impression management especially front of ‘political stage’ becomes a measure for them in defining themselves constantly, changing direction, and actions.
“Goffman (1959) has suggested that first impressions, which are based upon perceptions of the observed’s reputation, knowledge and skills, are significant in terms of their potential for putting human interaction on the wrong or right track (Thompson, et al., 2015: 20).”

In the findings and observations, the majority of politicians in Parliament attempt to present themselves as closely as possible with physical symbols outside the 'political stage'. The visible symbols are their dress style such as wearing a shirt, tie and coat with pins of Parliament logo. The pin indicates that they are MPs. Symbols guide internal behavior and mediate interactions (Maglio and Spohrer, 2013: 668). Interaction becomes symbolic when individuals interpret and define their own objects and actions or actions of others and act on assigned meanings (Chamberlain-Salaun, 2013: 6).

If that is the case on politics, it will be about the politician's self-action – Cooley 'looking glass self’ that in every human interaction is always filled with symbols and interactions, both in social life and in life itself. “Cooley (1992) developed the concept of the looking-glass self that describes the part of identity, which develops through one's interpersonal interactions within the context of interpersonal relationships (Unoka and Vizin, 2017:2).” Furthermore, political communication politicians in Parliament realized in various forms, in the form of sharing models but do not have equal significance by those involved. The top down model is still valid but the intensity is reduced, it is not surprising when politicians from the same faction have different opinions.

**Conclusion**

In parliament, it found that politicians in communicating there are an element of ‘violence’ that occurs in “political stage,” this happens with different views and motives in conveying political messages.
In parliament, there is no single model of political communication theoretically applied because politicians use a random model according to the style and behavior of individual politicians. It means that every politician is doing the process of political delivery messages based on the habits and style of politicians.

The research finds that communication politicians can develop towards meaningful communication models. The ‘political stage’ has symbols and meanings so that the interactions and ways of communication are interpreted based on political interests, agreements, and compromises related to the identity and background of the politician. This, which is the difference in the motive of how ‘violence’ in the delivery of political messages occurs.

Political communication in Parliament cannot be conceived as linear communication because the communication is interactional and transactional. Therefore, every political message is ultimately a meeting of interests and disagreements. It can build a conceptual model in which ‘violence’ in the delivery of political messages physically or psychologically occurs on the ‘front stage,’ ‘center stage’ and ‘backstage.’
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