CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an introductory section of the study. It covers the background of the study, the research questions, the aims of the study, and the limitation of the study, as well as the research methodology which includes data collection and data analysis, clarification of key terms, and organization of the paper.

1.1 Background

Reality is constructed by practices which are performed continuously in social contexts. According to van Leeuwen (2008), these practices shape discourse because information about discourse is based on doings (=practices), rather than beings. As van Leeuwen (2009, cited in Wodak and Meyer, 2009:144) argues, for instance, “knowledge about what ‘leadership’ is, is ultimately based on what leaders do”. However, a discourse will alter these practices, for instance by obscuring some aspects of practices that are less important. In addition, evidence for the discourse comes from texts because manifestation of language which is an irreducible part of reality, as Fairclough (2003) posits. Hence texts provide evidence for the existence of reality.

In providing evidence of reality, a text exercises language to represent some aspects of reality. Consequently, a text never displays reality in an intact form, but as representation. Therefore, according to van Leeuwen (2009, cited in
Wodak and Meyer, 2009) a text needs to be reconstructed to retrieve reality that a
text draws on.

Van Leeuwen (1993) provides a method for reconstructing discourse. Building on the work of Foucault (1977), van Leeuwen uses discourse as social
cognition, as “socially constructed ways of knowing some aspect of reality”

In his approach to discourse as recontextualization of social practice, van Leeuwen (1993) introduces elements of social practice that are transformed when represented in a discourse. These elements are contained in actual social practice. Those are actions, actors, performance modes, presentation styles, times, spaces, resources, and eligibility. However, these elements, for instance elements that are less important as discussed above, are then selected (deleted or added) and substituted when represented in a text.

Among those elements, actions and actors are the central discussion to the approach, as van Leeuwen (2009) allows a question to be asked: what kinds of actions are attributed to what kinds of actors. He then formulates the social actor network (1993). The network presents possible representations of actors in a discourse, or the various ways actors can be represented: excluded, included,
activated, subjected, generalized, collocated, associated, using what categorization, or using overdetermination. This formulation can be used to analyze how actors are represented in a discourse.

In my study, the above-mentioned framework was drawn upon to investigate the ideological posture beneath the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia. This constitution is the central discourse in the Republic of Indonesia as a constitutional state, specifically with regard to the authority discourse. As stated in the 1945 Constitution itself, Chapter 1, Article 3, Indonesia is a constitutional state. Consequently, the system of government is based on constitution (Rechtsstaat), not on power (Machtsstaat). In this system, therefore, the 1945 Constitution is crucial as a rule that covers all practices in Indonesia. This means all kinds of authority in the Republic of Indonesia are limited by the 1945 Constitution. Any practice that does not agree with it is unconstitutional and therefore illegal before the law.

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia was established on August 18, 1945, or a day after the proclamation of independence, and until today it has undergone four amendments: in 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. It outlines the regulations that are the source of all kinds of laws in the Republic of Indonesia. My analysis using van Leeuwen’s framework will reveal three things. First, it examines the social actors in the 1945 Constitution. Second, it investigates the linguistic representation of social actors in the text. Finally, it reveals the ideological posture behind the representation. These may contribute to the
understanding of the ideology of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Some studies have been conducted employing van Leeuwen’s framework and focusing on the representation of the social actors. In his study entitled “Discourse and Ideology: Democracy in the Election Manifestoes of New Labour 1997-2005”, Farrelly (2009) tried to analyze the way Labour Party construes democracy in the texts of general election manifestoes year 1997, 2001, and 2005. He focused on the inclusion-exclusion category of van Leeuwen’s Social Actor Network. The findings indicated that although the tendency seems to have become less pronounced in New Labour election manifestoes over time, the state actors tend to be included in the context of democracy more often than do other actors. He found that the power relations of democracy are inverted and at the same time the inversion is hidden under particular exclusions and inclusions of state and other actors.

Another study focusing on the representation of social actors was conducted in 2005 by Labarta and Dolón. The study entitled “The Discursive Construction of Identities: A Critical Analysis of the Representation of Social Actors in Conflict” analyzed the representation of two different social groups in Spanish-newspapers corpus of a conflicting urban construction project. In their corpus, Labarta and Dolón found that pro-project actors are basically included in the text mostly through the plural “we” and through the name of the person or naming of the institution they represent. Identity exclusion of the actors only takes place when negative consequences to the neighborhood are delivered. Exclusion
in such context de-emphasizes their responsibility, or in other words, not accepting responsibility. On the contrary, anti-project actors basically tend to be excluded in the text, and this exclusion is to ignore the negative social impact that the project has on the neighborhood.

The two studies above both focus on the representation of social actors in specific discourse. None of it attempts to reveal the ideological posture behind the representation. The present study focuses on the representation of social actors in specific discourse and attempts to reveal the ideological posture behind the representation.

1.2 Research Questions

The current study attempts to answer these following questions:

1. Who are the social actors in the 1945 Constitution?
2. How are the social actors represented linguistically?
3. What are the ideological postures behind the representation?

1.3 Aims of the Study

The aims of the study are as follows.

1. Examine the social actors in the 1945 Constitution
2. Investigate how the social actors are represented
3. Reveal the ideological posture behind the representation
1.4 Limitation of the Study

The study focuses on analyzing the representation of social actors in the discourse of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and the ways they are represented in the text. In addition, the present study is concerned with the ideological postures behind the ways the social actors are represented in the text.

The framework of the investigation of the study is van Leeuwen’s theory (1993 and 2008) of discourse as recontextualization of social practice. The analysis begins with the identification of social actors in the discourse of the 1945 Constitution. The analysis continues with the investigation of how the social actors are represented. The data found, then, were used to reveal the ideological posture behind the ways the social actors are represented.

1.5 Research Methodology

The general approach used in this research is primarily qualitative. As a framework of analysis of the data and of discussion, the present study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). As Paltridge (2006) states, “there is no single view of what critical discourse analysis actually is, so it is difficult to present a complete, unified view on this”. However, most scholars, such as Fairclough (1989), van Dijk (2009), and van Leeweun (2009), agree that this is an interdisciplinary approach to language and that it views language as social practice, and that its ultimate goal is to uncover the ideologies behind the use of language. Hence this method was used to uncover the ideologies behind the use of language in the 1945 Constitution. To do that, CDA needs to uncover the
meanings of language use in a discourse. One of many ways to do that is by employing Halliday’s Systemic Functional Grammar theory as the tool, as van Leeuwen (1993) did in formulating his framework.

The data collection and analysis are elaborated below:

1.5.1 Data Collection

The data of this current study were taken from the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. This document was retrieved from the official Web site of High Court of Indonesia: www.mahkamahkonstitusi.go.id on June 27, 2011. Until today, The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia has experienced four amendments: in 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. The text used as the data source of the present study was the latest text that has undergone the fourth amendment.

1.5.2 Data Analysis

The Constitution text was analyzed using van Leeuwen’s approach to critical discourse analysis. The basis of van Leeuwen’s framework is the view that discourse is the recontextualization of social practice; that social structures are constructed by actions that are evidenced linguistically and sociologically in texts. In van Leeuwen’s terms, the approach to text analysis takes account of attribution and representation of social elements (action, performance mode, actor, presentation style, time, space, resource, eligibility, deletion, substitution and addition). However, van Leeuwen’s approach involves more deeply with the action and actor (or participant) as van Leeuwen proposed two ultimate questions to be asked in this framework, namely (1) what kinds of actions are attributed to
what kinds of *participants*, and (2) what kinds of *actions* tend to be objectivated, de-agentialized, and so on (van Leeuwen, 2009, in Wodak and Meyer, 2009).

Van Leeuwén’s approach to CDA begins with the identification of social actors of social actions in the text. It is then followed by the examination of the ways they are represented linguistically based on the category of representation he proposed, called Social Actor Network. Then it is enclosed by the interpretation of the results of the previous steps. These results will contribute to the interpretation of the given discourse in order to answer the research questions of the present study.

1.6 Clarification of Terms

There are several terms that need clarification in this study. The terms are as follows.

1. Social actors (van Leeuwen, 1993 and 2008)

Van Leeuwen uses the term ‘social actor’ in sociological sense, not in grammatical one. Consequently it refers to human beings engaging in or involving with social interaction, not to entity standing as grammatical participants which can be concrete or abstract, animate or inanimate, as understood in Hallidayan Systemic Functional Grammar. Furthermore, in van Leeuwen’s framework, social actor has a broader sense where it is not only a person or group who does a particular action (agent), but also person(s) or group(s) to whom particular action(s) is done (patient) and
person(s) or group(s) who benefit from an action, whether in positive or negative sense (beneficiary).

2. Ideological posture

Ideology can be comprehended in two senses: first as theory and second as view of life. As theory, ideology is defined as a set of ideas, practices and consciousness. De Tracy introduced the term “ideology” in 1796 to signal an analytical science that perceives ideas. Althusser (1969, cited in Gray, 2005) defines it as “a dynamic set of practices in which all groups and classes participate.” Marx and Engels (in Rehmann, 2007) understand it as “inverted consciousness.”

As view of life, ideology is defined comparatively similarly by linguistic scholars. Van Dijk uses ideology as “shared, fundamental and axiomatic beliefs of specific social groups” (cited in Wodak and Meyer, 2009:65). Reisigl and Wodak see it as “an one-sided perspective or world view composed of related mental representations, convictions, opinions, attitudes and evaluations, which is shared by members of a specific social groups” (Wodak and Meyer, 2009:88). Meyer defines it as “coherent and relatively stable set of beliefs or values” (Wodak and Meyer, 2009:8).

In this study, ideology is used in the second sense. As a view of life, ideology is a set of ideas, beliefs or values that constitute and establish one’s goal and their actions to achieve that goal. In other words, ideology is what every practice of social life is based on. Therefore,
ideology and social life are inseparable; that practices and doings which shape social life must contain ideology.

Posture in this study is comprehended as opinion, as a way in which a government or other organization thinks about and/or deals with a particular matter. Ideological posture in this study, then, refers to a belief system that underlies the construction of the preamble and guides the text of the 1945 Constitution.

1.7 Organization of the Paper

This paper is organized into five chapters; each is subdivided into sections which elaborate issues under focus. Chapter 1 provides the introduction to the present study in general; it deals with the background of the study, research questions, research methodology, data collection and data analysis, clarification of terms and organization of the paper. Chapter 2 introduces the theoretical foundation that serves as the framework for investigating the data of the study. Chapter 3 presents the procedure of the study that covers the research problem, research design, data collection and data analysis. Chapter 4 provides analyses of the data and the findings, and discusses it in a detailed comprehension. Chapter 5 concludes the current study and offers suggestions for future studies.