

Turnitin Originality Report

Processed on: 30-Jun-2023 8:38 PM WIB
 ID: 2124762040
 Word Count: 3813
 Submitted: 1

KOLITA By Nurhayati
 Nurhayati

Similarity Index 1%	Similarity by Source
	Internet Sources: N/A Publications: 1% Student Papers: N/A

< 1% match (Caterina Carta, Élisá Narminio. "The Human Factor: Accounting for Texts and Contexts in the Analysis of Foreign Policy and International Relations", International Studies Perspectives, 2021)

[Caterina Carta, Élisá Narminio. "The Human Factor: Accounting for Texts and Contexts in the Analysis of Foreign Policy and International Relations", International Studies Perspectives, 2021](#)

< 1% match (Todd H. Nelson. "History as ideology: the portrayal of Stalinism and the Great Patriotic War in contemporary Russian high school textbooks", Post-Soviet Affairs, 2014)

[Todd H. Nelson. "History as ideology: the portrayal of Stalinism and the Great Patriotic War in contemporary Russian high school textbooks", Post-Soviet Affairs, 2014](#)

The power struggle in the testimony of Sudirman Said to the House Ethics Council (MKD) Nurhayati Fakultas Ilmu Budaya UNDIP noerhytwid@yahoo.com Abstract This study concerns with political discourse representing the conflict between Executive and Legislative institutions related to the Freeport case. The study aims to uncover that the discourses of Sudirman Said and the members of MKD, represent the two opposing institutions to exercise power. Using critical discourse analysis approach, I want to answer three research questions: (i) what linguistic expressions were used to exercise and to challenge power; (ii) what background knowledge influenced the process of exercising and challenging power; and (iii) how power relationship determines the discourse. Data are the utterances in the ethic tribunal hearing collected from the recorded event of testimony uploaded in Youtube. I use three stages of doing CDA, those are describing formal properties of the text, interpreting the discourse process, and explaining the relationship between discourse and social context. The finding shows that MKD exercised their legitimate as well as illegitimate power through (i) controlling the access of Sudirman said in giving information and clarification, (ii) asking non-essential questions, (iii) using question tags for getting justification, and (iv) controlling the turn system. On the other hand, Sudirman Said challenged the MKD's power through (i) avoiding to answer the question; (ii) violating the norm of court discourse; and (iii) asking for the relevant questions. The such discourses were produced because both institutions claim as having position that can not be intervened. On the other hand, the ways of action (genre) in the discourse event may be shaped by other genre, that is the genre of interrogation in court. Key words: power relation, domination, sustaining power, challenging power, manipulating meaning. INTRODUCTION One of the impacts of social change resulted from the freedom of the press in Indonesia is that common people can consume political events in which they don't have acces directly. This also

increases the interest of social scientists as well as linguists to study political discourses using a critical approach (see Amir, 2014; Santosa et al., 2014; Wariyanti, 2014; Nurhayati, 2015a; 2015b; and Zifana and Wintarsih, 2015). The increasing number of the critical studies about political discourses will keep continuing because of the dynamic discourse practice in political domain. In the end of 2015, there was a freeport gate involving the speaker of the Indonesian House of Representative, Setya Novanto, and oil and gas tycoon Mohammad Riza Chalid. The gate came to public after Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources, Sudirman Said (SS), reported Setya Novanto, to the Court of Honor Council (MKD), for profiteering name of President and Vice President in the Freeport contract extension and for asking the entire 20 percent divestment of the stake in Freeport Indonesia. The gate became more popular after the recording of conversation in a meeting attended by Novanto, Chalid, and Freeport Indonesia CEO Maroef Sjamsoeddin was known in media. The polemic became the conflict between two institutions, legislative vs. executive institutions. There is a big narration constructed in the conflict. One of them is the action of asking Sudirman Said, Ma'ruf Syamsudin, and Setya Novanto, respectively for giving their testimony in the ethic tribunal hearing. Embedded in the hearing forum is the discourse of power struggle between the two institutions which normatively have balanced power. Through the paper, I want to analyse the discourse produced by SS and members of MKD in the first ethic tribunal hearing. In the study, I purpose to uncover the way the two institutions exercise their power through talk and text. To achieve the purpose of the study, I will answer three research questions: (i) what linguistic expressions were used to exercise and to challenge power; (ii) what background knowledge influenced the process of exercising and challenging power; and (iii) how power relationship determines the discourse. **METHODOLOGY** This is qualitative research using the first ethics tribunal hearing as the source of data. The discourse practice was being aired live on national television and then uploaded in Youtube. Data of the research are utterances between Sudirman Said and 16 members of MKD in the hearing, downloaded from Youtube. Using critical discourse analysis approach, I start analysing the data from describing formal properties of the text covering lexical, grammatical, and textual level (Fairclough 2001: 92-93). The second stage is interpreting the process of producing the text through situational context and background knowledge or member's resource (MR) (Fairclough 2001: 118). The third stage is explaining the way the power relationship between the institutions shapes the discourse practice of the hearing. **POWER AND DISCOURSE** In critical discourse analysis, power is generally defined as the ability of control by one group over the others (van Dijk 2008:9). In this case, we talk about groups or institutions rather than personal. In a society, power relations can be built between social groupings such as between men and women, old and young, government and citizens, doctor and patients (Fairclough 2001: 28). Power may be used in positive or neutral way, such as to protect, to govern, or to teach other groups without producing negative impacts of the power exercise. The such power is categorized as legitimate power. On the contrary, if power is used to control other groups for the benefit of certain group and it causes other groups loss their social rights, the power exercise is illegitimate and it is called power abuse (van Dijk 2008: 17). In fact, many groups accidentally articulate illegitimate power to create unequal power relation. It is usually articulated by a dominant group over dominated groups to sustain its position. From the differentiation, van Dijk (2008: 17) differentiates legitimate power use from illegitimate power abuse. Exercising power abuse or exercising domination is violating fundamental norms and values to fulfill the needs of the dominant (van Dijk 2008: 18). CDA is, therefore, more interested in the latter. CDA gives priority to uncover the way certain group produces their discourse to exercise their domination over other groups. Power can be control over action, acces, minds, or discourse.

Control over action means that a group has a capacity to regulate, to command, or to constraint other groups to do something. Control over acces can be seen for example in the way media decides what events are broadcasted, who is interviewed or whose statements are cited. Control over minds is the practice of influencing the minds of group's members to make certain meaning rather than other meanings. Control over discourse means the capacity of one group to control other groups in producing discourse. It covers what can or should be said, how events or happenings can or should be expressed, which speech acts can or should be conducted, and how are the speech acts organized (van Dijk 2008: 10-11). The mentioned aspects that are goal of crontrol are interelated. Hundred years ago, exercising power might be more effective through controlling actions. However, at the present time, it is controlling mind that becomes the most effective way because controlling mind has impacts of controlling discourse, actions, acces, etc. In domination, controlling mind can be realized through communicative power abuse in the form of manipulation, indoctrination, and disinfomation (van Dijk 2008: 18). It means that power relation in a society is manifested in social interaction. The dominant group will select mode of interaction to practice their controlling. In verbal mode of interaction, they will select certain language properties to exercise their power. The dominated groups, accordingly, must know the dominant's wishes, wants, preferences, intentions (van Dijk 2008: 29). The dominant may exercise their discourse of power using direct commands or indirectly through inferential process.

DISCUSSION

The first ethic tribunal hearing that invited Sudirman Said (SS) to give his testimony was conducted in the parliament building, on December 2, 2015. The setting was like in the court room, in which there were 16 members of parliamentary ethics board. One of them was positioned as the chairman and SS was positioned as a witness who has to give information and clarification in order to decide whether or not the speaker of the House of Representative, Setya Novanto, is against the ethic. The genre of Discourse is in the form of formal interview, in which the plaintiff would speak up only if he was asked to do it. The physical context of situation and the type of genre represent an unequal power relation between the interviewers and the witness. The interview limited the freedom of plaintiff in giving information. His discourse is controlled by the board. On the other hand, outside the hearings, Sudirman Said and the board represent the two insititutions that according to constitution have a relative equal power. It caused the board could not exercise their domination absolutely and the witness didn't always receiving the power domination during the testimony. Sometimes SS also challenged the power. That is why the hearing session is the site of power struggle.

LINGUISTIC PROPERTIES TO EXCHANGE POWER

I will divide the description in two parts, those are the linguistic properties used by the parliamentary ethics board and the ones used by S S. I will not discuss all the properties, but only those which function dominantly to exercise power. They are pronoun, mood system, modality, turn taking system, topic selection, and rhetoric. In the hearing session, the board addressed S S saudara pengadu and sometimes Anda or Bapak. The terms of address are usually used to signal the formal distance between interactants. In interviewing, instead of imperative mood, the board mainly used declarative or interrogrative mood. Clauses in declarative mood are used to give information related to the questions asked. They are used as background or co-text of the questions. Some of the information delivered in declarative clauses are new and some others are old information. However, the board sometimes manipulated the declarative clauses to accuse S S. Look at the excerpt of one of the board, Sufmi Dasco, in the following example. (1) (i) Ada ketidakkonsistenan Bapak dalam hal masalah pembahasan soal pemburu rente, Pak. (ii) Jadi kalau dilihat dari laporan dan tindakan Bapak, (iii) Bapak ada tebang pilih soal pemburu rente yang katanya harus kita basmi. (iv) Kalau kita konsisten seperti tadi

teman-teman bilang, (v) yang menggunakan kekuasaan untuk memburu rente itu adalah pelanggaran hukum. (vi) Tentunya harus dilaporkan ke penegak hukum. (vii) Dan kalau dilihat dari laporan, dari transkrip, dari rekaman yang ada, (viii) kan di sini Bapak seharusnya punya kesimpulan, (ix) pemburu rentenya tidak hanya satu, seorang pejabat negara yang bisa dilaporkan ke MKD. (x) Ada orang swasta yang tidak masuk ke ranah MKD. (xi) Kalau memang konsisten, (xii) laporkan ke penegak hukum dua-duanya. (xiii) Sudah pasti kalau ada pelanggaran hukum pasti ada pelanggaran etika. Jadi kita nggak kerja dua kali. In the example, there are twelve declarative clauses and one imperative clause. The main function of declarative is to give information, goods, or services. In clauses (i) and (iii), the speaker gives information that subject, SS, conducted activities of doing inconsistent act and selecting a case of corruption that should be eradicated. The information receiver is S S who is the subject of the clause. The two activities are categorized into bad activities. Giving information to the interlocutor that he conducted bad activities is the act of accusing him, instead of merely informing. There are many such declarative clauses that were manipulated to accuse the plaintiff. The situational context of the discourse is that the two institutions were in conflict because of previously Said's report. Connected to the situational context, it is possible that MKD may have taken revenge. In the situation, MKD had power to do that. That is why the such discourse may represent their power abuse to accuse S S. The dominant use of mood system in the hearing is in the form of interrogative mood. It is appropriate with the discourse type, that is interview or interrogation. The board used their legitimate power to ask for clarification related to the ethical problem of which S N was accused. The information asked was about the chronology of the meeting between S S, R C, and M S; the originality of recording; and the relationship between S S and PT Freeport Indonesia. The board used W-H questions, Yes/No questions, and declarative clauses with rising intonation. Using those interrogative moods, the board actually exercised their power to control S S's freedom in giving the clarification or testimonies. He only gave the information as required. Similar to the previous explanation, the board also articulated their power abuse not only through asking for clarification, but also through doing accusation using a negative interrogative clause "Kenapa tidak...?" (Why don't you...?). Look at the examples of the excerpts below. (2) Kenapa Anda tidak melaporkannya ke aparat hukum? (M. Prakosa) (3) Kenapa Anda tidak berkoordinasi sementara ada pihak di sini disebutkan bernama Luhut B. Panjaitan, atau Anda tidak mau mengambil resiko itu? (Akbar Faisal) The context attached to the questions is that: (i) the interviewer assumed that S S has ability to judge that the action of Setya Novanto intervening is against the law; (ii) the interviewers assumed that S S had opportunity to take the case to court; (ii) the plaintiff only reported Setya Novanto to MKD, instead of taking him to court. Therefore, the board accused that S S had opportunity to take Setya Novanto to court, but he didn't do it. The members of the board also produced clauses that contain modalities such as harus, seharusnya, dan mestinya. Those modal markers signal the authority owned by the board in giving judgement or imposing obligation upon the subject of the propositions who is S S. The use of such modal markers represents the unequal power relation between the two parties. Using the such modal markers, the members of the board used their power over the plaintiff to give indirect command. Another linguistic property that is exploited to articulate power is through controlling the turn system. As the interviewers, the members of the board have dominant right to distribute the turn. They used their authority to decide when they start dialogue, when they give the turn to S S, and when they stop his utterance. Interrupting S S was conducted whenever the interviewer felt that S S didn't give the required information or when the interviewer wanted to change the topic. It means that the interviewer kept controlling the flow of the dialogue for the interest of his institution. During the

hearing, there were some topics that were asked by the board. The topics are not merely about the allegation of Setya Novanto, such as the originality of the recording, the chronological meeting between Setya Novanto, Reza Chalid, and Maroef Syamsuoddin, or the relationship between S S and Setya Novanto, but also about issues that don't have direct relation with the ethical violation. The freedom of the members of the board to ask various topics reveals the unequal power relation in the hearing. Below are the examples of questions that don't refer to the main topic. (4) ... dari rekaman yang Saudara kutip ini, Pak Luhut pernah bicara dengan Jim Bob di Amerika. Apa yang dibicarakan antara pak Luhut dengan Jim Bob? (Syarifudin Sudding) (5) Kenapa Anda begitu patuh untuk menyerahkan ini (rekaman) kepada para pihak ? (Ridwan Bae) (6) Apakah Anda melaporkan ini ke Presiden? (Akbar Faisal) (7) Apa maksud dan tujuan Saudara menjawab surat (kepada Freeport) itu? (Guntur Sasono) (8) Pak Ketua, S N, sudah memberikan maaf kepada Pengadu. Bagaimana menurut pengadu. Pemberian maaf ini diterima atau tidak? (Guntur Sasono) Now, it comes to describe the linguistic properties used by S S in responding the board's questions. I will start describing the addressing term used by S S. If the board has freedom to choose three alternations of addressing him as mentioned previously, S S only used one form of addressing term, that is Yang Mulia (Your Majesty). He was constrained by the norm of the court. Using the term, SS is forced to admit that there was an unequal power relation between him and the interviewers. During the testimony, SS used declarative mood to give information asked by the interviewer. However, the domination of the board in interviewing was sometimes challenged by SS through several ways. The first is the use of negative sentence "Saya tidak tahu". As we know that in this ethical court, some of the information asked had already been known by the interviewer from the letter of complaint, from the part of the recording, and from the media. The questions were more intended to ask for clarification and to know the consistency of the witness in giving testimony. The negative sentence "Saya tidak tahu" is used to respond the board's the questions that, according to SS, didn't have relation with their complaint. The negative sentence is an alternate of keep silence or not answering, because not answering the question in court is accused contempt of court. Therefore, saying "Saya tidak tahu" may be thought as the effective strategy of not answering the question. The second way of challenging the domination is by protesting that the question is irrelevant. Another strategy to avoid answering the question is through violating maxim of relevance. Here is the example. (9) AF : Artinya, Anda membantah pernyataan kolega Anda di kabinet bahwa anda tidak melakukan koordinasi dengan presiden dan wakil presiden ya? Iya atau tidak Pak? SS : Presiden memberi arahan, para menteri tidak boleh berpolemik, tetapi saya menyatakan bahwa semua informasi sudah saya sampaikan kepada Presiden dan Wakil Presiden. The example shows that the interviewer, Ahmad Faisal, asked Yes/No question. It is stressed using second clause, "Iya atau tidak Pak?". The question is a form of inferencing produced by the interviewer. Yes/No question was chosen to ask for clarification. On the other hand, giving direct clarification as required may result a dilemmatic position. Therefore, instead of saying Yes or No, or of not answering, SS produced a proposition that is less relevant "Presiden memberi arahan, para menteri tidak boleh berpolemik". Uttering the proposition implies that SS didn't want to answer the question. As mentioned before, the members of the board as the dominant participants controlled the turn system of the hearing. SS took turn after the interviewer finished his utterance and gave a clue that he gave the turn to him. This is the representation of power relation between the powerful and the powerless. I have also mentioned that the interviewers had power to interrupt the utterance of the witness. However, SS did not accept the domination absolutely. In the hearing, there is an excerpt in that SS challenged the domination through violating the turn system and a

politeness norm. Look the excerpt below. (10) KM 1 : Saudara kan tadi dengan gegap gempita "ada pemburu rente". Di sini kalau saudara melakukan kebijakan, melanggar Undang-Undang Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia. Pantas diduga, pantas diduga, jangan-jangan yahh termasuk bagian itu. Ini Undang-Undang yang dilanggar ini Undang-Undang Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia. SS 2: Saya keberatan dengan tuduhan yang mulia. KM 3: Saya kan tidak menuduh, saya cuma bertanya SS 4 : Yang mulia menuduh saya. Yang mulia menuduh saya. Dan menghakimi saya telah melanggar hukum. KM 5: Ya faktanya, Saya tanya jawaban saudara Ya. SS 6 : Silahkan diulangi dan saya akan catat bahwa yang mulia menuduh saya melanggar hukum. In the example, number without bracket refers to turn. Therefore, there are six turns started by Kahar Muzakir. In the first turn, eventhough using hedges pantas diduga and jangan-jangan, he used declarative clauses to make accusing. It is a form of power abuse because the session should be used to hear testimony or asking for clarification from the witness, instead of accusing him. Realizing that he was accused of violating the law, SS took turn to do complaining, eventhough there was no clue that KM would give him the turn. Next, in turn (4), SS even grabbed or interrupted KM's turn before he finished his turn. This is not usual in the hearing. This is the struggle of power conducted by the dominated participant. The next challenge was conducted by the witness, SS, through the threatening the dominant participant. INTERPRETATION AND EXPLANATION The place, the sitting organization, and the uniform worn by the board constructed that the discourse event happened between two participants in unequal power. The board used their legitimate power to hear the information from the witness relating to his understanding the case. However, the social change in Indonesian politic from executive heavy to legislative heavy makes the members of the board tend to abuse their power over the witness to sustain their position. They tried to find the facts that the complaint reported by SS to MKD was illegitimate. On the contrary, SS, representing the executive institution, tried to struggle the power abuse, so the genre in the discourse was not absolutely like an interview in court. SS exercised his power to challenge the domination of the board. Based on the interpretation, it comes to the explanation that the discourse in the hearing belongs to the struggle between legislative and executive institution to sustain power. The discourse practice in court and the reforming the function of legislative as 'check and balance' of the executive performance are the major determinant of MKD in conducting the discourse. CONCLUSION Using the critical discourse analysis, We can 'read' the ethic tribunal hearing as a site to struggle for power between two institutions. The dominant institution tried to exercise not only their legitimate power but also the illegitimate power abuse to sustain the domination. They manipulated linguistic expressions to articulate the power. On the other side, the executive institution as the dominated institution tried to challenge the domination through violating the norms of ethical court. REFERENCES Amir, Johar. 2014. Permainan Kata-kata dalam Wacana Politik sebagai Wahana Meraih kekuasaan. In KIMLI.2014. International Seminar Proceedings. MLI in collaboration with Universitas Lampung. [Fairclough, Norman. 2001. Language and Power . 2nd edn. London: Longman ----- . 2003. Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. London: Routledge.](#) Nurhayati. 2015a. Reviewing the Application of Critical Discourse Analysis on Seminar Papers. In KOLITA 13. International Seminar Proceedings. PKBB, Atma Jaya University. Nurhayati. 2015b. Political Discourse Analysis of Megawati's Speech in the Opening of the Fourth Congress of the PDIP. In LAMAS IV. 2014. International Seminar Proceedings. Master Program in Linguistics, UNDIP in collaboration with Balai Bahasa Provinsi Jawa Tengah. Riyadi, et.al. 2014. Bahasa Demo Orasi. In KIMLI. 2014. International Seminar Proceedings. MLI in collaboration with Universitas Lampung. [van Dijk, Teun A. 2008. Discourse and Power. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.](#)

Wariyanti. 2014. Bahasa dan Kekuasaan: antara Bahasa, Moral, dan Hukum dalam Pemilihan Walikota Kediri 2013. In KIMLI. 2014. International Seminar Proceedings. MLI in collaboration with Universitas Lampung Zifana, Mahardika; Wintarsih. 2015. Representasi Ratu Atut Chosiyah pada Pemberitaan Kasus Korupsi Alat Kesehatan Provinsi Banten dan Suap Pilkada Lebak di Portal Berita Vivanews dan Suara Karya. In KOLITA 13. International Seminar Proceedings. PKBB, Atma Jaya University