

## THE SPECIAL STATUS, POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND SOCIAL CONSTRUCTI OF YOGYAKARTA BASED ON WESTERN THOERIES

Rusnaini<sup>1\*</sup> Dasim Budimansyah<sup>2</sup>, Karim Suryadi<sup>3</sup> and Cecep Darmawan<sup>4</sup>

---

This research is based on the assumption that Yogyakarta city's special status is a social construction of reality related with power and knowledge. The aims of this study were: (1) to discover the dynamics of Yogyakarta's special status; (2) to establish the political discourses since the attainment of the city's special status; (3) to find out the political discourses of Pro-Election groups on textual, discourse practices, and socio-cultural practices; (4) to understand the order of discourses and their reality in regard to the constructions behind the discourses of Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups. This research was analyzed using the theory of social reality construction of Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann and the theory of power and knowledge of Michel Foucault. The research method employed was a qualitative one, using critical discourse analysis (CDA) technique of Norman Fairclough. The data for this research was obtained from legal and formal documents about Yogyakarta's special status, documents on political discourse especially texts about Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups, and of course via interviews.

**Keywords:** Yogyakarta city Special Status, Pro-Establishment Group, Pro-Election Group, Citizenship, Social Construction, Political Discourse.

### INTRODUCTION

The elections of regional leaders in the regional autonomy policy, post-Indonesian New Order of 1998, was a national issue, and is related with decentralization issue of regional autonomy. Hidayat (2008: 2-3) noted that the perspective of political decentralization defined decentralization as devolution of power from the central government to regional government. The analysis of Lemhannas (National Resilience Institute of Indonesia) in 2007, presented by Muladi as a Governor, stated that direct election of a governor was nor relevant with regional autonomy issue. The reason is because the governor is a representative of central government in the region, and is an extension of the President's power, so direct election is not relevant (<http://otda.bappenas.go.id>). The issue of direct election was not among the issues agreed upon in regard to the Yogyakarta's special status.

The unique policy of regional government in Indonesia could be seen from the grant of special autonomy as an acknowledgment that the 'special' regions were allowed to be different from other regions. Yogyakarta city received that acknowledgment and was called Special Region of Yogyakarta. However, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Citizenship Education Studies, Faculty of Teacher Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jl. Dr. Sutami 36 Surakarta, Central Java Province, Indonesia, *E-mail: rusyogya82@gmail.com*

<sup>2,3,4</sup> General Education Studies, School of Postgraduate Studies, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jalan. Dr. Setiabudhi No. 229 Bandung, Indonesia.

issue of Yogyakarta city special status became a discourse when on 26 November 2010 President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) noted that the development of Draft Bill on Special Status of DIY had to be based on the national pillar, i.e. the Unitary State of Indonesia Republic. Therefore, there should not be a monarch system that conflicted with the constitution and democratic values of Indonesia.

This research attempts to investigate the reality construct of Yogyakarta's special status from the point of view of social reality construction theory of Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, and to investigate the polemic of Yogyakarta's special status using the theory of power of Michel Foucault. The findings of this research would be analyzed using critical discourse analysis of Norman Fairclough. This research was expected to examine the acts of citizenship, including civic engagement and civic participation concerning the special status of Yogyakarta, referring to Hamad (2004: 42) who stated that "a construct could lead us to evidences of the existence of other 'reality' behind the text." Based on the research questions, the aims of this research were: to find out the dynamics of Yogyakarta city special status; to establish the discourses on Yogyakarta's special status from the Pro-Establishment group on the textual, discourse practice, and socio-cultural practices; and also to discover the order of discourse and reality construction behind the discourses of Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Theory of Citizenship**

The investigation of citizenship had always begun with the liberal citizenship theory. The liberal theory of citizenship emphasized on individuals and individual rights. Liberalism focused on the freedom of citizens to fulfill their life needs in the field of politics, economy, social, and culture. Citizens acted to pursue their own interest, while the nation served the function of protecting the citizens' rights. Furthermore, the right to participate was considered a political right, and citizenship participation was also called liberal democracy right.

The concepts of 'personal interest', 'citizens' freedom', and human rights in liberal thinking were criticized by the communitarians, who believed that individual sense of identity was created only through one's relationship with other citizen in the community, in which the citizen was a part of. Therefore, the libertarian democracy, according to Guillermo O'Donnell (Meyer, 2005: 8-9) tended to be a type of elite or delegating democracy that gave the opportunity to fully participate in democracy only to certain citizens. Communitarian thinking declined individualism. The main reason for this was the social democracy (UN convention in 1966 concerning basic rights).

## **THE DIMENSION OF CITIZENSHIP**

### **Citizenship as a Status**

Citizenship as a status was a citizenship understanding partially based on the legal-formal status of citizenship as stated in laws and legislatures. Roche (2002: 70-71) stated that citizenship analysis was needed as acknowledgment of basic additional dimensions, i.e. the additional complexity of citizenship status. Thomas and Gran (2002: 66) stated: "Along with citizenship rights as being connected to the state, theories of civil society also need to be developed to provide the informal aspects of citizenship integrating both the public and private spheres. The end result would be a stronger foundation of the rights and obligations of citizenship."

Turner (1997:8) included the elements of community and identity in his citizenship model. He further noted that cultural identity, which was a collective identity, was the most prominent aspect of citizenship. Turner stated that: "The next important aspect of citizenship is that it confers, in addition to a legal status, a particular identity on individuals and groups. The notion of the 'politics of identity' indicates an important change in the nature of contemporary politics. Whereas much of struggle over citizenship in the early stages of industrialization was about class membership and class struggle in the labor market, citizenship struggles in late twentieth-century society are often about claims to cultural identity and cultural history."

### **Citizenship as a Practice**

Citizenship as a practice was a new term coined by Engin F. Isin in 2009. Citizenship as practice emphasized on acts of citizenship. Acts of citizenship were not similar and congruent with active citizenship. Active citizenship only referred to the fulfillment of duties, for example participating in general election. While acts of citizenship could be interpreted as an action (of individual or group) in daily life which provide positive effect or contribution, directly and indirectly, for public (Kalidjernih, 2009: xii-xxi).

Concerning the development of citizenship as a practice, this research used a wider and more innovative definition of citizenship as proposed by Turner (1993: 2): "It is therefore necessary to define citizenship in order to proceed with this argument. Citizenship may be defined as that set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which as a consequences shape the flow of resources to persons and social group".

### **Modern Citizenship**

In the concept of modern citizenship, Roger M. Smith (2002: 106-107) identified modern citizens as: (1) citizen who participated in political and governmental

activities; (2) citizen who had legality in his citizenship status; (3) citizen who belonged to social organization as a political community; and (4) citizen who fought for public services from the government. Furthermore, he proposed several ways to become modern citizen: (1) participating in the election of parliament members; (2) participating in formulating political policy; (3) eradicating feudalism and racism from national life; (4) monitoring citizenship directly in the social and personal dimensions. All these activities related closely with a modern citizenship competence.

### **Social Construction Theory of Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann**

The term social construction was defined as a social process through actions and interactions in which individuals continuously creating a reality owned and experienced together (Poloma, 2004: 301). In social studies, social construction was inseparable from the social construction theory of Peter Ludwig Berger and Thomas Luckmann. Berger and Luckmann wrote their main theoretical essay, *'The Social Construction of Reality, A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge'*, in 1966. They believed that socializing had to follow reasoning as required by phenomenology, which began with daily life reality as the main reality of societal symptom (Berger and Luckmann, 1990: xiv). Berger and Luckmann summarized their theory by stating that 'reality was socially constructed' and that sociology of knowledge should redefine the definition of 'reality' and 'knowledge' in social context.

Berger and Luckmann explanation concerning social construction was based on the explanation of knowledge sociology. Knowledge sociology stated that human actions were influenced by their understanding of real knowledge, formed through three interrelated stages; objectification (social interaction process in institutionalized inter-subjective world), internalization (process in which individuals identified themselves with social institution or organization they belonged to), and externalization (process of self-adjustment with socio-cultural world as a human product). The main thesis of Berger and Luckmann was that humans (people) and society were dialectic, plural, and dynamic products. This dialectic process occurred through three stages: externalization, internalization, and objectification. Berger and Luckmann (1990: 88) viewed society as a process occurred in the three simultaneous dialectic moments; which meant that what we called social reality was in fact a product of human construct. As in Durkhemian tradition and structural functionalism (Parsonian) tradition that focused on objectification moment, Berger and Luckmann proposed the assumption that objective social reality existed in the relationships of individuals with social institutions (one of the biggest social institution was the nation).

Social reality was found through inter-subjective experiences (inter-subjectivity). Through the concept of inter-subjectivity, how certain society life was continually constructed could be explained (Berger and Luckmann, 1990:

xxi). Therefore, social world was experienced as inter-subjective object, owned and experienced by individuals together with other people, so that we “lived in a world constructed as a community” (Ritzer and Smart, 2011: 482). Through this community, social reality was socialized so that it became shared property of all its members. Individuals accepted social reality with objective dimension through the process of socialization. Primary socialization in family was a process of internalization of the first and foremost reality (*protorealism*) and would be one’s own home world. Primary socialization would result in the first identification of self (Berger and Luckmann, 1990: 193). Then, any doubts concerning the first knowledge would be confirmed and solved in the next stage of socialization. Conflict would arise if the primary socialization conflicted with the next socialization. If the crisis occurred resulted in the negation of primary socialization, it would cause the old knowledge to be identified with pejorative connotation of mistakes. With a new knowledge, a child would leave his old knowledge (Berger and Luckmann, 1990: 203). However, the old knowledge would never vanish entirely. It took really strong shocks to disperse the knowledge ingrained in the first socialization (Berger and Luckmann, 1990: 203-204). Social construction was related with the subjective interpretation of social reality and was inseparable from several factors, including daily stock of knowledge, typification and rectification.

### **Social Stock of Knowledge**

Social stock of knowledge included the knowledge of personal situation and social situation of self in the society. An individual defined his situation by withdrawing from shared ‘stock of knowledge’ that he took over and developed through his own experiences (see Campbell, 1994: 237-238). According to Berger and Luckmann (1990: 59), with social stock of knowledge, society knew the ‘placing’ of individuals in society and appropriate ‘treatment’ for each of them.

### **Typification**

Typification is a process of identifying something as a fixed object. Typification in general could be seen as labeling of something, someone, or certain attributes. Typification was defined as the process of creating certain social construction standard based on assumptions. Berger and Luckmann (1990:45) noted several typification that were deemed important, in terms of inter-subjectivity, including: typification of experiences (all forms that were identifiable, even objects outside the real world); typification of things (was something that we understood as ‘something that represented something’); and Typification in social life (role and status).

### **Reification**

Reification was defined as the assessment of one’s ability measured from several objects he owned. Reification was the understanding of humane phenomena as if

they were things, in terms of non-humane or superhuman. From this, emerged a belief of 'superpower' or 'superhuman'. Berger and Luckmann (1990: 128) noted that "it was clear from the discussion on objectification that when an objective social world was established, reification would never be far from it." The concept of reification also explained about the basics for institutional reification, which was by assigning ontologism status that was detached from the activities of meaning making. Both the entire institution and its parts could be understood through reification.

The theory of social construction not only understood meaning in interaction among individuals but also in groups (civil society) and social structure (nation). Therefore, the cultural, economic, and political factors could not be ignored. As society became more modern, the social construction of reality from Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann was revised by considering the variables or phenomena of mass media which was highly substantial in the process of externalization, objectification, and internalization. Furthermore, Bungin (2008: 212) argued that when the discourse in mass media reached the readers, a social construction would emerged through three generic stages: *First*, justification construction as a form of mass media construction in society that tended to justify everything presented in mass media as a true reality; *Second*, availability was constructed by mass media, a generic attitude from the first stage that one's choice to read the mass media was because his choice and willingness to let his thoughts constructed by mass media; and *Third*, making mass media consumption a consumptive choice, in which someone habitually depended (addicted) to mass media.

In line with this, Rivers & Peterson (2003: 314) stated: "For some people, newspaper was a source of information and ideas concerning various serious public matters. They needed not just the news but also the interpretation or opinions on editorial column to help him formulate his own opinion."

Adoni & Mane (1984: 323-340) found that media played a role in constructing social reality. They divided social reality into three parts: objective social reality, the social symptoms existed in daily life; which were frequently faced by individuals as facts; symbolic social reality, the symbolic forms of objective social reality, commonly known by the public in the forms of art, fiction, and the content of media; and subjective social reality, the social reality constructed in one's self based on the objective social reality and symbolic social reality.

## **HERMENEUTICS, CRITICAL THEORY, DISCOURSE, DISCOURSE ANALYSIS, AND CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS**

### **Hermeneutics**

Richard E. Palmer (2005: 38) noted that, chronologically, hermeneutics was identified as: 1) Bible exegesis theory, 2) common philosophical methodology, 3)

linguistic comprehension, 4) methodology foundation of *geisteswissenschaften* (humanity/social science), 5) existence phenomenology and existential understanding, and 6) interpretation system, both re-collective and iconoclastic, implemented by people to find meaning behind myth and symbols.

### **Critical Theory**

Critical theory emerged in the 1930s in an intellectual group based in Social Research Institution of Frankfurt University, Germany. In 1930s, Nazism arose to suppress the intellectuals, and this threat sparked intellectuals to be critics of social Marxism. The foundation of Frankfurt school's critical theory consisted of: *first*, knowledge was not self evident, it needed to be critically examined; *second*, critical analysis discovered that the reality was not just about surface appearance but also concerning internal cause and condition, which could not be sufficiently understood using empirical generalization; *third*, based on the first two definition of critic, critical theory attempted to analyze social theory itself in terms of categories of basic understanding used in various theories. A theory developed historically, not only by rejecting previous attempts (of theories), but also by analyzing the attempts to find the limitations; *fourth*, critical theory was determined by critical involvement in society. Kincheloe & McLaren (2009: 172) stated that: "A critic is a researcher or theorist who tried to use his work as a form of social or cultural criticism, and who accepted certain basic assumptions: that all thinking was fundamentally mediated by power relations developed socially and historically; and that facts could not be separated from the domain of value or be freed from certain ideological inscription."

### **Discourse**

Paul Ricoeur (in Haryatmoko, 2012:17) defined discourse by differentiating it from language, and detailing four elements in the discourse; including (1) the subject stating the discourse, (2) the content or proposition of the discourse to be presented, (3) the object receiving the discourse (to whom a statement was delivered), and (4) temporarily, a context when a statement was delivered. Habermas (2007: 447) used the term discourse to explain a certain kind of communication needed when the statement of the speaker was challenged or questioned. Unlike normal communication, discourse was a systematic argument that presented several considerations to show the validity of a claim, and issues of legalizing with cognitive and normative dimension.

### **Discourse Analysis**

The pretense of discourse analysis was content, nuance, and latent meaning in media text or speech. Discourse analysis was an alternative of content analysis. While content analysis emphasized on "what", discourse analysis focused more

on “how” of message or communication text. In discourse analysis, the important element of the analysis was interpretation. With discourse analysis, we could know not only what the content of the text was but also how the message was delivered through words, phrases, sentences, and the method of delivering news. Discourse analysis emphasized the interpretation of text. In general, there were three paradigms of discourse analysis; (1) positivist discourse analysis, (2) interpretive discourse analysis, and (3) critical discourse analysis/CDA.

### **Critical Discourse Analysis/CDA**

In general, CDA followed various approach: 1) Marxism, 2) Critical Theory (Frankfurt School, which in the end fell to Habermas), 3) Michel Foucault, 4) Moscovici, 5) Symbolic Interactionism (Constructionism belong in this group, including Pierre Bourdieu and Interpretivism) and MAK Halliday. Fairclough CDA (called “Dialectical-Relational Approach”) was influenced by Karl Marx, Foucault, and Halliday. As comparison, Teun van Dijk CDA was influenced by Moscovici; Ruth Wodak CDA was influenced by Critical Theory and Symbolic Interactionism. Fairclough CDA focused on dimension: the general structure and common linguistic operations. Fairclough emphasized on the relationship between language and its general context, quite similar with Teun van Dijk. However, van Dijk talked in the dimension of Agency, like Mind Control (by agency). Other comparison for this was Theo van Leeuwen that focused on the dimension of Agency, and worked on detailed linguistic operations.

### **Theory of Critical Discourse Analysis of Nourman Fairclough**

Fairclough critical discourse analysis model was divided into two main stages of analysis; the stage of communicative events analysis and the stage of order of discourse analysis. The stage of communicative events was divided into three dimensions: text, discourse practice, and socio-cultural practice (Fairclough, 1998: 3).

Order of discourse was a relationship of different types of things, such as the discursive type, space, workplace, which provide boundaries to how the text was produced and consumed. In analyzing text, the order of discourse of the paper or article needed to be examined in terms of the form of the text; e.g. hard news, feature, article, or editorial. This would help the researcher to assign meaning to the text, the production process of the text, and the social context of the text.

### **Theory of Power and Knowledge Relation of Michel Foucault**

In Foucault theory, power, discourse, and knowledge are inseparable aspects. According to Foucault, every power was constructed and realized through certain knowledge and discourse. It meant that knowledge influenced power through discourse. Discourse, in Foucault’s view, is not understood as a series of words or



propositions in text, but as something that produced something else (ideas, concepts, and effects). Discourse could deliver ideas concerning something. These ideas could influence an individual or a group of individuals to follow the ideas outlined by someone or group of individuals. What made someone follow the ideas was the power.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This research used qualitative approach with critical paradigm to see the process of illustrating the special status of Yogyakarta city as a reality construction. The primary data in this research was obtained from the discourses of the Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups, in forms of spoken and written statements.

Total discourses gathered were 95 texts; consisted of 75 texts of Pro-Establishment group discourse and 20 texts of Pro-Election group discourse. The primary data for this research was completed with secondary data, comprised of legal governmental documents, consisted of laws and regulations from Central Government, Mandate from the king in Kraton Ngayogyakarta and the king in Pura Paku Alaman, and Draft Bill on Special Status of DIY. Another technique used to gather the data was in-depth interview of key informants; i.e. prominent figures of the Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups.

### **FINDINGS**

#### **The Dynamics of Yogyakarta's Special Status**

The reality of Yogyakarta's special status was not God-given, nor was it naturally developed. It was shaped and constructed. Historically, the efforts of Pro-Establishment group to construct the special status of Yogyakarta were based on arguments focusing on the factor of historical journey of Yogyakarta's special status, which was considered evidence enough. All these historical events were considered close to the truth because of the evidence, that: (1) The position of Governor in Yogyakarta for three periods of Indonesia history was held by the people from Kasultanan and Pakualaman circle; (2) the leadership of the two dynasties was believed to have legal, historical, social, and cultural legitimization; (3) the people of Yogyakarta maintained that the authority of governance to be held by the Kasultanan and Pakualaman dynasties.

Political construction of the special status of Yogyakarta then became knowledge. Knowledge was political because its pre-requisites were based on power relations. Both pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups attempted to define reality and expected that the knowledge could transform the social constellation. The groups that defined Yogyakarta's special status and put in discourse the history of Yogyakarta's special status in historical and juridical dimension of constitution, transformed the social constellation of Central-Regional (DIY) government and of

Pro-Election and Pro-Establishment groups. The changes in knowledge configuration encouraged reorganization of presented reality. When Sultan HB X and Pro-Establishment group conceptualized the special status of Yogyakarta, this concept was then translated into the passing of Law on Special Status of Yogyakarta No 13 of 2012. Therefore, the social constellation changed.

Conceptually, the reality of special status of Yogyakarta was not naturally developed, and was not God-given either. It was shaped and constructed. Both groups that competed in ideas on the special status had a share in constructing the special status of Yogyakarta. Therefore, it could be said that, in essence, construction of Yogyakarta's special status was knowledge. Power was something productive when everyone took part in shaping reality. These actions had scientific criteria that became the measurement unit of truth. Power of knowledge was concentrated in the validity (truth) of scientific statements concerning the special status of Yogyakarta. Therefore, the Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups attempted to deliver, control, and organize their discourses to fit the requirements of scientific demand, because this kind of discourse was deemed to have authority. The knowledge of Yogyakarta's special status was not based on subject, but on relationships. On one side, the power of the two groups produced knowledge, and on the other side, the knowledge of the two groups created power. Finally, from the discourse battle of the two groups, the power of knowledge effect of Pro-Establishment group resulted in the passing of Law No 13 of 2012 Concerning Special Status of DIY.

#### **Discourse of Pro-Establishment Group on the Levels of Textual, Discourse Practice, and Socio-Cultural Practice**

On the micro level, or text, the characteristic of political discourse of Pro-Establishment group represented a centripetal movement and pro status quo approach. On the aspect of relations, the political discourse of Pro-Establishment group represented power relations that were interrelated with the special status of Yogyakarta, including the national aspect; represented by the President, Chief of Parliament, and Minister of Domestic Affairs; the Pro-Establishment group as the creator of the discourse; and public or society. On the aspect of identity, the political discourse of Pro-Establishment group empowered the primordial sentiment and democracy *a la Mataram*.

On the macro level, or socio-cultural practice there were three things that influenced the political discourse of Pro-Establishment group: 1) cultural aspect, i.e. traditional culture of Java; 2) institutional aspect, including: a) the existence of local political consolidation and b) the process of drafting Bill of Special Status of DIY; 3) local situation aspect, including: a) the expansion of various local informal association, and b) the tendency toward the leadership of Sultan HB X; and 4) national situation aspect, including the policy of regional autonomy and the tension between primordial politics and civil politics.

### **Discourse of Pro-Election Group on the Levels of Textual, Discourse Practice, and Socio-Cultural Practice**

On the micro level, or text, the characteristic of political discourse of Pro-Election group represented a centrifugal movement and had a nuance of counter-discourse. On the aspect of relations, the political discourse of Pro-Establishment group represented power relations that were interrelated with the special status of Yogyakarta, including the aspect of regional government, represented by Sri Sultan HB X and Sri PA, the Pro-Election group as the creator of the discourse, and public. On the aspect of identity, the discourse of Yogyakarta's special status of the Pro-Election group reinforced the identity as a critical and anti status quo group.

On the meso level, or discourse practice, the political discourse of Pro-Establishment group was highly influenced by several things, i.e. the socio-cultural factors and the factors of activities/organization involved. On the macro level, or socio-cultural practice there were three things that influenced the political discourse of Pro-Election group: 1) cultural aspect, i.e. modern culture of Java; 2) institutional aspect, i.e. the power of Sultan HB X as king and Governor of DIY; 3) local situation aspect, i.e. the emergence of moderate groups in the process of discussing Yogyakarta's special status; and 4) national situation aspect, i.e. the phenomena of local politics and media coverage that took Sultan HB X side.

### **Order of discourse and Reality Construction behind the Discourses of the Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election Groups**

Referring to Foucault, whatever the form of knowledge, rationality, and truth was, the meaning could not be found in itself. Meaning could only be found in its relation with other meaning. It was also true to the meaning of political discourse concerning the special status of Yogyakarta. Therefore, to understand the political discourse of Pro-Establishment group, one should also understand the political discourse of Pro-Election group.

### **Differences of Political Discourses of Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election Group**

The political discourses of Pro-Establishment group and of Pro-Election group were different. Those differences could be identified on the following:

The political discourse of Pro-Establishment group was a construction of Yogyakarta's special status viewed from the perspective of government in DIY based on ideological interest, particularly the establishment of DIY Governor based on genealogical dynasty. This showed that the discourse of Pro-Establishment group was conservative, in line with the vision and interest of local power.

Meanwhile, the discourse of Pro-Election group was a counter of Pro-Establishment's discourse. In other words, the political discourse of Pro-Election group was essentially affected by the discourse it countered. This made the discourse

of Pro-Election group an implicit dialogue, i.e. a discourse constructed in relation with its opponent's discourse. Pro-Election group put out a discourse of separating the political position as the Head of Region (governor) of DIY and the cultural position as Sultan Yogyakarta. This showed that the discourse of Pro-Election group was transformative, demanding a political transformation from political culture of clientele to the political culture of citizenship.

#### ***Similarities between Discourses of Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election Groups***

The discourses of both groups (Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election) were products born of historical background, subjective or objective. Therefore, there were similarities between the discourses of Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups. The similarities were identified on the following aspects:

*First*, Pro-Establishment and Pro-Election groups both conducted interpretative politic in the discourse concerning the special status of Yogyakarta. Both groups could be regarded as meaning-producing agents, both referential meaning and intentional meaning. *Secondly*, the construction of Yogyakarta's special status by the two groups aimed to make people understand about the special status of DIY based on each group's view.

#### ***Construction behind the Discourse of Yogyakarta's Special Status***

The construction behind the discourse of Pro-Establishment group found, included; *First*, Pro-Establishment group created an ideological hegemony by producing big narration about the family and dynasty of kings in DIY. Referring to Foucault, the discourse practice of Pro-Establishment group as outlined above was a production of knowledge that was considered as the 'truth'. The discourse of Pro-Establishment group was, in essence, a production of 'truth' concerning the special status of Yogyakarta; *Second*, Pro-Establishment group produced their own truth and the society (public) was persuaded to follow the established truth.

The construction behind the discourse on Yogyakarta's special status delivered by Pro-Election group included: *First*, Pro-Election group de-legitimized the discourse of Pro-Establishment group by producing knowledge concerning the special status of Yogyakarta; *Second*, Pro-Election group produced their own truth, which was a reinterpretation of Yogyakarta's special status adjusted with modernization, and they attempted to persuade people to follow that truth.

### **CONCLUSION**

Social construction of reality was, in essence, an interpretative politic and political interpretation. Transformation of primordial loyalty of Pro-Establishment group toward the king was related with the political discourse on the special status of Yogyakarta city. Every discourse was a result of historical dialectics that involved many aspects experienced by the creator of the discourse. Social group in urban

region had powers that happened in every social relation. This social group could not be separated from the power relation with local government.

When political decision making in regional area was interfered by voluntary associations, it showed the existence of community power. A local king in a region built a social construct based on integrated logic aimed to maintain identity, strategic logic aimed to achieve a goal, or 'subjective' logic aimed to maintain cultural values.

In discourse practice, acts of citizenship could be defined as an act (of individual or group) which could provide positive effect or contribution, directly or indirectly, towards society. Political discourse of social groups showed efficacy of citizen's political involvement.

### *References*

- Adoni, H 7 Mane, S. (1984Z). "Media and the Sosial Construction of Reality" in Communication Research. California: Sage Publication.
- Berger, P.L. & Luckman, T. (1990). Tafsir Sosial atas keyakinan: Sebuah Risalah Tentang Sosiologi Pengetahuan. Diterjemahkan oleh Hasan Basari. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Bungin, B. (2008). Konstruksi Sosial Media Massa: Kekuatan Pengaruh Media Massa, Iklan Televisi dan keputusan konsumen serta kritik terhadap Peter L. Berger dan Thomas Lukman. Yogyakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Campbell, T. (1994). Tujuh Teori Sosial, Sketsa, Penilaian, Perbandingan. Jogjakarta: Kanisius.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1998). Kesadaran Bahasa Kritis (terjemahan Hartoyo). Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press.
- Habermas, J. (2007). "Truth And Society: the Discursive Redemption of Factual claims to Validity". Dalam R.T Craig & H.L Muller (Penyunting), *Theorizing communication*. Los Angeles-London-New Delhi-Singapore: Sage Publication.
- Hamad, I. (2004). Konstruksi Realitas Politik dalam Media Massa. Jakarta: Granit.
- Haryatmoko. (2012). Etika Publik. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Hidayat, A.A.A. (2008). Pengantar Kebutuhan Dasar Manusia: Aplikasi Konsep dan Proses Keperawatan. Jakarta: Salemba Medika. <http://otda.bappenas.go.id>
- Kalidjerah. (2009). Puspa Ragam Konsep dan isu Kewarganegaraan. Bandung: Widya Aksara Press.
- Kincheloe, J.L. & McLaren, P.L. (2009). "Mengkaji Ulang Teori Kritis dan Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Penyunting). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Penerjemah Dariyanto dkk.. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Meyer, T. (2005). Demokrasi Sosial dan Libertarian. Jakarta: FES Indonesia.
- Palmer, Richard E. (2005). Hermeneutika. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Poloma, Margareth. (2004). Sosiologi Kontemporer. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Ritzer, G. & Smart, B. (2011). *Handbook Teori Sosial*. Penerjemah Imam Muttaqien dkk.. Bandung: Nusamedia.
- Rivers, W. L, Jensen, J. W. & Peterson, T. (2003). *Media Massa & Masyarakat Modern*. Diterjemahkan oleh Haris Munandar dan Dudy Priatna. Jakarta: Prenada Media.

- Roche, M. (2002). "Social Citizenship: Grounds of Social change". Dalam E.F isin&B.S. Turner (Penyunting), Handbook of Citizenship Studies.London:Sage Publication.
- Roger M. Smith. (2002). Should We Make Political Science More of a Science or More about Politics?. PS: Political Science and Politics, Vol. 35, No. 2. (Jun., 2002), pp. 199-201.
- Thomas and Gran. (2002). Political citizenship Foundations of Rights, PP. 13-52 in Engin Isin and Bryan Turner (eds.), Handbook of citizenship Studies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Turner, B.S. (1993). Citizenship and Social Theory.London,Newbury Park, New Delhi:Sage Publication.