

CONSTRUCTING INDONESIA AS A GLOBAL ACTOR THROUGH TRANSITIVITY: A CLAUSE-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF PRABOWO SUBIANTO'S SPEECH AT THE 80th UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSAMBLY

Imamati Zikra Ar Rusyfa^{1*}, Ramadan¹, Enni Erawati Saragih²

¹Politeknik LP3I Medan, ²Universitas Ibn Khaldun

imamatizikraarusyfa@gmail.com^{1*}; ramadanijawa92@gmail.com¹;

ennierawati.saragih@uika-bogor.ac.id²

*Corresponding author

Article History

First Received:
(August 11, 2026)

Revised:
(August 18, 2026)

Accepted:
(September 6, 2026)

Final Proof Received:
(September 7, 2026)

Published:
(September 7, 2026)

ABSTRACT

States' positions in international affairs depend on both their material capabilities and how their agency, capacities, and responsibilities are represented in discourse. While prior research has established the significance of transitivity in distributing agency among political actors and has explored Indonesia's international roles from foreign-policy and role-conception perspectives, limited attention has been given to the construction of Indonesia's global agency at the clause level through the configuration of processes and participant roles. This study examines configurations of process types and participant roles across successive clause-level representations of Indonesia's redistribution of agency and construction of its role as a global actor in Prabowo Subianto's speech at the 80th UNGA. Utilizing a qualitative discourse analytic approach, the study analyses 30 selected clauses in which Indonesia is explicitly or contextually represented. The findings reveal a cumulative shift from historical affectedness and recipient status toward epistemic, moral, and material agency. Material configurations initially represent Indonesia as an affected or assisted participant, whereas the mental process positions it as a knowing and volitional agent capable of interpreting experience and articulating commitments. The relational process further attributes progress, preparedness, responsibility, and capability to Indonesia, while the subsequent material process increasingly positions the country as an actor that provides assistance, contributes to peace, and addresses global challenges. The reversal from recipient to provider, through which past experiences of receiving international solidarity are recontextualized as a basis for extending solidarity and assuming broader international responsibility, is particularly significant. The study concludes that Indonesia's global agency is constructed not through a single grammatical choice but through the cumulative redistribution of participant roles and process configuration across the speech.



Copyright ©2026 The Author(s)

This is an open access article under the [CC-NC-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license.

This study demonstrates how clause-level grammatical configurations can collectively produce a diachronic discursive trajectory that transforms historical affectedness into epistemic authority, moral responsibility, and capacity for international action, thereby extending transitivity research from the representation of individual acts of agency to the construction of an evolving state actor in diplomatic discourse.

Keywords: Transitivity, global actor, agency, Indonesia, diplomatic discourse

INTRODUCTION

States do not enter the international arena merely as holders of material power or formal sovereignty; they also construct and negotiate identities, roles, and interests through social interaction and discursive practice (Wendt, 1992). Diplomatic discourse is central to this process because it provides states with communicative space in which they can represent historical experiences, articulate political values, claim particular forms of agency, and legitimize the roles they seek to perform within the international order (Fierke, 2005; Hansen, 2006). Recent scholarship on Global South actorhood has emphasized the need to move beyond the predominantly material or economic conceptions of international actors by considering their historical trajectories, political identities, epistemic positions, cooperative practices, and claims to participation in global governance (Abbondanzieri, 2025). Such a perspective is especially relevant to postcolonial states seeking recognition within the international system and the capacity to define the roles and responsibilities through which they participate. Accordingly, global actorhood can be understood not simply as a pre-existing status possessed by a state but also as a position articulated, performed, and legitimized through discourse.

Recent studies have increasingly demonstrated that diplomatic communication directly participates in the construction of state identity and international positioning. Tang (2023), for

example, demonstrates how Chinese diplomatic actors employ mediated discourse to construct national attractiveness and legitimize broader foreign-policy visions, while Lu et al. (2024) demonstrate that diplomatic speeches encode political positions and ideological meanings through recurrent discursive strategies. From a systemic functional linguistic perspective, Wang (2023) further shows that grammatical choices concerning agency can construct a state active, responsible, competent, and cooperative in international communication. Similarly, Luan and Zhang (2024) employed the transitivity system to investigate the configuration of participants and processes in ecological educational discourse, demonstrating the capacity of transitivity analysis to reveal particular ideological and discursive orientations. Wu (2025), through a longitudinal analysis of UNGA speeches, demonstrates that leaders' linguistic choices in multilateral settings contribute to the construction and adjustment of national identity in relation to changing diplomatic agendas and international conditions. These studies reinforce the view that diplomatic language does not merely communicate an already established foreign-policy position; it also provides linguistic resources through which a state constitutes itself as a particular kind of international actor.

The UNGA is especially significant in this regard. The General Debate provides national leaders and high-level representatives with an institutionalized



Copyright ©2026 The Author(s)

This is an open access article under the [CC-NC-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license.

multilateral arena in which they can articulate national priorities, respond to international crises, and position their states in relation to issues of development, security, peace, cooperation, climate change, and global concerns (Baturu et al., 2017). Within such diplomatic settings, representations of what a state has experienced, what it knows, what it is capable of doing, and what responsibilities it is willing to assume become important discursive resources for constructing its position and agency in international affairs (Chilton, 2004; Wodak, 2009; Fairclough, 2010). From this perspective, the construction of a state as a global actor is not only a matter of material capacity or formal participation in international institutions, but also of how its agency, values, capabilities, and responsibilities are discursively represented and legitimized.

Recent research on UNGA discourse further demonstrates that such speeches function as sites of national self-positioning in which responsibility, cooperation, leadership, and international order are discursively negotiated (Wu, 2025). Consequently, representations of what a state has experienced, what it shows, what it values, what it is capable of doing, and what responsibilities it is prepared to assume become central resources for constructing its agency in international affairs. In this sense, diplomatic actorhood is not reducible to statements about national identity; it is also realized through grammatical choices that specify whether a state appears as one that is acted upon, perceives and evaluates, possesses particular attributes and capacities, or acts upon the world.

The transitivity system provides a productivity framework for examining these grammatical configurations within systemic functional linguistics because it

construes experience through the interaction of process types, participant roles, and circumstances (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Recent studies have demonstrated its value for investigating political and international discourse. Alharbi (2021) combined transitivity with social-actor analysis to show how grammatical choices can foreground or background actors and redistribute their involvement in politically sensitive representations. Wang (2023) demonstrated that recurrent configurations of agency and transitivity contribute to the construction of national image in international political communication. Muwafi et al. (2025), in their analysis of Arabic and English Al Jazeera headlines on the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, further show that differences in process and participant configurations contribute to contrasting representations of actors involved in geopolitical conflict.

Collectively, these studies establish that transitivity can reveal how agency, responsibility, vulnerability, and action are linguistically distributed. However, their principal analytical emphasis remains on differences among actors, languages, text versions, or recurrent process patterns. Comparatively less attention has been directed to how the same state actor is successively repositioned through different participant roles and process configurations within a single diplomatic text's unfolding structure.

A separate body of scholarship examined Indonesia's international positioning primarily through international relations and foreign policy perspectives. Studies of Indonesia as an emerging or middle power have identified roles such as regional leader, bridge builder, norm entrepreneur, and autonomous actor within changing regional and international orders. Grzywacz (2020) and Dannhauer (2024),



for instance, examines Indonesia's agency in the ASEAN Outlook to the Indo-Pacific and demonstrates how elite role conceptions and cooperative dynamics shaped Indonesia's attempt to reclaim regional leadership. Umar (2023) argues that Indonesia's conception of international order has been consistently grounded in the pursuit of autonomy, sovereignty, sovereign equality, and multilateralism, while also showing how successive administrations have performed Indonesia's identity and international aspirations differently. More recent work by Wicaksana and Yakti (2025) identifies a movement toward partial multialignment as Indonesia diversifies its multilateral engagements and strategic partnerships. From a broader Global South perspective, Abbondanzieri (2025) likewise emphasized that international actorhood should be understood multidimensionally rather than through the role of material capability. These studies significantly advance the understanding of the roles Indonesia seeks to perform and how its foreign policy agency operates, but their analytical level remains predominantly strategic, institutional, or role-theoretical rather than lexicogrammatically.

Therefore, related but analytically distinct strands of scholarship can be identified. First, research on Indonesian foreign policy explains Indonesia's role conceptions, strategic behavior, autonomy and aspirations within regional and global orders, but does not examine how these forms of agency are constructed through clause-level grammatical choices. Second, studies of diplomatic and international political discourse demonstrate that language contributes to national identity, legitimacy, and state representation, but generally focus on broader discursive strategies, narratives, image construction,

or comparative positioning. Third, transitivity-based studies have demonstrated how process types and participant roles allocate agency and responsibility, but they have largely treated such allocation as a distribution among different social actors, texts, or linguistic versions. The specific intersection remains insufficiently addressed across the strands: how successive transitivity configurations can redistribute agency across repeated representations of the same state actor, thereby constructing an intra-textual trajectory of international actorhood. The analytical issue, therefore, is not simply whether Indonesia is represented as agentive, but how different forms of agency accumulate and change as Indonesia reputedly occupies different grammatical positions throughout a diplomatic speech.

Prabowo Subianto's speech at the 80th United Nations General Assembly provides a particularly productive case for examining this question because it brings representations of Indonesia's historical experience into direct relation with claims concerning knowledge, development, moral, responsibility, capability, solidarity, and international contribution. Therefore, the speech enables the analysis of how the same national referent is grammatically repositioned across successive clauses rather than being treated as possessing a single stable form of agency. This is especially significant because Indonesia moved from being represented through historical affectedness and the receipt of international solidarity to positions associated with knowing, evaluating, committing, acting, and providing assistance to others. Such a movement makes it possible to investigate state agency not as a static attribute attached to Indonesia but as a discursively developing



configuration produced through relations among successive clauses.

Against this background, the present study addresses the following research question: How do configurations of process types and participant roles across successive clause-level representations of Indonesia redistribute its agency and construct its role as a global actor in Prabowo Subianto's speech at the 80th UNGA? This study makes three related contributions. Theoretically, it extends transitivity-based accounts of political agency by conceptualizing agency not only as a clause-specific allocation of Actor, Goal, Senser, Carrier, or other participant role but also as a cumulative discursive trajectory generated through the sequential redistribution of those roles across a text. In particular, the movement from recipient to provider is conceptually significant because it demonstrates that recipienthood and providerhood need not constitute fixed categories of international identity: historical dependence or solidarity received can be recontextualized as a source of epistemic authority, moral obligation, and outward-oriented agency. Empirically, the study connects this grammatical trajectory to scholarship on Indonesia's international positioning by showing how a contemporary presidential address linguistically constructs Indonesia's movement from historical affectedness toward epistemic, moral, and material forms of global agency. Methodologically, this study traces the same state referent across ordered clauses and examines how changing combinations of process types and participant roles produce a broader pattern of actor construction rather than relying primarily on process-frequency counts or comparisons among different political actors. Examining Prabowo Subianto's UNGA speech in this way therefore

advances both transitivity scholarship and research on Indonesia's international positioning by linking clause-level grammatical choices to the discursive construction of evolving state actorhood.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative discourse analysis approach based on the transitivity system within SFL (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Transitivity is used to examine how experience is constructed through configurations of *processes*, *participants*, and *circumstances*, and how these configurations represent agency, affectedness, knowledge, capability, and responsibility. The research data consist of the English transcript of Prabowo Subianto's speech at the 80th session of the UNGA, obtained from American Rhetoric.

The clause is designated as the unit of analysis because the transitivity system operates at the clause level. The entire speech was first segmented based on *process-participant* configurations rather than merely on punctuation marks. From the total number of 80 clauses, those representing Indonesia—either explicitly through forms such as “Indonesia”, “our country”, and “our nation”, or contextually through the pronouns “we”, “us”, and “our”—were selected. Pronominal references were determined based on their antecedents and immediate co-text. Instances of “we” referring to the international community or other collectives were excluded, as were references that remained ambiguous after contextual examination. This procedure yielded 30 clauses for the analytical data set.

Coding was conducted based on Halliday and Matthiessen (2014). First, the process in each clause was classified as *Material*, *Mental*, *Relational*, based on the



experiential meaning of the entire clause, rather than the verb in isolation. Subsequently, participant roles were determined according to the process type—for example, “*Actor–Goal/Recipient*” for *Material* processes, “*Senser–Phenomenon*” for *Mental* processes, and “*Carrier–Attribute*” or “*Token–Value*” for *Relational* processes. Thus, the grammatical subject was not automatically equated with the “*Actor*”. For example, in “*My country knows this pain*”, “*My country*” is coded as the “*Senser*”, “*knows*” as a “*Mental Cognitive*” process, and “*this pain*” as the “*Phenomenon*”.

Passive constructions are analyzed by distinguishing the grammatical subject from its experiential function. In a configuration such as “*We were denied justice*”, “*we*” is treated as the *affected participant/Recipient*, while the “*Actor*” is noted as implicit if not textually stated. Dependent and embedded clauses are analyzed internally when they contain a process–participant configuration relevant to the representation of Indonesia; however, embedded clauses are not automatically counted as separate sampling units. Modality is also distinguished from process classification. Operators such as “*can, will, may,*” and “*must*” are not coded as processes but are noted as interpersonal meanings. For instance, in “*Indonesia can contribute*”, “*contribute*” is classified as a

Material process, while “*can*” indicates a modality of capability.

Ambiguous coding cases notes are resolved by re-examining the entire clause and its immediate co-text, applying the semantic and grammatical criteria of Halliday and Matthiessen (2014). Special attention is paid to verbs potentially realizing more than one process type, ambiguous pronominal references, active–passive constructions, and relational configurations that could be interpreted as other process types. Coding is conducted iteratively—involving process classification, participant identification, context verification, and the review of uncertain cases—to maintain analytical consistency.

Once coded, the 30 clauses are analyzed both individually and in terms of their progression within the speech. The analysis focuses not merely on process frequency, but on how shifts in *process–participant* configurations reposition Indonesia from a state of affectedness and recipient status toward knowledge, capability, commitment, and action. Thus, the analysis traces how transitivity configurations cumulatively construct Indonesia as a global actor. The analyzed clauses, along with their process classifications, participant roles, and citation numbers, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Selected Clauses for the Transitivity Analysis of Indonesia

No	Excerpts
1	<i>My country knows this pain</i>
2	<i>Indonesians lived under colonial domination, oppression, and slavery</i>
3	<i>We were treated less than dogs in our own homeland</i>
4	<i>We Indonesians know what it means to be denied justice</i>
5	<i>[We Indonesians] were denied justice</i>
6	<i>[We Indonesians were] denied equal opportunity</i>
7	<i>We also knew what solidarity can do</i>
8	<i>The United Nations stood with Indonesia</i>
9	<i>[The United Nations] gave us vital assistance</i>



10	<i>Decisions made here based on human solidarity, by the Security Council and this Assembly, gave Indonesia independence international legitimacy</i>
11	<i>[Decisions made here] supported our early development</i>
12	<i>Indonesia today stands on the cusp of shared prosperity, and greater equality and dignity</i>
13	<i>We will never forget</i>
14	<i>today we must never be silent</i>
15	<i>We remain committed to internationalism, to multilateralism</i>
16	<i>Indonesia today is one of the largest contributors to United [Nations] peacekeeping forces</i>
17	<i>We will continue to serve where peace needs guardians</i>
18	<i>Indonesia is prepared to deploy 20,000 or even more of our sons and daughters</i>
19	<i>We will take our share of the burden</i>
20	<i>We choose to answer these challenges directly at home and to help abroad whenever we can</i>
21	<i>Indonesia recorded the highest rice production and grain reserves in our history</i>
22	<i>We are now selfish self-sufficient in rice,</i>
23	<i>we are starting now to export rice to other nations in need</i>
24	<i>[we are] providing rice for Palestine</i>
25	<i>Indonesia will be the granary of the world</i>
26	<i>we choose to confront climate change not by slogans, but by immediate steps</i>
27	<i>Indonesia is shifting decisively from fossil fuel-based development towards renewable based development</i>
28	<i>[We aim] to lift all of our citizens out of poverty</i>
29	<i>[We aim] to make Indonesia a hub for solutions to food, energy, and water security</i>
30	<i>Indonesia is committed to being part of making this vision a reality.</i>

FINDINGS

Transitivity and the Discursive Construction of Indonesia's National Identity

The transitivity analysis reveals that Indonesia's national identity is constructed through a systematic shift in the *Participants* and types of *Processes* throughout the speech. Indonesia is not represented through a static set of national attributes, but rather through an identity trajectory that moves from the historical experience of oppression toward increasing agency and the capacity to act within the international order. This trajectory can be traced through eight interconnected discursive positions, namely Indonesia as an "affected nation," a "knowing nation," a "recipient of international solidarity," "an advancing nation," a "morally responsible nation," a "capable actor," a "provider of solidarity," and ultimately a "global solution provider." Thus, the significance of the transitivity patterns lies not merely in

the existence of *Material*, *Mental*, or *Relational* processes, but in the gradual redistribution of agency through which Indonesia is repositioned from an affected and assisted participant into a knowing, responsible, and increasingly agentive actor. This progression is summarized in Table 2, which maps the stages of discursive positioning, the national identity constructed at each stage, and the corresponding excerpts through which these shifting roles are realized within the transitivity system.

Table 2. Stages of Indonesia's Discursive Positioning Trough Transitivity

No	Stages of Discursive Positioning	Constructed Identity	Excerpts
1	Affected Nation	A nation that experienced colonialism and injustice	2, 3, 5, 6
2	Knowing Nation	A nation that understands	1, 4, 7



		suffering, injustice, and the meaning of solidarity	
3	Recipient of Solidarity	A nation that received international support and legitimacy	8 – 11
4	Advancing Nation	A nation moving toward prosperity, equality, and dignity	12
5	Remembering and Responsible Nation	A nation that remembers past assistance and transforms that memory into moral responsibility	13 – 15
6	Capable Peace Actor	A nation that possesses the capacity and readiness to assume responsibility for peace	16 – 20
7	Provider of Solidarity	A self-reliant nation that provides assistance to other nations	21 – 24
8	Global Solution Provider	A nation that projects itself as a provider of food and solutions to global challenges	25 – 30

The first stage portrays Indonesia as an affected nation whose history is rooted in colonial domination and injustice. This representation is evident in excerpts 2, 3, 5, and 6. For example, excerpt number 2 can be found in the table 3 below.

Table 3. Transitivity Analysis of Excerpt 2

<i>Indonesians</i>	<i>lived</i>	<i>under colonial</i>
--------------------	--------------	-----------------------



Copyright ©2026 The Author(s)

This is an open access article under the [CC-NC-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license.

		<i>domination, oppression, and slavery</i>
Participant: Actor	Process: Material	Circumstance: Condition

Although “*Indonesians*” function grammatically as the *Actor* of the material process “*lived*”, the clause does not construct Indonesia as a highly agentive actor. Rather, “*under colonial domination, oppression, and slavery*”, the *Circumstance* of condition situates Indonesians within externally imposed and restrictive historical condition. Thus, the affectedness in this clause is not primarily realized through Indonesia’s participants role but through the circumstantial configuration surrounding the material process. The construction represents Indonesia as a nation whose historical existence was constrained by colonial power, establishing the initial position of affectedness from which subsequent forms of agency develop.

This condition of affectedness becomes more explicit in the passive material constructions in excerpts 3, 5, and 6: “*We were treated less than dogs in our homeland,*” “*We Indonesians are denied justice,*” and “*We Indonesians were denied equal opportunity.*” In these clauses, Indonesia occupies affected participant roles such as *Goal* or *Recipient*, while the agents responsible for the actions are backgrounded or omitted. Such agent suppression directs attention away from the perpetrators and toward the consequences of colonial domination of Indonesians. The grammatical foregrounding of those subjected to oppression enables colonial experience to function as a constitutive element of national identity.

However, the speech does not confine Indonesia to the position of historical victimhood. Through *Mental* processes, the colonial experience is

reframed as a source of knowledge. Excerpts 1, 4, and 7 construct Indonesia as a *knowing nation*. For example, excerpt number 1 can be found in the table 3 below

Table 4. Transitivity Analysis of Excerpts 1

<i>My country</i>	<i>knows</i>	<i>this pain</i>
Sensor	Mental	Phenomenon

This configuration constructs Indonesia as a knowing nation, transforming historical suffering into a source of epistemic agency. Rather than merely being represented as affected by past injustice, Indonesia is positioned as a collective knower whose experiential knowledge provides a basis for understanding the suffering others. The repeated use of the mental process “*know*” is significant, as suffering is represented not merely as an experience but as knowledge currently possessed by the nation. Indonesia is thereby positioned as epistemically entitled to address injustice, with its understanding rooted in historical experience. This construction is further developed in excerpt 7, “*We also know what solidarity can do*,” where the focus of knowledge shifts from pain and injustice to solidarity. This sequence establishes a semantic progression from knowing suffering to recognizing the transformative potential of collective support. Thus, historical victimhood is transformed into a source of both epistemic and moral authority.

The construction of Indonesia as a knowing nation is followed by its representation as *recipient of solidarity*. Excerpts 8 – 11 relocate agency from Indonesia to international institutions. In excerpt 8, “*The United Nations stood with Indonesia*,” the United Nations occupies the active participant position, whereas Indonesia is represented as the party

receiving institutional solidarity. This configuration becomes more explicit in excerpt 9, “*the United Nations gave us vital assistance*,” where “*the United Nations*” functions as the *Actor*, “*us*” as *Recipient*, and “*vital assistance*” as the transferred entity. A similar configuration occurs in Excerpt 10, “*Decisions made here...gave Indonesia independence and international legitimacy*,” in which Indonesia again serves as the *Recipient*. Excerpt 11 further reinforces the representation of Indonesia as a *Beneficiary* of the multilateral international order. These clauses establish an important historical relationship between Indonesia and multilateralism. Indonesia is represented not simply as a contemporary supporter of the United Nations, but as a nation whose independence, international legitimacy, and early development were supported by international solidarity. This historical positioning later provides a discursive basis for Indonesia’s commitment to internationalism and multilateralism. Thus, the representation of Indonesia as a *Recipient* of solidarity becomes an important link between its historical experience and its subsequent moral and international positioning.

Except 12, “*Indonesia today stands on the cusp of shared prosperity, and greater equality and dignity*,” marks an important transitional point in the construction of Indonesia’s national identity. Through the relational configuration “*stands on the cusp of*”, Indonesia is positioned as *the carrier* of a projected condition associated with “*shared prosperity, greater equality*,” and “*dignity*”. The temporal circumstance “*today*” is particularly significant because it contrasts contemporary Indonesia with the nation previously represented by colonial domination, oppression, and deprivation. The clause therefore constructs a movement



from deprivation to prosperity, inequality to greater equality, and dehumanization to dignity. Accordingly, Indonesia is positioned as an *advancing nation*, no longer defined solely through historical victimhood but increasingly associated with progress and restored national dignity. Excerpt 12 therefore functions as a discursive bridge between Indonesia as recipient of international solidarity and Indonesia as a morally responsible and increasingly capable actor.

The next stage constructs Indonesia as a *remembering and morally responsible nation*. In excerpt 13, “*We will never forget*”, the *Mental* processes of remembering position Indonesia as a *Senser* whose relationship with the past remains active in the present. The significance of this memory becomes clearer in excerpt 14, “*Today we must never be silent.*” The *Modality* obligation “*must*” and the negated state “*be silent*” transform historical memory into a moral imperative. The transition from “*We will never forget*” to “*we must never be silent*” establishes a discursive link between memory and responsibility: remembering past solidarity generates an obligation to respond to contemporary injustice. This position is subsequently institutionalized in excerpt 15, “*We remain committed to internationalism and multilateralism.*” Through the relational construction “*remain committed*” represented as Carrier of a relatively stable commitment to internationalism and multilateralism. These orientations are therefore constructed not merely as temporary foreign-policy preferences, but as attributes grounded in Indonesia’s historical experience of having benefited from international solidarity.

The subsequent clauses construct Indonesia as a *capable peace actor*. This positioning is particularly evident in

excerpts 16–20. For example, excerpt number 16 can be found in the table 3 below.

Table 5. Transitivity Analysis of Excerpts 16

<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>today</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>one of the largest contributors to United Nations peacekeeping forces</i>
Carrier	Time	Relational	Attribute

The clause attributes an established capacity for international contribution to Indonesia rather than representing country through historical affectedness or recipienthood. Therefore, the expression one of the largest contributors construct Indonesia as a capable actor by assigning it a recognized status within international peace keeping. Moreover, “today” implicitly contrast this contemporary capacity with the earlier representations of Indonesia as a nation subjected to colonial domination and dependent international solidarity, contributing to the broader trajectory from affectedness toward international agency.

In excerpt 17, “*We will continue to serve where peace needs guardians,*” “*we*” function as the *Actor* of the process “*serve*”, representing Indonesia’s peace-related identity through continued action. Excerpt 18, “*Indonesia is prepared to deploy 20,000 or even more of our sons and daughters,*” further combines readiness with material capacity. The relational expression “*is prepared*” attributes preparedness to Indonesia, while the embedded material process “*deploy*” projects the concrete mobilization of resources for peacekeeping.

Responsibility is further emphasized in excerpt 19: “*We will take our share of the burden.*” Here, “*We*” functions



as the Actor, while “*our share of the burden*” is depicted as a responsibility Indonesia voluntarily assumes. Excerpt 20, “*We choose to answer these challenges directly at home and to help abroad whenever we can,*” highlights national volition through the *Mental* process “*choose*.” Indonesia is no longer portrayed as a passive participant reacting to external actions, but as a conscious decision-maker determining its responses to both domestic and international challenges. Excerpts 16–20 illustrate a progression from identity and status to service, readiness, responsibility, and volition. This pattern contrasts with earlier passive constructions such as “*were treated*” and “*were denied*,” and with volitional constructions such as “*we choose, we will serve, and we will take*,” marking a significant transitivity shift in the speech: the transformation from *affectedness* to *agency*.

This redistribution of agency becomes particularly visible in excerpts 21 – 24, which construct Indonesia as a *provider of solidarity*. Excerpt 21, “*Indonesia recorded the highest rice production and grain reserves in our history*,” represents Indonesia as an *actor* associated with measurable national achievement. In excerpt 22, “*We are now self-sufficient in rice*,” the *Relational* process attributes “self-sufficiency” to the nation. Together, these clauses establish the domestic capacity necessary to enable Indonesia to assume a provider role in the following clauses. This new position is realized explicitly in excerpts 23 and 24: “*We are starting now to export rice to other nations in need*” and “*(We are) providing rice to Palestine*.” In both clauses, Indonesia functions as the *Actor* and provider, while other nations and Palestine become *Beneficiaries* of its material actions. This configuration contrasts

strongly with excerpt 9, “the United Nations gave us vital assistance,” in which Indonesia *had occupied* the role of *Recipient*. The reversal from Recipient to actor/provider constitutes one of the clearest forms of redistributed agency in the speech. Indonesia is no longer represented primarily as a nation that receives international solidarity, but as a nation whose domestic capacity allows it to extend solidarity; in the past, this is discursively transformed into solidarity provided in the present.

The project culmination of this provider identity appears in excerpt 25, “*Indonesia will be the granary of the world*.” The relational construction directly associates Indonesia with projected global identity. Rather than merely describing an activity that Indonesia performs, the clauses define what Indonesia is envisaged to become. The expression “*the granary of the world*” enlarges the scale of national identity from domestic self-sufficiency to global usefulness. Indonesia is consequently enabled to contribute materially to the needs of the international community. The final group of clauses further extends Indonesian agency beyond peacekeeping and food provision toward the identity of a global solution provider. Excerpt 26, “*We choose to confront climate change not by slogans, but by immediate steps*,” again uses the mental-volitional process “*choose*” to foreground deliberate agency. The embedded material process “*confront*” presents climate change as a challenge toward which Indonesia adopts an active orientation. This is followed, in excerpt 27, by the material-transformative process “*Indonesia is shifting decisively from fossil-fuel-based development towards renewable-based development*.” Here, Indonesia functions as the *Actor* of transformation, constructing environmental



change as an internally initiated process rather than an external demand.

The same future-oriented agency is observable in excerpts 28 and 29 through the mental process “aim”. In “(We aim) to lift all of our citizens out of poverty,” Indonesia is represented as a goal-directed actor whose projected actions concern the welfare of its citizens. In “(We aim) to make Indonesia a hub for solutions to food, energy, and water security,” this goal orientation expands internationally. The phrase “a hub for solutions” is especially significant because it projects Indonesia not simply as a participant in global problem-solving but as a potential center from which solutions may emerge. Excerpt 30, “Indonesia is committed to being part of making this vision a reality,” consolidates this identity through the relational attribute “is committed,” accompanied by the embedded material process “making.” The speech therefore closes this sequence by combining commitment with action, reinforcing the representation of Indonesia as a state willing to participate actively in producing desired global outcomes.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that Indonesia’s construction as a global actor is produced through more than accumulation of positive attributes or references to international contribution. More importantly, the speech progressively recognizes the experiential roles through which Indonesia is represented. This pattern extends previous transitivity research because the principal transformation does not occur through a contrast between different political actors but through the changing grammatical positioning of the same state referent across the discourse. Muawi et al. (2025) demonstrated how different process and participant configurations distribute agency, vulnerability, and responsibility

among actors in geopolitical discourse. The present study shows that such configurations can also produce an intra-textual redistribution of agency. Therefore, Indonesia’s actorhood is not represented as a fixed property that exists uniformly throughout the speech; rather it emerges through a cumulative shift from affectedness and recipienthood toward epistemic, moral, and material forms of agency. This suggests that transitivity can be used not only to identify who is represented as acting or being acted upon in individual clauses but also to trace how state agency is progressively recognized across a diplomatic text.

One possible interpretation of this pattern is that it represents a form of strategic diplomatic self-presentation. A speech delivered before the UNGA is necessarily oriented toward an international audience. Therefore, Indonesia’s representations as knowledge, responsible, capable, and internationally contributing can be understood as attempts to project a favorable nation image. From this perspective, references to peacekeeping, food provision, climate action, and multilateral commitment may function rhetorically to position Indonesia as a credible and constructive participant in global affairs. Such an interpretation is compatible with Tang’s (2023) observation that diplomatic discourse can construct and legitimize a state’s capacity to assume a more prominent international role. However, strategic self-presentation alone doesn’t fully account for the identified linguistic pattern. It explains the possible diplomatic function of presenting Indonesia positively, but it does not specify how that image is grammatically produced. the transitivity analysis provides a more precise account by showing that positive self-presentation is realized through systematic



changes in experiential configuration: Indonesia shifts from roles associated with affectedness and reception toward those of Sensor, Carrier of capability-related attributes, and Actor in outward directed Material process. Thus, while strategic, self-presentation may describe the broader communicative purpose, transitivity identifies the linguistic mechanism through which that purpose is realized.

The second interpretation concerns historical legitimation. The colonial past and Indonesia's experience of receiving international solidarity could be understood as rhetorical resources used to legitimize contemporary foreign policy claims. The speech does not invoke colonial oppression to commemorate national suffering. Instead, historical experience provides a basis from which Indonesia claims knowledge of injustice and subsequently articulates commitments to solidarity, multilateralism, peace, and assistance to others. In this respect, the findings complement Grzywacz's (2020) role-theoretical account of Indonesia's international positioning. Grzywacz demonstrates that Indonesia's international roles emerge from interaction between nationally conceived identities and expectations surrounding how those roles should be performed. The present findings add a lexicogrammatical dimension to the perspective by showing how historical experience can be transformed into a recourse for legitimizing international role performance. Therefore, the colonial narrative's significance lies not simply in its representation of Indonesia as a former victim but in its capacity to authorize subsequent claims to knowledge, responsibility, and action.

The interpretation also explains why the movement from recipient to provider is conceptually significant. Earlier

representations position Indonesia as the beneficiary of international solidarity, particularly through configurations in which external institutions provide assistance, legitimacy, or developmental support. Later representations reverse this relationship by positioning Indonesia as a source of associate and contribution to others. This reversal should not be understood merely as a change in topic from past dependence to present capability. It constitutes a transformation in the relational logic of solidarity. Solidarity received in the past is recontextualized as a moral precedent for the present. In this sense, contemporary agency does not erase historical affectedness; rather, it becomes one of the discursive conditions through which the agency is legitimized.

Therefore, the speech constructs international contribution not simply as evidence of increased material capacity but as a morally continuous response to Indonesia's own historical experience.

A third possible explanation is rhetorical sequencing. The movement from colonial suffering to contemporary capability may reflect conventional rhetorical organization in which a speaker moves from past adversity to present achievement and future aspiration. On this reading, the obvious development of agency could result primarily from the speech's temporal structure rather than from a distinctive grammatical strategy. The interpretation is plausible because the speech repeatedly juxtaposes historical experience with present conditions and future commitments. Nevertheless, rhetorical sequencing alone cannot explain why particular stages of the discourse are associated with systematic changes in participant roles process types. A chronological progression from the past to the present does not necessarily require a



shift from the affectedness or recipient positions to the senser, carrier, and the actor roles. Therefore, the transitivity evidence provides a more specific explanation: temporal sequencing becomes politically meaningful because it is accompanied by a redistribution of experiential agency. The narrative moves forward in time, but Indonesia's grammatical relationship to events also changes.

Relational process also play an important role in this process. Representations of Indonesia as committed, prepared, self-sufficient, or one of the largest contributors do not themselves understand concrete action in the same way as material process. Representations of Indonesia as committed, prepared, self-sufficient, or one of the largest contributors do not themselves understand concrete action in the same way as material process. Instead, they establish statuses, capacities, and dispositions that make subsequent action plausible and legitimate. This indicates that global agency is constructed not only through clauses in which Indonesia functions as an actor but also through the interaction of several process types. Mental process establish knowledge and volition, relationship processes attribute capability and commitment, and material process realize outward-directed action. Therefore, the construction of global actorhood depends on an experiential architecture in which different process types perform complementary functions.

The broader implication is that state actorhood in diplomatic discourse should not be treated as a stable identity simply asserted through explicit labels. It can be construed cumulatively by changing the experiential positions across a text. In the present case, Indonesia's global actorhood emerges through a sequence in which historical affectedness provides

experiential knowledge, experiential knowledge supports moral positioning, attributed capabilities enables credible commitment, and material action projects international contribution. This pattern extends transitivity scholarship from the distribution of agency within individual representations toward the analysis of sequential agency configuration. It also extends research on Indonesia's international positioning by demonstrating how clause-level grammatical organization can be used to ground international claims. Thus, Indonesia is represented as a global actor not simply because the speech states that the country is capable or internationally important, but because its grammatical positioning progressively changes from being affected by receiving from the international order to knowing, evaluating. Contributing to, and acting upon that order.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Indonesia is constructed as a global actor in Prabowo Subianto's speech at the 80th United Nations General Assembly though the cumulative reconfiguration of process types and participant roles across successive representations of the state. Rather than assigning Indonesia a single and stable form of agency, the speech progressively shifts its grammatical positioning from historical affectedness and recipienthood toward epistemic, moral, and material agency. Particularly significant is the reversal from recipient to provider, through which the international solidarity once received by Indonesia is recontextualized as a basis for knowledge, responsibility, capability, and outward-oriented contribution. Thus, Indonesia's global actorhood is constructed not through any single clause or process type, but through the cumulative



redistribution of agency across the discourse.

Theoretically, this finding extends transitivity-based accounts of political agency by showing that agency can be examined not only as a distribution of participant roles within individual clauses or among different actors, but also as sequential redistribution across repeated representations of the same actor. Transitivity therefore provides a means of tracing how diplomatic discourse can progressively construct state actorhood through changing experiential configurations. More broadly, the study suggests that analyses of diplomatic discourse can benefit from examining how process-participant patterns accumulate across a text rather than focusing primarily on process frequencies or isolated grammatical choices. Such an approach makes it possible to connect clause-level linguistic organization which broader claims to international identity, responsibility, and agency. These conclusions concern Indonesia's discursive positioning within the speech and should not be interpreted as evidence that projected global role is necessarily recognized or realized in international practice.

REFERENCES

- Abbondanzieri, C. (2025). About actors of the Global South: Trajectories, continuities, and futures. *Forum for Development Studies*, 52(2), 215–232.
- Alharbi, A. (2021). Controversy and discourse: The arts of transforming negativity through transitivity. *Sage Open*, 11(4).
- Baturo, A., Dasandi, N., & Mikhaylov, S. J. (2017). Understanding state preferences with text as data: Introducing the UN General Debate corpus. *Research & Politics*, 4(2).
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Dannhauer, P. (2024). Elite role conceptions and Indonesia's agency in the ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific: reclaiming leadership. *The Pacific Review*, 37(1), 30–55.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Fierke, K.M. (2005). *Diplomatic interventions: Conflict and change in a globalizing world*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grzywacz, A. (2020). Indonesia's (inter)national role as a Muslim democracy model: effectiveness and conflict between the conception and prescription roles. *The Pacific Review*, 33(5), 728–756.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Introduction to functional grammar*. (4th ed). Routledge.
- Hansen, L. (2006). *Security as practice: Discourse analysis and the Bosnian war* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Lu, Y., Zhou, T. A. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of Chinese diplomatic speeches on China-US relations. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 11.
- Luan, L., & Zhang, D. (2024). Ecological discourse analysis of Russian educational texts based on the transitivity system. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1).
- Muwafi, D. W., Fareh, S., & Jarad, N. (2025). Al-Jazeera Arabic and Al-Jazeera English headlines on the Russian-Ukrainian conflict: a Hallidayan transitivity analysis.



- Critical Discourse Studies*, 22(3), 299–317.
- Tang, L. (2023). Constructing attractiveness: Chinese diplomatic actors' cultural soft-power discursive practices through the British Press. *Critical Arts*, 37(6), 34–51.
- Umar, A. R. M. (2023). The rise of the Asian middle powers: Indonesia's conceptions of international order. *International Affairs*, 99(4), 1459–1476.
- Wang, X. (2023). Images of China construed in president Xi Jinping's overseas signed articles (2014–2021): The role of agency. *Sage Open*, 13(2).
- Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391–425.
- Wicaksana, I. G. W., & Yakti, P. D. (2025). Indonesia's new partial multialignment strategy: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *TRaNS: Trans -Regional and -National Studies of Southeast Asia*, 13(2), 264–281.
- Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wu, W. (2025). Constructing national identity in public health crises: a comparative DHA study of China and the United States (2003–2023). *Frontiers in Public Health*, 13.