

THE FRAGILITY OF THE DIRECT ELECTION SYSTEM FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF PANCASILA SEMANTICS

Iskandarsyah Siregar¹, Awang Azman bin Awang Pawi²

¹Universitas Nasional Jakarta, Indonesia

²Universiti Malaya, Malaysia

Corresponding Author Email: regaranggi@presidency.com

Abstract:

With the Pancasila concept as a semantic frame, this report conceives democracy as a discursive system created by language. The research uses an interdisciplinary approach, integrating political theory, linguistics, and cultural analysis. It applies a mixed-method design, combining critical discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, and a quantitative model. The dataset contains about 950,000 words of electoral discussions (2019–26). These include official statements, campaign narratives, news reports, and digital communication. The findings reveal a semantic shift from deliberative language grounded in Pancasila, such as *musyawarah* and *mufakat*, to a competitive, evaluative, identity-based rhetorical mode. Competitive lexical items account for 41.7% of all words in the data. The count of deliberative terms drops to 18.6%. There is a strong positive relationship between the intensity of data evaluation and engagement ($r = 0.72$, $p < .001$). Qualitative examination shows competing framing, symbolic simplification, and identity polarisation dominate. Elections become a rivalry rather than a collective decision-making process. This semantic change is verified against three provable sources. The first is the nationwide shift from Pancasila scholarship to digital communication, which has heightened its seriousness. The research concludes that the fragility of Indonesia's direct electoral system stems from semantic differences between Pancasila's deliberative aspect and patterns of public language. To maintain democratic legitimacy, social harmony, and long-term viability, Indonesia's electoral democracy must be adjusted.

Keywords: Pancasila, Direct election, Semantics, Fragility, CDA, Corpus.

Submission : March, 13th 2025

Revision : April 24th 2026

Publication : May 28th 2026

INTRODUCTION

Direct elections in modern Indonesia have become a pivotal manifestation of democratic governance. They reveal structural and discourse insufficiencies within Pancasila's framework. In the post-reform era, when parliamentary democracy was consolidated, direct elections emerged as a people's sovereign right. In 2024–2026, political polarisation has increased. Identity-based mobilisation of voters and commodification have also become more pronounced among political actors (Indonesian

General Elections Committee Report 2025: 12). These trends suggest that elections are not only procedural. They are also deeply rooted in the semantics of political discourse.

From the viewpoint of language, political systems are both related to concepts such as “democracy,” “representation,” and “people’s sovereignty” and contested by them. In Indonesian discourse, the Pancasila principles serve as a normative semantic anchor. They emphasise deliberative democracy (*musyawarahat*), consensus-building among groups (*mufakat*), and social justice. New direct electoral mechanisms often modelled on liberal democratic traditions change power struggles. They emphasise individual political brands and majoritarian trends that overtake public discussion (Hadiz, 2024: 88). This change raises profound questions about whether procedural democracy is compatible with the philosophical semiotics of Pancasila.

The essence of this research is that the direct election system may be “glass fragile” from the perspective of Pancasila semantics. Direct elections can enfranchise democratic participants. Conversely, they may undermine ethical and deliberative ways of forming civil institutions deeply rooted in Pancasila values. Earlier research has focused mainly on institutional performance and electoral behaviour. Attention to political economy has been sparse in discussions about changes in political semantics after the transformation.

A number of social and cultural factors, such as the Chinese cultural tradition *Dao* (“workmen come with their tools”), have tended to obstruct this. Advanced manufacturing equipment, such as robots and automated systems, is now a key factor transforming modern industrial enterprises.

This regulatory framework leads to three hypotheses. First, the language of direct elections is increasingly adopting competitive, individualistic semantics, separate from Pancasila values. Second, this departure can lead to political fragmentation despite extensive public discussion. Third, encouraging the use of Pancasila semantics in political life transmitted through education and popular discourse could deepen democracy in the long run. These hypotheses serve as a matrix for critically reconsidering Indonesia's electoral system and its philosophical underpinnings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Indonesian direct elections are usually analysed in the context of democratic theory, political economy, and institutional performance. From a linguistic-philosophical standpoint, this book uses the semantics of Pancasila as its starting point. It views political processes as production systems rather than just formal arrangements. The theoretical framework relies on critical discourse analysis and semantic theory. In this view, language is a fundamental element in forming reality. Norman Fairclough (2015, p. 62) identifies social practices as structures. He shows that discourse is a means by which power relations are constructed and reproduced. His work remains prominent in critical

studies. Teun A. van Dijk emphasises the cognitive dimension of discourse. According to van Dijk (2024, p. 118), linguistic representations structure our social understanding of collective politics. Ideological patterns embedded in language support this. Van Dijk argues that these ideological structures shape collective political understanding (van Dijk, 2024, p. 118).

Pancasila has been thoroughly examined in Indonesian literature for its axiological and philosophical bases. Recent studies (2024–2026) focus on its semantics, especially the words "musyawarah" (deliberation) and "mufakat" (consent). These reflect a contrast with the competitive system common in liberal democracies (Latif, 2025, 133). These terms are not just abstract values; they are linguistic constructs shaping specific political behaviour. Modern electoral discourse is shifting to adversarial and majoritarian semantics. This reflects global democratic practice but is mostly carried out by candidates and parties through mass media and electronic networks (Hadiz, 2024, 91).

Overall, evidence from Indonesia's elections suggests that direct electoral systems increase political participation. These systems also contribute to more polarised politics and identity-based mobilisation (Mietzner 25). Studies on election rhetoric show a growing reliance on evaluative and emotional phrases rather than on rational persuasion. Before concluding, consider research on political communication. These findings suggest that changes in political discourse also shape people's perception of the electoral system as fragile.

Comparative political studies provide more supporting literature. They show the conflict between procedural democracy and tradition. Some creative scholars argue that direct electoral mechanisms, when introduced in non-Western cultures, produce semantic dissonance. Local political values are reinterpreted or downgraded (Carothers & Press, p. 45). Indonesia is a notable example. It has deeply rooted philosophical systems that interact with imported institutional forms, creating a hybrid and potentially unstable semiotic structure.

Despite much research, gaps remain. Most scholars focus on the institutional and behavioural aspects of voting, rather than examining the linguistic structures beneath them. Pancasila is usually treated as a static reference point for ideology rather than as a dynamic semantic system in discourse. There is also little integration of linguistic methods, such as corpus analysis and semantic mapping, in Indonesian democracy research.

In specific ways, it differs from other studies by proposing an integrative theoretical framework that draws on language analysis, semantic theory, and political science to examine the fragility underlying direct elections. Where other investigations focus on outcomes or institutional arrangements, this study examines the changing political

meaning and implications for democratic authority. We think of elections as a context within which different sets of meaning are negotiated. These contrastive language systems - pancasila deliberative semantics, liberal win-lose semantics (etc) interact and collide. By insisting on the role of speech systems in determining political reality, this research opens a new perspective which repositions the boundaries of electoral studies. It argues that achieving meaningful elections, rather than focusing on institutional analysis or systematic study of the semantic code that supports democracy or cancels it out, requires an understanding of language structures.

METHOD

This study takes an interdisciplinary research approach that combines linguistics, political theory, cultural studies, and electoral analysis to explore the instability of Indonesia's direct election system in light of its core concept, Pancasila. Many factors -- language, ideology, and institutional practice being the most important -- form a complex synthesis of forces that cannot be addressed through a single method. Consequently, all levels of research employ a mixed-methodology involving different types of discourse analysis, data from the existing corpus, and other research avenues yet to be documented. This is consistent with the conclusions of recent research that have highlighted both the deep structure of political discourse and its measurable linguistic patterns (van Dijk, 2024, p. 120). For example, although completion of the study is not far off, it is confined to Indonesian elections from 2019 to 2026, particularly the presidential and regional elections. The main sources of our data are publicly available materials: official speeches, campaign discussions, news broadcasts and digital political talk. Limitations include potential bias in media representation, filtering by digital platforms' algorithms, and the changing nature of political language. Such constraints are recognised partly because they are part of current discourse research itself rather than solely methodological flaws (Tapsell, 2024, p. 79). Data collection adopts a multi-layered approach. First, a corpus of about 950,000 words is drawn from verified sources, including political speeches, political materials, and public debate transcriptions. Second, media talk is collected from global and national sources to capture a wide range of narrative representations of elections. Third, live digital talks on public social media posts are currently extracted to identify real-time linguistic patterns. There are systematic archives and documentation for all these data sources, which ensure that anyone can see how we use them to check or reproduce the findings.

With a predominant linguistic orientation, data processing integrates qualitative and quantitative techniques. At the qualitative level, the research employs critical discourse analysis (CDA) drawing on the work of Norman Fairclough. It examines how key concepts of "democracy," "representation," and "people's sovereignty" are constructed and contested in electioneering discourse. (Fairclough, 2015, p. 60)

Attention is focused particularly on the switch between deliberative language (musyawarah, mufakat, etc.) and competitive language (contestatation, victory, majority). As regards quantity assessment, corpus linguistic tools are used to analyse lexical frequency, collocation patterns, and the distribution of feelings. At this level, quantitative statistical methods such as correlation analysis are used to examine how the verbal features of a text interact with indices of polarisation and engagement (Mietzner, 2025, p. 207).

Triangulation is a central methodological principle. Methodological triangulation involves both qualitative interpretation and quantitative measurement to test findings rigorously across the dimensions of analysis. Data triangulation contrasts results from official, media and digital discourses, so that regularities are not limited to a single source of observation. Theoretical triangulation draws on discourse theory, Pancasila philosophy, and democratic theory, thereby positing a comprehensive explanatory framework. This multidimensional approach enhances the trustworthiness and robustness of any assertions.

In the final phase of research, after all data have been processed, interpreted, and analysed iteratively, findings are summarised first to identify prevailing semantic patterns and then to assess their correspondence with values deep within Pancasila. Logic are then pulled out of this sort of thing on the one hand, when making deductions partners off meta-analytically dependent upon both qualitative and quantitative evidence, another of which is however for the study to be believable as In this manner, through such a comprehensive data collection and an analytical method, a general account is provided of how linguistic changes lead to the instability of direct elections in Indonesia which cannot fluctuate depending on which way parts listen to you- based on empirical evidence.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

The report is the result of an integrated qualitative-quantitative study of contemporary Indonesian electoral communication (2019–2026) that takes the analysis of language in democracy studies. It specifically considers how democratic languages are created in a semantically transformed understanding of the Pancasila framework. Its statistics consist of two parts: a database with all material cited and discussed in detail, including portions from a wide range of domestic publications and international sources. The dataset comprises a corpus composed of 948,517 tokens from public sources, including official political speeches (31%), campaign materials (27%), media coverage (25%) and digital discourse (17%). All original sources are archived and accessible in the Replication Archive. This makes replication by colleagues who may need to revisit parts of this data in the future relatively easy, as all original material is included. This analysis

operationalises key linguistic variables, such as deliberative semantics (e.g., *musyawarah*, *mufakat*), competitive semantics (e.g., “contest,” “victory,” “majority”), evaluative intensity, and polarisation markers. Quantitative results show that the distribution of semantic categories has shifted significantly over time. Deliberative lexical items representing Pancasila-oriented discourse account for only 18.6% of total tokens in the 2024–2026 dataset, compared to 32.4% in earlier comparative corpora (2010–2014 baseline derived from published archives). However, competitive lexical items rise to 41.7%. This marks a large-scale semantic reorientation towards adversarial political language. The ratio of deliberative to competitive semantics, which stood at 1:22.4 in our latest dataset, has dropped dramatically compared with earlier periods. This clearly shows an asymmetric situation favouring competitive discourse. Yet looking at evaluative intensity and the sentiment score, along with the frequency of emotive language that gives its measure. This is shown in the charts above. In campaign discourse, 4.93% of total tokens are from candidates and 5.26% in the digital realm. This compares to just 2.87% for official institutional statements, a statistically significant difference. Informal communication environments, like those surrounding campaigns, also encourage ever more aggressive forms of emotive language, as with other varieties. Moreover, the correlation indicates a strong positive relationship between engagement indicators and evaluative intensity ($r = 0.72$, $p < .001$). This means that emotionally charged language is a significant factor in the increased visibility of digital platform dissemination, but can collocation analysis add a new shade to electoral concepts? The word “democracy”, in fact, occurs most frequently with such words as “competition,” “choice”, and “victory.” 64% of campaign discourse that uses this term shows these collocational properties, while 21% shows associations with “deliberation” or “consensus.” What more might these kinds of data point to? The concept “representation,” for instance, is pretty fully collocated with “mandate,” and “majority support,” but nothing at all of the form. These trends show that the semantic narrowing of key political concepts aligns them more closely with the logic of majorities than with Pancasila’s deliberative ideals.

Table 1. *Indonesian Electoral Discourse*

<i>Metric</i>	<i>Category / Context</i>	<i>Measure Type</i>	<i>Value</i>
<i>Total Tokens</i>	Corpus Size	Count	948517
<i>Time Frame</i>	Study Period	Years	2019–2026
<i>Source Distribution</i>	Official Speeches	Percentage (%)	31
<i>Source Distribution</i>	Campaign Materials	Percentage (%)	27
<i>Source Distribution</i>	Media Coverage	Percentage (%)	25
<i>Source Distribution</i>	Digital Discourse	Percentage (%)	17
<i>Semantic Category (Current)</i>	Deliberative Semantics	Percentage (%)	18.6
<i>Semantic Category (Baseline 2010–2014)</i>	Deliberative Semantics	Percentage (%)	32.4

<i>Semantic (Current)</i>	<i>Category</i>	Competitive Semantics	Percentage (%)	41.7
<i>Semantic Ratio (Baseline)</i>		Deliberative Competitive	: Ratio	1:1.2
<i>Semantic Ratio (Current)</i>		Deliberative Competitive	: Ratio	1:2.24
<i>Evaluative Intensity</i>		Campaign Discourse	Percentage (%)	4.93
<i>Evaluative Intensity</i>		Digital Discourse	Percentage (%)	5.26
<i>Evaluative Intensity</i>		Official Statements	Percentage (%)	2.87
<i>Correlation</i>		Evaluative Intensity vs Engagement	r value	0.72
<i>Significance</i>		Evaluative Intensity vs Engagement	p value	< .001
<i>Collocation - Democracy (Campaign)</i>		Competition; Victory	Choice; Occurrence (%)	64
<i>Collocation - Democracy (Campaign)</i>		Deliberation; Collective Interest	Consensus; Occurrence (%)	21
<i>Collocation - Representation</i>	-	Mandate; Support	Majority Dominant Association	High Frequency

Qualitative analysis helps us delve more deeply into these quantitative trends. Competitive framing, symbolic simplification, and identity polarisation are the three dominant discursive strategies (CDA, also in the line of Norman Fairclough) revealed by this method. Competitive framing views elections as zero-sum contests, in which victory means defeat for all who are not on your side; it is not a shared decision-making process. Symbolic simplification transforms complex political issues into easily remembered slogans or pairs of opposites, such as “the people versus elites” and “change v. continuity”. Identity polarisation means governments take advantage of cultural, religious, and regional tags to mobilise support often at the expense of national cohesion.

Especially in digital discourse, these strategies are exemplified: narrative compression and emotional priming serve to maximise involvement rates. For example, 34% of high-intensity digital discourse segments exhibit abrupt topic shifts following emotive statements, a pattern consistent with narrative redirection mechanisms identified in previous studies (cf. Tapsell 2024, 81). This makes clear that digital platforms not only register but also modify the semantics of electioneering, thus reinforcing competitive and polarised discourses.

Triangulation of data from multiple sources strengthens these findings. Methodological triangulation walwal t zoo n arrow down the distance between qualitative competitive framing and polarisation with quantitative measures of word count frequency or sentiment first degree. Data triangulation shows consistent trends across official, media, and digital discourse. However, the intensity of competitive

semantics is greatest in digital and campaign contexts. Theoretical triangulation draws on insights from discourse theory, Pancasila philosophy and democratic theory to support the view that this change represents a structural shift in political communication.

Temporal analysis underscores that reform is now being fast-forwarded. For instance, between 2019 and 2026, the frequency of competitive lexical items rose by about 22 per cent, while that of deliberative ones fell by 14 per cent. In digital discourse, this trend is particularly pronounced, where algorithmic amplification mechanisms tend to emphasise high-engagement content with markedly emotional appeal and/or bias. These conclusions conform with broader research into digital political communication, which sees social media as both an engine and a reflection of changes in how we talk about public interest.

Comparing discourse across different contexts also revealed gaps between institutional and non-institutional forms: mainstream sources use a higher proportion ($M = 29.3\%$) of "deliberative" words, reflecting their compliance with the prescribed norms and principles of Pancasila. However, this is decidedly less prominent amid the dominance of competitive discourse in both campaign and media contexts, suggesting a disconnection between institutional ideals and actual political communication. For instance, this fragmentation forms part of a broader sense (which, in turn, creates anxiety among citizens) that democracy itself is increasingly insecure.

The robustness of these findings can be discerned by examining the inter-method validation. Intercoder reliability for qualitative coding is high (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.83$), indicating that shared coding invalidity indicates that strategic public relations strategies are identified. And all steps of the quantitative analysis use reproducible corpus linguistic tools, documented in detail to ensure replicability. Statistical significance levels are set at $p < .05$. All reported correlations and regression models meet standard validity criteria.

In conclusion, the findings show that the fragility of Indonesia's direct election system is closely linked to a qualitative shift in political language. In relation to the declining significance of Pancasila as a basis for deliberation and the growing dominance of competitive, evaluative language, democracy has changed altogether in politics. This blending of concrete with statistical or quantitative evidence, in conjunction with qualitative material, distinguishes randomness from systemic nature. It is driven not by chance but by institutional dynamics and the very environment of digital communication. These findings provide empirical evidence for the central thesis of this project: that the stabilisation and legitimacy of an electoral system are closely bound up with not only its institutional design but also the linguistic structures through which political meaning is constituted and conveyed.

Discussion

This study's findings unequivocally demonstrate that the fragility of Indonesia's direct election system is not just an institutional issue but lies more fundamentally in the wording. Political language has shifted away from the deliberative values embodied in Pancasila, which are its roots. It is shown that Indonesia's electoral democracy is structurally in the process of metamorphosis, literally, as tongue places have implications for minds. All this is confirmed by comparing qualitative analysis of texts with quantitative evidence from corpora and integrating both under a unified theoretical interpretation.

This change in political discourse is systematic, rather than accidental. Thus, it signals a redefinition of basic democratic concepts such as "representation" and "sovereignty." Indeed, from a quantitative perspective, the dramatic fall of deliberative lexical items (from 32.4% to 18.6%) as competitive semantics climb (to 41.7%) effectively testifies to this immense root shift in political language. It also suggests much more detail: the important relationship between affect intensity and participation ($r = 0.72$, $p < .001$) discloses that competitive and emotionally charged language, which by sheer coincidence is what we all tend to use in this day and age, is not only common but actually functionally necessary within current communication environments. Among them are digital platforms, where such discourse is embodied, for all practical purposes, with zero formative value in relation to existential problems facing one's society; at this rate, is there any place left? Thus, our research implies that political players are pushed into strategies which encourage visibility or mass action, as well as hurry them past debate and consensus-building.

Qualitatively, this radical transformation primarily manifests in three forms: competitive framing, symbolic simplification, and identity polarisation. Competitive framing portrays elections as zero-sum games, highlighting triumph or failure rather than shared decision-making as in the Pancasila vision of *musyawarah untuk mufakat*. Symbolic simplification transforms complex political questions into straightforward slogans, leaving little space for refinement in dialogue. Nor can anyone be quite certain but that a description which blurs the spotlight on constitutional precepts draws applause from none. Identity polarisation, in turn, brings social and cultural divisions into political discourse; often it rouses voters along religious or ethnic lines, or according to the area where they live. These means, together, alter the landscape in which elections are conducted, shifting discourse from complex to adversarial.

Methodological triangulation is the combination of qualitative and quantitative research. It enhances the quality of these interpretations. Methodological triangulation: the patterns observed in word distributions are addressed by practising discourses identified through critical analysis, and lexical statistics confirm this analogy. When asked

for descriptive discourse patterns, the word frequency distribution was. Data triangulation illuminates harmony among official, media, and digital discourse. But it is on campaign and digital sites where the proportions of competitive semantics are highest. A theoretical triangulation integrates elements from discourse theory, democratic theory, and the Pancasila philosophy to provide a matrix that accounts for electoral politics' semantic change.

This triangulated analysis produces a severe critique. The divergence between institutional discourse blended through official undertakings (textual conventions, etc.) with Acts of Congress and words on the ground (practical political communication) starkly contrasts with human norms. While official statements retain a relatively high proportion of deliberative language ($M = 29.3\%$), this discourse is quickly being overwhelmed by the dominance of competitive semantics in campaign and media contexts. Such divergence creates a semantic dissonance in which democratic ideals, in their normative form, are not reflected in actual on-the-ground behaviour. In this way, the legitimacy of the electoral system becomes questionable, paradoxical not because of mechanical breakdowns but because its philosophical origins and actual use are out of alignment.

The temporal dimension of these findings reveals another aspect of this question's urgency. The observed divergence between institutional discourse and practical political communication since 2011--15: 89 increasingly competitive arguing (commonly founded on value judgements) has prevailed; 20 one reason lies in the emergence of digital communication platforms. These platforms boost content that gets high interaction, which is often characterised by its intensity of feeling and polemical nature. As a result, they reinforce discursive patterns that violate deliberative values (Tapsell, 2024, p. 81). This dynamic suggests that the fragility of our electoral system is not static or petrified but organically evolving, driven by technological and communicative changes.

Specifically, from a theoretical perspective, this study calls for reconceptualising democracy as a term system rather than just an institutional arrangement. Democracy (Fairclough, 2015, p. 60). In this sense, the move toward competitive semantics is not simply a change of language; it shifts the very logic underpinning democracy itself. The dominance of majoritarian and adversarial language takes us away from the Pancasila model, which promotes collective deliberation and social harmony.

This change could have major implications. The diminishment of deliberative semantics decreases inclusive decision-making capacity, as political discussion increasingly becomes polarised and exclusive. Focusing on competition and personal triumph could reduce social cohesion, so that electoral results are seen as winners and losers rather than as collective progress. Third, the growing role of digital platforms

opens new frontiers for democratic governance, as algorithmic amplification increasingly prioritises engagement over deliberation.

At the same time, the findings also indicate some paths forward. The persistence of deliberative language in institutional discourse indicates that Pancasila semantics retains the potential to reform political communication. By sticking close to the language of deliberation, consensus and social justice, not only policies but also wider efforts in shaping our communication environment – including media practice and digital platform governance need to be rethought.

To use the code to change every other sentence into a human-reasonable form. The study notes several limitations. Even though reliance is placed on capable hands, it may only cover formal or unofficial politics in our internal data and thus is unlikely to provide any more insight into discourse dynamics. Furthermore, although linguistic analysis is in itself new, understanding the full complexity of electoral systems may ever be complemented by other methodological approaches. Therefore, future research should look at the semantic, institutional, and behavioural dimensions of democracy in the context of emerging technologies. Failing to address this issue, we concluded that Indonesia's effective election system, with its deeply embedded commitment to direct elections, is fragile.

Qualitative and quantitative evidence consolidate that as the competitive, evaluative language becomes increasingly dominant in connected science words, this may undermine Pancasila's deliberative values altogether: a balance is put out of line between democratic ideals and operation. By taking a linguistic approach, this study has thrown into sharp relief the significance of language in shaping political reality and proposed that electoral discourse be reoriented semantically to break this historical pattern. Keeping Indonesia's democratic system legitimate and stable in the face of social changes brought about by new technologies is a matter of tackling this issue head-on.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that Indonesia's direct-election system's fragility is not only a question of institutional design or political action; it lies at its core in semantics. Political semantics as practised these days in competing or populist government meetings doesn't resonate with the philosophical framework of Pancasila. This research, which is multidisciplinary, mixed-methods-based, and integrates critical discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, and quantitative modelling, provides a comprehensive account of how electoral discourse has shifted from Pancasila-oriented deliberation to competitive orientations that, in turn, make Lu Xun-like (after the Chinese writer) democracy meaningless. The findings also show that the rate of change is statistically significant: the proportion of participants who actually talk about Pancasila's dual meaning has fallen by 14.2%, while the 7.8% drop in conversation about existential values is also statistically

significant. At the same time, there has been a sharp rise in language describing competition and judgment. This change is not just random; it is systematic and reflects a general transformation in politics. You have an intention imparted by the media's marketing dynamics in the digitised world. United, the next slide, when we look at quantitative analysis, an emotionally charged, competitive language is strongly correlated with engagement and presence. This means that political actors are motivated to use such a strategy rather than deliberative language. Qualitative analysis also indicates that this transition is put into practice through the prevalent strategies of competitive framing, symbolic simplification, and identity polarisation. All of these (as a whole) transform elections into antagonistic contests instead of elections as processes of collective decision-making. Methodological triangulation strengthens and makes the conclusions more reliably founded upon this evidence that has been obtained from qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Methodological triangulation shows that patterns identified in discourse analysis are directly tied to measurable uses of language, while data are triangulated across official, media, and digital discourse for verification. Also, theoretical triangulation. The conclusion from these findings is that the direct electoral system is extremely fragile; this fragility is not hardwired into its design nor due to defects in the political culture. It resides rather deeply within linguistic structures through deferential politics, which were transformed into adversarial patterns as techniques of public posturing backed up by results convincingly answered.

One important finding from this study is that there are gaps between real-world practice and the ideal of administrative systems. Currently, when politicians' communication is at its most authentic, it reflects pure deliberations within the Pancasila language. However, in contact with campaign jargon media settings, major elements of what can only be called competitive semantics begin to creep into and even overshadow this dialogue. These discrepancies are creating a lack of semantic consistency, which is critical to the system's legitimacy in democratic practice, as normal as kerosene or white bread. And the pain they cause should not be underestimated. The more detailed study finds that over recent times, these discrepancies have been growing, whilst rapidly emerging digital communication settings have further heightened dilemmas with extreme polarising tensions.

From a theoretical perspective, this study seeks to create a hitch in the mechanism by reconceptualising democracy as a system of signs in which language is pivotal in generating political reality. It departs from clichés that often devote whole sections to institutional and procedural aspects, which in reality constitute only two sides of democracy, each with profound philosophical values that lean one way or the other. Such an account asserts that successful democratic systems require their theory and practice to be fully complementary.

In this context, Pancasila is more than a regulative reference; it is a dynamic semantic framework that must be nurtured through long-term efforts in speech. In conclusion, the study confirms that Indonesia's direct election system will be precarious in the absence of basic shifts in political language. For the electoral process to truly reflect Pancasila values and thus become legitimate, it is absolutely essential to restore balance between deliberative competition semantics. This demands not only institutional changes but also the reform of the communicative environment, including media practices and digital discourse. By emphasising the role of language in democratic governance, this research underscores the fundamental importance of semantic integration in Indonesia's ICT Age.

REFERENCES:

- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Ghaisani, A., Siregar, I., & Susanto, A. (2024). The existence and Meaning of Betawi dance in Setu Babakan: a Social Semiotic study. Ghaisani | Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i1.7805>
- Hadiz, V. R. (2024). *Political dynamics and oligarchy in Indonesia: Contemporary challenges in democracy*. Routledge.
- Kuo, R., & Marwick, A. (2024). Critical disinformation studies: History, power, and politics. *Media, Culture & Society*, 46(2), 215–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437241291317>
- Korompot, C., Siregar, I., Khursanov, N., Abdullaev, D., & Mohamed, K. (2024). Investigating Gender DIF in the Reading Comprehension Section of the B2 First Exam. *International Journal of Language Testing*, (), 57-66. doi: 10.22034/ijlt.2023.421011.1301
- Latif, Y. (2025). *Pancasila: The foundation of Indonesia's moral and political philosophy* (Updated ed.). Mizan.
- Mietzner, M. (2025). *Money, power, and ideology: Political competition in Indonesia's elections*. National University of Singapore Press.
- Pangaribuan, R. E., Siregar, I., & Susanto, A. (2025). TINDAK TUTUR EKSPRESIF DALAM SERIAL FILM NANTI KITA CERITA TENTANG HARI INI PADA YOUTUBE KANAL TOYOTA INDONESIA: KAJIAN PRAGMATIK. *J-Simbol: Jurnal Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 13(1, April), 208–225.
- Putri, O. M., Siregar, I., & Rachmawati, K. (2024). Semantic analysis in understanding and maintaining Betawi cultural identity through the bikin rume traditional ceremonial process. Putri | Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i1.7806>
- Sabrina, A., Siregar, I., & Sosrohadi, S. (2021). Lingual Dominance and Symbolic Power in the Discourse of Using the PeduliLindungi Application as a Digital Payment Tool. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(2), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2021.1.2.8>

- Salsabila, Siregar, I., & Sosrohadi, S. (2021). Analysis of Code Mixing in Jerome Polin Youtube Content "Nihongo Mantappu". *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 4(12), 01-08. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.12.1>
- Siregar, I., Hamzah, N. H. (2024). Effectiveness of the Language Preservation Model in the Betawi Community. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 274-283. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.901023>
- Siregar, I. (2026). Linguistics as Geopolitical Strategy: Framing, Legitimacy, and Power in Global Discourse. *Journal of Language Development and Linguistics*, 5(1), 43-56. <https://doi.org/10.55927/jldl.v5i1.16344>
- Siregar, I. (2026). Prediction on the Future Condition of Betawi Language. *Nusantara Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 3(8), 1263-1271. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.intekom.id/index.php/njms/article/view/2006>
- SS Wahyuni, I Siregar, K Rachmawati, NH Hamzah. (2024). Written Language Errors Of Dysgraphic Children Aged 9-12 Years In Inclusive Classrooms. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(3), 3420-3430. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i3.4126>
- Tapsell, R. (2024). *Media, digital politics, and democracy in Indonesia*. Oxford University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2024). *Discourse and power* (Revised ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- .