The inaugural speech of the Indonesian presidents: Analysing speech acts of Jokowi and SBY inaugural speech

Didin Nuruddin Hidayat[*1], Yudi Septiawan[2], Ismalianing Eviyuliwati[1], Teuku Zulfikar[3], Sudarya Permana[4]

[1]Department of English Education Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia
[2]Department of Information System, Institut Sains dan Bisnis Atma Luhur, Pangkalpinang, Indonesia
[3]Department of English Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry, Banda Aceh, Indonesia
[4]Department of English Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Language plays a significant part in shaping and influencing people's perspectives on societies and political sectors, especially in an inaugural speech. Hence, the researchers aimed to analyze the inaugural speeches' rhetoric and schematic words of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) in 2004 and Joko Widodo (Jokowi) in 2019 during their tenure as the Indonesian President. To uncover their inaugural speeches, the researchers used the macro- and micro-linguistics theoretical frameworks proposed by Hymes (1974) concerning the equality between linguistic and social perspectives. The study revealed that SBY and Jokowi mostly used polite words, a low, moderate voice, and tended to appreciate their rivals in their inaugural speeches. The differences in macro and micro-linguistics features assert that these two national figures have different traits even though they come from the same ethnic group, the Javanese. Further, this study suggested some pedagogical implications for English teachers to give students an idea

---

[*]*Corresponding Author:*

Didin Nuruddin Hidayat
Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta
Jl. Ir H. Juanda No.95, Cempaka Putih, Kota Tangerang Selatan, Banten 15412, Indonesia
Email: didin.nuruddin@uinjkt.ac.id

of the importance of formal (and informal spoken English), bridging a gap between academic English and practical daily English in society.

Keywords: *Inaugural speech; SBY; Jokowi; Sociolinguistics*

1. Introduction

Language is a powerful way to express opinions and beliefs and can also be applied to manipulate thoughts and influence other people (Orwell, 1969, cited in Wilson, 2003; David, 2017). Further, it integrates linguistic features and cognitive processes that form a complex dynamic cognitive system (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Caplan, 1992; Marini, 2001). Taiwo (2009) observes that language is a powerful weapon because it can generate people to vote, debate, and even rebel. It is closely related to the use of language in the political sphere. Language can be associated with various fields such as social, cultural, education, and politics (Purnomo, 2017).

Nowadays, language is essential to politicians, and it colors most politicians' activities such as campaigns, rallies, elections, inaugurations, and many others. A large number of linguistic studies (Arnold, 1993; David, 2014; Fairclough, 1989; Lenard et al., 2017; Ratnasari et al., 2019; Stojan & Mijić, 2019) have concerned with the analysis of the techniques and kinds of language used by politicians to strengthen the ideologies of supporters and to obtain peculiar purposes. This is then associated with the speech theory delivered by Hymes (1974). According to Hymes (1974), a different group of people applies speech differently, and each group has its privileged behavior in linguistics.

To scrutinize the language of specific groups, it needs to provide a clear framework to elaborate on the definition of language in the context of ethnographic study. Hymes (1974) suggested three levels of analysis: *speech situation, speech event,* and *speech acts.* The three speech levels have different contexts. *Speech situation* occupies the highest place of the three because it describes the social conditions in which speaking occurs. The next level of analysis is the *speech event*. The use of language underlies this analysis and social interactions that occur in *speech situations (Fitch & Sanders, 2004). Speech acts* are the lowest level of analysis of the three levels proposed by Hymes. Unlike *speech situations* and *speech events*, *speech acts* look at this analysis from fundamental things. In a broader sense, *speech acts* are all speech and actions we express through speech (Schmidt & Richards, 1980).

Political rhetoric, language style, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and critical discourse analysis are some aspects of studying political language (Parkin, 1984). The language features meet with political communication features, including direct statements, political writings and speeches, campaigns, open debates, and political interviews (Beard, 2000). Some speech features potentially affect the audiences' social condition (Charteris-Black, 2005). Repeating certain words and phrases indicates that society accepts the ideas and concepts offered by politicians (David, 2014).

Moreover, the main aims of political addresses are to impact, instruct, convince, or engage the majority. The language of politics is not a neutral medium that conveys ideas independently formed (Ostwald et al., 2019). An institutionalized structure of meanings channels political thought and action in specific directions (Gautam, 2022). Some political speeches were addressed to the individuals before the election, and these speeches are better known as a pre-election campaign, particularly at rallies and elections.

Further, the situation frequently dictates the speeches after the election is completed. In this case, an elected candidate should thank the individuals for voting for him through a Victory Speech (Afzal & Hassan, 2021). The Victory Speech is a space to introduce the elected candidate (Darong, 2021). It is also an important opportunity for the elected legislators, for example, to reaffirm their duty to serve by repeating the projects and promises of their party during the campaigns (Mio, 2017). The Inaugural Speech is the first speech an elected candidate delivers when beginning a new prestigious position. Inaugural speech is given by political leaders to inform the people of their vision and missions as leaders.

An inaugural speech is one of the main objects of linguistic research. Some outstanding works have been conducted in this of interest. A study conducted by Ayeomoni and Akinkuolere (2012), for example, found that the identification of *speech acts types* in an inaugural speech of President Umaru Yar'Adua (2007) was very helpful in defining the speech's meanings. Speech acts dominate a speech, and it describes a person's personality. Hence, every sentence must always contain *speech acts*. President Umaru Yar'Adua was a senior and respected political leader of Nigeria. With his colorful experience, Umaru delivered his speeches to the audience clearly, and with understandable speech acts (Ayeomoni & Akinkuolere, 2012).

Another study was conducted by Rohmawati (2016) regarding Barack Obama's Inaugural Speech. She explained that Obama applied three kinds of attitudes: Affection, Judgement, and Appreciation (Martin & Rose, 2003). The speech delivered by Obama addressed several key issues, including the damage caused by global warming. Another topic that Obama also mentioned was terrorists. Finally, Obama invited all world leaders to be more responsible for their people, and these statements led Obama to use more judgment features in his speech.

Researchers observed that studies on SBY's and Jokowi's Inaugural Speech differed from those and Rohmawati (2016). The study of SBY's and Jokowi's Inaugural Speech was more critical of the sociolinguistics than those two, including macro- and micro linguistics features. Ayeomoni and Akinkuolere (2012) applied the *speech acts* theory to identify the *speech acts* of President Umaru, while Rohmawati (2016) focused on Obama's attitude toward his speech.

What distinguish this study from others is its cultural background factors. Culture, in this case, certainly affects the political speeches delivered by the presidents. African and American cultures, for example, are different from Asian cultures. Indonesia, one of

the Asia countries, is renowned for having a variety of cultures, such as Minang, Malay, Batak, Betawi, Dayak, and Java. SBY and Jokowi, who are Javanese, always apply the concept of politeness in delivering their state speeches (Sumekto et al., 2022), including when addressing their inaugural speeches as president (Laksana, 2021). Although SBY and Jokowi are both Javanese, some fundamental differences are observed in macro- and micro-linguistics.

SBY is the sixth president who successfully served two terms (2004-2014). During his tenure, SBY has delivered dozens or even hundreds of speeches on various formal and informal occasions. SBY has a strong, disciplined, and courageous personality with his military background. In delivering his speech material, SBY's style of speech was orderly, rigid, and used long terms. The language used by SBY in his speech included langue or language that follows the standard rules of language (Humaidi, 2017; Mozefani et al., 2020). As a speaker who uses langue language, SBY has successfully provided three aspects that form language (langue), namely phonology (sound system), morphology (word formation), and syntax (sentence formation) (Laurie, 1983). He is a Professor at the Defense University of Indonesia (*Universitas Pertahanan Indonesia*). He completed his master's at Webster University and was awarded two honorary doctorates from well-known universities (Encyclopedia of World Biography). Besides, SBY was also awarded the Best Oral Language Figure 2003 (Liputan 6.com, 2003). At that time, he served as Coordinating Minister for Politics and Security Affairs. The award was presented at the 8th Indonesian Congress. In addition, he is also considered to have a structuring style in delivering a speech. Structuring style is a typical person who applies high rhetoric and schematic in speaking. That can be seen from how he manages his speeches that emphasize the rhetorical power with long logical and elaborate data or facts (Tempo.co, 2018).

However, his formal style of delivering speeches did not significantly impact when he gave a speech in front of the children on the commemoration of National Children's Day 2012. Several children were asleep when SBY delivered a speech (Tempo.co, 2012). Perhaps SBY's speech was so formal that SBY forgot his audience was children. It also made SBY stop giving speeches only to wake sleeping children. Being aware of the way he talked made children bored. SBY then changed his speaking style to be more communicative with children. This certainly has to do with micro- and macrolinguistic factors. SBY is indeed a true Indonesian speaker. He was quickly aware of the macrolinguistic aspects of 'SPEAKING' conceived by Hymes.

Meanwhile, Jokowi, the president of Indonesia since 2014, is from the same ethnic background as SBY, Javanese. Jokowi has a different character and communication style from that of SBY. It can be seen generally among several observers; that the translator of the Indonesian presidency Muhammad Iqbal Sirie has an opinion about the president's two-speaking style. SBY and Jokowi have different communication styles in speaking at various international-level meetings (Sulistiyani & Mukaromah, 2018). The difference lies in the choice of words conveyed to the listeners. President SBY uses

formal languages, while President Jokowi prefers to use informal and straightforward terms (Rimadi, 2015).

Jokowi is the seventh President replacing SBY after serving for two terms. Growing up with ordinary people, Jokowi's rhetorical style follows his characters. In contrast to SBY speaking in a formal language (langue), Jokowi frequently gives a speech using parole. He uses simple, famous words that all people easily understand. Another strength of Jokowi's language style is his body language helping him facilitate speech messages that can be conveyed clearly. In addition to spoken language, Jokowi actively carries out non-verbal kinesics, including emblems and compelling displays.

In contrast to SBY, which uses adapter sign language more often, Jokowi is more active in doing illustrator movements. He uses hand gestures in conveying his messages as a reaffirmation of what is said in spoken language. In addition to SBY's language and body movements that are different from Jokowi's rhetorical style, the facial expressions shown by SBY are also much different from Jokowi. SBY is not expressive in rhetoric, while Jokowi's expression shifts following the message conveyed and the movements carried out (Sulistiyani & Mukaromah, 2018).

Furthermore, a language-based analysis frequently cannot examine why one chooses specific language choices. In analyzing a speech, especially a political speech, a combination of linguistic and social perspectives will lead to a better understanding of how linguistic choices have been made for political purposes and how social context affects linguistic selection (Ekström et al., 2018; Fairclough, 1992; Herkman, 2017). This study analyzed the inaugural speeches of the sixth president of the Republic of Indonesia, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY), and the latest President of the Republic of Indonesia, Joko Widodo (Jokowi). The reasons above ensured the researchers deepened and revealed aspects of the language in SBY's and Jokowi's inaugural speeches.

2. Literature review

The literature review discusses three features regarding the rhetorical analysis of the inaugural address. They function to identify the social and linguistic aspects of SBY and Jokowi's inaugural speech. The first part elaborates on the macrolinguistic features. Macrolinguistic covers interdisciplinary fields of study such as psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, sociolinguistics, etc. This study would further discuss sociolinguistic features contributing to inaugural speech personal factors. The second part explains micro linguistic features, defined as the study of the core level of linguistics such as phonetics, phonology, syntax, semantics, morphology, and pragmatics. Finally, researchers try to connect the macro- and microlinguistic features to the concept of politeness of SBY and Jokowi's inaugural speech. It analyzes how a culture shapes language expressions and influences SBY and Jokowi's ways of delivering their inaugural speech.

2.1. Macrolinguistic features

According to Leech, macro linguistics is a part of linguistics concerning more comprehensive language factors (Leech, 1983). This makes macrolinguistics the interdisciplinary study of applied language and linguistics. Macrolinguistic elements represent a whole sample of discourse above the level of words and sentences (Caspari & Parkinson, 2000), such as coherence and propositions (Hay & Moran, 2005). Macrolinguistic connects language with broader social systems, such as language geography and psycholinguistics. Moreover, macrolinguistics often interprets the relationship of language with cultures, countries, and other outside social influences.

Several theoretical frameworks proposed by Hymes (1974, cited in Eaton, 2019) will be used in analyzing the macrolinguistic features. Those are Situation: Setting and Scene (S), Participants (P), Ends (E), Act Sequence (A), Key (K), Instrumentalities (I), Norms of Interaction and Interpretation (N), and Genre (G) or "SPEAKING grid". The "SPEAKING grid" facilitates the designation of the content and meaning of the speech, provides researchers a scientific instrument for "situated and purposive" description and analysis of communication (Hymes, 1974: 106), and presents an etic frame of which an emic description may be formed (Keating, 2001; Saville-Troike, 2003).

a. Situation: setting and scene (S)

Situation covers different times, places, settings, and scenes, and they can cause the use of distinct language variations. There are two kinds of situations in a conversation: formal and informal. Formal situations bring participants to use standard languages, such as state speeches, job interviews, service meetings, and company meetings. The second is an informal situation. In this situation, participants tend to use the language variations they want in conversation (Hymes, 1974; Fitch, 2001).

b. Participants (P): speaker/sender/addressor/listener/audience/hearer/receiver

The participants consisted of speakers-listeners, sender-hearer, and addressor-receiver with specific social roles. In the context of political speeches, the participants are speakers and audiences. Social distance and social status affect the choice of language variations. Social distance refers to how well participants know the speech audience. There are two types of relationships: intimate relationships and distant relationships (Kalou & Sadler-Smith, 2015). Intimate relationships are commonly practiced by people who already know each other well. Meanwhile, distant relationships are relationships between people who do not know their speech audience well. Secondly is social status, which refers to the position of someone in society. Some factors determine a person's social status, such as job, economic background, politics, and education. Hence, a speaker tends to use a more polite and standard form of language in a speech when interacting with people of higher status. Otherwise, a speaker who has a high status tends to use simple language with people of a lower social status.

c. Ends (E): purposes of the speech event, required goals, and tangible results.

Ends belong to the conventionally identified and predicted results of change and the individual aims that participant strives to perform on special occasions. Hymes (2013) mentions that the ideas of an event from a societal viewpoint may not be equal to the conceptions of those occupied in it. Individuals can employ the method for individual or social purposes or artistic impressions (Duranti, 1985).

d.   Act Sequence (A): message form and content

Act sequence deals with "information about the ordering of communication acts within an event" (Saville-Troike, 2003). It is attributed by Duranti (1985) as the event's "sequential organization". Hymes (1974) recommends that message content is covered in the analysis, perhaps as an issue of a problem and a setting of matter. The issue is predetermined for numerous events and acts, though the problem is moderately unconstrained for others, notably conversation. Hymes (2013) proposes that all speaking commands require message forming in two ways: modifying its shape or administering its definition. Consequently, message form and content are accessible to the speech acts and the focus of its syntactic pattern. Further, they are interdependent and can be called jointly part of the "act sequence".

e.   Key (K): tone, manner, or spirit of speech acts

Key refers to the tone, manner, or speech acts in which a particular message is conveyed light-hearted, serious, well-defined, formal, insulting, disrespectful, pretentious, and so forth (Duranti, 1985). The key may also be considered nonverbal by particular sorts of conduct, movement, or even attitude.

f.   Instrumentalities (I): medium of transmission of speech and forms of speech

Under instrumentalities, the information regards itself with the channel or medium of speech delivery (Hymes, 1974). It entails a variety of spoken, written, telegraphic, semaphore, or other media. Concerning channels, one needs to distinguish methods of use. The spoken channel, for instance, may be used to sing, hum, or piping features of speech.

g.   Norms (N): rules of interaction and interpretation

Norms regard the distinct ways and characteristics ascribed to speaking (Hymes, 1974; Saville-Troike, 2003). Further, Norms refer to how these may be viewed by someone who does not share them, such as silence, loudness, and so forth (Blackman & Sadler-Smith, 2009; Saville-Troike, 2003).

h.   Genre (G): textual categories – the type of the event

Genre attributes to divided utterances, such as poems, proverbs, riddles, sermons, supplications, discourses, and commentaries (Hymes, 1974). These are all registered in particular ways in reverse to informal speech. The genre regularly corresponds with speech events. Though, it must be employed as analytically autonomous of them. They may happen at various events.

Simply put, macro-linguistics pertains to how language and society mix, particularly how social factors can affect the application of language in broader society. Macro-linguistics often compares languages beyond counties or cultures, the development of language over time, or other large external societal forces.

2.2. Micro-linguistic feature

Micro-linguistics is a part of linguistics concerning the study of language practices in general, without concern for the meaning of the notional content of linguistic locutions. Micro-linguistics is an in-depth composition of language and its structure. It pertains to how small language differences emerged and changed the sound and look of language. Micro-linguistics does not center on how a language influences society. However, it centers on its structure by examining details, for example, phonetics, syntax, and morphology. Accordingly, micro-linguistics studies numerous features of a particular language and do not provide a comprehensive aspect of its procuring or practicing. Tager (1949) initially issued the term micro-linguistics in an article in *Studies in Linguistics: Occasional Papers*.

a. Phonetic

Phonetics studies speech sounds from a language, how sounds are generated, actualized acoustically, and then processed (Jurafsky & Martin, 2019). There is very little evidence to reveal how phonetic languages relate structurally to phonology. However, Phonetic variations make it clear that there is a level of phonetic description in a language, although this receives little attention from the sign language literature (Crasborn, 2014).

b. Syntax

The word "syntax" is from the Ancient Greek sýntaxis, which implies "arrangement." In detail, Syntax is an expression of a language involving two elements, particularly sound and meaning, combined with grammar (Valin & Lapolla, 2001). Syntax becomes an integrated part of a language. Every lexical item, especially the verb, has substantial control over the syntactic structure of a sentence (Miller, 2002). Finally, Syntax is only restricted by the lexicon and the meaning and form of sentence sounds (Utah, 2020).

c. Morphology

Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832), a German poet, novelist, and philosopher, applied the term morphology in the early 19th century. Wolfgang, at the time, defined morphology in a biological context. Morphology is a Greek word, morph meaning 'form,' and logos meaning 'science'. Hence, morphology is the study of word forms. In linguistics, morphology is a linguistics subdomain (Koopman et al., 2014)that analyzes the problem of words, structure, and how they are set (Aronoff & Fudeman, 2011).

2.2.1. The concept of politeness

In Sociolinguistics, a person is considered to be polite when they look at the face of their interlocutors. Politeness is divided into two, namely deference (or negative) politeness and solidarity (or positive) politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Solidarity politeness occurs if the speaker and listener have known each other and are emotionally attached, which implies that the relationship is not fake. The phrase "Come and have a drink!" expresses the speaker's sensitivity to others. Meanwhile, deference (negative politeness) requires restraint and formality in the utterance, such as, "I don't want to bother you, but can I have a minute?".

Locher and Watts (2008) state that politeness and impoliteness are not combined in speech. They distinguish politeness as expressions and potential. Mills (2003) also argues that responses at the 'potential' level often occur in interactions between family members. Speakers in this context may use more polite words or phrases to respect the family. Besides, Haugh (2015) also presumed interactional difficulties between people. For example, parents tend not to hear 'impolite' words, even when they already know the potential for such impoliteness. Culpeper and Haugh (2014) also examine whether, in military training, the language spoken by the sergeant to trainees has offensive and impolite words. In this context, the sergeant's shouting at the trainees is considered conventional. Hence, a discursive approach to analyzing politeness should consider certain aspects and contexts (Linguistic Politeness Research Group, 2011).

2.2.2. Speech politeness in the Javanese culture

The Javanese language is stratified into three levels. These levels are practiced uniquely according to the person whom to talk to. The Javanese sustains ethical attention deeply both in attitude and utterance. In conversing, a youngster uses complex Javanese language that seems more polite. Oktafia (2015) states that the culture of politeness is more in preference. Soedarmanta (2014) affirms that verbal and body language are good deeds to show politeness custom. Further, Achmad (2017) identifies Javanese characters into nine classes, one of which is politeness.

Being polite is an act that is highly respected in Javanese life. Accordingly, parents always educate their children and grandchildren to talk and be respectful in everyday life, including being polite in dresses. They expect that others will respect their children and grandchildren. Javanese proverb explains that three things determine a person's self-esteem: how to dress, speak, and behave (*ajining dhiri soko lathi, ajining sariro soko busono)*. Furthermore, Anshoriy (2008) affirms that politeness in speaking can significantly influence a person's life.

In Javanese speaking, the type of language used determines one's modesty. There are three sorts of Javanese according to the level of people speaking. The lowest level is the *ngoko*, then *kromo,* and the highest is *kromo inggil*. When speaking, young people must apply a higher language level than older people. It also shows the behavior of the

speaker. Speakers will be considered impolite if speaking to parents using the *ngoko* language.

3. Method

This is qualitative research analysing the inaugural speeches of two Indonesian Presidents, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) and Joko Widodo (Jokowi). The study is concerned with how SBY and Jokowi delivered their rhetoric and schematic words in their speeches during their tenure serving as the president. Accordingly, the researchers used the theoretical frameworks proposed by Hymes (1974, cited in Eaton, 2019), where he developed the analysis of the connection between a language and a broader feature. However, the main point of concern still sees a language that provides a balance between linguistic and social perspectives.

The researchers applied two features of the theoretical framework developed by Hymes (1974). The first analysis used macro-linguistic analysis, intended to see the context of speech situations and *events (Fishman, 1973).* The study then analyzed the objects using micro-linguistic features to obtain an in-depth analysis. Macro-linguistics takes a broad view of linguistic phenomena, whereas Micro-linguistics focuses on the details of language itself, including its sounds, grammatical structures, syntax, and meanings. This analysis emphasizes *speech acts* in which the speech occurs, such as the use of the personal pronoun, the use of persuasion, the use of reference, the use of metaphors, and the use of address terms. Furthermore, the concept of politeness also presents more evidence about the words and phrases used in the speech of SBY and Jokowi.

This study used SBY's inaugural speech when he was the sixth president of the Republic of Indonesia in 2004. Jokowi's inaugural speech was when he was appointed president for the second time in 2019. SBY and Jokowi are also from the Javanese culture, with unique characteristics in delivering a speech. Furthermore, both the language style and gestures in delivering speeches became another interesting factor to be analyzed in this study. These reasons are sufficient to convince researchers to discuss SBY's and Jokowi's inaugural addresses as president in 2004 and 2019.

4. Findings and discussion

The researchers analyzed the data using the theory mentioned in the previous section. The inaugural speeches of SBY and Jokowi were analyzed using the theoretical framework by Hymes in two features, namely analysis of macro-linguistic and analysis of micro-linguistic.

4.1. Analysis of macro-linguistic

This inaugural speech was delivered directly after SBY was sworn into office. The scene was at the presidential palace in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia, and it was

broadcasted live from all local television stations all over Indonesia. The setting and the scene required SBY to create a very formal speech.

SBY is the sixth president of the Republic of Indonesia. He originally came from the eastern part of Java. This is an exciting point because his place of origin influences his language choice, which will be discussed further in the concept of politeness section. SBY is also known as 'the Thinking General'. This is because he not only achieved the rank of four-star general but also gained a doctorate title from Bogor Agricultural Institute (IPB) plus two honorary doctorates in political science from Thammasat University in Thailand and the field of law from his alma mater, Webster University in the United States of America.

SBY is the first person to win a direct election involving all people of Indonesia who have the right to vote. A president was elected by the House Representative Assembly (DPR) in the past. His victory was quite extraordinary since his party, Democratic Party only got less than 10% of the overall voters. However, if the former voting system were still used, he might not have been elected as the president, considering that his party only got four chairs in the parliament. SBY won a landslide victory in September 2004 in the second round of the Indonesian presidential election. He defeated the incumbent President Megawati Sukarnoputri. Previously, SBY was the coordinating minister for Politic and Security under the Megawati's government. They had a clash that made him resign from his position and start the campaign as one of the presidential candidates. His popularity increased significantly after he resigned as Megawati's minister. This is one of the reasons why it is interesting to analyze this inaugural speech because SBY and Megawati are rivals, but SBY still highly appreciates Megawati in his remarks. This will be discussed further in the concept of politeness.

The audience in this inaugural speech can be classified into two groups: the immediate audience and the far audience. The former audience consisted of invited local and international guests, governmental officers, military leaders, mass media, etc. In contrast, the distant audience was all people of Indonesia watching live from their televisions. Considering the broad scope of the audience, SBY needed to make a speech that was relevant for the upper classes and understandable for the middle and lower classes. Hence, SBY avoided using specific political jargon and carefully selected the lexical choice. There are two types of political communication: internal and external (Alfani, 2015; Schäffner, 1996). The former type means when the political speech is delivered to particular people or organizations, politicians, government officers, and political organizations, whereas the latter is intended for ordinary citizens. Considering the near and the far audience, as mentioned above, this political speech was a mixture of internal and external political communications.

Several purposes of the speech can be identified from the text. Initially, it thanked all Indonesian people for their trust and belief in SBY. This is very legitimate, considering that SBY would not have been elected president if most citizens had not

decided to vote for him. Secondly, the speech was intended to give a brief overview of the new government; to give the audience a sense of direction on where SBY would lead Indonesia and how his government would address the problems being faced by Indonesia. Thirdly, the speech also aimed to gain solidarity and support from SBY's supporters and opponents. SBY saw this as the perfect time to unite to build a better Indonesia. Fourthly, considering that SBY came from a military background like some other leaders, such as Hugo Chavez (Salojarvi, 2019), most people of Indonesia felt traumatized after being ruled by General Soeharto for 32 years. SBY needs to assure people that he is different from General Soeharto. Hence, he stressed the importance of democracy and guaranteed that he would uphold the constitution.

The nature of the speech, an inaugural speech, makes the speech more polite than the common political speech (Choi et al., 2016). This is based on the following reasons. Firstly, after being elected as the president, this was the first time for SBY to give a good impression to all people of Indonesia. Hence, he needs to make a 'safe speech' because he does not provoke any parties but embraces solidarity and support from all elements. Secondly, he is aware that this is the perfect time to appreciate all support given by the people, without whom he cannot win the election. He addresses his appreciation not only to his supporters but also to those who oppose him. This is why he shows gratitude to all people, including his opponents, such as Megawati Soekarno Putri, the previous president. Thirdly, he already won the election and became the president. He had two choices: reducing or escalating the political tension. He chose the second option by highly appreciating his opponents.

Meanwhile, in his speech, Jokowi offered five strategic objectives for national development in the second period. However, there is one exciting thing in Jokowi's Inaugural speech in 2019. He said that the bureaucracy's task is delivering and ensuring that people benefit from the program. In addition to presenting five important agendas that were the priorities of his administration in the next five years, the president also urged the stakeholders and the bureaucracy to proceed to innovate and be results-oriented. An important conclusion from the speech is that Jokowi wants to enlarge his political view that the people are the central actors in Indonesia's political and democratic system. The importance of the centrality of the people is, in some literature, categorized as populism (Moffitt, 2017; Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2018). Looking at his background, Jokowi is a populist figure. In Indonesian history, during the New Order and post-reform era, he was the only elected president in the country who came from ordinary people. Unlike SBY, Jokowi does not come from elite circles. He is also not a founder figure of political parties like SBY. Many people even know him as a party's ordinary cadre and 'officer' (Faqih, 2014). It is not a new thing that Jokowi's political views are on the importance of promoting the results of real development programs. Since being elected the mayor of Solo, he has run this program to his victory in the 2014 presidential election. In the inauguration ceremony for the first period on October 20, 2014, he even delivered a speech entitled "Under the Will of the People and the

Constitution" (Humas Setkab RI, 2014). This title implies that he is the figure of the people who get the mandate to rule the government in this country, following the constitutional basis formulated by the founding fathers of the Republic of Indonesia. As a populist leader, Jokowi inevitably adapts to the rapidly developing domestic and international political environment. Even so, his populist character still seems visible. Thus, it is not surprising that he gets the support of the majority of the people in the 2014 presidential election.

Jokowi's Inauguration speech in 2019 highlighted his plans for leading the next 5 years. The speech also implies that Jokowi wants to end his ten-year tenure as president with remarkable accomplishments. Thus, the closing speech of Jokowi in a Bugis-language proverb indicates that he encouraged people to support the government policies toward an advanced Indonesia. "*Pura babbara' sompekku, Pura tangkisi' golikku*" (my sail is flying, my helm is mounted), "Together we move toward an advanced Indonesia!".

Based on the previous analysis, SBY and Jokowi have distinctive backgrounds and styles in terms of support, leadership, and approach. These factors significantly impact people's views on choosing their leader in the future. The success of SBY and Jokowi in the election for two consecutive periods shows that having a good vision of society is a key to attracting people's sympathy.

4.2. Analysis of micro-linguistic
The Use of Personal Pronouns

Both SBY and Jokowi use Personal Pronoun *I* for specific purposes. There are two meanings taken from the use of *I* in the speech. First, SBY and Jokowi use *I* to show their power and leadership. They would like to show that they are the ones who have the power to lead all Indonesian people. Besides, they also use *I* to show intimacy and solidarity. Here are the examples:

Table 1
The use of personal pronouns.

	To show power and leadership.	To show intimacy and solidarity
SBY	- that I lead…. - I will inaugurate the members of my cabinet for the 2004-2009 period.	- ….with the mandate that I received directly from you…. - I am no different from each and every one of you….
Jokowi	- I often remind the minister…. - I check in the field….. - I want, and I will force the bureaucracy to deliver….	- ….that I am proud of…. - I also express my thanks….. - ….I invite bapak, ibu, and brother and sister….

- I also ask the minister….
- I guarantee that I will remove (them).

The Use of Persuasion

One of the aims of this speech is to persuade the Indonesian people to believe in SBY's ability and Jokowi to lead Indonesia and gain solidarity. Hence, they use some persuasive statements to engage their audience:

Table 2
The use of persuasion.

To persuade the audience.	
SBY	- Let me assure you… - It is time to walk together… - I sincerely urge you all… - It is time for us to consolidate our spirit of determination…
Jokowi	- Because of that, that is what we want to carry out… - We will continue infrastructure construction… - We will continue to simplify the bureaucracy… - We have to transform…..

The use of reference

Halliday and Hasan (1976) assert that one of the factors that can influence cohesion is using reference. In a speech, reference also means informing the audience of the speaker's beliefs. SBY's two most notable references in his speech are democracy and religion. The word "*democracy*" appears 11 times in the text. Democracy became a critical state system in Indonesia after the fall of the Soeharto regime. By repeating the word "*democracy*", SBY would like to show that his government is different from what Soeharto had established, an iron-fist system. Politicians commonly use repetition to convince the listeners of the statement's authenticity (David, 2017).

SBY also frequently uses religious expression in his speech, and he uses the phrase "*thank God*", "*God Almighty*", and "*God willing*" to show his obedience to God. On the other hand, Jokowi also uses the religious phrase, but only the phrase "*God willing*" appears in his speech. The use of religious expression in Indonesia is common, considering that most Indonesians are Muslims. However, Jokowi's speech shifted greetings to Muslims and all religions in detail, while SBY only used universal greetings "salam sejahtera" after "*Assalammualaikum*".

Besides, Jokowi rarely uses a reference in his speech. This is because Jokowi does not only focus his speech on one particular area. Jokowi raises five critical points.

However, the word "innovation" is the implied reference to his speech. He always emphasizes development, simplicity, and transformation, which define what innovation is.

The use of metaphors

It is identified from the text that SBY and Jokowi frequently use metaphors. Some of the metaphors are as follows:

Table 3
The use of metaphors.

Metaphors Sentences	
SBY	- United we stand, divided we fall. - For a great nation, the more complex the test, the higher its tenacity. - The more complex the change, the stronger our sense of unity. - This is the time to greet a new dawn/
Jokowi	- Indonesia should have escaped the middle-income trap. - Once again, breaking the routine is one thing. - I don't want a bureaucracy that just keeps on sending things. - Long procedures must be cut down.

The use of metaphors in political speeches is quite common among politicians (Stojan & Mijić, 2019; Lenard et al., 2017). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that metaphor consists of isolated instances of original figurative language and repetitive and pervasive language patterns that may even seem literal to the persons engaged in communication. Even though metaphors only have little influence on the semantic meaning, they provide a pragmatic function. Pragmatic concerns about "what [speakers] hope to achieve by talking, the relation between the form they choose and the effect they want it to have" (Lakoff, 1990).

In this speech, SBY uses metaphors to enhance nationalism, collectivism, and patriotism among the Indonesian people. On the other hand, Jokowi uses metaphors to encourage ministers and state officials to support the five main points. In his speech, Jokowi also showed his firmness by emphasizing the personal pronoun "I" when saying, "I don't want a bureaucracy that just keeps on sending things."

The use of address terms

There are two types of address forms that SBY uses in his speech. He uses the V/V forms (formal/deferential) for the immediate audience, such as guests, other countries' leaders, and political leaders, he uses the V/V forms (formal/deferential). Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) assert that using the V/V form is common among the upper classes, and this is intended to illustrate mutual respect and politeness. He

addresses the near audience with *the honorable, sir or madam, His Excellency.* On the other hand, for the far audience, that is Indonesian people, SBY uses the T/T forms (informal/familiar). When SBY transitions between topics, he always addresses the audience with "*saudara sebangsa setanah air,* " equivalent to *"my fellow citizens"*. This is a typical address term that is familiar in Indonesia. Brown and Levinson (2006) include this as positive politeness regarding the addressee as being at the same level as the addressor. By using that term of address, SBY would like to show a close relationship with his people, in contrast, to keep their distance.

Another example is when SBY said, "I am no different from each *of you – I am just an ordinary citizen from an ordinary family, born and raised by the state and community.* Interestingly, in the translation, he uses the pronoun *"you/your"* twelve times and *"my"* ten times. In an Indonesian context, those pronouns show the power distance. This means that the speaker regards themselves as superior to the hearers.

On the other hand, it is almost impossible in western cultures to avoid using those pronouns, and that does not show superiority as in the Indonesian context. SBY does not use the V/T forms as indicated in the text translation. The phrase "*my administration*", which appears nine times, is written as *pemerintah* or "*the government*". The other examples that show that SBY uses V/T forms are "*let me remind you*" and "*... my deepest gratitude to the Indonesian people, for your participation, support and trust*". Those statements are written as *namun saya mengingatkan* or *"but I remind"* and *... terima kasih kepada seluruh rakyat Indonesia atas partisipasi, dukungan dan kepercayaannya* or "*... deepest gratitude to the Indonesian people, for the participation, support and trust*".

Like SBY, Jokowi uses address terms but with a slightly different greeting. Jokowi opened and closed the speech very politely by greeting all religious adherents in Indonesia, for example, "*Assalamu'alaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh*" , "*Salam Sejahtera bagi Kita Semua", "Om Swastyastu", "Namo Buddhaya", "Salam Kebajikan".* Jokowi also frequently addresses the audience with "*saudara sebangsa setanah air*", equivalent to "my fellow citizens". Jokowi's and SBY's speaking styles are different in intonation, dialect, and speech flow. Jokowi prioritizes nationalism and unity in almost every critical speech, including the Inaugural speech, while SBY emphasizes the acceleration of development in all sectors.

Furthermore, Jokowi elegantly inserted the Bugisnese proverb at the end of the speech to give an impression of the vice president in the previous period, Jusuf Kalla, who is from the Bugisnese. This also includes the unique address terms in Jokowi's speech. For the audience context, Jokowi repeatedly uses T/T forms. Jokowi uses the greetings "*bapak*" and "*ibu*" to show his closeness and equality with the audience. The word "*bapak*" appears 11 times, and the word "*ibu*" appears 4 times in the speech.

4.3. Analysis of politeness concept

It is interesting to analyze that SBY and Jokowi pay great attention to politeness in their speeches. One example of this is when they complement and appreciate all the audiences, his supporters and his opponents, quite extensively from the beginning to the end of his speech. This is in contrast with the other leaders' inaugural speeches, such as President George W. Bush (Bush, 2005), Nelson Mandela (Mandela, 1994), and President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (Türk, 2018). Two reasons underpin the concept of politeness that he demonstrates: political attitude and cultural background.

In Indonesia, it is uncommon to see politicians and leaders attack each other in public or even in debates. Every presidential candidate has a right not to get involved in a political debate. Even though they are rivals, they will still respect one another if they meet face to face. Several Indonesian scholars, such as Haryatmoko (2003) and Jazeri (2017), regard these as typical characteristics of polite politics. This is also what SBY and Jokowi attempt to show the audience. Although SBY and Megawati have an inner conflict, SBY still highly honors her. He compliments Megawati for having "*great efforts in upholding the constitution, leading the government, and guiding the nation successfully*". Besides, SBY also mentions Megawati as one of the national figures. Furthermore, he respects Megawati's father, former President Soekarno, as a "*great founding father*" and cites Soekarno's popular metaphor, "*united we stand, divided we fall*". These are intended to reduce the political tension that SBY thinks unnecessary to be prolonged. On the other hand, he also would like to create a sense of harmony with his rivals, which is contradictory to the political condition in the Nordic countries, such as Denmark, Finland, and Sweden (Herkman, 2018).

Jokowi, in his speech, also showed the same thing as SBY by greeting all former presidents and rivals in the 2019 elections, Prabowo Subianto and Sandiaga Uno. Jokowi even greeted Prabowo and Sandiaga by calling "*sahabat baik saya",* meaning "my good friend". Despite being elected in the 2019 elections, Jokowi still respects his opponent. Before ending his speech, Jokowi did not forget to thank Jusuf Kalla, who had accompanied him for 5 years in the previous period. Jokowi's attitude is considered one of Jokowi's appreciation and polite manners towards Jusuf Kalla.

It cannot be denied that cultural background influences the way people communicate. Fitzgerald (2003) claims that "communicative behavior is believed to be strongly influenced by the cultural value system" (p. 21). Their cultural background also influences the politeness shown in SBY's and Jokowi's speeches. Originally, both SBY were from the eastern part of Java. However, demographically, his place of origin is close to Central Java. It is observed that the way he speaks in terms of tone and manner does not reflect the typical East Java people who speak pretty fast and rough but are closer to the Central Javanese people who are calmer and speak in a low, moderate voice.

Meanwhile, Jokowi is originally from Central Java, Surakarta. The Javanese dialects of Surakarta (Solo) and Yogyakarta are standard Javanese dialects. They

occupy the top rank in a hierarchical status. They are gradually accepted as the most delicate variants, the most rapidly developing, and the most able to express the essence of Javanese culture (Sulistyowati, 2014). Therefore, the Surakarta dialect directly influences the character of Jokowi, both in terms of intonation, choice of words, and speaking style.

Furthermore, Indonesian people, particularly Javanese, have a strong philosophy in their life (Suhadi & Purwarno., 2018). They should respect the order of society, honor elders and superiors, stay close and be considerate with inferiors, maintain a harmonious relationship, and avoid all open conflict (Hakam, 2017). Those are why even though SBY and Jokowi have a conflict with their opponents, they still need to appreciate and honor them.

4.4. Implications for English teaching and learning

SBY and Jokowi's inaugural speech noticed that sociolinguistics in teaching English is essential to learn. The macro- and microlinguistic aspects of inaugural speech can be good English teaching material in the classroom. Macrolinguistics can give students an idea of the importance of formal (langue) and informal (parole) language in public speaking. In teaching speaking practice, the teacher can give any speech text for later analysis by students using the macrolinguictics scope. As a result, students can learn about the relationship between language and culture. Students can also explore more about communication and language styles.

Moreover, the microlinguistics aspect also contributes to the teaching of English. In the context of the inaugural speech, details of microlinguistics, such as the use of personal pronouns, references, and metaphors, provide a rich and broader perspective for students to learn more about a language detail. Apart from language issues, SBY and Jokowi's speeches also teach students that the concept of politeness in a formal speech is fundamental to practice. That is because Indonesia is the one that upholds a polite culture at any stage.

5. Conclusion

The above study has proved some differences in macro- and microlinguistics analysis on the inaugural speech of SBY and Jokowi in detail. As all settings present unique aspects to elaborate on, the researchers recommend that an inaugural speech is influential in scrutinizing someone's behavior, especially country leaders, which perhaps neglects cultural aspects. From this perspective, the outcomes of the prior studies on the inaugural speech from different methods and approaches are defined by their locus in a particular context. Thus, their conclusions are not final.

The context of presidential inauguration speeches provides details on social and cultural features. It also has an immeasurable impact on English learning for students. Hence, it is beneficial for teachers to address this topic in their classes. The inaugural speech is ceremonial; thus, its context is more formal than any other speech occasion.

Interestingly, Jokowi frequently uses simple words in formal situations. This situation is contrary to SBY, the previous president. SBY always uses well-structured language in his speech.

For leaders, rhetoric is an essential means of influencing and managing humans. It seems challenging for a leader to gain reputation and achievement without mastering rhetoric. SBY and Jokowi, through their state speeches, succeeded in making the public believe that they could understand the audience with a unique and varied choice of style and choice of words. Moreover, they can also maintain their respective speaking styles, SBY with his formal style and Jokowi with his simple style.

References

Achmad, S. W. (2017). *Asal-usul dan sejarah orang Jawa*. Yoyakarta: Penerbit Araska.

Afzal, S., & Hassan, A. (2021). Using rhetorical and persuasive techniques: A political discourse analysis of the victory speech by Imran Khan. *Journal of Communication and Cultural Trends*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.32350/jcct.32.05

Alfani, H. (2015). Political communication channel and the phenomenon of political communicators in Indonesia. *Communication Sphere*, *1*(1), 33–41.

Anshoriy, H. M. N. (2008). *Kearifan lingkungan dalam persfektif budaya Jawa*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Arnold, T. C. (1993). *Thoughts and deeds : Language and the practice of political theory*. New York: Lang Pub Inc.

Aronoff, M., & Fudeman, K. (2011). Thinking about morphology and morphological analysis : What is morphology? In *What is morphology?* (pp. 255–257). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1038/018255a0

Ayeomoni, O. M., & Akinkuolere, O. S. (2012). A pragmatic analysis of victory and inaugural speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(3), 461–468. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.3.461-468

Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. London: Routledge.

Blackman, D., & Sadler-Smith, E. (2009). The silent and the silenced in organizational knowing and learning. *Management Learning*, *40*(5), 569–585. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507609340809

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (2006). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 321–325). Routledge.

Bush, G. W. (2005). *President sworn-in to second term*.

Caplan, D. (1992). *Language : Structure, processing and disorders*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Caspari, I., & Parkinson, S. R. (2000). Effects of memory impairment on discourse. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *13*(1), 15–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044(99)00009-3

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*.

Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Choi, H., Bull, P., & Reed, D. (2016). Audience responses and the context of political speeches. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *4*(2), 601–622.

Crasborn, O. (2014). Phonetics. *To Appear, HSK Handbook of Sign Language, Steinbach/Pfau/Woll (Eds), De Gruyter*, 1–16.

Culpeper, J., & Haugh, M. (2014). *Pragmatics and the English Language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Darong, H. C. (2021). Interpersonal function of Joe Biden's victory speech (systemic functional linguistics view). *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, *5*(1), 57. https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v5i1.31420

David, M. K. (2014). Language, power and manipulation: The use of rhetoric in maintaining political influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, *5*, 164–170.

David, M. K. (2017). Language, power and manipulation: The use of rhetoric in maintaining political influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, *5*(1), 164–170.

Duranti, A. (1985). Sociocultural dimensions of discourse. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, *1*(January 1985), 193–230.

Eaton, S. H. (2019). *Macrolinguistic analysis of discourse production in people with aphasia,individuals with mild cognitive impairment, and survivors of traumatic brain injury*. University of Central Florida.

Ekström, M., Patrona, M., & Thornborrow, J. (2018). Right-wing populism and the dynamics of style: a discourse-analytic perspective on mediated political performances. *Palgrave Communications*, *4*(1), 1–11.

Encyclopedia of World Biography. (2020). *Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono Biography*.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity.

Faqih, M. (2014). *Megawati dianggap malah tegaskan Jokowi capres boneka*. Republika.Co.Id.

Fishman, J. (1973). *The sociology of language; an interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.

Fitch, K. (2001). The ethnography of speaking: Sapir/Whorf, Hymes, and Moerman. In *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 57–63). London : Sage Publication.

Fitzgerald, H. (2003). *How different are we? Spoken discourse in intercultural communication*. Multilingual Matters.

Gautam, B. L. (2022). Language politics in Nepal: A socio-historical overview. *Journal of World Languages*, *7*(2), 355–374. https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2021-0010

Hakam, A. (2017). Communal Feast Slametan: Belief system, ritual, and the ideal of Javanese Society. *HAYULA: Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Islamic Studies*, *1*(1), 99–113.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

Haryatmoko, J. (2003). *Etika politik dan kekuasaan*. Kompas.

Hay, E., & Moran, C. (2005). Discourse formulation in children with closed head

injury. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *14*(4), 324–336. https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2005/031)

Herkman, J. (2017). Articulations of populism: the Nordic case. *Cultural Studies*, *31*(4), 470–488.

Herkman, J. (2018). Old patterns on new clothes? Populism and political scandals in the Nordic countries. *Acta Sociologica*, *61*(4), 341–355.

Humaidi, A. (2017). Struktur teks, kognisi sosial, dan dimensi sosial pidato Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (Text structure, social cognition, and social dimension Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono'S Speech). *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pembelajarannya*, *6*(1), 115. https://doi.org/10.20527/jbsp.v6i1.3744

Humas Setkab RI. (2014). *Pidato presiden Joko Widodo pada pelantikan presiden dan wakil presiden Republik Indonesia di gedung MPR Senayan Jakarta 20 Oktober 2014*. Setkab.Go.Id.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jazeri, M. (2017). Communication culture in political debate in Indonesia. *KnE Social Sciences*, *3*(9), 364–376.

Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2019). Phonetics. In *Speech and Language Processing : An Introduction to Natural Language Processing, Computational Linguistics, and Speech Recognition*. 3rd Draft of October 16, 2019.

Kalou, Z., & Sadler-Smith, E. (2015). Using Ethnography of communication in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *18*(4), 629–655. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428115590662

Keating, E. (2001). The ethnography of communication. In *Handbook of ethnography,* (pp. 285–301). London : Sage Publication.

Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychol. Rev.*, *85*, 363–394.

Koopman, H., Sportiche, D., & Stabler, E. (2014). Morphology : Starting with words. In *An Introduction to syntactic analysis and theory* (Issue April). Wiley-Blackwell.

Lakoff, G. (1990). *Talking power: The politics of language in our lives*. New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago University Press.

Laksana, I. K. D. (2021). Discourse of Indonesian language in public domain: its use in public debate prior to the presidential election 2019. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S1), 922–934. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns1.1477

Laurie, B. (1983). Lexicalization. In *English word-formation*. UK : Cambridge University Press.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Inc.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2004). Ethnology. In *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 327–354). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611574

Lenard, D. B., Strossmayer, J. J., & Ćosić, N. (2017). The analysis of metaphors and metonymies in political speeches: A case study of the former Croatian Prime Minister Ivo Sanader. *Nevena Ćosić ELR Journal*, *January 2017*, 61–81.

Linguistic Politeness Research Group. (2011). *Discursive Approaches to Politeness and Impoliteness*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Liputan 6.com. (2003). *Penghargaan berbahasa Indonesia terbaik bagi sejumlah tokoh*.

Locher, M., & Watts, R. (2008). Relational work and Impoliteness. In *in D. Bousfield and M. Locher (eds.): Impoliteness in Language* (pp. 77–99). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mandela, N. (1994). *Nelson Mandela's address on his inauguration as state president*.

Marini, A. (2001). *Elementi di psicolinguistica generale*. Springer Verlag, Milano.

Martin, J. R., & Rose., D. (2003). *Working with discourse; Meaning beyond the clause*. Sydney: Copyright JR Martin and David Rose.

Miller, J. (2002). The lexicon : Syntax and lexical items. In *An Introduction to English Syntax* (pp. 47–49). Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mio, J. S. (2017). Metaphor Density in President Obama's and Governor Romney's Presidential Acceptance Speeches: Implications for Leadership and Conveyance of Vision. *Acta Psychopathologica*, *03*(03). https://doi.org/10.4172/2469-6676.100094

Mitchell, N., & Haugh, M. (2015). Agency, accountability and evaluations of impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *11*(2), 207–238. https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2015-0009

Moffitt, B. (2017). Populism in Australia and New Zealand. In *The Oxford Handbook of Populism* (pp. 121–139). Oxford University Press.

Mozefani, F., Prisanto, G. F., Ernungtyas, N. F., & Irwansyah, I. (2020). Retorika politik Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono: Pendekatan analisis wacana kritis. *MEDIALOG: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, *3*(1), 45–68. https://doi.org/10.35326/medialog.v3i1.512

Mudde, C., & Rovira Kaltwasser, C. (2018). Studying populism in comparative perspective: Reflections on the contemporary and future research agenda. *Comparative Political Studies*, *51*(13), 1667–1693. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414018789490

Oktafia, R. (2015). *Nilai-nilai kearifan budaya Jawa dan peranannya dalam mewujudkan masyarakat madani. Perspektif Islam Volume 3, Nomor 1*. Sidoarjo: Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo.

Ostwald, K., Ong, E., & Gueorguiev, D. (2019). Language politics, education, and ethnic integration: the pluralist dilemma in Singapore. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, *7*(1), 89–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2017.1330216

Parkin, D. (1984). Political language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *13*(1), 345–365. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.13.1.345

Purnomo, M. D. (2017). *The power of language (kuasa bahasa) : Dalam dimensi sosial, politik, budaya, dan pendidikan)*. Yogyakarta : Naila Pustaka.

Ratnasari, D., Hidayat, D. N., Alek, A., & Defianty, M. (2019). Interpersonal Meaning Analysis of Indonesian Politicians ' Instagram Captions. *Advances in Social*

Science, Education and Humanities Research, *408*, 222–230.

Rimadi, L. (2015). *Begini gaya bahasa Jokowi dan SBY menurut penerjemah kepresidenan*. Liputan6.Com.

Rohmawati, I. (2016). Appraisal devices realizing attitudes in Barack Obama's Inaugural Speech. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, *5*(1), 27–56. https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv5i1859

Salojarvi, V. (2019). Populism in Journalistic Photographs: Political Leaders in Venezuelan Newspaper Images. *Iberoamericana – Nordic Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, *48*(1), 28–39. https://doi.org/10.16993/iberoamericana.439

Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schäffner, C. (1996). Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis. *Current Issues in Language & Society*, *3*(3), 201–204.

Schmidt, R. W., & Richards, J. C. (1980). Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *I*(2), 129–157. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.2.129

Soedarmanta, J. B. (2014). *Mempertahankan cita-cita, menjaga spirit perjuangan, refleksi 80 tahun Harry Tjan Silalahi*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Stojan, N., & Mijić, S. N. (2019). Conceptual metaphors in political discourse in Croatian, American and Italian newspapers. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, *8*(1), 69–76. https://doi.org/10.2478/ajis-2019-0007

Suhadi, J., & Purwarno. (2018). Reflection of Javanese Characters in Afifah Afra's Novel Nun Pada Sebuah Cermin. *KnE Social Sciences*, 422–434.

Sulistiyani, D., & Mukaromah, M. (2018). Gaya retorika kepala negara Ri: Analisis komparatif Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) dan Joko Widodo. *Jurnal Audience*, *1*(1), 31–44. https://doi.org/10.33633/ja.v1i1.2682

Sulistyowati. (2014). Artikulasi identitas wong Solo di Eks Enklave Surakarta: Konstruksi bahasa dan pemertahanannya. *Humaniora*, *26*(2), 149–163. https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v26i2.5238

Sumekto, D. R., Ghozali, I., Yuwono, S. E., Santoso, G. B., & Tukiyo. (2022). Javanese politeness experience as depicted in its speech levels of the transactional communication. *Humaniora*, *34*(1), 36–50. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.65058

Taiwo, R. (2009). Legitimization and coercion in political Discourse: A case study of Olusegun Obasanjo address to the PDP elders and stakeholders forum. *Journal of Political Discourse Analysis*, *2*(2), 191–205.

Tempo.co. (2012, August). SBY pidato anak-anak tidur. *Tempo.Co*.

Tempo.co. (2018, November). Pengamat bandingkan gaya bahasa Soeharto, SBY, Jokowi, Prabowo. *Tempo.Co*.

Türk, H. B. (2018). 'Populism as a medium of mass mobilization': The case of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. *International Area Studies Review*, *21*(2), 150–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/2233865918761111

Universitas Pertahanan Indonesia. (2020). *Guru Besar*.

Utah, U. of. (2020). *Theoretical syntax and semantics*.

Valin, R. D. Van, & Lapolla, R. J. (2001). Syntax: Structure , meaning and function. *A Paper for "Independent Reading" Course*, *May*, 713.

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistic (7th ed.)*. West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.

Wilson, J. (2003). Political discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 398–415). Blackwell Publishing.