

# What does Systemic Functional Linguistics say about speech? A discourse-semantic analysis

Hieronimus Canggung Darong<sup>1</sup>,

Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, Indonesia

To cite this article: Darong, H. C. (2022). What does systemic functional linguistics say about speech? A discourse-semantic analysis. *World of Media. Journal of Russian Media and Journalism Studies*, 4, pp. 46—67. DOI: 10.30547/worldofmedia.4.2022.3

## Abstract

This comparative study uses Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory as analytical framework. The aim is to analyze the types of grammatical, lexical items, and language resources used regarding the experiential, interpersonal, and textual functions that are all respectively realized by the register category of field, tenor, mode along with the schematic structure, and the unity of the speech texts. After being converted into clauses, the speech texts were analyzed. Although the doer is slightly different, the result of analysis revealed that the field, as the realization of the experiential function of the texts, is similar. As such, the realization of experiencing action taken by the speaker and audience for the advancement of America is a feature shared by the transitivity patterns focusing on material process, reference, and lexical string analysis. In the meantime, the interpersonal function which is realized by the tenor, differs slightly in that Joe Biden and Barack Obama developed a close distance with the audience, whereas in Donald Trump's text, there is no sense of intimacy and a great deal of separation from the audience. Then, all texts belong to the spoken mode resulting from simple nominal group constructions. Pushing further, the texts were written in a similar manner in terms of their schematic organization, which included an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. The study also discovered that the texts are classified as being highly cohesive by the anaphoric references that were frequently employed, a strong pattern of conjunction linkages, and lexical relations between lexical items appearing across sentences.

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author:

Hieronimus Canggung Darong, Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, Indonesia.

Email: hieronimusdarong@gmail.com

## Keywords

Discourse semantic, meta function, context, speech, SFL.

## Introduction

Language is considered to be the most important component in communication. The general definition which states that language is a tool of communication used by humans can explain the concept of language and is widely considered relevant to most people. As such, Leech (1993: 47) states that language does have an informative function, in addition to expressive, directive, aesthetic, and phatic. In addition, another special function of language is as a political tool. This function is considered prominent and often persuasive, aiming to influence, invite, and give confidence to the audience about something or activity. The word chosen must be acceptable and not contradict the listener's interest. The accuracy of word choice or word suitability is demanded to convey the speaker's meaning. In addition, the writer or speaker must know who he or she is talking to.

One of the moments from which one can pay attention to the political tool language function is an election-victory speech. Speech is the text used to articulately explain or describe ideas, feelings, views, and ideologies (written or spoken). It also serves as a technique for centering the audience and allowing the language to convey particular meanings (Beebe, 2003). The speech text includes a beginning (opening), middle (body), and end as well as certain systems, opinions, and beliefs (closing). As a result, it serves as a tool for communication and is crucial in presenting social, cultural, and political issues (Brigrance, 1991).

Speech text study also appears to be motivated by the belief that it contains important language registers from a linguistics standpoint. This suggests that understanding the text in question requires knowledge of its context, purpose, and meaning. To put it another way, the speech takes into account not just the participants' relationships but also the social environment and language use (speaker and audience). Analyzing the language alone is insufficient; one must also consider the context in which it is used.

There have been many previous research studies on speech. The studies underlined the psychological aspect represented in the speaker's linguistics domain (see Bao, Zhang, Qu, & Feng, 2018; M tt , Puumala, & Ylikomi, 2021; Navarro, Macnamara, Glucksberg, & Andrew, 2020; W. Wang, 2020). They argued that the psychological aspect represented in the speaker's language might significantly influence the message conveyed to the reader or interlocutors.

As such, the text which is constructed in the form of clauses and sentences can represent one's psychological aspect. This argument is pertinent to the context of this study in that words, clauses, and sentences are designed functionally from which the writer may analyze the speaker's language meaning for the audience.

Additionally, the words choice and their context- relations definitely affect the coherence and cohesiveness of spoken texts (Bao et al., 2018; Bu, Connor-Linton, & Wang, 2020; Chu, & Huang, 2020; da Cunha, 2019; Gusthini, Sobarna, & Amalia, 2018; Hopke, & Simis, 2016; Horv th, n.d.; Jitpranee, 2018; Kelly, 2020; Martin, & Zappavigna, 2019; Moragas-Fern ndez, Calvo, & Capdevila, 2018; Nartey, 2018; Poulimenou, Stamou, Papavlasopoulos, & Poulos, 2016; Silke, Quinn, & Rieder, 2019; Zhang, 2016). However, the studies highlight the macro- context in which coherence and cohesiveness are built. Bringing to micro- context so-called internal relation of words used in the text is another significant aspect to consider. Although highlighting the importance of lexical relations as done by previous studies, this study is slightly different in terms of focusing on the context that is more on micro-level.

Unlikely, the speech should be organized so that it motivates the listener to meet the goal presented, focusing on the action suggested by the speaker's so-called experiential meaning. (Ademilokun, 2019; Bartley, 2018; Figini, Rocchia, & Rezzano, 2019; Kusuma, Dewi, & Kurniawan, 2018). In the context of this study, their ideas about transitivity analysis are beneficial for revealing the focus of speakers' speech. Other research emphasized the text's literal meaning (Ahmed, & Al, 2020; Briones, 2016; Leong, 2019; Ong, 2019; Othman, 2020; Potter, 2016; Suparto, 2018). They demonstrated that the subject and rhyme of the text can be carefully examined to discover the textual meaning. As a result, their placement within the text may assist readers or listeners in comprehending the message being put forth. As such, the idea of meaning as claimed by earlier studies is insufficient to reveal the textual meaning. Theme and rhyme analysis should go along with nominal group analysis to have a greater perspective what and how texts are; the mode of the texts, whether spoken or written by which the channel of text communication is determined.

Additionally, thematic information within the text may be readily disclosed by focusing on the approach, socio-pragmatic framework, and methodology (Ahmed, 2020; Boch, 2020; Brookes & Mcenery, 2019; Fetzer & Bull, 2012; Schumacher, Hansen, Velden, & Kunst, 2019). Similarly, Afzaal (2020) and Cartagena & Prego-V zquez (2018) have stated that the language competence of the speaker or audience is crucial to support such approach and framework in question. However, in order for someone to be considered communicatively

competent, one needs to master both linguistic rules, and rules of social use of language so-called communicative competence. This competence is reflected in the word choices and language used in the context, not only macro but also micro as the concern of this study.

Despite the positive outcomes of such an approach and skill, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), another theory, is nevertheless widely used in text analysis. According to this theory, earlier studies discovered that process types and context affect the meta functions of language utilized in a text (Bartley, 2018; Darong, 2015; Darong, 2021b, 2021a; Kelly, 2020; Kusuma et al., 2018). The investigations also emphasized the theory's advantages in identifying a text's language function. However, it is essential to note that the SFL theory is frequently referred to as a discourse- semantics. As such, the concept of a connection between a language's various meaning kinds and a certain lexical and grammatical area is known as semantics. As a result, the text has the meaning that is encoded or realized in not just one but three different meaning systems so-called ideational, interpersonal, and textual. It needs a mastery of grammatical analysis abilities as well as common technical word constructions that are built on the structure or pattern of the clause to analyze and define the meaning systems in question (Eggs, 1994).

By expanding the ties to the contextual factors of the field, mode, and tenor of which the meaning interpretations are expressed, Eggs further emphasizes that the word semantic is employed to relate the meanings taken outward from the speech text. As a result, language analysis based on SFL is focused on both the text's clause level and its so-called lexico-grammar for expressing meaning. In the meantime, language is a reflection of speakers/orator who can provide identification such as hope, willingness, changes and determination through the language used. Likewise, this phenomenon happened to the three respective presidents of America who won the election. On this occasion, each has distinctive characteristics in speaking, both from the choice of diction or lexical, functions and other linguistic elements should all are embraced in the view of the SFL theory.

Previous studies have hardly ever focused on lexical and grammatical aspects. By focusing on language meta functions and lexico-grammatical structures employed in the speech text, this study develops prior research on the usage of SFL by answering the following research questions: *first*, what are the types of grammatical and lexical items used to realize the register category of field of the speech texts; *second*, what are the types of grammatical and language resources used to realize the register category of tenor in the speech texts; and *third*, what

are the types of language resources used to denote the mode of the texts. The study addresses these questions by analyzing the types of grammatical and lexical items used, the types of grammatical and language resources used, and lastly the types of language resources used.

### **Systemic Functional Linguistics**

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), where the 'S' stands for 'Systemic', is a broad term for a network of relationships and choices that pushes from general to certain characteristics that are typical in nature. Additionally, it indicates that the text uses an interconnected system of meaning. The 'F' for 'Functional' is concerned with how the system is realized functionally in structures. As a result, the system should be designed so that it has a specific purpose that is accomplished by register categories including field, tenor, and mode. The last letter, 'L', stands for the theory of 'Linguistics', which is one way that the study of linguistic phenomena might be conducted (Halliday, 1985).

According to SFL, language has a functional purpose. Functionality generally refers to how something conveys meaning and message in context. As such, it refers to so-called meta functions of ideation, interpersonal relations, and text (Egins, 1994). This is supported by previous studies saying that according to SFL, there are three meta functions in question: ideational which is realized by register category of field; interpersonal function which contributes to social relationships; and textual function, which deals with the use of language to create logical and coherent texts and is realized by a text's register category of mode. More significantly, the theory of SFL underlines that context is crucial in the creation of a particular text (Andersen, Emilie, & Holsting, 2018; Baysha, 2019; Kaneyasu, 2020; Scholman, Demberg, & Sanders, 2020; Upadhyay, Houghton, & Klin, 2018). Therefore, for the audience or readers, context-dependent analysis of a speech text may therefore be useful in addition to linguistic sources.

The first is 'language about things', and it deals with the internal and external realms of real existence. In this regard, Halliday (1978) noted that the representation of the internal and external world of phenomena could seize the shape of 'content so-called experiential meaning'. As a result, it is mirrored in the transitivity of language. The language of transitivity, which is believed to be an ongoing process, is used to depict the taking of one's external world consciousness into one's internal world awareness (relations, events, states, and material actions). Material, mental, relational, behavioral, verbal, and existential processes are involved (Halliday, 1985). To add, an examination of the ideational process as realized by the text's register category of field

(Ademilokun, 2019; Figini et al., 2019; Guswita, & Suhardi, 2020; Montes, Barboza, & Olascoaga, 2014; Wang, 2010) found that the majority of texts depict the actions taken by both the speaker and the audience. In this regard, one's external world consciousness are reflected in the employment of process types within the texts.

The relationship between participants in specific speech events is the subject of the second. As such, it is ascertained in the commodity exchange occurred during the interactions. With regard to the potential meaning conveyed in their language, Chen and Shuo (2018), Damanik, Zein, Thyrhaya, and Nurlela (2020), Darong (2021b), Hulu (2019) found that the participants, namely the addresser and addressee, might have a tight interpersonal relationship, a profound intimacy, or be far from one another. In their studies, the mood structure, modality and pronoun are crucial for fostering interpersonal relationships among individuals. However, the texts should be constructed in such a way that they can express the aspects in question by considering the commodity exchange at their grammatical level. Meanwhile, the third is seen as linguistic communication. The message is perceived both innately and extrinsically in that it is connected to the language used in its context. The organization of ideas or thematic structure, which consists of the clause's theme and rheme, represents this language function, known as the textual function (Kusumawardani, & Putra, 2021; Potter, 2016; Umiyati, 2019) found that the speaker might be able to get the listeners' attention to focus on the message being delivered by carefully construct the system of clause in which the theme and rheme are embedded.

Additionally, Martin (1992) and Eggins (1994) proposed discourse as a semantic component. The stratum of meaning is involved somehow. The name 'discourse-semantics' denotes the unique texture characteristics; a linguistic resource that benefits the text. As a result, the method for writing texts and the various linguistic resources employed systematically serve the model discourse level. In other words, the semantics aspect of conversation entails the cohesion types from which the texture arises. Additionally, discourse- semantics analyses a text in light of its situational (register) and cultural contexts (genre). In this regard, claimed that discourse-semantics appears to apply the theory of context, where language plays a crucial role, as well as the theory of language. As a systematic social process relation, genre as meaning integration is actualized in the register category of field, tenor, and mode.

Expanding on the register category, Martin (1992) and Eggins (1994) showed that field is concerned with the ongoing social action in context. Besides, it deals with action, what is occurring in the world, or the social situation under

discussion. Tenor, on the other hand, focuses on the relationships between those taking part in particular social speech activities. It is concerned with who participates in social action, as well as the amount to which factors like age, position, gender, and social status play a role in their interpersonal relationships. Mode also addresses how language is used in social interaction. The channel of action may be determined by such linguistic roles. More significantly, the theory of SFL holds that context is crucial in the creation of a particular text (Baysha, 2019; Heruti, Bergerbest, & Giora, 2019; Kaneyasu, 2020; Scholman et al., 2020; Upadhyay et al., 2018). For the audience or readers, context-dependent analysis of a speech text may therefore be useful in addition to linguistic sources.

SFL also suggests the text wholeness and relatedness as integral to the context. The premises and ideas follow a clear organizational structure, which contributes to the sense of unity and relatedness. The phrase ‘coherence’ in relation to the subject under study refers to a set of clauses that have been placed into a social context, including situational and cultural context. To put it another way, these settings use situational or registered coherence in addition to generic coherence (Halliday, & Hasan, 1976; Eggins, 1994). However, for the text to be cohesive and connected, lexical relationships, a well-managed and consistent participant presentation, and semantic ties must all be present (Leong, 2019).

An important point to keep in mind is the rule of the text-making resource is included in the functional linguistic theory’s discourse stratum. This indicates that the discourse is focused on describing the several types of cohesiveness that allow a text to be realized. Reference, lexical relation, conjunction ellipsis, conversational structure, and a number of lexical ties are examples of cohesion types appropriate for this use. These types are advantageous for the step-by-step construction of texts. The schematic structure of genre refers to certain processes or stages that must be followed and socially established. By using the text’s functional constituent pattern, it is linguistically portrayed. To put it another way, a schematic can be thought of as a genre’s staged, or step-by-step, organization that includes coherence and cohesiveness elements.

## **Methodology**

Employing comparative method by means of discourse-semantic label as highlighted in the theory of SFL, this study analyzed the three selected speech texts delivered by three different figures on their respective victories. To have unedited versions, the texts in questions were searched from Google and crosschecked in YouTube to guarantee their originality.

The reason for choosing such presidential speeches was due to the agenda setting. The most significant source of presidential authority has long been thought to be influencing the policy agenda. The president plays a big part in determining the policymaking agenda. Agenda setting is likely the most important source of presidential authority. Most individuals agree that presidents have the power to influence the agendas of the government and the American people.

In general, presidential speech reflects distinct values and has a specific structure, order, and point of view. The presentation of cultural, political, and social life is significantly influenced by the speech in question, making it another significant social communication tool to the country or world. This means that the value of speech can be perceived in the thoughts and information it conveys about society as well as in how it serves as a window into the personality of the speaker or writer regarding the world. This study is guided by the idea that the three recent presidents set their distinctive agendas that can be revealed through language used in their victory speeches. In this regard, the important language function in regard to meaning and context of the US presidents' victory speeches was taken into consideration in this study.

Since the objective of this analysis was to look at the context of situation which is known as the register category of field, tenor and mode and genre as the context of culture, SFL theory proposed by Halliday (1985) was used. As such, the transitivity analysis demonstrating the significant process type and the lexical string relations of each text were determined for the benefit of the field. The lexical strings and transitivity structures of the three texts should be presented before conducting an analysis. Besides, the reference link should also be displayed. It is because reference tools can also make the text's field visible. In the meantime, to understand the tenor of each text, a study of mood, modality, and pronouns was done. Nominal group analysis is advantageous for the mode of the texts being studied. Meanwhile, conjunction analysis along with pronoun and lexical relations within texts are necessary to know the unity of texts. A comparison of the findings analysis has to be done eventually to draw generalizations about the use of the linguistic resources used in the texts. Thus, the efficiency of SFL theory as a method of analysis was the exclusive focus of the analysis stages.

Along this line of objectives, data collection methods in this study included note-taking and observation. Observing method used to examine the language used. The use of language in this context is not just being examined verbally; it is also being examined in writing. Therefore, language forms used in the texts that are pertinent to this research should be noted. The note-taking technique



used in this study was an advanced technique. Several sorts of language use that are pertinent to this inquiry should be noted. To sum up, data collection method and data analysis were employed with these following steps

- Watching the speech recordings;
- Downloading the speech scripts;
- Reading and examining the data carefully;
- Modifying the scripts into clauses;
- Finding out and naming every sentence that contains meta functions of language (ideational, interpersonal, and textual);
- Identifying and classifying the process types and the lexical string of the script;
- Identifying and classifying the mood structure, pronoun and modality the script;
- Identifying and classifying the nominal group of the script;
- Tabulating data;
- Data analysis using Halliday's theory;
- Comparing the findings;
- Drawing conclusions

## Results and discussion

Aside from the literal meaning, the connotation was the most prevalent type of diction identified in Biden's speech on November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020. The use of such dictions reflects who he is, and the goals to achieve. His experience in politics and high self-determination make him dare to utter some promising changes for America. The speech that consists of 71 clauses is uttered elegantly and attracts the audience smoothly. The focus of the utterances is concerned with the action done for America.

Meanwhile, Trump's speech consisting of 59 clauses, delivered on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 shares something different. Trump's campaign is divisive. Some even say that Trump's speech about making America great again means restoring white supremacy (Kelly, 2020). Trump also in his personal view towards others, both religiously and ethnically is considered negative. A much different policy and controversy compared to the Obama previous leadership caused Trump to come under fire from the world. Such policy and controversy included recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital, stopping Chinese tech giant Huawei, limiting the flow of refugees from a number of Islamic countries to the US, and building the US-Mexico border wall. The policies in question have shaken the world's geopolitical and economic conditions.

Unlikely, Obama's speech consisting of 83 clauses, delivered on November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2008 made the US people see that having hope was a new energy because they saw Obama's position when it came from hope. The hope for peace, tolerance, new immigration policy, and prosperity, among many other things.

To date, it is important to note that there is a necessity to reveal the speech from the relation of grammatical and lexical items used in the text. The items in question are of benefit to reveal the functions of language as the concern of this study. As such, the functions so-called meta functions of language are realized respectively as the register category of field, tenor, and mode. Integral to the registers in question, schematic structure and unity of the speech texts need be examined further. Saying it differently, the micro aspect in which the internal grammatical and lexical items as well as language resource are used should be examined as stated below.

### ***Text analysis***

The grammatical choice in transitivity, lexical cohesiveness, and reference analysis lead to the field register category. The study of the process types used in the texts is what the transitivity is concerned with. Lexical string analysis can be used to view the lexical cohesiveness. Meanwhile, the reference analysis focused on how participants were introduced in the texts and how to get the majority of the reference items. The analysis of the aspects in question is presented in the tables below (Tables 1, 2, 3).

*Table 1*

### **Process types of the speeches**

<b>Process types</b>	<b>J. Biden's speech</b>	<b>D. Trump's speech</b>	<b>B. Obama's speech</b>
Material	103	76	163
Mental	16	17	36
Verbal	14	4	17
Behavioral	4	-	7
Existential	3	3	11
Relational	32	17	52

Table 2

**Lexical relations**

Speech	TLS	TLR	The longest string	Lexical string in process types	Rep	Syn	Co-Hyp
J. Biden’s	30	104	America	Material process	88	16	3
D. Trump’s	23	55	America	Material process	15	13	3
B. Obama’s	41	121	America	Material process	98	24	5

Note: TLS: Total of Lexical String; TLR: Total of lexical relations; Rep: Repetition; Syn: Synonym; Co-Hyp: Co-hyponymy

Table 3

**Reference analysis**

Speech	Reference chain	The most popular references	Reference construction
J. Biden’s	17	We, American	Anaphoric
D. Trump’s	15	I, America	Anaphoric
B. Obama’s	36	We, America	Anaphoric

The fundamental focus of a speech as a social activity is participant engagement, which is related to the register category known as a field. Regarding the information in Table 1 above, the material processes predominate in all texts. This suggests that the experiential actions are at the heart of the majority of clauses in the three texts. The participants – most commonly the speaker (I), the audience, and all Americans (You) – perform the activities. The speaker and audience are both Americans (We). Except for Trump’s victory speech, where ‘I’ is mostly utilized, in most cases ‘We’ are used.

Additionally, only a small number of lexical strings are long, and the majority are short (Table 2). It is necessary to notice that the longest string supports the texts’ primary concern (what, where, and who the text is intended for) (Eggs, 1994). It was discovered that the text string labeled ‘America’ is the longest of these texts. Acceptably, the speaker’s plans, promises of change, and mission for future American life serve as their focus or target. It can be argued that the majority of lexical strings in those texts are linked to the material process, given that each text contains lexical strings connected to various process categories (verbs of action). Additionally, repetition representing the concern of text appear is the most frequent lexical relation used in the texts under study. Synonyms

and co-hyponymy, which do not support the topic of the texts or what is being discussed, come next.

A text's field can also be revealed using reference analysis. It shows how the addresser introduces participants and then follows them when they are shown in the text. Knowing the participants who were most prominently featured in the field, and about whom the text is actually speaking, is crucial (Egins, 1994). The references to 'we' and 'America(n)' are far more prevalent in Obama's and Biden's texts. The use of the pronoun 'We' is taken to relate to their personal attitude. Both references were eager to make America better. To achieve the objective, progress, and prosperity of America, the audiences are involved. Therefore, the word America also occurs as the texts' most frequent reference.

In contrast to those, 'I' and 'America' are the most frequent references in Trump's text. In our view, he positioned himself in the forefront of the effort to realize the greatness of America. As a result, this is consistent with the process types analysis of transitivity, where the main actors: 'We' for Obama and Biden, and 'I' for Trump perform the activity. Regardless of their individual distinctions, they all share the speech's primary target – America – as the future orientation. 'We', the majority of participants who appeared in the texts (aside from Trump's) represents the experiential activity that the texts are about. The goal of this activity is America, and it genuinely deals with a change. The results from the analysis of the process type in which the material process appears most frequently supports this claim. Additionally, the term 'America' was the longest string in lexical string analysis, while reference analysis revealed that 'We', 'I' (Trump), and 'America' were the texts' longest strings overall. The results of this study show that SFL theory can be used to determine the speaker or writer's concerns. The material process type that was most prevalent and was supported by the dominant lexical string as well as reference usage suggests that both the speaker's and the listener's (audience's) action (Darong, 2015, 2021a; Guswita, & Suhardi, 2020; Kelly, 2020; Kusuma et al., 2018)

### *Tenor of the texts*

An examination of the mood structure and modality could reveal the tenor. The results of the two aforementioned features are shown in Table 4.

## Mood structure

Criteria for analysis	J. Biden's speech	D. Trump's speech	B. Obama's speech
<i>Mood</i>			
Declarative	116	98	238
Imperative	3	4	2
Interrogative	-	-	1
<i>Modality</i>			
Will	5	14	19
Must	3	5	3
Can	2	4	21
May	3	2	4
Should	3	5	4
Be going to	1	2	2
<i>Pronoun</i>			
I	11	33	23
We	30	17	47
You	18	13	15

The examination of the mood structure reveals similarities among the three texts. Declarative clauses predominated in the texts. It demonstrates how similar their information-delivery styles are. Unlikely, the results of modality analysis varied from one text to the next. Obama and Trump both promised to follow through on their goals, while Biden concentrated on his obligations. The fact that Obama and Trump predominately used 'will' (inclination/futurity) whereas Biden tended to use 'must' supports such judgment. However, compared to Biden, Obama and Trump have a lot more 'can' in terms of their ability to rouse the crowd. Biden makes the claim that the speaker and Americans in general are the major players for America.

The use of pronouns is another way to look at the tenor as a fulfillment of the interpersonal function of the texts. In terms of reference analysis, the pronoun 'We' was primarily present in Obama's and Biden's speeches, whereas 'I' was primarily present in Trump's. As such, Trump prefers to gently distance himself from the addressee and position himself as the principal agent. Meanwhile, Obama and Biden direct attention and engage the crowd to advocate for America. The force of transformation is unity. In addition, it should be emphasized that the more an addresser employs the pronoun 'we', the closer their relationship

with the addressee and vice versa. In actuality, Trump failed to maintain close distance with the audience.

In general, the three speech texts' various tenor revealed diverse interpersonal relations. These results are consistent with those of Ademilokun (2019), Darong, (2021b), Silke et al., (2019) and Wang (2010) who discovered that the modality of the clauses they exchange with the audience, the use of pronouns, and the system of mood all serve to demonstrate the differences in interpersonal relationships. Due to the distinctive mood structures, the modality usage, and the pronoun employment, the speakers' potential relationships, relatedness, familiarity, and intimacy with the audience are all different.

### ***Mode of the texts***

It has been suggested that determining whether a text is spoken or written can be inferred through the examination of nominal groups. Written text is defined by the usage of complicated nominal groups, whereas spoken text is concerned with simple nominal groups. It is abundantly obvious from the nominal group analysis that several kinds of structural patterns for nominal groups are in use. Among these, 'T' or one-word nominal groups appeared most frequently in three texts and followed nominal groups composed of one to two simple modifiers. The investigation proved that only a few nominal groups are complex and that the construction of the 'DT' nominal group is typically utilized. These seem to follow logically from the phrase and clause being used. They are often grabbed using the modifier Q (Qualifer). At this time, the speech texts' nominal groupings are basic and denote the spoken mode. The results of this study support prior research that the message of specific texts is determined by its grammatical complexity (Andersen et al., 2018; Tolochko, & Boomgaarden, 2017). The message in question might be conveyed in a manner that complements the text's mode.

### ***The schematic structure the texts***

The phrase schematic structure must be connected to the term genre in which it is considered as a feature of analysis in discourse. As a result, through the use of schematic organization, genre is realized linguistically.

Table 5

**Schematic structure of the texts**

Stage	J. Biden's speech	D. Trump's speech	B. Obama's speech	Function and ideology
Introduction	Clause 1-11	Clause 1-7	Clause 1a-5b	Arousing the audience's attention
Main body of the text	Clause 12a-56b	Clause 9a-50b	Clause 5-72	Stating gratitude, changes and American' progress
Closing	Clause 58a-71	Clause 50-59	Clause 73-82b	Expecting an action for America
Ideology	An obligation for changes in togetherness. ('We') is the doer	Expectation of great change. ('I') is the doer	Expectation of great change by the power in togetherness. ('We') is the doer	

Referring to the stage, as shown in Table 5, all three speeches are very similar. They are similarly organized in a way that they adhere to the standard three-part form of introduction (opening), main body of the text, and conclusion (closing). The introduction (opening) stage is focused on how to get the audience's attention by posing some thought-provoking or contentious issues. The main body and concluding parts have similar appearance. Each relates to the speech's primary topics, which are the progress, changes, and development of America in every facet of life. The points are arranged so that they build upon and are related to one another. They are also built in a very logical order. In this regard, the texts fit in with Brigance (1991) and Beebe's (2003) theory that a speech text should include an introduction (opening), a body (middle), and a conclusion (closing).

***Unity of the texts***

The aspects of text-forming resource systems are included in the stratum of discourse of the SFL theory. This indicates that the discourse is preoccupied with describing the various forms of cohesiveness that give the text texture. Reference (Table 3), conjunction (Table 6), and lexical relation (Table 2) are examples of the cohesion types appropriate for this situation.

Table 6

**Conjunction the texts**

Types of logical relations	J. Biden's speech	D. Trump' speech	B. Obama's speech
Additive	46	38	69
Contrast	6	1	24
Purpose	17	5	23
Simultaneous	7	2	13
Means	3	2	5
Successive	4	3	1
Condition	4	2	12
Cause	7	5	22
Comparative	3	2	2
Consequence	1	2	1
Location	2	3	1
Alternation	2	2	3

The method of introducing and keeping track of the participants in a text is referred to as referencing. In this context, the participants relate to the characters, settings, and objects discussed in a text. These three victory speeches exhibit a high degree of cohesiveness as shown by the reference analysis chart that summarized in Table 3. The fact that the majority of the references in the texts are endophoric- anaphoric lends credence to the conclusion in question. It is consistent with Eggins' (1994) idea saying that if the majority of items are retrieved from endophoric, they belong to highly cohesive. Since endophoric ties shape the text's internal texture, this reference helps the piece come together so-called cohesion.

The type of conjunction relation that is employed in the text is also crucial to the text's structures. All clauses in the texts under study fit together according to conjunctive reticula and its analysis, as shown in Table 6. The texts' cohesiveness is supported by the presence of conjunctive relations of addition, which are frequently used. It implies that the usage of conjunctive relations can also reveal the text texture. Conjunction relation is concerned with how logical connections between text elements are formed and expressed (Eggins, 1994) Additionally, the use of other conjunctive relations, such as conjunctive of purpose, contrast, cause, condition, comparison, alternation, succession, means, and simultaneity, supports the text cohesiveness, particularly with regard to its schematic structure, which includes an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. By using



a variety of conjunctive relations that are presented in external implicit and explicit as well as internal implicit and explicit, these three basic domains are formed cohesively.

Finally, the lexical relationship of which the lexical items employed, such as verbs, adjectives, nouns, and adverbs, are used to indicate the cohesiveness of the texts in this study. Such lexical items also deal with chains of clauses and sentences or event sequences. Here, the main focus is on connecting a text to its primary topic. Thus, the study of lexical relations can be described as a methodical method of characterizing the relationship between words in a text. In this respect, lexical string analysis is of benefit to examine the lexical relations in question.

The findings of this study support those of earlier studies that suggested that the choice of words may contribute to the coherence and cohesiveness of speech texts (Bu et al., 2020; Chu, & Huang, 2020; Gusthini et al., 2018; Hopke, & Simis, 2016; Poulimenou et al., 2016; Qian, & Pan, 2019; Risberg, & Lymer, 2020). This study mostly focused on how words and grammatical structures are created or produced in order to provide a particular meaning. Word selection, context, and meaning are widely acknowledged as guiding principles in functional linguistics when producing texts. A speech's lexical item, phrase, and grammatical structure should all reflect a meaning system in order to achieve certain communicative goals. Speech therefore embraces its own features in terms of linguistic use and function.

In order for the message to be conveyed properly, speakers need to have a good knowledge of the language and its use. Both of them contribute to the success in conveying a message to the audience. Aside from considering macro context, one of the efforts to make one's speech attractive and powerful is the use of grammatical and lexical items along with language sources to apply the meta functions of language as well as the unity of text.

## **Conclusion**

With respect to the findings, there are some points to infer regarding the use of SFL theory in this study. The types of grammatical and lexical items used to apply the register category of field of the speech texts are concerned with the actions taken by the speaker and audience. While this is happening, the grammatical and language resources used to realize the register category of tenor are different. Last but not least, all texts belong to spoken modes and are described as highly being cohesive. In addition, the texts are primarily ordered in accordance with recurrent patterns or stages of schematic structure, including

introduction (opening), main body of the text, and the conclusion (closing). In this study, SFL was only used to analyze speech texts, therefore future research can assess its efficacy by looking at different text genres. Additionally, directing to the context of second or foreign language teaching could be more intriguing.

## REFERENCES

- ADEMILOKUN, M. (2019). Corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis of modality in social transformation campaigns in Nigeria. *Discourse and Interaction*, 12(2), pp. 5–28.
- AFZAAL, M. (2020). Book reviews. *Discourse Studies*, 22(5), pp. 632–643.
- AHMED, M., & AL, A. (2020). Discourse markers of Moo in Iraqi colloquial language. *Discourse Studies*, 22(5), pp. 1–14.
- AHMED, Y. (2020). Political discourse analysis: A decolonial approach. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 18(1), pp. 1–17.
- ANDERSEN, T. H., EMILIE, A., & HOLSTING, M. (2018). Clause complexing in systemic functional linguistics – towards an alternative description. *Functional Linguistics*, 5(10), pp. 1–25.
- BAO, C., ZHANG, X., QU, Y., & FENG, Z. (2018). American English perfect construction across registers. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 25(4), pp. 314–341.
- BARTLEY, L. V. (2018). Putting transitivity to the test: A review of the Sydney and Cardiff models. *Functional Linguistics*, 5(4), pp. 1–21.
- BAYSHA, O. (2019). Dehumanizing political others: A discursive-material perspective. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 17(3), pp. 1–16.
- BEEBE, S. A., & BEEBE, S. (2003). *Public Speaking; An Audience-centered approach* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). America: Southwest Texas State University.
- BOCH, A. (2020). Increasing American political tolerance: A framework excluding hate speech. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World Volume*, 6, pp. 1–12.
- BRIONES, R. R. Y. (2016). Textual analysis through systemic functional linguistics. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 1(2), pp. 109–144.
- BRIGANCE, W. N. (1991). *Speech; Its Technique and Disciplines in a Free Society* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- BROOKES, G., & MCENERY, T. (2019). The utility of topic modelling for discourse studies: A critical evaluation. *Discourse Studies*, 21(1), pp. 3–21.
- BU, H., CONNOR-LINTON, J., & WANG, L. (2020). Linguistic variation in the discourse of corporate annual reports: A multi-dimensional analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 22(6), pp. 1–31.

CARTAGENA, M. C. C., & PREGO-VÁZQUEZ, G. (2018). Participation frameworks and socio-discursive competence in young children: The role of multimodal strategies. *Discourse Studies*, 21(2), pp. 1–24.

CHEN, D., & SHUO, Z. (2018). Analysis of interpersonal function in speech - A case study in Obama's WHCD address. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science*, 6(8), pp. 31–40.

CHU, R., & HUANG, C.-T. (2020). The day after the apology: A critical discourse analysis of President Tsai's national apology to Taiwan's indigenous peoples. *Discourse Studies*, 23(1), pp. 1–18.

DA CUNHA, I. (2019). A corpus-based analysis of textual genres in the administration domain. *Discourse Studies*, 22(1), pp. 1–29.

DAMANIK, V. H., ZEIN, THYRHAYA, T., & NURLELA. (2020). Interpersonal meaning in Donald Trump's speech in response to coronavirus pandemic. *Jurnal Sains Sosio Humaniora*, 4(2), pp. 715–725.

DARONG, H. C. (2015). Manggarain candidate ruler's jargon 2015 and its pedagogical implications in language teaching. *Missio*, 7(2), pp. 278–296.

DARONG, H. C. (2021a). From clause to function: Texts analysis using Systemic Functional Linguistics theory and its pedagogical implication in language teaching. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 6(1), pp. 29–46.

DARONG, H. C. (2021b). Interpersonal function of Joe Biden's victory speech (Systemic Functional Linguistics view). *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation Volume*, 5(1), pp. 57–66.

DARONG, H. C., JEM, Y. H., & GUNA, S. (2022). Lexical cohesion devices in students' narrative text and its pedagogical implication in language teaching: A discourse-semantics point of view. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 12(1), pp. 362–374.

EGGINS, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter.

FETZER, A., & BULL, P. (2012). Doing leadership in political speech : Semantic processes and pragmatic inferences. *Discourse & Society*, 23(2), pp. 127–144.

FIGINI, F., ROCCIA, V., & REZZANO, N. S. (2019). The construction of field in science popularization stories. *International Journal of Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 2(1), pp. 1–13.

GUSTHINI, M., SOBARNA, C., & AMALIA, R. M. (2018). A pragmatic study of speech as an instrument of power: Analysis of the 2016 USA presidential debate. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(1), pp. 97–113.

GUSWITA, K. A., & SUHARDI. (2020). Transitivity analysis of Jokowi and Prabowo campaign speech in Indonesian presidential election 2019. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 5(1), pp. 143–158.

- HALLIDAY, M.A.K., & HASAN, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic - The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold
- HALLIDAY, M. A. (1985). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- HASAN, R. (2014). Towards a paradigmatic description of context: Systems, metafunctions, and semantics. *Functional Linguistics*, 1(9), pp. 1–54.
- HERUTI, V., BERGERBEST, D., & GIORA, R. (2019). A linguistic or pictorial context: Does it make a difference? *Discourse Processes*, 56(8), pp. 1–16.
- HOPKE, J. E., & SIMIS, M. (2016). Response to ‘Word choice as political speech’: Hydraulic fracturing is a partisan issue. *Public Understanding of Science*, 26(1), pp. 124–126.
- HULU, F. (2019). Interpersonal function in Martin Luther King Jr.’s speech. *International Journal of Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 2(1), pp. 43–46.
- KANEYASU, M. (2020). Expectations for ‘natural’ ways of talking: A context-dependent perspective on fixedness in conversation. *Discourse Studies*, 23(1), pp. 1–18.
- KELLY, C. R. (2020). Donald J. Trump and the rhetoric of resentment. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 106(1), pp. 2–24.
- KUSUMA, R., DEWI, S., & KURNIAWAN, E. (2018). Seeing recount from systemic functional linguistic perspective: *Sine Qua Non* Attributes. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 4(1), pp. 43–52.
- KUSUMAWARDANI, W. S., & PUTRA, P. A. A. (2021). Textual metafunctions in inauguration state speech text of President Joko Widodo. *Linguistika*, 28(2), pp. 118–129.
- LEECH, G. N. (1993). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman
- LEONG, P. A. (2019). Visualizing texts: A tool for generating thematic-progression diagrams. *Functional Linguistics*, 6(4), pp. 1–13.
- MÄÄTTÄ, S. K., PUUMALA, E., & YLIKOMI, R. (2021). Linguistic, psychological and epistemic vulnerability in asylum procedures: An interdisciplinary approach. *Discourse Studies*, 23(1), pp. 46–66.
- MARTIN, J. R. (1992). *English text: system and structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co.
- MARTIN, J. R., & ZAPPAVIGNA, M. (2019). Embodied meaning: A systemic functional perspective on paralanguage. *Functional Linguistics*, 6(1), pp. 1–33.
- MONTES, P. A., BARBOZA, A. M., & OLASCOAGA, A. I. (2014). Systemic functional linguistics and discourse analysis as alternatives when dealing with texts. *Profile*, 16(2), pp. 101–116.

MORAGAS-FERNÁNDEZ, C. M., CALVO, M. M., & CAPDEVILA, A. (2018). The process en route: The metaphor of the journey as the dominant narrative for the political discourse in Catalonia. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 15(5), pp. 1–23.

NARTEY, M. (2018). ‘I shall prosecute a ruthless war on these monsters ...’: A critical metaphor analysis of discourse of resistance in the rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 16(2), pp. 1–18.

NAVARRO, E., MACNAMARA, B. N., GLUCKSBERG, S., & ANDREW, R. A. (2020). What influences successful communication? An examination of cognitive load and individual differences. *Discourse Processes*, 57(10), pp. 1–20.

NI, W., SEKEN, I., & SUARNAJAYA, I. (2014). A discourse-semantic analysis of the expository paragraphs written by the eleventh grade students of Sman 1 Kubu in the academic year 2013/2014 based on systemic functional linguistic theory. English Education Study Program, Postgraduate Program Ganesha University of Education Singaraja, Indonesia.

ONG, J. (2019). A case study of classroom discourse analysis of teacher’s fronted reading comprehension lessons for vocabulary learning opportunities. *RELC Journal*, 50(1), pp. 1118–1135.

OTHMAN, W. (2020). Causal relations on a cline of explicitness: An SFL perspective. *Functional Linguistics*, 7(2), pp. 1–14.

POTTER, L. (2016). Ideological representations and theme-rheme analysis in English and Arabic news reports: A systemic functional approach. *Functional Linguistics*, 3(5), pp. 1–20.

POULIMENOU, S., STAMOU, S., PAPAVALASOPOULOS, S., & POULOS, M. (2016). Short text coherence hypothesis. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 23(2), pp. 191–210.

QIAN, D. D., & PAN, M. (2019). Politeness in business communication: Investigating English modal sequences in Chinese learners’ letter writing. *RELC Journal*, 50(1), pp. 20–36.

RISBERG, J., & LYMER, G. (2020). Requests and know-how questions: Initiating instruction in workplace interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 22(6), pp. 753–776.

SCHOLMAN, M. C. J., DEMBERG, V., & SANDERS, T. J. M. (2020). Individual differences in expecting coherence relations: Exploring the variability in sensitivity to contextual signals in discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 57(10), pp. 1–18.

SCHUMACHER, G., HANSEN, D., VELDEN, M. A. C. G. VAN DER, & KUNST, S. (2019). A new dataset of Dutch and Danish party congress speeches. *Research and Politics*, 6(2), pp. 1–7.

SILKE, H., QUINN, F., & RIEDER, M. (2019). Telling the truth about power? Journalism discourses and the facilitation of inequality. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 16(3), pp. 1–7.

SUPARTO, A. D. (2018). Analisis Ketransitifan dalam Framing Artikel Berita Online. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 7(1), pp. 16–32.

TOLOCHKO, P., & BOOMGAARDEN, H. G. (2017). Analysis of linguistic complexity in professional and citizen media. *Journalism Studies*, 19(12), pp. 1786–1803.

UMIYATI, M. (2019). Textual metafunction in Donald Trump’s speech “Recognizing Jerusalem as Israel’s Capital”. *International Journal of Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 2(2), pp. 55–60.

UPADHYAY, S. S. N., HOUGHTON, K. J., & KLIN, C. M. (2018). Is “few” always less than expected? The influence of story context on readers’ interpretation of natural language quantifiers. *Discourse Processes*, 56(8), pp. 1–20.

WANG, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama’s speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), pp. 254–261.

WANG, W. (2020). Grammatical conformity in question-answer sequences: The case of Meiyou in Mandarin conversation. *Discourse Studies*, 22(5), pp. 1–22.

ZHANG, K. (2016). Gender, power and political speech: Women and language in the 2015 UK General Election (Book Review). *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, 26(1), pp. 104–106.