

Representation of the Conflict between KPK and Polri in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's Speech

Bobby Sander
English Language and Literature
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This paper is entitled "Representation of the Conflict between KPK and POLRI in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's Speech". By employing a sociocognitive approach in accordance with the categories of semantic macrostructure and microstructure proposed by van Dijk (2008), the study demonstrates how the representation of the conflict between KPK and POLRI is projected and the ideology behind the former President's speech. This study focuses on the former President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's speech on October 8th, 2012, which presents his standpoint towards the conflict. The analysis shows that the conflict between KPK and POLRI is represented as frailty of the state institutions in enforcing the law, therefore showing a great political crisis. Regarding the analysis of microstructure, this study also finds that the President shows his full support for KPK more than POLRI as he questions the accusation of Novel Baswedan and the DPR's offer related to the readjustment of KPK's regulation. Furthermore, the President shows his egocentric demeanour by significantly emphasising his attempt of reconciliation in response to the public's expectation. Additionally, the president considers the conflict as a collective responsibility. This consideration is then viewed as a strategy to restore his blackened reputation due to the public's consideration of the government's inactivity in resolving the conflict and therefore reflexes a social democracy.

Keywords: *representation, sociocognitive approach, ideology, macrostructure, microstructure*

INTRODUCTION

The way people use language in their social environments draws the attention of critical discourse analysts. As Richardson (2007) says, the way certain individuals use language can be analyzed by using Critical Discourse Analysis as a theory and method. Since Critical Discourse Analysis itself focuses on the relations between discourse, power, dominance and social inequality (van Dijk T. A., 1993), it deals with broader social issues.

There are several approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis, one of which is the sociocognitive approach. As Temmerman (2000) states, it begins with the perception of how people see the world through their minds. Through discourse, people transfer ideas to others by using language (written or spoken) as a medium, then the ideas are processed based on their own perceptions. This is what linguists call a sociocognitive approach.

The present study examines representation in a speech. Different from the previous studies, this study explores a speech in Indonesian

language, specifically a presidential speech of the former Indonesian President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. By using a sociocognitive approach proposed by van Dijk (2008), this study aims to investigate the representation of the conflict between KPK (Corruption Eradication Commission) and POLRI (The Indonesian National Police) in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's speech. Within this context, this study employs the macrostructure and microstructure analysis.

This study employs a qualitative method to analyze the data and to answer the research questions. A speech script of the former President of the Republic of Indonesia, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, has been used as the data of the present study. The script was taken from media online, Kompas.com (Liauw, 2012). The speech concerns the conflict between KPK and POLRI. The data were analyzed in several stages. By using the sociocognitive approach proposed by van Dijk (2008), elements of discourse obtained from a full script of speech of the former President

Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono were classified into the macrostructure and microstructure. Finally, the analysis results were interpreted especially to find the ideology behind the representation.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative method and the sociocognitive approach of Critical Discourse Analysis proposed by van Dijk (2008) as the theoretical framework to investigate the representations of the conflict between KPK and POLRI in the speech of the former President of the Republic of Indonesia, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. The text (scripted speech) was critically analyzed in accordance with the categories of semantic macrostructure and microstructure.

The data of the study are in the form of a speech script of the former President of the Republic of Indonesia, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono on October 8th, 2012. The speech is about the conflict between the Commission of Corruption Eradication (KPK) and the National Police (POLRI).

In analysing the data, the close reading of the speech is done beforehand. This becomes the initial step in conducting the analyses of both macrostructure and microstructure. Then, the analysis of semantic macrostructure or thematic analysis is the next step in analyzing the text. This step explores the topics or themes of the text, leading to the identification of the macro-topics, labelled with the letter M, such as [M1], [M2], [M3], and so on, based on the theory of macrostructure (van Dijk T. A., 2008).

The analysis of semantic microstructures is the next step in analyzing the text. Through this analysis, the data were analyzed by attending to more specific elements of the text, including words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. The text was then analyzed by using the theory of van Dijk's sociocognitive approach of CDA (2008), with a specific focus on the local meanings, namely lexicon and coherence.

As the close reading is done as the initial step of the analysis, it determines the lexical choice to be analysed in the analysis of

microstructure. Through the close reading, the lexical choices *kita* ‘we’ and *saya* ‘I’ are chosen to be analysed further due to its occurrences within the speech. Hence, it is assumed that this lexicon has a significant influence regarding the analysis of microstructure.

The analysis of the lexicons *kita* ‘we’ and *saya* ‘I’ are basically conducted based on the findings of the analysis of macrostructure. This is done because, as mentioned earlier, that the analyses of both macrostructure and microstructure support and influence each other (van Dijk T. A., 1980). Finally, the final step of the analysis is the examination of the results of the two levels of analysis, namely semantic macrostructure and microstructure, to explore the ideologies underlying the representations of the conflict between KPK and POLRI in the former president’s speech.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis of macrostructure, the study finds that there are three macro-topics which can be interpreted as the President’s

main interests to be delivered through his speech. They are determined by the total number of propositions found in the text. First, the President accentuates his self-image through his speech compared to the other macro-topics. Second, the solution given by the President to reconcile the conflict becomes the second matter. Last, the President places the emphasis on Novel Baswedan’s case.

Table 4.1 below shows that there are ten prominent issues (macropropositions) identified from the text of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono’s speech regarding the conflict between KPK and POLRI. Each macroproposition is supported by a number of propositions or supporting ideas in the text. As has been mentioned, the related propositions are categorized based on the corresponding topic or issue.

Table 4.1 Macropropositions in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono’s speech

No .	Macropropo sitions	Proposi tion (n)	Paragra ph(s)
M1	A distinct perspective between KPK and	12	3, 24 - 36

	POLRI in solving the case of license simulator		
M 2	Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's demeanour towards the conflict between KPK and POLRI	37	1 – 23
M 3	The readjustment of KPK's enactment offered by DPR	7	51 – 57, 67
M 4	A dissension among KPK and the other law enforcements formerly	2	2, 20
M 5	A misconduct towards the Novel's case	13	37 – 49, 66
M 6	The solutions of reconciliation given by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono	16	10, 34 – 42, 57 – 71
M 7	The people's perception towards the conflict between KPK and POLRI	2	45
M 8	The President's expectancy hereafter to the Indonesian	5	46 - 54
M 9	The President's appeal to the public concerning	1	61

	the country development		
M 10	The coordination between KPK and POLRI in the past	2	69 - 70

Table 4.1 also shows different distributions of propositions that support each macroproposition, or [M], which have resulted from the macrostructure analysis. The number of propositions supporting a macroproposition indicates how strong the issue brought forward by the macroproposition is in the text. In this case, the macroproposition with the most support from propositions can be said to be the dominant issue under discussion.

The table reveals that the dominant issue raised in the text concerns **Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's demeanour towards the conflict between KPK and POLRI**. It is the macroproposition number 2 [M2], which is supported by 37 propositions. The next three most prominent issues include **The solutions of reconciliation given by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono** (16 propositions), **A misconduct towards the Novel's case** (13

propositions), and **A distinct perspective between KPK and POLRI in solving the case of license simulator** (12 propositions).

The analysis of macrostructure shows that the most dominant concern (supported by 37 propositions) is Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's demeanour towards the conflict between KPK and POLRI. It can therefore be interpreted that President put himself forward more than deliberating the solution upon the conflict between KPK-POLRI, furthermore it shows his self-image. This is caused however by a certain event, such as the public exasperation towards the President's attempt of reconciliation.

By the public discussion on the social media, the President's initiative to do an intervention towards the conflict has been trending on the social media. People consider that the government stays put inactively. In addition, people not only regard the President negatively but also demand a further action from the President to resolve the conflict between KPK and POLRI.

On the other hand, the people's demand implies a contradiction regarding the attempt of reconciliation done by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono in the previous time. Many criticisms are suggested to him to prevent any intervention in that it is not within his jurisdiction. Due to the continuing pressure from the people, the President eventually responded to the conflict through the speech.

The self-image of the President, as has been mentioned before, is the main concern in his speech. In this theme or topic [M1], the President explains explicitly about his attempt with the ministers to reconcile KPK and POLRI; he also tries to prove that the people are wrong to appraise the government of being inactive. In responding the Novel's case through his speech, his attempt to get the people's respect moreover continues by reading out the law regarding the President's rights and obligations. This further shows that POLRI and DPR have incorrect points of view concerning the law. It is also supported by the assumption that the President wants to convince his

people to put their beliefs in him by denying DPR to agree on the offer of readjustment of KPK's regulation, while on the other hand, people currently start to show their doubt upon the country administered by the President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono.

Besides explaining his attitude upon the conflict between KPK and POLRI, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono also puts the solution given by himself as the second main concern to resolve the dissension between both institutions. However, the conflict between KPK and POLRI itself comes after the attitude adopted and the solutions given by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono in terms of the analysis of semantic macrostructure. There are specifically two main concerns which are the bottom line of the conflict between both institutions. The first is the case of Novel Baswedan supported by 21 propositions; whereas the case of license simulator which Djoko Susilo is considered to be the prime suspect in the case is the second supported by 13 propositions.

Based on the results, the case of Novel Baswedan is a more important matter instead of the case of license simulator. The case of license simulator apparently happened to be the beginning of the second dispute between both institutions (the first dispute involved Susno Djuadji (POLRI), Bibit Samad Rianto (KPK), and Chandra Hamzah (KPK)). However, the case of Novel Baswedan evidently triggered the dissension between KPK and POLRI off. This apparently is the reason of why the President afterwards intervened to reconcile both institutions by giving the solutions through the speech.

The findings of the analysis of macrostructure shows several outcomes that may be taken as an interim conclusion of this study. First, the President accentuates his self-image more through the speech he delivers. It is demonstrated by the prevailing number of propositions appearing in the text. The President's explanation in giving solutions towards the conflict is the second outcome based on the finding of the analysis of macrostructure. By this

result, it shows the President’s attempt of reconciliation is seemingly presented here. The third is that the President stands up for his advocacy along with KPK more than POLRI. It is shown by the macroproposition found in the text. This outcome is more elucidated by the explanation of the Novel’s case given by the President. It becomes the consideration because of, once more, a significant number of propositions found in the text.

Based on the analysis of microstructure, the ideology of social democracy is reflected in the representation of the conflict between KPK and POLRI. To resolve the conflict, the President uses several strategies. The strategy used by the President is the use of inclusive pronoun *kita* ‘we’. Besides that, the irresoluteness of the President is shown through his speech. However, the irresoluteness shown leads to the fact that the President gives his full support to KPK more than POLRI. Concerning the analysis of lexical choice used in the speech, there is a fact which “characterizes” Susilo

Bambang Yudhoyono, that is, the use of pronouns ‘we’ and “I”. This characteristic is therefore worth noting because of its significant quantity in the text and the effect to the public psychologically.

Table 4.2 below shows the comparison of the use of both pronouns ‘we’ and ‘I’ (used by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono in his speech) by its occurrences. These pronouns are taken based on the results of the analysis of macrostructure. Each pronoun is categorized based on the contextual function in the text. Then, each category shows its occurrences (n) along with the total percentage.

Table 4.2 The comparison of the use of Pronouns ‘we’ and ‘I’ in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono’s speech

Pronoun	Function	The Occurrences of Pronoun (n)	
		Occurrences	Percentage
<i>Kita</i> ‘we’	Inclusive	42	29%
	Exclusive	0	
<i>Saya</i> ‘I’	Personal Opinion	57	71%

Author ity & Power	22
Self- Present ation	24

Table 4.2 above reveals the dominant distributions of the use of pronoun *saya* 'I' compared to the use of pronoun *kita* 'we' based on the percentage shown in the table. Furthermore, it also reveals that Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono uses the pronoun of *saya* more frequently as personal opinions (57 occurrences). Another revelation shows that Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono uses inclusive pronouns of *kita* (42 occurrences) dominantly and never uses any exclusive pronouns of *kita*. Based on the findings of the analysis of microstructure, it shows that Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono used the pronoun of 'we' (*kita* in Bahasa) in his several statements through his speech which is shown as follows:

Kita masih ingat bahwa dulu pernah ada perselisihan antara KPK dengan Polri, ketika juga ada perbedaan pendapat menyangkut Pak Susno Duadji dengan Pak Bibit dengan Pak Chandra. (Paragraph 2)

[We do still remember that there was a dissension between KPK and POLRI, along with the dissenting opinion regarding Mr. Susno Duadji, Mr. Bibit, and Mr. Chandra]

The use of *kita* 'we' here is interpreted as a strategy to show the President's sense of togetherness with the people. This pronoun includes the President himself and the people; hence, the pronoun is inclusive. Furthermore, the President legitimises his presence politically and shares responsibilities, knowledge, experience, and even philosophies (common ground) with the people by using this pronoun (Verderber, Verderber, & Sellnow, 2011; Degani, 2015). Related to the categorization of pronouns, the pronoun of 'we' used by the President is categorized as a first-person, plural, inclusive personal pronoun.

In a political system, the sense of togetherness is persuasive yet effective for a certain party particularly in persuading the people to acquire support (Karapetjana, 2011). For instance, the sense of the sentence "we must build this country" is much stronger instead of in the

sentence “this country must be built” or even “Indonesian must build this country”. Therefore, the use of an inclusion in the President’s statement is rhetorical.

The pronoun ‘we’ used by the President associates with the President’s image himself. The pronoun ‘we’ is shown in several statements through his presidential speech. In the first paragraph, he also used the pronoun ‘we’ as he states that the effect of the dispute between KPK and POLRI had started to be experienced. Even though the sense of togetherness in this statement is not as influential as the previous statement, the use of the pronoun ‘we’ is mostly used by the President throughout the text. Moreover, this pronoun is used by many politicians as an effective way of persuasion.

Based on the findings, the potent sense of togetherness shown by the President is still found in the text as follows:

“...*kita tempuh...*” (13rd, 33rd, and 49th paragraph)

“...*kita semua...*” (10th paragraph)

“...*kita capai...*” (60th paragraph)

As has been explained before that the pronoun ‘we’ politically has a sense of togetherness; it is moreover rhetorical. The understanding and sympathy of Indonesian are required in this context since a new political problem emerged. One of the outcomes has appeared, that is, the sense of disrespect and distrust indicated by the public towards POLRI.

Besides the use of pronoun ‘we’, the findings of the analysis of microstructure also show that Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono used the pronoun of ‘I’ (*saya* in Bahasa) in his several statements through his speech which is shown as follows:

Dua, keinginan Polri untuk melakukan proses hukum terhadap Komisaris Polisi Novel Baswedan, saya pandang tidak tepat, baik dari segi timing maupun caranya (65th paragraph)

[Second, I believe that POLRI’s desire to bring a prosecution against the Police Commissioner, Novel Baswedan is incorrect, by looking at both the timing and the way]

The excerpt above shows the use of pronoun *saya* 'I' in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's speech. Based on its context, the pronoun *saya* used by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono above shows a personal voice. Personal voice or opinion itself functions to encourage a personal involvement between the speaker and the audience (Karapetjana, 2011).

However, the use of pronoun *saya* above also leads to the disadvantages to the colleague of the President's himself as they actually work together to solve the problem. This leads to the exclusivity shown by the President (Beard, 2000). His personal voice excludes the others' opinion such as the ministers' and DPR's in responding the problem.

Based on the results of the lexical analysis of microstructure (see table 4.2), the pronouns *saya* which function as personal opinions appear more frequently (57 occurrences) in the text compared to the other functions. This can be interpreted that the President concerns more about himself and therefore leads to the individualism. This fact is supported

by the President's expressions as follows:

“....*saya dukung...*” (8th & 35th paragraph)

“....*saya pandang..*” (1st, 65th, and 67th paragraph)

“...*saya harapkan..*” (8th paragraph)

Concerning the results of the analysis of macrostructure, it is more obvious that the President is more concerned on his demeanour regarding his attempts of reconciliation. The number of propositions supported and the use of the pronoun 'we' show a distinct image of the representation of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono through his speech.

Based on the analysis of microstructure of coherence, it shows that the President gave solutions in resolving the conflict in a form of government ordinance. This regulation is therefore mandatory since there would be a government ordinance introduced. The government ordinance however demonstrates the irresoluteness of the President himself. He previously states that an attempt of intervention

done by the President between state institutions in maintaining the law is considered beyond his jurisdiction; it is moreover inappropriate and has to be avoided. It is shown in the 21st paragraph as follows:

...tetapi tentu tidak baik dan juga harus dihindari, Presiden terlalu sering melakukan campur tangan untuk urusan penegakan hukum seperti ini. (21st paragraph)

[The intervention is actually bad and must be prevented, since the President has intervened occasionally regarding the law enforcement] The statement presupposes that the President wants to show his neutral state in particular to those who criticize him in the past regarding his intervention in law maintenance. He wants to be politically aware of what has to be done afterwards in resolving the conflict. Though, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono took a further action of reconciliation which is actually against the President's statement that KPK and POLRI both are independent institutions. Hence, the President actually influences both institutions in maintaining the law.

Another incoherence is also shown in the President's speech, in particular concerning the readjustment of KPK's regulation offered by DPR. It can be seen in the explanation as follows:

pemikiran untuk melakukan revisi Undang-Undang KPK ini kepada rakyat, mestilah dijelaskan apa dan mengapa Undang-Undang itu harus direvisi kepada masyarakat, termasuk para pengamat dan aktivis pemberantasan korupsi sebaiknya juga bersedia mendengarkan apa yang menjadi alasan DPR itu. Jangan langsung divonis, seolah-olah itu sebagai upaya untuk memperlemah KPK atau untuk melucuti kewenangan KPK. (52nd paragraph)

[If DPR have their own perception to revise the KPK's regulation to the people, it has to be explained why the regulation must be revised to the people. Both political analyst and activist also should be willing to consider the reasons from DPR. Do not straightly judge them as the attempts to weaken KPK's authority]

From the explanation *Jika DPR RI memiliki* above, the President firstly doubts DPR's offer concerning the revised regulation. He indirectly questions

DPR's reason to revise the current regulation of KPK, and it has to be informed publicly. By the purpose of showing his wisdom, he also asks the people to consider the revision offered by DPR. What becomes the main concern is the last statement when the President asks the people not to misconstrue DPR's offer in the first place. There is, however, a contradictory on the President's statement when the President himself shows his strong disagreement against the readjustment of KPK's regulation offered by DPR. It is clearly shown as follows:

.....prinsip dan posisi dasar saya tetap saya dengan yang saya sampaikan pada tahun 2009, ketika waktu itu juga ada wacana menyangkut peran dan kewenangan KPK, yaitu saya tidak setuju dan menolak setiap upaya untuk memperlemah KPK. (55th paragraph)

[.....my viewpoint regarding DPR's proposal to revise the KPK's regulation is that I will still stand for my own principles to resist any attempts to weaken KPK. This is the same as I explained in 2009 concerning the issue of KPK's role and authority]

The offer from DPR is apparently considered by the President in the first

place as an attempt to weaken KPK, which is shown in the statement above. Moreover, the statement shows that the issue of KPK ever happened before. This hence presupposes that KPK tends to contradict the other law enforcements.

Based on the findings, the conflict between KPK and POLRI in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's speech is represented as a great political crisis. This political crisis then becomes the main representation as M1 (12 propositions), M5 (13 propositions), and M6 (16 propositions), as the sub-representations, are the most leading macropropositions shown in the President's speech. As those three macropropositions address the conflict between KPK and POLRI, this hence shows that President is predominantly concerned about the contradictory sides between KPK and POLRI.

M1 focuses on the dispute between KPK and POLRI, specifically in solving the case of license simulator. This dissension is caused by the case of Novel Baswedan which is believed as the initial cause of the conflict

between both institutions. The case of Novel Baswedan is addressed by the President which determines the M5. Finally, M6 shows solutions the President imposes for both institutions in enforcing the law.

In addition, the introductory part of the President's speech demonstrates his utmost concern regarding the conflict between KPK and POLRI, as follows:

Pada malam hari ini, saya ingin memberikan penjelasan yang hari hari terakhir ini menjadi perhatian masyarakat luas, yaitu perbedaan pandangan ataupun perselisihan antara pihak Polri dan pihak KPK di dalam menjalankan tugas bersamanya, menegakkan hukum, utamanya memberantas korupsi, kemudian dampaknya telah sama-sama kita rasakan. Oleh karena itu, saya pandang perlu sekali lagi, untuk memberikan penjelasan pada malam hari ini. [1st paragraph]

[Tonight, I will give a clarification about an issue which draws people's attention lately, that is, a dissenting voice between POLRI and KPK in enforcing the law and specifically fighting the corruption which makes quite an impact on us. Therefore, in my point of view, an explanation is needed]

It is necessary to realize that not only an introductory part of the speech is considered as a macrotopic, but also the closing part / summary of the speech (van Dijk T. A., 1980). In this part, the President summarises his speech by stating the solution both institutions have to follow in the future. It becomes more explicit that the conflict leads to his most concern at that time to solve and therefore is critical.

However, the conclusion part of the speech not only presupposes the most considerable concern the President has concerning the conflict but also shows the institutions' incapability in enforcing the law. This is supported by the statements made by the President in paragraph 17, 21, and 60. First, in paragraph 17, the statement says that KPK used to have several conflicts with the other governmental institutions such as Supreme Court, BPK, and Attorney General. Second, the statement in paragraph 21 says that the President occasionally interfered the conflict between the governmental institutions. Finally, that there is a rivalry within the institutions is assumed through the

statement in paragraph 60. Hence, it presupposes that the governmental institutions work unprofessionally as they make the President eventually interfere their own problem in enforcing the law.

Furthermore, the conflict is also considered as a collective responsibility for Indonesian. This is shown by the use of the word *kita* 'we' used by the President through his speech. This word shows an inclusive pronoun as the President includes all participants through his speech (the President, ministers, people, and state institutions).

The pronoun *kita* 'we' appears in many parts of the speech (10th, 13th, 25th, 34th, 40th, and 50th). One of them is shown as follows:

Yang kedua, saya akan menjelaskan dan sekaligus nanti solusi apa yang harus kita tempuh, berkaitan dengan permasalahan hubungan antara Polri dengan KPK. (13th Paragraph)

[Secondly, I will give an explanation along with the solution we must impose

concerning the conflict between POLRI and KPK]

Therefore, the use of the word 'kita' which refers to both the speaker (the President) and the listeners (Indonesian) rhetorically has a great effect. By including the listeners as the part of the President, he shares and proposes an awareness and participation of the people to solve the problem. Furthermore, the use of the pronoun is viewed as the tools to legitimize the President's opinion in satisfying the people's wishes (Degani, 2015).

Based on the findings, the study also found that the speech reflects a social democracy underlying the representation of the conflict between KPK and POLRI in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's speech. Social democracy itself is defined as a non-Marxist vision of socialism (Berman, 2006). Moreover, it is defined as political ideology that support the social interventions (based on collective interests) and aim to lead to the solidaristic outcomes (Berman, 2006).

Based on the results of the study, the value of social democracy is based on

the most three pre-eminent macropropositions found in the text, namely M2 (37 propositions), M6 (16 propositions), and M5 (13 propositions). First, M2 shows the President's demeanour towards the conflict between KPK and POLRI. Second, the solutions of reconciliation is referred as M6. Lastly, M5 refers to a misconduct towards the case of Novel Baswedan. M2 significantly is the most dominant by holding 37 propositions compared to the other two. This can be interpreted that M2 is of paramount importance the President wants to emphasize most through his speech. The reason of why the President is more concerned about his own attitude is due to the urge the people have of the President to do an intervention.

Based on his speech, the President's demeanour further reflects a social democracy. As mentioned earlier, the President uses the inclusive pronoun *kita* 'we' to "include" the people in solving the problem (see the previous section) and therefore enhancing his strategy gaining the people's trust. The pronouns are shown in several

paragraphs (1st, 2nd, 13th, 25th, 34th, 40th, 47th, 50th, 57th, 61st, 62nd, 63rd, and 67th) along his speech. The excerpt below is one of the President's statements where he uses the inclusive pronoun *kita* 'we', as follows:

Saya ingin langsung masuk pada inti permasalahan, apa yang terjadi di antara KPK dan Polri, serta solusi seperti apa yang mesti kita jalankan. (Paragraph 25)

[I will directly address the conflict between KPK and POLRI and the solutions we will follow afterwards]

Regardless the value of social democracy shown in his speech, the individualism of the President is also shown. This is determined by the use of another pronoun *saya* 'I' used by the President in his speech. Based on the results of the lexical analysis of microstructure, it found that the pronoun *saya* functions as several values such as a personal voice and exclusivity. The value of a personal voice is determined by the occurrences of the pronoun itself (see table 4.2) based on the relevant function (personal-opinion) which

eventually leads to the value of exclusivity shown by the President.

In Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's speech, he eventually decides to interfere the conflict and in attempt to reconcile both institutions by establishing the government ordinance. This shows his inconsistency of what he says along the speech. The inconsistency of the President is clearly shown in the analysis of microstructure of coherence.

The President states that the interference by the President is a must to be prevented. However, the President lets himself interfere the conflict between both institutions. It presupposes that the conflict is a critical moment in politics to be solved and as a "counteract" for the President himself regarding his "damaged" reputation.

Furthermore, the support by the President towards KPK is shown through his speech. The support, however, is expected since the

President is the founder of KPK (based on his campaign slogan of his election "Anti-Corruption"). Compared to POLRI, KPK has received more support by the President. This is shown in M5 (13 propositions) as the President addresses the case of Novel Baswedan. It assumes that the President is concerned more about KPK instead of POLRI.

The excerpt below presupposes that the President has a great belief on Novel Baswedan not being convicted, as follows:

...mereka yang bertugas di KPK adalah personil yang dinilai baik (38th paragraph)

[.....they who work in KPK are good personnel]

Another support from the President appears as he addresses the readjustment of KPK's regulation offered by DPR. He directly doubts and assumes that the offer is supposed to weaken KPK, not to improve their quality in fighting the corruption.

REFERENCES

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

Berman, S. (2006). *The Primacy of Politics: Social Democracy and the Making of Europe's Twentieth Century*. New

- York: Cambridge University Press.
- Degani, M. (2015). Framing the rhetoric of a leader: An analysis of Obama's election campaign speeches. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Karapetjana, I. (2011). Pronominal choice in political interviews. *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*, p. 36.
- Liau, H. (2012, October 9). Kompas.com. Retrieved January 19, 2013, from Kompas.com: <http://nasional.kompas.com/read/2012/10/09/16035782>
- Richardson, J. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Temmerman, R. (2000). *Towards new ways of terminology description: The sociocognitive-approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Verderber, R. F., Verderber, . S., & Sellnow, . D. (2011). *The challenge of effective speaking*. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.