MICRO TEXTUAL ANALYSIS ON FIRST PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHES IN U.S. PRESIDENT'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

M Nizar Zulhamsyah, Agwin Degaf
Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim
Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia
mnzulhamsyah@gmail.com, agwindegaf@uin-malang.ac.id

Abstract

In an inauguration day, a president should deliver his first speech which often consists of essential matters for him to convey his vision, mission and strategies in leading the nation which are significant, vital and sometimes different from one president to others. In this paper, first presidential speeches performed by Barack Obama and Donald Trump in the U.S. President's inaugural address are studied through micro textual analysis. This study results the difference and diverse characteristics found from analysing micro textual element, comprising stylistic, syntactic and semantic element employed by both presidents. It is expected that the study contributes theoretically to develop the use of micro textual structure on disclosing one's ideology and practically improve the way people perceive one's speech because it always has an idea which is rather delicate to understand.

Keywords: Micro Textual Structure, First Presidential Speech, Stylistic, Syntactic, Semantic Element

INTRODUCTION

In a presidential inauguration day, inaugural speech—also known as inaugural address—often consists of essential matters for president to deliver his visions, missions and strategies as a leader of the nation which are significant, vital and sometimes different from one president to the others. In that chance, the speeches should be delivered as impressive as possible to attract people's attention in the first day of his presidency. This situation makes every inaugural event of U.S. President considered as an important moment to project what the president wants and how he wants his people and other nations see him as a leader. Therefore, this study discusses micro textual structure portrayed in the inaugural addresses of the two latest U.S. presidents to reveal the strategy they used in constructing their own ideology on their first presidential speech.

Since micro textual structure is studied in this article, it utilizes first presidential speeches which deliver the discourse's ideology presented from each president. The inaugural address used in this study consists of first presidential speech of President

Barrack Obama and first presidential speech of President Donald Trump. Regularly, the speeches are considered as the most solemn setting for first remark made by the presidents, which are delivered during an occasion of power changing from administration to the new president.

In this study, the chosen objects are uniquely different; the object is first presidential speech delivered by Barack Obama in 2009, and Donald Trump in 2017. The most notable difference from the speeches is both presidents are coming from different party, as we know that in American political setting there are two major parties; Democrat and Republic. Besides, those parties have different views on how the nation should be, so that the different ideology appear as well.

In order to deliver speech, the elected president must have rhetorical skills which help him to impress people as the voters, who did vote for him instead of another candidate. Furthermore, rhetorical skills not only impress people but also could convince people that the next step are on his hand and show essential move he takes because he needs to make the people trust him and his government. Practically, the rhetorical skill generally is presented in the form of text that is usually used to tell something without saying it. Moreover, the text plays significant roles on every discourse as an act of implying something by telling something else.

To analyze the data, the authors use Van Dijk's model of discourse as the theoretical framework which has three dimensions; text, social cognition, and social context. The main thing about his model of discourse is elaborating all three dimensions into one single analysis (Eriyanto, 2009, p. 224). On textual dimension, it is about how text's structure and discourse strategies used to imply or even emphasize certain theme. The text is analyzed linguistically or often called textual analysis which the results are depended on its vocabulary usage, semantic choice, structure choice and even its coherence and cohesiveness concerning on how relation between words and phrases construct another meaning.

The brief concept of Van Dijk's model of discourse explained above helps the authors to distinguish contents of the speeches. First, it is about an idea which talks about specific representation that the speaker/writer wants to present on its text, which generally holds specific ideological value. Essentially, this type of analysis is planned to understand how something is presented in the text which could also hold specific ideological value. Second, it talks about the relation between speaker and the audience. It means that an analysis on how the construction of relation from the speaker/writer with the reader/hearer is. For example, the relation is informal or formal, open or closed, etc. Third, it is about identity, meaning that relation of specific construction from the writer to the reader and how the identity is presented.

Specifically, in this study the authors only focus on the textual analysis on micro dimension or simply called micro textual analysis because in that dimension, there are lots of discourse strategies shaping the way speaker delivers his ideas to audiences. With such

framework of analysis, the authors believe that it is the best way to understand each chosen president speech especially on how its ideology presented. Furthermore, in order to get rich and detailed analysis, the authors will limit this study on micro textual analysis and focus the text analysis on each strategy founded on the both speeches.

Ideology in Textual Analysis

In this part, discourse's ideology was chosen as the theoretical framework of this study, because it is believed to hold 'the illustration' on how the speaker's thought constructed in his speech. It means that the ideology presented will have its basis from the speech itself. According to a notion brought by Fairclough (1989, p. 3) ideology is closely linked to language because it is public, shared, and mutually consumed where people mostly build their own assumption. Moreover, there are such textual strategies that maintain ideological perspectives which direct the reader to certain belief of construction of a truth. Therefore, along with the existence of such strategies implemented in the presidents' speeches, this study tries to signify the ideology construction on each speech.

Therefore, this study employs method of discourse analysis to find the ideology presented of last two U.S. president in their first presidential speech on inaugural address. According to a notion explained by Rahardjo, (2004, p. 5) the development of discourse analysis cannot be separated from the intentionality of language. Therefore, it is clear that every language spoken has its own purpose and should be full of meaning. Moreover, Fairclough and Wodak (1997, p. 25) explained that critical discourse analysis perceives a discourse as a construction form of social practice that has rich relations between discourse phenomena and situation, institution, and social structure.

In addition, discourse analysis observes language as important factor on building and leading public opinion to the specific way. Therefore, discourse analysis is commonly often used to reveal unseen motives from a text, especially the one that presented on public. Discourse practice could illustrate an effect of ideology which commonly producesand reproduces imbalance power relation between upper-class and lower-class society, man and woman, majority and minority trough social position (Eriyanto, 2009, p. 7).

Previous Studies Related to Textual Analysis

Suryana (2008) wrote a thesis entitled *"Ideologi pemberitaan surat kabar Republika dan Kompas dalam kasus penerbitan majalah playboy Indonesia"*. This study found the ideology on selected newspaper by using Pan & Kosicki's framing model. In this study, the writer focused on how the newspaper implement its ideology in framing such an issue. In this study, ideology construction was found through analysis of framing model. The framing model generates unified theme of organized ideas which linked to textual elements used on certain discourse.

Another study that mostly applied discursive strategies which is more about practical description rather than theoretical is Van Dijk (2000) with *The reality of racism* in Zurstiege

G. (eds) *Festschrift für* die *wirklichkeit*. He studied about European politicians who spoke about immigration debates. The way he analyzed was by simply going through the text, clause by clause, sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph, and trying to categorize any relevant functions such units have within the speech itself. He studied the categorization of recognizable moves and strategies, e.g., those of derogation (negative other-presentation), in group favoritism (positive self-presentation), the use of specific metaphors, lexicalizations, hyperbolas, which he also analyzed in earlier work on racism and discourse.

Furthermore, Van Dijk's study (2000) entitled o*n the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration*, is considered as similar to the above study mentioned. Even though it is similar, this study is still worth to be taken as previous study because of its significance. The difference is that this study uses numbers of theory and different method to create suitable framework of analysis. This study also has different focus in which it focused on how the available theories and methods are contested to find suitable tool for analysis.

Another analysis showing how speech is vital in framing ideology is the study of Degaf (2017) with *Kasus Ahok dalam perspektif ilmu linguistik*. This study talks about the blasphemy case carried out by Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok) in his speech in the Kepulauan Seribu several months ago. In simple terms, the study attempted to explore Ahok's sentence/speech which is considered to have hurt the hearts of Muslims. Ahok's utterances that are considered blasphemous is viewed using linguistic glasses, namely in terms of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Syntactically, what is seen in this previous study is the construction of passive-active sentences in one of the speeches that are considered as a form of blasphemy by the audience. Then, the grammatical point of view is strengthened by analysis of meaning, which is related to the emotive meaning that can be generated by a word. This emotive meaning then sparked public anger over Ahok's words. The next analysis is related to who speaks and what or by van Dijk (2004) referred to as US vs THEM. Regarding the labeling of who is considered "us" and who is considered "them" this also brings its own consequences for the utterances uttered by Ahok. In addition, an analysis related to the context of an utterance is also included in this previous study. A comprehensive language analysis related to the Ahok case is expected to provide alternative answers regarding whether Ahok's speech in the thousand islands is a form of blasphemy or not. Thus, analysis of the text alone is considered insufficient, so that the role of context and factors outside the text become very important in this case.

In the study of Degaf (2017) entitled *Pemberitaan Rohingya pada portal berita Republika: Kajian analisis wacana kritis*, he attempted to describe how Republika describes the massacre of Rohingya in Rakhine State (also known as Arakan, or Rohang in Rohingya), Myanmar by using van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis approach. The Rohingya ethnicity is a Muslim ethnic minority and of course the massacre of this ethnic has caused criticism from various parts of the world, especially Indonesia, where the majority of the population is Muslim. According to van Dijk (2004), there are two main discursive

strategies in reporting an individual/group in the media, and these strategies are related to who is considered as "US" and who is considered as "THEM". The labeling of us vs them is realized through several discourse strategies, including authoritative argumentation strategy, passive sentence use strategy, and number game strategy. Some of these discourse strategies are used by the media - in this case Republika - to give positive (positive self-presentation) and negative (negative other presentations) labels to individuals/groups that are reported.

METHOD

The objective of this study is to understand how ideologies are constructed using macro structure in speech by the two U.S. Presidents in their own inaugural addresses. More specifically, this study is qualitative study in form of discourse analysis on the discourse's ideology using stylistic, syntactic and semantic elements, and the object of the study is two inaugural addresses from the two U.S. President, Barrack Obama and Donald Trump. In other words, this study is discovering the lingual data technically by using micro textual analysis method. According to Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 2) this kind of study attempts to collect and analyze the data in form of words in form of non-numerical data. Bogdan and Biklen (1998, p. 4) stated that qualitative approach is a study procedure that produce descriptive data from person or behavior observed. This study also makes an effort to analyze phenomena of both textual on how the two U.S. Presidents construct their own ideology using stylistic, syntactic and semantic elements in first presidential speech on inaugural address, which its results is described using words or sentences supporting discourse rationale. The perspective used in this study on processing the data is mainly used discourse analysis in Van Dijk method. Since the perspective is appropriate because it sees a text as key factor on constructing and leading public opinion or impression as the discourse analysis itself is supposed to reveal unseen motives from text, especially the discourse's ideology on first presidential speech, this study needs to show clear description of the analysis through analyzing another subject.

The data source of this study is the online videos on YouTube. The first video is published by channel ABC News titled "Donald Trump's first presidential address to Congress" on February 28th, 2017. The second video is published by channel The Obama White House titled "The President Addresses Joint Session of Congress: 2/21/09" on February 21st, 2009. Those data source which is in the form of digital video was chosen in order to preserve a sense of authenticity on each speech from both presidents. After that, the digital video was converted into textual form by using audio transcription method

The data of this study is collected methodologically in form of lingual data which consist of words, phrases, and sentences founded on transcription of the digital video. Descriptive, factual, and natural information collected from the textual form of digital video is the primary data of this research. There are two phases conducted inanalyzingthe data which are in form of lingual data consisting of words, phrases, and sentences.

The first phase is describing its semantic, syntactic and stylistic element to reveal how the ideas of the speeches presented to the readers and how the possible effect from each element or discursive strategy founded. Next, the second phase is uncovering the differences between semantic, syntactic and stylistic element between two presidents to reveal how different is the two presidents describe what they said and how the possible effects might occur or affect hearer's impressions. After that, there is a collective discussion concerning the ideology representation of each president to sum up how is the ideology of two presidents on first presidential speech in inaugural address.

FINDINGS

This section presents the answers toward the statement of problem of this study. Findings from Trump's and Obama's speech are collectively explained as information to formulate how they presented ideology on first presidential speech. Later, there is a further explanation about general comparison highlighting how both presidents present their ideology, a quick explanation about the data summary, an interpretation of the results, and some comparisons with previous studies.

Stylistic Elements (Euphemism and Dysphemism)

This part presents differences on stylistic element. On euphemism, Trump uses words 'financial obligation' to illustrate the idea, and it is considered as more acceptable word rather than debt, bill or money. Thus, with this kind of move, Trump is successfully bringing positive sense on such unpleasant thing about payment toward the audience and their perspective on him will be also more positive.

Obama used 'safe heaven' used to give his audience sense that U.S. homeland is harmless and peaceful. Obama intentionally used this euphemism because he knows the argument was about unpleasant topic which always related with violence, criminal, terror, etc. This move was also intended to give the audience clearer thought about terrorism in Afghanistan cause something like hell and as U.S. President he will not allow fire from the hell spreading on his safe heaven, and with this move he also alleviate his positive appearance on the audience.

Next on dysphemism, Trump uses word 'epidemic' to illustrate the situation and it is considered as dysphemism because the use of word creating more negative sense or more unpleasant. This is frankly used by Trump in order to make the audience understand how bad the situation is by creating that kind of sense. The use of word will certainly different if he used other such as widespread, extensive, broad or wide-ranging, because these words will not give the audience strong sense about the grave situation of drugs.

Obama used word 'infuriated', according to Oxford Dictionary (2010) that word means "to make somebody extremely angry". That word is considered as dysphemism because it has synonym of enrage, madden, incense and annoy which according to Oxford

Dictionary (2010) all of those except 'annoy' means "to make somebody very angry" and annoy means "to make somebody slightly angry".

Table 1. Stylistics elements comparison

Trump Euphemism	Obama Euphemism
But our partners must meet their financial obligations (Trump, 2017).	*Because I will not allow terrorists to plot against the American people from* **safe havens** *half a world away* (Obama, 2009).
Trump Dysphemism	**Obama Dysphemism**
Our terrible drug epidemic will slow down and ultimately, stop (Trump, 2017).	*Democrats and Republicans alike were* **infuriated** *by the mismanagement and results that followed* (Obama, 2009).

In stylistic element, Trump used most of the strategy as tool for him to assure his audience about what he will do on his presidency. From lexical choice on stylistic element, he used euphemism and dysphemism to strengthen his argument and make the audience get the sense he tried to give. This is important because using such strategy Trump will easily get attention from the audience and also in same time, the audience will get the point of his argument.

On the other side, Obama speech seems to give past instance and future illustration. If it is seen from stylistic element, it is found that lexical choice strategy, euphemism and dysphemism, is normally used as a move to make his arguments, claims, and ideas stronger. Similar with Trump, Obama also used this strategy to ease his audience to be able to rapidly understand and get the sense in which Obama deliberately intended.

Syntactic Elements (Active-Passive and Nominalization)

Even though Trump's speech commonly uses active sentence, there is also passive sentence which is also used consciously as the active one to give specific sense for audience. As previously stated, passive sentence in this example might be intended to highlights a situation rather than actors behind the situation. Trump addresses situation about violence which cost thousands of U.S. citizen life and murder rate on that year. With passive sentence, he wants the audience to be focused on the presented situation and make them think about it. This is important because this move is used as one of reasons for his plan on fighting crime and violence, thus make it easier for society to accept the plan.

On Obama's speech, the use of passive sentence is commonly intended to give illustration. This strategy founded when he gave statement about American economy might be weakened and their confidence also shaken. On delivering such statement, he used word 'weakened' instead of 'weaken' which need subject. This move is intentionally used because Obama knows that American itself who let their economy weakened as his previous statements. With this move, the audience will only focus and think about

situation of economic recession instead of think that their government and themselves who caused the recession. Such thought on the audience is important because Obama needs his people to believe that there is hope to get better situation. If in his address he stated who caused U.S. economic weaken, his audience will focus on blaming them, rather than accept it as shared situation.

In regard to nominalization, Trump used this strategy to make the audience focus on event by transforming verb into noun of event and omit any subject. He addresses that there are threats, vandalism, and shooting which recently occurred on his nation instead of giving statement that might include who is the actor behind those crime and violence. With this move, the audience will only focus on those events, they will probably think those are very bad events rather than who are behind it or how the criminals did it. This sense is believed to function as reason or background to make preceding argument supported and become more plausible, because Trump needs the audience to believe that current situation needed to be fixed very soon.

On Obama's speech, the authors did not find any nominalization strategy. This might possible because Obama commonly used active verbal sentence and numbers of nominalized verb on some sentences. Even on the sentence with nominalized verb, its meaning will not drastically different from verbal one. Nominalization of verb on Obama's speech used to give photograph of action on the audience rather than omit or hide the subject.

Table 2. Syntactic elements comparison

Trump Passive	Obama Passive
In Chicago, more than 4,000 people were shot last year alone – and the murder rate so far this year has been even higher (Trump, 2017).	*But while our economy* ***may be weakened*** *and our confidence shaken; though we are living through difficult and uncertain times… (Obama, 2009).*
Nominalization	**Nominalization**
Recent threats targeting Jewish Community Centers and vandalism of Jewish cemeteries … (Trump, 2017).	*N/A.*

Viewed from sentence structure and nominalization on syntactic element, Trump intentionally used those uncommon form of sentence – especially in speech political discourse which commonly uses active and verbal sentence – in order to shift his audience attention and again make them get his point of argument easily. It easier for the audience to understand Trump's idea instead of accomplishing his plans.

Meanwhile, Obama used most of the sentences in his speech with active verbal or active nominal. It is quite rare to find the passive and there is no nominal sentence which can be categorized into one of discourse strategy of nominalization. This all make sense as

what Obama said need to be clear in a way of subject and object existence, while in other side, Trump's speech used both of the strategy, even though it just a few sentences.

Semantic Element – Actor Description

Related to strategies on semantic element, all of the strategies are used intentionally as both presidents' intention and interest. In Trump's speech, he used actor description to shape what will audience think about presented actor. He did that by limiting and focusing on what is necessary to make audience think and feel a sense which Trump desired. The Actor presented is Abraham Lincoln, Trump described him as first republican president rather than other descriptions which Lincoln have. With this kind of move, Trump deliberately wants the audience to think that the presented actor is republican which same as himself. This desired thought or sense later functioned as supporting reason to strengthen and amplify previous illustration which related with Trump's plan.

On Obama's speech, this strategy founded when he gave statement which mentions U.S. Vice President. This strategy used intentionally to give additional information on the audience, thus they will think about the vice president more than just second in command. He used phrase "because nobody messes with Joe" to give the audience illustration that if the vice president handles the task given, he will certainly accomplish it because no one dares to play with him. This move is important for Obama because he need the audience to sure that his preceding arguments about skepticism can be countered and increase the Americans' confidence that they can make come back in this economic recession.

Table 3. Semantic Element – Actor Description

Trump	Obama
The first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, warned that the "abandonment of the protective policy by the American Government [will] produce want and ruin among our people" (Trump, 2017).	*That is why I have asked Vice President Biden to lead a tough, unprecedented oversight effort - **because nobody messes with Joe*** (Obama, 2009).

In general, the use of strategies here is deliberately for making connection between arguments, thus creating supports which is plausible and easy to understand. To make clear idea about his plan for presidency, he needs to deliver his idea as coherent and cohesive as possible. On the other side, Obama mostly used similar strategy as Trump in order to support and strengthen the related arguments, claims, or ideas.

Van Leeuwen (1996) says that all discourse on people and action involves various types of actor descriptions. An Actor (perpetrator) can be described as a member of a group or as an individual, by first name or family name, function, role or group name, as specific or unspecified, by their actions or (alleged) nature, by their position or relationship with other people, and so on.

In actor description, there is a slight difference from both presidents. Trump used it to give the audiences sense of republicans by quoting previous presidents' advice and label them as republicans. In Obama speech, this strategy used to give more personal touch about the presented actor capacity and also support the previous argument by making it more promising. Thus, rather than giving sense of democrats as Trump did, Obama simply give sense of assurance in which the presented actor is more than capable to achieve their goals.

Semantic Element – Authority

When people express their opinion, they have the option of changing certain realities by naming the authorities to support their case, usually organizations or people who are part of a political party, or who are generally recognized as an expert or moral leader (van Dijk, 2004).

On Trump's speech, he uses this strategy mainly to make his audience sure about what is he promised. First, he stated about his direction on Department of Justice to reduce violent crime by forming a task force, and he also promised that he will make Department of Homeland Security and Justice along with other departments to dismantle criminal cartels across nation. With such move, the audience will more assured and thus believe on what he said. Moreover, the sense of believe in audience is important for Trump make sure his plans will be supported and ultimately achieved.

On Obama's speech, this strategy founded when he gave statement about his promise and what he had done as one of his plans to fix the economic recession. He mentioned some authorities, such as his cabinet, mayors, governors, and even himself to make sure that his audience will believe the plan and willing to cooperate for it. Without this strategy, the audience might not believe on what he said, and as a U.S. President, it is his job to invite all American to work together to make better country.

Table 4. Semantic Element – Authority

Trump	Obama
I have further ordered the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice, along with the Department of State and the Director of National Intelligence, to coordinate an aggressive strategy … (Trump, 2017).	*I have told each **member of my Cabinet** as well as **mayors** and **governors** across the country that they will be held accountable by **me** and the American people for every dollar they spend* (Obama, 2009).

Trump and Obama use this strategy in quite different manner. They both mention some national departments for the same purpose, but how those used to shape their idea is not similar. Trump applies it to support his previous argument and make the audience believe that his moves will be achieved. While Obama use it as one of his arguments – about responsibility of economic policy taken – to create sense of inclusivity among

audience and direct their idea that together, with Obama, they will deem those authorities responsible for the action.

Semantic Element – Burden

The burden is the way how discourse makers describe certain cases (phenomena) as big problems unless the case has been resolved and, by doing so, support from others can be obtained to immediately deal with the issue (van Dijk, 2000; 205). Simply put, the burden is a strategy to impose problems on other parties, without even being aware of that party.

On Trump's speech, he used this strategy to create principle on audience's mind about past mistake will not affect the course of future. With this principle, he consciously blames previous party that responsible of the mistake happened and create chance for Trump to get in the situation and do one of his jobs as president to fix the mistake, thus make the audience think in similar way and believe that.

On Obama's speech, this strategy founded when he gave idea about self-mistake made by American which caused the economic recession. He used this strategy to remind his audience that the recession is a mistake of ourselves. Moreover, he also put information that the mistake is caused by both government and its people. With such strategy, he wanted to give the audience sense of regretful whether they work in government or live as common citizen. In addition, Obama used this move in order to support both previous and preceding arguments which required his audience to understand that if America wants to get better, they should do it themselves and start it on their own mind.

Table 5. Semantic Element – Burden

Trump	Obama
I will not allow the mistakes of recent decades past to define the course of our future (Trump, 2017).	*…for too long, **we have not always met these responsibilities - as a government** or **as a people*** (Obama, 2009).

In this kind of strategy, Trump and Obama have different way of utilizing it. Trump creates the idea that past mistakes are not allowed to affect his future plan. This indirectly creates barrier between him and the mistakes, making the audience think that his plan will not create same fault as previous leaders. Obama approach is more on self-encouragement by asking the audience to know what they are lacking. This creates idea that people alongside its leader have done mistakes in the past and it is up to them how to deal with it to have a better future.

Semantic Element – Consensus

One of the political strategies that are often used in debates on issues of national importance is the display, claim or wish of consensus (van Dijk, 2004). To claim or insist on cross-party or national consensus is a well-known political strategy in situations where

the country is threatened, for instance by outside attack (van Dijk, 2006). The use of this consensus strategy then has implications for audience support for policies or opinions from politicians because the arguments made by these politicians are considered to represent a common agreement/belief.

On Trump's speech, this strategy founded when he used national issue about American people deserving something good by making hope that everything broken can be fixed, every problem can be solved, and every hurting family can find healing, which used to invite Democrat's people to join forces and go together to accomplish the hope given. With this kind of address, Trump was creating a sense which the audience will think and believe that the losing party Democrat should work with governing party Republic because what is planned looks very promising and good for American people.

On Obama's speech, this strategy founded on his statement about an idea to make both parties Democrat and Republic to work together and bring some plans to help solving the economic recession. He also mentioned the audience on chamber which consisted of government's officers and even himself to join together working on the recession. This strategy uses national economic issue to make it plausible. With this consensus, he wanted to make his audience believe that the plans he had and dreams he hold by presenting his argument that opposing parties need to work together. If he did not use this strategy, it is impossible for him to get the audience assurance and those plans and dreams will never be achieved.

Table 6. Semantic Element – Consensus

Trump	Obama
On this and so many other things, Democrats and Republicans should get together and unite for the good of our country, and for the good of the American people **(Trump, 2017).**	*Given these realities, everyone in this chamber - **Democrats and Republicans - will have to sacrifice** some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars. **And that includes me*** (Obama, 2009).

In consensus strategy, Trump and Obama have similar way of using it, they both planned to bring together both parties for greater common causes. However, there is a minor difference, Trump highlighting the political parties to work together as a nation for the greater cause, while Obama add himself to the equation or simply put himself as the example or initiator to start working together. This – along with Obama's request to "sacrifice" – creates an idea that Obama is willing to take measures, be the example, and put himself on the line.

Semantic Element – Empathy

Depending on their political or ideological perspective, politicians in various ways will show sympathy or empathy for the suffering of war veterans or families left behind by war and then experience poverty. lo that case, the apparent nature of empathy is

supported by the fact that the part of the discourse that follows but does not show much empathy at all, on the contrary. Empathy in that case will be accorded to in-group members, represented as victims (van Dijk, 2004).

On Trump's speech, he used this strategy to give more genuine empathy on group of families of law enforcement. He stated that every police and sheriff is member of community, they are friends and neighbors, and they are also member of family on their own which every time duty calls, their life is at risk. With this, audiences are asked to open heart and mind to show some sympathy and willing to cooperate with them. This impression is quite important because Trump previously asked the audience to cooperate and trust people on law enforcement and together making saver and peaceful society.

On Obama's speech, he commonly used this strategy as personal approach to touch audience's heart and make them understand deeply from inside. In example presented below, he used empathy when he addressed an idea about how America sees his men and women in uniform who have served and delivered for the Nation. This strategy is important because Obama needs his audience and his people who listen to believe that each and every of those men and women are always honored and cared by Nation. With this, the audience will believe that Obama also cared for those people and will not forget them as most of his speech is about economic, healthcare, and education.

Table 7. Semantic Element – Empathy

Trump	Obama
Police and sheriffs are members of our community. They are friends and neighbors, they are mothers and fathers, sons and daughters - and they leave behind loved ones every day who worry whether or not they'll come home safe and sound (Trump, 2017).	*To each and every one of them, and to the families who bear the quiet burden of their absence, Americans are united in sending one message:* ***we honor your service, we are inspired by your sacrifice, and you have our unyielding support*** (Obama, 2009).

In empathy strategy, Trump and Obama utilize it as a tool to show their compassion toward subjects thus balancing the subsequent statement delivered. Trump creates empathy in the audience, making them likely to agree with the idea of the statement. Obama adds personal gratitude and place himself as a person who felt the tragedy. This helps him create an idea that he puts his people first, thus amplifying his charm as a president who cares his people.

Semantic Element – Evidentiality

Claims or points of view in an argument are more plausible when politicians present some evidence or proof for their knowledge or opinions. This may happen by references to Authority figures or institutions, or by various forms of Evidentiality: How or where did they get the information (van Dijk, 2006).

On Trump's speech, this strategy is crucial especially on argument about increasing national security to protect each American from terrorism which sometimes considered as biased argument. In order to make it more convincing and logical, he needs to give some proof to make his audience belief that treat from terrorism is real. Trump claims that data from Department of Justice shows majority of terrorist came from outside. With this proof, the audience will believe or at least consider that terrorism is came from outside, thus previous argument about increasing national security by limiting how person could enter the nation need to be done.

Obama's speech, this strategy used on many of his arguments to make it sound more valid and trustable. In the example below, he used evidentiality to give his audience view of how terrible is American education has. Obama presented facts which make the audience think and consider that education system should be fixed too. Without those proof, the audience will just don't understand why even Obama planned to work on better education system, thus he needs to show the audience that it is bad and need a reform too.

Table 8. Semantic Element – Evidentiality

Trump	Obama
According to data provided by the Department of Justice, the vast majority of individuals convicted for terrorism-related offenses since 9/11 came here from outside of our country (Trump, 2017).	*And yet,* **just over half of our citizens have that level of education***. We have one of the* **highest high school dropout rates of any industrialized nation***. And* **half of the students who begin college never finish** (Obama, 2009)*.

In evidentiality strategy, Trump and Obama used evidence in similar means. They both mention some data or facts from valid sources to gain trust from the audience. This helps to gain logical sense which is important to create certainty among audience.

Semantic Element – Example/Illustration

One of the most effective strategies in presenting an argument is to provide concrete examples, usually in the form of a story that illustrates a general picture of a particular situation (van Dijk, 2000; 218). More than general truths, concrete examples not only have the power to be easily imagined and easier to remember, but also to suggest convincing forms of empirical evidence. Rhetorically, concrete examples also make speeches more alive, and when they are based on direct experience of politicians, audiences can more easily believe in the performance of these politicians.

On Trump's speech, he gives example/illustration about how unfair international sales on American companies and workers. He told his audience about his meeting with one of companies which has mistreated for long time while do business by paying high rate of tax, and they even get used to it. With this narrative, Trump wants his audience to

understand how terrible the situation is, because it is important to give support on his previous plan about restarting the engine of American economy so they can also accomplish their goals. The presented narrative will easily give the audience picture of current economic situation of America and also make them to believe that Trump's plan is must to do.

On Obama's speech, he used a lot of examples on delivering his arguments. Similar with empathy, this strategy also used by him to give his audience more plausible sense of arguments. In the example below, Obama used this strategy when addressing idea about where American can found or built their answer to fix and get up from the economic recession. With such move, the audience would believe that the recession can be handled. The way Obama told the audience also give them indistinct view about his idea. This is important to give such view because Obama needs his people's will by believing that the answer is there and it is existing, thus he can drive the Nation into a better situation

Table 9. Semantic Element – Example/Illustration

Trump	Obama
They told me -- without even complaining because they have been mistreated for so long that they have become used to it -- that it is very hard to do business with other countries because they tax our goods at such a high rate (Trump, 2017).	*The answers to our problems don't lie beyond our reach. They exist in our laboratories and universities; in our fields and our factories; in the imaginations of our entrepreneurs and the pride of the hardest-working people on Earth* (Obama, 2009).

In example/illustration strategy, both presidents gave clear examples on each argument. They present fact or logical reasoning of how certain event unfold if measures were taken. They also add some personal touch by positioning themselves as the person who related on certain situation. In general, there is no significant difference on how they use this strategy.

Semantic Element – Humanitarianism
This strategy is an argumentation strategy involving opinions on the defense of human rights, and criticism of those who violate or ignore these rights, and the formulation of general norms and values for humane treatment of the issues being debated (van Dijk, 2006). There are many ways humanity is manifested in debates or speeches. One of the basic ways is to formulate norms, in terms of what we should or should not do.

On Trump's speech, he used principle about American spirit to find friends, partners, harmony, stability, and peace. This address is intentional to make his audience understand that his plan is to strengthen alliance and make peace, and make his previous argument (about keeping America safe the Nation should provide needed tools to prevent war and if it happens to fight and win) supported.

On Obama's speech, the use of this strategy might be similar with empathy in a way that he showed his care and proposed a norm-like idea based on it. In the example below, he used humanitarianism to create the idea based on human rights about parents should not pass any burden to their children. He used this move to make his audience think the norm-like idea like that is plausible and Obama might make the audience to believe in that. This is important because such strategy is used to give support on both previous and preceding arguments and make them stronger. Thus, the plans presented are certainly will get support from people of United States of America.

Table 10. Semantic Element – Humanitarianism

Trump	Obama
We want harmony and stability, not war and conflict. We want peace, wherever peace can be found. America is friends today with former enemies (Trump, 2017).	*There is, of course, another responsibility we have to our children. And that is the responsibility to ensure that we do not pass on to them a debt they cannot pay* (Obama, 2009).

In humanitarianism strategy, Trump and Obama have a minor difference on its application, making their approach divergent. Trump shows his idea more on the future of general people or what he can do to improve it, while Obama tells his idea using narrative infused with real person stories and approach this as if he is a close relative or family of the person. This difference might be trivial but it clearly shows how each president perceives humanity.

Semantic Element – Number Game

Many arguments are oriented to increase credibility which emphasizes objectivity. Van Dijk (2006) states that numbers and statistics are the main means in our culture to persuasively display objectivity. They represent facts against mere opinion.

On Trump's speech, he used this strategy to give his audience proof about rising charge of Obamacare premiums. He used phrase "double and triple digit" instead of giving exact value of the rising charge. With such move, he wants the audience to easily understand and quickly catch the illustration given, because we all know that increasing in digit number means that it rises ten and hundred times more expensive, thus the audience will certainly think and believe that the healthcare price is ridiculous and need to be replaced as Trump's argument previously on the speech.

On Obama's speech, this strategy founded on some arguments and claims which mostly become example or proof to support the arguments or claims. In the example below, he used number game to give illustration about how terrible the premium of healthcare which runs in the Nation. He used phrase "four times faster than wages" to make his audience easy to understand and catch instantly the meaning of it.

Table 11. Semantic Element – Number Game

Trump	Obama
Obamacare premiums nationwide have increased by double and triple digits (Trump, 2017).	*In the last eight years, premiums have grown **four times faster than wages**.* (Obama, 2009).

In number game strategy, Trump and Obama used this in the same way as authority or evidentiality. Moreover, they also use this to alter the audience focus towards desired facts. This is expected since the purpose of the strategy is to fortify integrity of the idea by highlighting their own objective.

Semantic Element – National Self-Glorification

According to van Dijk (2006), especially in state speeches, positive self-presentation can be routinely implemented with various forms of national self-glorification: Positive references or praise for one's own country, its principles, history, and traditions. This self-glorification can be done with explicit or implicit utterances.

On Trump's speech, this strategy makes or increases some confidence on audience because both speaker and audience are in same nation even not in same side/party. Trump gives statement which marks his presidency as new chapter of America encompassing on national capabilities and proud. This strategy is important, especially in early part speech, because audience will know that what the whole speech about is all based on idea to make America great again. With this move, Trump's effectively drive the audience sense toward expectations, hopes and dreams of better America.

On Obama's speech, this strategy used in national level which means that he used National Self-Glorification to make America looks greater than any other nations. In the example below, he used this strategy to give representation about how vigilant America on overcoming extremism. He said that there is no force more powerful than America on his statement on the speech. With such move, Obama wanted to rise up the U.S. people's pride and believe of themselves and to remind that America is strong. This is important because with such sense, the audience will have less doubts about one of Obama's plans to overcome the extremism and even give some supports to make it achieved

Table 12. Semantic Element – National Self-Glorification

Trump	Obama
Our allies will find that America is once again ready to lead. All the nations of the world – friend or foe – will find that America is strong, America is proud, and America is free (Trump, 2017).	*To overcome extremism, we must also be vigilant in upholding the values our troops defend - because **there is no force in the world more powerful than the example of America*** (Obama, 2009).

In national self-glorification, Trump and Obama present dominance when addressing about their nation. The way they use this is also similar, both presidents claim the nation have superior ability on both economic and military power and great force progress and prosperity.

DISCUSSION

In respect to larger theory of discourse analysis or perhaps the critical one, this study has demonstrated that in general, micro textual analysis which use strategies from stylistic, syntactic, and semantic element may come up with numbers of properties. The properties itself are originated from the first presidential speech which cannot be considered as standard features in meaning analysis (van Dijk, 2000, p. 224). This is possible because this study only sees the speeches on micro level, which there are two other levels which can be used in meaning analysis.

There are differences on how Trump and Obama used these strategies on their first presidential speech. From 14 strategies analyzed, 6 of them used differently, and those variances are mainly caused by distinct focus of each president had. From the table below, semantic element is most used on both speeches, followed by stylistic element, and syntactic element. In the semantic element itself, example/illustration is most used on both speeches, evidentiality and humanitarianism least used on Trump speech, and actor description least used on Obama speech.

Table 13. Occurrences of Micro Textual Analysis

Types	Trump	Obama	Similar?
Euphemism	3	6	Yes
Dysphemism	3	5	Yes
Active-Passive	1	1	Yes
Nominalization	1	-	Yes
Actor Description	6	2	No
Authority	4	4	No
Burden	4	7	No
Consensus	6	3	No
Empathy	7	7	No
Evidentiality	3	4	Yes
Example or Illustration	13	16	Yes
Humanitarianism	3	4	No
Number Game	4	7	Yes
National Self-Glorification	5	6	Yes

Based on the findings above, it can be said that each micro textual elements used as strategies to form ideas on speech have variable implications towards its ideology. Those implications drawn from three findings of both speeches; a) most used element, to understand common structure of how the ideas presented, b) elements which have significant gap on its usage, to understand general preference of strategies deployed to

present the ideas, and c) elements which have different textual application, to understand characteristics of the presented ideas.

As looking closer at those implications, it can prove that stylistic, syntactic, and semantic elements have equal results that showing ideology in both speeches. In stylistic, strategies available found in this study are used in same manner by both presidents, even though the occurrences are significantly different. In this way, it is found Trump ideology on delivering statement is constructed on less figurative language than Obama. The use of lexicon is certainly as a function of context features by expressing the underlying concept and belief of the speaker which can be articulated in various ways depending on the speaker's position, role, goals, perspective, or opinion (van Dijk, 2000, p. 95). In political discourse such as presidential speech, each use of word or lexicon needs extra attention because each word has its specific meaning and most importantly it also has specific sense towards audience (Richardson, 2007, p. 47)

In syntactic, it proves another story of both speeches using available strategies in similar approach. This is expected since speech discourse are generally written to encourage the audience, thus active voice is the main preference. Active sentence commonly used to spotlight the actor/doer of certain situation while passive sentence highlights the object/victim and sometimes the passive one can omit any presence of the actor (van Leeuwen, 1996, pp. 38-42). Meanwhile, nominalization is rare to use by both presidents. Whereas, in speech discourse, nominalization used in a comparable way as using passive sentence, because when a sentence's verb is nominalized, it is possible to omit subject and sense of the sentence will shift from action-oriented into event-oriented (van Dijk, 2000, p. 99). Here, both presidents' ideologies are constructed as a hands-on illustration about certain national situation, while having slight passive structure or nominalization just to direct the audience's focus on the event.

In semantic, there is a lot of variation, from strategies used in similar or different manner and the significant occurrence gap on some strategies. One of strategies that mostly used by both is example or illustration. Power of an argument is coming from how clear examples, illustration, or logic given by speaker. It is not just about proof or truth or how those presented memorably or imaginable, but more about how compelling the presented information are. Moreover, clear illustration also makes speech more energetic when it based on personal experience from speaker (van Dijk, 2000, p. 218). Another strategy is national self-glorification. This strategy is also known as positive self-representation. In political discourse, this strategy commonly shows superiority and anything related to it when addressing about speaker's side/party/nation (van Dijk, 2000, p. 220). It can be said that Trump ideology constructed on formal and action-oriented statement with preference on separating himself from past mistakes, placing himself as a commander of the action, and highlighting broader level entities. On the other side, Obama ideology constructed on personal statement with preference on promoting shared responsibilities, placing himself as an example while embracing others to do the action, and highlighting individual level entities.

Furthermore, it can be noticed that both presidents indirectly used strategy of lexicalization to give self-positive representation. This means that both presidents whether consciously or not make their audience to create difference or polarization between us and them. This was a human nature in communication which prone to give self-positive presentation and negative-other presentation (van Dijk, 2000, p. 94). Even though as discussing it before that most of lexicalization strategy used to give bolder sense on certain issue, it still can be said that intentionally or not both presidents were likely to give positive sense on 'us' and negative sense on 'them'.

The ideology, on the other hand, shown by both presidents' speech is delivered differently if uncovered with micro textual elements in this study which is different from the study of Suryana (2008) in which ideology is revealed by using framing model analysis behind mass media discourse using a frame which relies on textual dimension.

Based on the discussion, analyzing micro textual strategies is good enough to consistently discover the discourse's ideology from the speeches performed by Trump and Obama, which implies their own unique characteristics.

CONCLUSION

In sum, the ideology presented by Trump and Obama in their speech is mostly not similar and has distinct characteristics. The differences occur in micro textual element, comprising stylistic, syntactic and semantic element. In stylistic element, Trump inclined to utilize less figurative language than Obama. In syntactic elements whom both presidents deliver the speech for illustrative purpose to describe certain national situation and inspire the audience to be on the same side, while having minor passive structure or nominalization just to direct the audience's focus on the situation. And in semantic elements, Trump statements are formal and action-oriented with preference on keeping himself away from past mistakes, presenting himself as a commander of the action, and highlighting broader level entities. On the other hand, Obama statements are personal with preference on promoting shared responsibilities on the past mistakes, introducing himself as an example while inviting others to follow the same action, and highlighting individual level entities.

Even some moves and strategies are considered as not standard, it is believed that those moves and strategies may have a decent or even powerful role in the political speech discourses which can be seen from how the discourse moves and strategies were used in the object of this study. Thus, the authors suggest that future study on discourse analysis should utilize more than one theoretical framework as comparison or secondary tool, if the study aims to give higher standard on meaning analysis.

REFERENCES

Bodgan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). Qualitative research in education (4th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Darma, Y. A. (2009). Analisis wacana kritis. Bandung: Yrama Widya.

Degaf, A. (2017, May 16). Kasus Ahok dalam perspektif ilmu linguistik. *Seminar Nasional Bahasa dan Sastra (Senabastra) IX*. Retrieved from http://repository.uin-malang.ac.id/1940/

Degaf, A. (2017, October 24-25). Pemberitaan Rohingya pada portal berita Republika: Kajian analisis wacana kritis. *Seminar Nasional Linguistik "Isu-isu Mutakhir Linguistik"*. Retrieved from http://repository.uin-malang.ac.id/2254/

Eriyanto. (2009). Analisis wacana: Pengantar analisis teks media. Yogyakarta: LKiS.

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

Fairclough, N., & Ruth, W. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-281). London: Sage Publication (CA).

Irvine, J. T. (2012, January 12). Language ideology - anthropology - Oxford bibliographies. Retrieved from Oxford Bibliographies: http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0012.xml

Jorgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2007). Discourse analysis as theory and method. London: Sage Publication.

Kridalaksana, H. (2001). Kamus linguistik. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.

Littlejohn, S. P. (1992). Theories of human comunication. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Miles, B., Mathew, & Huberman, A. W. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: a sourcebook of new methods. California: Sage.

Obama, B. H. (2009, February 21). The President Addresses Joint Session of Congress: 2/21/09. (B. H. Obama, Performer) United States Capitol, Washington, D.C., United States of America. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y65ZgehoCDQ

Raharjo, M. (2004). Wacana kebahasaan: Dari filsafat hingga sosial politik. Malang: Cendekia Paramulya.

Richardson, J. E. (2007). Analyzing newspaper: An approach from critical discourse analysis. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Trump, D. J. (2017, February 28). Donald Trump's first presidential address to Congress. (D. J. Trump, Performer) United States Capitol, Washington, D.C., United States of America. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JOSaIvkDO6g

University of Oxford. (2010). Oxford advanced learner's dictionary 8th edition CD-ROM. (8). Oxford, New York, United States: Oxford University Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). The study of discourse. In T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse as structure and process discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 1). London: Sage Publication.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). News as discourse. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.

van Dijk, T. A. (2000). On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In M. Reisigl, & R. Wodak, *The semiotics of racism* (pp. 85-103). Vienna: Passagen Verlag.

van Dijk, T. A. (2000). Reality of racism. In Zurstiege, *Festschrift für die wirklichkeit* (pp. 211-225). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

van Dijk, T. A. (2004). From text grammar to critical discourse analysis. *Working Paper. II.* Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, Ideology, and Discourse. *Working Paper. II.* Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard, & M. Coulthard, *Text and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32-69). London: Routledge.