



**LANGUAGE, POWER, AND DEMOCRACY IN
PRESIDENTIAL DISCOURSE: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE
ANALYSIS**

¹Amon Bernabas Tennis, ²Metria Dicky Putra, ³Iskandar

^a Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada

^b English Department, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

^c SMA Negeri 1 Puruk Cahu

* Corresponding author, amontenisbernabas5@gmail.com

APA Citation:

Tennis, A.B., Putra, M.D., Iskandar. (2026). Language, Power, and Democracy in Presidential Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 16 (1).

Received
31/03/2026

Received in
revised form
23/04/2026

Accepted
28/06/2026

ABSTRACT

This research presents the analysis of the statement made by the President of Indonesia on August 31, 2025, amid political protests and social turmoil. It seeks to investigate how the discourse reflects democracy using Norman Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework. The study employs a descriptive qualitative methodology and examines speech across three aspects: text, discourse practice, and socio-cultural practice. At the textual level, the president employs imperative forms, modal verbs, and interfaith salutations to establish authority while conveying a sense of inclusiveness. Within the realm of discourse practice, the assertion serves as a compelling tool that presents elite agreement as being attentive to the desires of citizens, disseminated widely through media to shape public opinion. At the socio-cultural level, it illustrates Indonesia’s democratic contradiction, acknowledging freedom of speech while strengthening governmental authority. The

analysis shows that the speech depicts democracy as a combination of freedom and discipline, along with solidarity and order. The research finds that political discourse transmits governmental stances while also maintaining hegemonic legitimacy. It additionally recommends that upcoming studies examine how media framing enhances or challenges presidential communication and analyze comparable addresses across crises to deepen insights into language, authority, and democracy in Indonesia

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Political Speech, Democracy

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini menyajikan analisis terhadap pernyataan yang disampaikan oleh Presiden Indonesia pada 31 Agustus 2025 di tengah gelombang protes politik dan gejolak sosial. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji bagaimana wacana tersebut merefleksikan demokrasi dengan menggunakan kerangka Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) dari Norman Fairclough. Penelitian ini menggunakan metodologi kualitatif deskriptif dan menganalisis pidato melalui tiga aspek, yaitu teks, praktik wacana, dan praktik sosio-kultural. Pada tataran tekstual, presiden menggunakan bentuk imperatif, verba modal, serta sapaan lintas agama untuk membangun otoritas sekaligus menyampaikan kesan inklusivitas. Dalam ranah praktik wacana, pernyataan tersebut berfungsi sebagai instrumen persuasif yang menampilkan kesepakatan elite sebagai responsif terhadap aspirasi masyarakat, yang kemudian disebarluaskan melalui media untuk membentuk opini publik. Pada tataran sosio-kultural, wacana tersebut mencerminkan kontradiksi demokrasi di Indonesia, yaitu mengakui kebebasan berpendapat sekaligus memperkuat otoritas pemerintah. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa pidato tersebut merepresentasikan demokrasi sebagai perpaduan antara kebebasan dan kedisiplinan, serta antara solidaritas dan keteraturan. Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa wacana politik tidak hanya menyampaikan posisi pemerintah, tetapi juga mempertahankan legitimasi hegemonik. Selain itu, penelitian ini merekomendasikan agar studi selanjutnya mengkaji bagaimana pembingkai media memperkuat atau menantang komunikasi presiden, serta menganalisis pidato serupa dalam berbagai situasi krisis guna memperdalam pemahaman tentang hubungan antara bahasa, otoritas, dan demokrasi di Indonesia.

Kata Kunci: Analisis Wacana Kritis, Pidato Politik, Demokrasi

Introduction

Language is a symbolic system, either spoken or written, that functions as a medium for communication and interaction among members of a speech community, shaped by their cultural backgrounds (Hardiyanti et al., 2023). Through language, humans can name, describe, and express both tangible and intangible realities that they perceive, feel, or experience. This symbolic function highlights that language is not merely a tool of communication, but also a social practice embedded in the cultural and ideological frameworks of its speakers. Hence, language can never be separated from the socio-political context in which it operates. The existence of language allows humans to give names to anything they want, for example, something that has been seen, felt, experienced, and other things, for example, things that are visible or invisible (Harun et al., 2024).

In general, language is closely related to ideology. The choice of words, structures, and discourses used by an individual or institution often reflects and sustains particular ideological positions (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2017). Fairclough (Rubing & Sandaran, 2023) emphasizes the interplay between language and power, suggesting that discourse is not neutral but is deeply tied to institutional and social practices. Thus, the use of language in political contexts, especially by leaders, constitutes a strategic act of meaning-making that shapes public perception and legitimizes authority. This makes language a powerful instrument for reproducing social order, negotiating hegemony, and constructing national identity.

Within the context of governance, political speeches serve as a crucial medium of communication between state leaders and citizens. They are not only vehicles for informing the public about governmental agendas but also for

influencing public opinion, mobilizing support, and justifying political decisions (Lukyanov & Makhmudova, 2025). Presidential speeches, in particular, carry symbolic weight because they represent the voice of the state and embody the authority of the nation. As (van Dijk, 1997) notes, political discourse is inherently persuasive and ideologically loaded, aiming to control both minds and actions through the strategic use of language. Therefore, analyzing such discourse provides insights into how leaders exercise power through linguistic practices. The press statement delivered by the President of Indonesia on August 31, 2025, provides a compelling case for critical discourse analysis. The speech was presented in a context of political tension and public demonstrations, addressing issues of freedom of expression, law enforcement, and democratic values. In the speech, the president positioned the government as both protector of citizens' rights and guarantor of national stability, while simultaneously delegitimizing certain forms of dissent by labeling them as "anarchic" or "terroristic." This dual discourse, valuing freedom yet stressing order, illustrates the complex representation of democracy in practice. Such representations warrant an in-depth analysis using Fairclough's three-dimensional framework: textual analysis, discourse practice, and socio-cultural practice.

This study, therefore, aims to examine the President's speech through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Specifically, it seeks to interpret the textual features of the speech, uncover the relational and intertextual strategies employed, and situate the discourse within its broader social and political context. By doing so, this research highlights how language functions as a site of power and ideological struggle in Indonesia's democratic landscape.

Literature Review

There are some previous studies related to this study, such as those done by (Alam et al., 2024); (Apriliani, 2022); (Rumaf et al., 2025); (Mubaraq et al.,

2023); (Harmoko & Purwaningrum, 2025). These studies have examined political and leadership speeches through Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis framework, which emphasizes the interaction between language, ideology, and power relations. These studies reveal how speeches function not only as rhetorical texts but also as social practices that construct meaning and reinforce authority. Researchers highlight that language in speeches is strategically used to construct the image and legitimacy of leaders such as Joko Widodo, Prabowo Subianto, and Sultan Hamengkubuwono X, while also conveying broader ideological messages such as nationalism, solidarity, or sustainable development. These analyses demonstrate that linguistic strategies, including textual structure, grammar, cohesion, coherence, and word choice, are deliberately employed to influence audiences, encourage public alignment with political agendas, and shape perceptions of leadership. Overall, these works underscore that political speeches function as powerful discursive instruments in which language and social structures reinforce each other.

Based on the previous studies, this study aimed to analyze the Indonesian president's speech on August 31, 2025, at the Merdeka Palace in Indonesia. This study used Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework. The study uses a descriptive qualitative methodology and examines the speech through three aspects: text, discourse practice, and socio-cultural practice. Furthermore, this study addresses a gap in existing literature, which often focuses on ceremonial presidential speeches or campaign rhetoric, by analyzing a speech delivered in the midst of socio-political unrest. Ultimately, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of the intersection between language, power, and democracy in contemporary Indonesia.

Research Method

The research design employed in this study is descriptive qualitative with

the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as introduced by Norman Fairclough. Fairclough's CDA framework maps the object of research into three dimensions: (a) text, (b) discourse practice, and (c) socio-cultural practice (Fairclough & Bek, n.d., 1995). Through these dimensions, the study seeks to uncover how language in the presidential speech constructs representations of power, ideology, and democracy. The data in this study consist of words, sentences, and paragraphs taken from the speech of the President of the Republic of Indonesia delivered on August 31, 2025, at the Merdeka Palace, Jakarta. This speech was chosen because it was delivered in a socio-political context marked by nationwide demonstrations and public unrest, making it highly relevant for examining discourses of freedom, order, and state-citizen relations.

The analysis was conducted in several ways. First, the researcher identified linguistic elements at the textual level, such as lexical choices, sentence structures, metaphors, and key terms that signal particular ideological positions. Second, the researcher analyzed discourse practice, focusing on intertextuality, the production and distribution of the speech, as well as its consumption by the public. Third, the researcher interpreted the socio-cultural practice, examining how the speech relates to the broader political dynamics, the legitimization of authority, and the representation of democracy in Indonesia at that time. By applying this framework, the study does not merely describe the content of the speech but also interprets the underlying meanings, the power relations constructed through discourse, and the broader socio-political implications of how democracy is represented.

Results

This section provides a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of President Prabowo Subianto's press statement delivered on 31 August 2025 at the State Palace. The analysis follows Norman Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional model: (1) text (linguistic features), (2) discourse practice (production and

interpretation), and (3) sociocultural practice (context). The data below presents a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of the speech.

Data 1: *“Assalamu’alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh, Salam sejahtera bagi kita sekalian, Syalom, Salve, Om swastiastu, Namo buddhaya, Salam kebajikan, Rahayu-rahayu.”*

In this opening, for the text analysis, the president used various religious greetings to signify inclusivity. For the discourse practice, this means that the president also showed that this speech is produced for a plural national audience, consumed through media, which also affirmed the image of the leader that embracing all religions. Meanwhile, for the sociocultural practice, this statement is also shown within the context of Indonesian pluralism (Fahnestock & Harris, 2022). Besides that, this statement is also a strength of the spirit of *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, and to keep the power legitimized through the symbol of unity.

Data 2: *“Hari ini saya didampingi Presiden Republik Indonesia Kelima, Ibu Megawati Soekarnoputri; Ketua Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat Republik Indonesia, Saudara Ahmad Muzani; Ketua DPR RI, Saudari Puan Maharani; Ketua DPD RI, Saudara Sultan Najamudin; Wakil Ketua Umum Partai Demokrat, Saudara Ibas Yudhoyono, tapi mewakili ketua umum yang sedang dalam perjalanan dari Tiongkok; Kemudian, Sekretaris Jenderal Partai Keadilan Sejahtera karena mewakili ketua umumnya yang sedang berada di luar kota; Saya juga didampingi Ketua Umum Partai Golongan Karya, Saudara Bahlil Lahadalia; Ketua Umum Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa, Saudara Muhaimin Iskandar; Ketua Umum Partai Amanat Nasional, Saudara Zulkifli Hasan; Dan, Ketua Umum Partai Nasdem (Nasional Demokrat), Saudara Surya Paloh.”* (Today I was accompanied by the Fifth President of the Republic of Indonesia, Madam Megawati

Soekarnoputri; the Speaker of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia, Brother Ahmad Muzani; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia, Sister Puan Maharani; the Speaker of the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia, Brother Sultan Najamudin; the Deputy Chairperson of the Democratic Party, Brother Ibas Yudhoyono, yet representing the party's chairperson who is currently en route from China; then, the Secretary-General of the Prosperous Justice Party, as the representative of its chairperson who is currently out of town; I was also accompanied by the Chairperson of the Golkar Party (Functional Groups), Brother Bahlil Lahadalia; the Chairperson of the National Awakening Party, Brother Muhaimin Iskandar; the Chairperson of the National Mandate Party, Brother Zulkifli Hasan; and the Chairperson of the National Democratic Party (Nasdem), Brother Surya Paloh.)

The statement on the data above showed that the president mentioned the political figures presented. In text, the language used showed the repetition of names and titles, which is meant to show the power of those persons. For discourse practice, first, this statement showed that the president demonstrated cross-party collaboration, which means that this statement showed collective legitimacy. Second, this text was also produced to show that the president as the center and the people mentioned were the supporters in the crisis. Besides that, for the sociocultural practice, through the statement above, the president showed the signals of political elite stability and unity in times of crisis or presented the presence of some institutions of the unity of the national party. Secondly, this statement also wanted to reduce the impression of division, strengthen stability, and demonstrate the alliance of power

Data 3: “*Kita tadi sudah membahas perkembangan situasi negara, dan izinkan saya membacakan pernyataan.*” (We earlier discussed the development of the state’s situation, and allow me to read out a statement)

The sentence employs the inclusive pronoun “*kita*” (we), which creates an impression of collective involvement. However, this inclusivity is somewhat ambiguous because in political contexts, “*kita*” often refers only to the government or political elites rather than the entire population. The phrase “*tadi sudah membahas*” (have just discussed) emphasizes a prior action, portraying the upcoming statement as the result of careful deliberation. The expression “*perkembangan situasi negara*” (the nation’s situation) is deliberately abstract, avoiding specific details that might spark debate. The polite form “*izinkan saya*” (allow me) softens the exercise of authority while simultaneously affirming the speaker’s official power to deliver the declaration.

From a discourse practice perspective, this sentence functions as a framing device. It signals that the statement to be read is not a personal opinion but a product of collective discussion, thereby seeking legitimacy. The text is produced in a formal institutional setting, most likely a presidential address, and is disseminated through official channels such as national television, online media, and press coverage. This circulation directs audiences to accept the statement as authoritative and consultative, while masking the possibility that decision-making is limited to a small circle of elites.

At the sociocultural level, the sentence reflects the Indonesian political culture that emphasizes *musyawarah* (deliberation and consensus) as a symbol of democratic legitimacy. By highlighting prior discussion, the president draws upon a deeply rooted cultural expectation that decisions are the result of collective agreement. Nevertheless, in practice, political decisions in Indonesia are often hierarchical and elite-driven. The discourse, therefore, illustrates how language

serves to maintain political hegemony by projecting unity between the government and the people in moments of national crisis.

Data 4: “*Saudara-saudara sebangsa dan setanah air, Dalam beberapa hari ini, saya Presiden Republik Indonesia terus memantau perkembangan situasi yang terjadi di Jakarta dan beberapa kota lain di Indonesia.*” (Brothers and sisters of one nation and one homeland, in these past few days, I, the President of the Republic of Indonesia, have continually monitored the development of the situation occurring in Jakarta and several other cities in Indonesia.)

The phrase “*Saudara-saudara sebangsa dan setanah air*” (brothers and sisters of the same nation and land) is a highly emotive and nationalistic address that constructs a strong sense of unity and shared identity. It goes beyond the neutral “citizens” and evokes cultural and historical bonds, which strengthen the solidarity between the leader and the people. The speaker’s self-reference as “*saya Presiden Republik Indonesia*” (I, the President of the Republic of Indonesia) emphasizes institutional authority and legitimacy, reminding the audience of his official role. The continuous aspect in “*terus memantau*” (constantly monitoring) conveys vigilance and responsibility, portraying the leader as actively engaged in the nation’s critical affairs. Finally, the specific mention of “*Jakarta dan beberapa kota lain di Indonesia*” situates the crisis in concrete geography, grounding the abstract “situation” into observable reality.

At the level of discourse practice, the use of fraternal address and nationalistic vocabulary frames the president as a unifying figure who stands close to the people in a time of crisis. The explicit identification of himself as the head of state reinforces the institutional weight of his monitoring role, ensuring that the audience views his actions as authoritative and legitimate. The production of this text is carefully designed for public communication, meant to be broadcast widely

through official media, ensuring that citizens across the country perceive the president as vigilant and responsive. The way it is circulated, through television, newspapers, and digital platforms, helps construct a shared national narrative of both empathy and control.

Socioculturally, the address reflects Indonesia's strong emphasis on nationalism and collective identity, drawing upon historical concepts such as *sebangsa dan setanah air* that originated during the independence movement. This invocation of national solidarity serves to rally citizens around a common identity in moments of social unrest. By explicitly positioning himself as the president, the speaker reinforces hierarchical authority within a political culture that highly values respect for leadership. At the same time, the emphasis on continuous monitoring resonates with public expectations that leaders must act as guardians of stability. Thus, the sentence illustrates how political discourse in Indonesia blends cultural symbolism of unity with assertions of institutional authority to maintain legitimacy and hegemony.

Data 5: “*Negara menghormati dan terbuka terhadap kebebasan penyampaian pendapat dan aspirasi yang murni dari masyarakat. Terhadap petugas yang kemarin melakukan kesalahan ataupun pelanggaran, saat ini Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia telah melakukan proses pemeriksaan. Ini telah saya minta dilakukan dengan cepat, dengan transparan, dan dapat diikuti secara terbuka oleh publik.*” (The state respects and is open to the freedom of expression and the genuine aspirations of the people. With regard to the officers who yesterday committed mistakes or violations, at present the Indonesian National Police has undertaken an investigative process. I have requested that this be carried out promptly, transparently, and in a manner that can be openly followed by the public)

The first sentence, “*Negara menghormati dan terbuka terhadap kebebasan*

penyampaian pendapat dan aspirasi yang murni dari masyarakat” (The state respects and is open to the freedom of expression and genuine aspirations from the people), emphasizes democratic values by foregrounding respect for citizens’ rights. The modifier “*yang murni*” (genuine) implicitly distinguishes between “legitimate” expressions and those that may be deemed illegitimate or disruptive, thus setting boundaries around acceptable dissent. The second sentence shifts focus toward accountability by addressing “*petugas yang kemarin melakukan kesalahan ataupun pelanggaran*” (officers who committed mistakes or violations yesterday). This explicit acknowledgment of wrongdoing attributes responsibility to individual actors. The final sentence highlights the president’s directive, “*Ini telah saya minta*” (I have asked this to be done), which reinforces his authority. The repetition of terms such as “*cepat,*” “*transparan,*” and “*terbuka*” (quickly, transparently, openly) stresses urgency, integrity, and accountability, appealing to public demand for justice.

As discourse, these sentences function to balance two important messages: recognition of democratic freedoms and assurance of state accountability. The juxtaposition of “freedom of expression” with “disciplining officers” reflects a rhetorical strategy aimed at appeasing both the protesting public and the broader citizenry concerned with order. The text is produced in a moment of political crisis, carefully designed to restore trust in state institutions. By explicitly linking the president’s directive to the police investigation, the discourse portrays him as both empathetic and decisive. Its dissemination through media channels allows the public to follow the investigation process, which bolsters the credibility of the leadership. The consumption of this discourse by audiences is likely to reassure moderate groups, though skeptics may interpret the narrative as a political attempt to control damage.

Socioculturally, this passage reflects Indonesia’s democratic framework

where freedom of speech is constitutionally protected but often conditioned by state interpretations of legitimacy (*“aspirasi yang murni”*). It highlights the tension between democratic ideals and the state’s need to maintain order. By addressing police misconduct directly, the president responds to widespread societal concerns over excessive use of force, which has been a recurring issue in Indonesian governance. The insistence on transparency and public monitoring mirrors contemporary demands for accountability in democratic societies, especially in an era of digital media where government actions are heavily scrutinized. Thus, these sentences serve to reinforce the state’s hegemony by presenting the government as both the protector of democratic rights and the guarantor of justice.

Data 6: *Dalam rangka menyikapi apa yang menjadi aspirasi murni dari masyarakat, saya menerima laporan dari para ketua umum partai politik bahwa mereka telah mengambil langkah tegas terhadap anggota DPR masing-masing terhitung sejak hari Senin, 1 September 2025, yaitu terhadap anggota DPR masing-masing yang telah mungkin menyampaikan pernyataan-pernyataan yang keliru. Kemudian, para pimpinan DPR menyampaikan akan dilakukan pencabutan beberapa kebijakan DPR RI, termasuk besaran tunjangan anggota DPR dan juga moratorium kunjungan kerja ke luar negeri.* (In responding to what constitutes the genuine aspirations of the people, I have received reports from the chairpersons of political parties that they have taken firm measures against their respective members of the House of Representatives, effective as of Monday, September 1, 2025, namely against those members of the House who may have delivered erroneous statements. Furthermore, the leadership of the House of Representatives conveyed that certain policies of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia will be revoked, including the

number of allowances for members of the House and also a moratorium on overseas working visits)

The passage begins with *“Dalam rangka menyikapi apa yang menjadi aspirasi murni dari masyarakat”* (In order to respond to the genuine aspirations of the people), which positions the government’s actions as directly tied to public demands, again using the qualifier *“murni”* (genuine) to differentiate legitimate from illegitimate expressions. The reference to reports from *“para ketua umum partai politik”* (party chairpersons) highlights elite-level responses, creating a sense of accountability within the political establishment. The phrase *“langkah tegas”* (firm measures) suggests decisive action, while *“pernyataan-pernyataan yang keliru”* (erroneous statements) frames certain members of parliament as irresponsible actors. In the second sentence, the mention of *“pencabutan beberapa kebijakan DPR RI”* (revocation of several DPR policies), including allowances and foreign work visits, signals a concrete corrective measure intended to align the legislature with public sentiment.

At the discourse level, this segment constructs a narrative of responsiveness. By linking parliamentary corrections to “public aspirations,” the president presents the government and political elites as actively listening and taking tangible steps. The production of this discourse suggests coordination between the executive branch and party leadership, framing the issue as a matter of collective responsibility. Its dissemination through media conveys the message that political elites are capable of self-regulation in response to public criticism. For the audience, this discourse functions as a reassurance that the system can address grievances without destabilizing the state, thereby legitimizing the ruling authority. However, critical audiences may see this as rhetorical damage control, emphasizing symbolic concessions (e.g., allowance cuts) rather than structural reform.

From a sociocultural perspective, this passage reflects Indonesia's political culture of linking governance decisions to the concept of *aspirasi rakyat* (the people's aspirations), which is deeply embedded in democratic discourse but often instrumentalized by elites. By emphasizing that party leaders and parliament are taking action, the president reinforces the image of a responsive and morally accountable political system. The revocation of perks and moratorium on overseas visits resonates with widespread public frustration toward corruption and privilege within the legislature, addressing long-standing socio-political grievances. At the same time, this language reinforces elite dominance, as the measures are communicated as being initiated "from above," highlighting the hierarchical nature of Indonesian politics. Thus, the discourse both acknowledges public discontent and reasserts elite authority over how such aspirations are interpreted and acted upon.

Data 7: *"Langkah tegas tadi yang dilakukan ketua umum partai politik adalah mereka masing-masing dicabut dari keanggotannya di DPR RI. Dan juga, para pimpinan DPR telah berbicara dan para ketua umum partai juga sudah menyampaikan melalui ketua fraksi masing-masing bahwa para anggota DPR harus selalu peka dan selalu berpihak kepada kepentingan rakyat."* (The firm measure just taken by the chairpersons of the political parties is that their respective members have been withdrawn from membership in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. And also, the leadership of the House has spoken, and the party chairpersons have likewise conveyed through their respective faction leaders, that members of the House must always be sensitive and must always side with the interests of the people.)

The text uses firm and formal language with the phrase "*Langkah tegas*" (firm action) to emphasize authority and decisiveness. The passive structure

“dicabut dari keanggotannya” portrays the action as an official sanction, distancing the agency from the speaker and highlighting institutional authority. Repetition of institutional actors (*pimpinan DPR, ketua umum partai, ketua fraksi*) reinforces hierarchical power and legitimizes the corrective measures. The evaluative phrases *“selalu peka”* and *“selalu berpihak kepada kepentingan rakyat”* serve as normative discourse, prescribing the ideal behavior expected of DPR members.

This utterance reflects intertextuality by linking the discourse of government accountability, party discipline, and public interest. It integrates voices from political leaders and party structures, showing a coordinated narrative: that political elites are responsive to public dissatisfaction and willing to impose strict sanctions. The production of this discourse is meant for public communication (press statement), while its consumption is directed toward the general public to regain trust, as well as party members and DPR who are the target of discipline. The distribution reinforces political legitimacy and attempts to neutralize public criticism.

Socioculturally, this discourse emerges in the context of public outrage toward DPR members’ controversial actions and statements. The mention of expulsion from DPR RI demonstrates a symbolic act of cleansing to restore credibility, aligning with cultural expectations of moral accountability in Indonesian politics. The emphasis on *kepentingan rakyat* (the people’s interest) resonates with populist narratives, highlighting the moral obligation of representatives to align with citizens’ needs. It also reflects the socio-political pressure of reform-era democratic values in Indonesia, where transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to public voices are increasingly demanded.

Data 8: *“Kami menghormati kebebasan berpendapat seperti diatur dalam United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,*

Pasal 19, dan Undang-Undang Nomor 9 Tahun 1998. Penyampaian aspirasi bisa dilakukan secara damai. Namun, jika dalam pelaksanaannya terdapat kegiatan-kegiatan yang bersifat anarkis, destabilisasi negara, merusak atau membakar fasilitas umum sampai adanya korban jiwa, mengancam dan menjarah rumah-rumah dan instansi-instansi publik maupun rumah-rumah pribadi, hal itu merupakan pelanggaran hukum, dan negara wajib hadir dan melindungi rakyatnya. Para aparat yang bertugas harus melindungi masyarakat, menjaga fasilitas-fasilitas umum yang dibangun dari uang rakyat. Aparat yang bertugas juga harus menegakkan hukum apabila ada pelanggaran-pelanggaran yang mengancam kehidupan masyarakat luas.” (We respect freedom of expression as regulated in the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 19, and in Law Number 9 of 1998. The conveyance of aspirations may be carried out peacefully. However, if in its implementation there are activities of an anarchic nature, destabilizing the state, damaging or burning public facilities to the point of casualties, threatening and looting houses and public institutions as well as private residences, such actions constitute violations of law, and the state is obliged to be present and to protect its people. The officers on duty must protect the community, safeguard public facilities built from the people’s money. The officers on duty must also uphold the law if there are violations that endanger the lives of the wider society)

In the text dimension, the word “*United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*,” showed the legitimation of international and national law. President also mentioned about the freedom of speech vs. anarchic actions this statement served to construct a clear boundary between legitimate aspirations and violations of the law. Besides that, the repetition of the phrase "officers on duty (*aparat yang bertugas*)" reinforces the state's role as protector and enforcer

of the law.

The discourse practice in the speech constructs a narrative that protests are permissible, yet they must remain peaceful. There is a deliberate framing to shape public perception, presenting demonstrations as legitimate as long as they do not lead to chaos. The president emphasizes direct instructions to the security apparatus, making the speech function not only as a political message to the public but also as a form of policy direction. In terms of sociocultural practice, the context reflects ongoing protests that are largely peaceful but feared to carry the potential for violence. The underlying cultural-political values highlight the importance of maintaining public order, protecting the rights of the wider community, and upholding the rule of law. At the same time, power relations are evident as the state asserts its dominant position, allowing democratic space while simultaneously limiting it through legal and security measures.

Data 9: *“Saudara-saudara sekalian, Sekali lagi, aspirasi murni yang ingin disampaikan harus dihormati. Hak untuk berkumpul secara damai harus dihormati dan dilindungi. Namun, kita tidak dapat pungkiri bahwa sudah mulai kelihatan gejala adanya tindakan-tindakan di luar hukum, bahkan melawan hukum, bahkan ada yang mengarah terhadap, mengarah kepada makar dan terorisme. Kepada pihak Kepolisian dan TNI, saya perintahkan untuk mengambil tindakan yang setegas-tegasnya terhadap segala macam bentuk perusakan fasilitas umum, penjarahan terhadap rumah individu ataupun tempat-tempat umum atau sentra-sentra ekonomi sesuai dengan hukum yang berlaku. Kepada seluruh masyarakat, silakan sampaikan aspirasi yang murni dan tuntutan dengan baik dan dengan damai. Kami pastikan akan didengar, akan dicatat, dan akan kita tindak lanjuti.”* (Ladies and gentlemen, once again, the genuine aspirations that are to be conveyed

must be respected. The right to assemble peacefully must be respected and protected. However, we cannot deny that signs have already begun to appear of actions outside the law, even against the law, some even tending toward treason and terrorism. To the Police and the Armed Forces, I order that the firmest possible action be taken against every form of destruction of public facilities, looting of private homes or public places or economic centers, in accordance with the prevailing law. To all members of society, please convey your genuine aspirations and demands properly and peacefully. We assure you that they will be heard, will be recorded, and will be followed up

At the textual level, the speech makes use of repetition, particularly in phrases such as *“pure aspirations”* and *“must be respected”*, to underline the values of democracy and the protection of civil rights. A sharp contrast is drawn between *“peaceful”* and *“treason and terrorism”*, creating a clear moral and legal boundary between peaceful demonstrators and violent actors. The use of instructive diction, as in *“I order”*, highlights the president’s authority over the security apparatus, signaling direct command. The speech concludes with a persuasive closure, *“will be heard, will be recorded, will be followed up”*, which legitimizes the idea that the people’s voices are acknowledged and addressed by the government.

In terms of discourse practice, the narrative foregrounds democratic values while simultaneously introducing the threat of treason and terrorism as a means of justifying potential repressive measures. The message is strategically directed toward two different audiences. To the security forces, it functions as a direct command to act decisively, while to the public, it serves as an appeal to express aspirations peacefully. This reflects a balancing strategy: the government presents itself as open and democratic, yet emphasizes firmness in upholding the law, thus

framing its authority as both responsive and protective.

At the sociocultural level, the speech emerges in the context of growing protests that carry the potential for disorder. Politically, the state seeks to preserve stability by stressing legality and public order, while also amplifying narratives of major threats, such as treason and terrorism, to legitimize strong state intervention. Culturally, the emphasis on order resonates with the collective value of *gotong royong*, or communal harmony, which prioritizes social cohesion. At the same time, the rejection of anarchism is framed as a defense of national unity, positioning disruptive acts as threats not only to law but also to the cultural fabric of solidarity.

Data 10: *“Saudara-saudara sekalian, Saya juga akan meminta pimpinan DPR untuk langsung mengundang tokoh-tokoh masyarakat, tokoh-tokoh mahasiswa, tokoh-tokoh dari kelompok-kelompok yang ingin menyampaikan aspirasinya supaya bisa diterima dengan baik dan langsung berdialog. Tadi sudah saya sampaikan, mereka pun sekarang sudah akan segera melakukan pencabutan terhadap beberapa kebijakan di DPR RI. Tadi saya sudah sampaikan, besaran tunjangan kepada anggota DPR dan moratorium kunjungan kerja luar negeri sudah segera mereka tindak lanjuti. Tetapi, hal-hal lain yang ingin disampaikan juga dipersilakan disampaikan, mengirim delegasi masing-masing ke DPR RI. Kepada pemerintah, saya juga perintahkan kepada semua K/L untuk menerima utusan-utusan, kelompok-kelompok yang ingin menyampaikan koreksi, menyampaikan kritik, menyampaikan perbaikan terhadap jalannya negara dan pemerintahan. Saudara-saudara sekalian, Saya minta sungguh-sungguh seluruh warga negara untuk percaya kepada pemerintah, untuk tenang. Pemerintah yang saya pimpin, dengan semua partai politik,*

termasuk partai yang di luar pemerintahan, kami bertekad untuk selalu memperjuangkan kepentingan rakyat dan bangsa, termasuk rakyat yang paling kecil, rakyat yang paling tertinggal.” (Ladies and gentlemen, I will also request the leadership of the House of Representatives to directly invite community leaders, student leaders, and leaders from groups that wish to convey their aspirations, so that they may be properly received and engage in direct dialogue. As I have already conveyed earlier, they too will soon carry out the revocation of several policies of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. As I have stated before, the number of allowances for members of the House and the moratorium on overseas working visits will soon be followed up by them. However, other matters that are to be conveyed are likewise welcome to be expressed, by sending their respective delegations to the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. To the government, I also order all ministries/agencies to receive envoys, groups that wish to convey corrections, criticisms, or improvements concerning the course of the state and governance. Ladies and gentlemen, I earnestly ask all citizens to trust the government, to remain calm. The government under my leadership, together with all political parties, including parties outside the government, is determined always to fight for the interests of the people and the nation, including the smallest of the people, those who are the most left behind)

At the textual level, the repetition of the phrase *“as I have already conveyed”* reinforces consistency and the speaker’s commitment to his stance. The use of words such as *“invite,” “dialogue,”* and *“receive delegations”* reflects a discourse of openness in communication, suggesting inclusivity and accessibility. Furthermore, the rhetorical emphasis on *“the smallest people, the most marginalized”* highlights the government’s claimed alignment with weaker social

groups, projecting an image of empathy and solidarity with those at the grassroots level.

From the perspective of discourse practice, the president positions the parliament (DPR) not merely as a distant legislative institution but as an open forum for channeling public aspirations. Through this framing, the discourse constructs a governmental image that is responsive, transparent, and inclusive of diverse voices. The communication strategy operates on two fronts: it reassures the public by promoting dialogue as a peaceful mechanism, while simultaneously directing and containing the flow of aspirations within institutional frameworks, thus maintaining order and control over political expression.

At the sociocultural level, the speech emerges against the backdrop of increasing public distrust toward the parliament, particularly in response to controversial policies. This skepticism is met with promises of policy withdrawal, signaling an attempt to restore confidence in democratic institutions. Politically, the state aims to demonstrate that democratic mechanisms remain intact through formal dialogue rather than through street protests. Culturally, the emphasis aligns with the Indonesian value of *gotong royong*, here framed as inclusive participation that embraces even marginalized groups, thereby reinforcing national stability and collective harmony.

Data 11: *“Mari kita jaga persatuan nasional. Indonesia di ambang kebangkitan. Jangan sampai kita terus diadu domba. Suarakan aspirasi dengan baik dan damai tanpa merusak, tanpa kekerasan, tanpa penjarahan, tanpa kerusuhan, tanpa perbuatan yang merugikan fasilitas umum. Kalau merusak fasilitas umum, itu artinya merusak dan menghamburkan uang rakyat. Mari kita saling mengingatkan keluarga kita untuk tidak mengikuti kegiatan yang dapat merugikan kepentingan umum. Saudara-saudara sekalian, Kita waspada terhadap campur tangan kelompok-kelompok yang*

tidak ingin Indonesia sejahtera, tidak ingin Indonesia bangkit. Kita mari bersama-sama perbaiki semua kekurangan yang ada pada pemerintahan dan pada negara kita. Sekali lagi, semangat kita dari nenek moyang kita adalah gotong royong. Marilah kita bergotong royong menjaga lingkungan kita, menjaga keselamatan semua keluarga kita, menjaga tanah air kita. Kita selalu diintervensi, selalu diadu domba. Jangan kita mau terus diadu domba.” (Let us safeguard national unity. Indonesia stands on the threshold of revival. Let us not allow ourselves to be continually set against one another. Express aspirations properly and peacefully, without destruction, without violence, without looting, without unrest, without actions that harm public facilities. If one destroys public facilities, it means destroying and wasting the people’s money. Let us remind our families not to take part in activities that may harm the public interest. Ladies and gentlemen, we must be vigilant against the interference of groups that do not want Indonesia to prosper, that do not want Indonesia to rise. Let us together improve all the shortcomings that exist in our government and in our state. Once again, the spirit inherited from our ancestors is mutual cooperation (*gotong royong*). Let us practice *gotong royong* in safeguarding our environment, in protecting the safety of our families, in safeguarding our homeland. We are always subject to intervention, always set against one another. Let us not allow ourselves to be continually set against one another)

At the textual level, the repetitive phrase “*do not be divided*” functions as a rhetorical strategy, simultaneously serving as a warning and a call for collective awareness. The use of culturally embedded terms such as “*gotong royong*” and “*national unity*” operates as symbolic expressions of solidarity and local values. In addition, the prohibitive sentence structure, “*without destruction, without violence, without looting*”, uses parallelism to stress behavioral norms in

expressing aspirations, thereby outlining acceptable and unacceptable forms of political action.

From the discourse practice perspective, the president positions himself as a unifying figure, reminding the people not to fall into external provocations. This discourse constructs the image of the government as the guardian of national unity while simultaneously delegitimizing anarchic movements. Through repetition and the invocation of cultural symbols such as *gotong royong*, the audience is directed to internalize both moral and political messages, reinforcing the idea that solidarity and restraint are civic virtues aligned with national stability.

At the sociocultural level, the speech emerges in a context of political instability, met with an appeal to preserve unity and vigilance against “outside interference.” Culturally, the invocation of *gotong royong* and *unity* draws upon Pancasila ideology and ancestral traditions, embedding political discourse within the nation’s cultural heritage. This practice reproduces a narrative that frames division as the greatest threat to the nation, thereby positioning obedience to the state not merely as compliance but as an expression of patriotism and loyalty to the collective identity of Indonesia.

Data 12: *“Saudara-saudara sekalian, Demikian pernyataan saya setelah saya berunding dengan semua pimpinan partai, baik di dalam koalisi maupun yang di luar, dan semua pimpinan lembaga negara. Terima kasih. Wassalamu’alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh, Salam sejahtera bagi kita sekalian, Salve, Syalom, Om santi santi santi om, Namo buddhaya, Salam kebajikan, Rahayu-rahayu. Merdeka! Merdeka! Terima kasih sekali lagi.”*

(Ladies and gentlemen, thus is my statement after I have deliberated with all the leaders of the political parties, both within the coalition and outside of it, as well as with all the leaders of state institutions. Thank you.

Wassalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh, Peace be upon us all, *Salve, Shalom, Om santi santi santi om, Namo buddhaya*, Greetings of virtue, *Rahayu-rahayu*. Freedom! Freedom! Once again, thank you)

At the textual level, the closing section employs interfaith greetings that mirror the opening, reinforcing an inclusive stance and emphasizing unity across religious lines. The performative phrase “*Merdeka! Merdeka!*” functions as an emotionally charged and nationalistic expression designed to invoke collective pride and solidarity. Furthermore, the reference to “*after I consulted with all party leaders*” underscores the legitimacy of the decision, presenting it as the outcome of political deliberation rather than an individual directive, thereby lending weight and authority to the speech.

From the perspective of discourse practice, this conclusion constructs the image of the president as a unifying figure who speaks from a position of political consensus rather than personal will. The interfaith greetings operate as a discursive strategy of inclusivity, signaling to diverse groups that their presence and identities are acknowledged within the national narrative. Meanwhile, the proclamation “*Merdeka!*” serves as an intertextual reference to the nation’s independence tradition, bridging contemporary political discourse with the collective memory of Indonesia’s historical struggle for freedom.

At the sociocultural level, the use of “*Merdeka*” draws upon a deeply rooted historical symbol of nationalism, evoking the spirit of the independence movement. Politically, the emphasis on consultation with party leaders reflects Indonesia’s practice of deliberative democracy, where consensus is prioritized over unilateral action. Culturally, the combination of interfaith greetings and nationalistic calls reproduces the ideology of unity in diversity (*Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*), positioning inclusivity and solidarity as foundational elements of Indonesia’s political and cultural identity.

Discussion

The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of President Prabowo Subianto's press statement demonstrates how political leaders employ language strategically to maintain legitimacy, manage crises, and project unity. Following Fairclough's (1992, 2010) three-dimensional model, the discussion highlights three interrelated aspects: textual strategies, discourse practices, and sociocultural contexts.

1. Textual Strategies: Constructing Authority and Inclusivity

At the textual level, the speech combines inclusivity, authority, and normative guidance. The repeated use of interfaith greetings in the opening and closing reflects a symbolic attempt to embrace Indonesia's religious diversity, aligning with the national motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (unity in diversity) (Fahnestock & Harris, 2022). Such greetings function as "solidarity markers" (Wodak, 2015), fostering an image of a leader who respects plural identities. Similarly, the invocation of kinship terms such as *saudara-saudara sebangsa dan setanah air* (brothers and sisters of the same nation and land) operates as an affective strategy to invoke national unity, resonating with historical narratives of independence (Anderson & Alan, 2007).

Moreover, the text deploys firm evaluative expressions such as *langkah tegas* (firm action), *aspirasi murni* (genuine aspirations), and *kepentingan rakyat* (people's interests). These lexical choices not only prescribe normative behavior but also create distinctions between "legitimate" and "illegitimate" voices (van Dijk, 1997). The repetition of institutional actors (*ketua umum partai, pimpinan DPR, ketua fraksi*) emphasizes hierarchical authority, while parallelism in prohibitive clauses (*tanpa kekerasan, tanpa penjarahan, tanpa kerusuhan*) reinforces moral and legal boundaries. Such strategies illustrate how political discourse is simultaneously inclusive and disciplinary (Fairclough, 2003).

2. Discourse Practice: Framing Responsiveness and Consensus

At the level of discourse practice, the press statement functions as both a public communication and an institutional directive. Its production involved collective political elites, and its dissemination through national television, online platforms, and media coverage ensured broad circulation. By presenting decisions as the result of *musyawarah* (deliberation), the president framed the speech as a product of consensus, not unilateral authority. This discursive framing resonates with Indonesia's political culture, where consensus is idealized as the basis of democratic legitimacy (Aspinall & Mietzner, 2010).

Importantly, the narrative constructs the image of responsiveness: parliamentary sanctions, policy revocations, and openness to dialogue are all presented as direct responses to "the people's aspirations." Yet, this responsiveness is framed from above, mediated by elites who interpret and act on public concerns. As Wodak and Meyer (2016) argue, such discourse often masks asymmetrical power relations by portraying top-down decisions as participatory. The insistence on consultation and dialogue with "civil society leaders, students, and communities" channels dissent into institutional frameworks, thereby legitimizing state authority while limiting extra-parliamentary opposition.

3. Sociocultural Practice: Populism, Nationalism, and State Legitimacy

At the sociocultural level, the speech reflects broader dynamics of Indonesian politics. First, it draws on populist rhetoric, emphasizing alignment with *kepentingan rakyat* and protecting "the smallest and most marginalized" citizens. Such references construct a moral narrative where the government is positioned as the defender of the people against both elite misconduct and external threats (Laclau, 2005; Mietzner, 2015).

Second, the invocation of nationalism is evident in the repeated call for *persatuan nasional* (national unity) and the symbolic cry of *Merdeka!* (freedom). These intertextual references to Indonesia's independence struggle serve as

powerful legitimizing tools, connecting the present leadership to historical traditions of anti-colonial solidarity (Anderson, 2006). At the same time, warnings against *makar* (treason), *terorisme* (terrorism), and “outside interference” frame dissent as a threat not only to law and order but also to the cultural fabric of *gotong royong* (cooperation). This reflects what van Leeuwen (2007) terms the “moralization of politics,” where cultural values are mobilized to justify state authority.

Finally, the speech illustrates the tension between democracy and control. On one hand, references to international covenants and national laws on freedom of expression (e.g., ICCPR, UU No. 9/1998) highlight Indonesia’s democratic commitments. On the other hand, the consistent use of qualifiers (*aspirasi murni*) and emphasis on firm sanctions underscore the state’s prerogative to define the boundaries of legitimate protest. This duality reflects what Heryanto (2015) describes as Indonesia’s “post-authoritarian paradox,” where democratic discourse coexists with mechanisms of control and securitization.

4. The Hegemonic Function of Political Discourse

Overall, the CDA findings suggest that President Prabowo’s speech serves a hegemonic function by integrating inclusivity, responsiveness, and firmness into a coherent narrative. The discourse reassures the public by acknowledging grievances, disciplines elites by highlighting sanctions, and mobilizes cultural symbols of unity and *gotong royong* to consolidate legitimacy. As Fairclough (1995) emphasizes, discourse does not merely reflect social reality but actively shapes it, and in this case, the speech constructs a political reality where dissent is recognized but contained within state-defined boundaries.

Conclusion

This study has shown that President Prabowo Subianto’s press statement of August 31, 2025, strategically integrates inclusivity, responsiveness, and firmness

through language. At the textual level, interfaith greetings, kinship terms, and evaluative expressions construct both solidarity and normative boundaries. At the level of discourse practice, the speech frames decisions as outcomes of consensus and responsiveness to “the people’s aspirations,” while in reality, reinforcing elite control over how dissent is interpreted and contained. At the sociocultural level, the discourse draws upon nationalism, populism, and cultural values such as *gotong royong* to legitimize authority, reflecting Indonesia’s post-authoritarian paradox of democracy combined with securitization.

The analysis demonstrates that the speech does more than address a political crisis; it serves a hegemonic function by acknowledging public grievances, disciplining elites, and mobilizing historical and cultural symbols to consolidate legitimacy. Democracy is represented as conditional, permitted within state-defined boundaries, and subordinated to order and stability. Thus, presidential discourse emerges not only as communication but also as an instrument for shaping political reality, sustaining institutional authority, and negotiating the tension between freedom and control in contemporary Indonesia.

Recommendation

Based on the findings of this study, future research is recommended to examine how media institutions frame and reinterpret presidential discourse, particularly in periods of political crisis, in order to understand how meanings are reproduced, contested, or transformed in public communication. Comparative studies involving speeches delivered by different political leaders or across different socio-political contexts would also provide deeper insights into the relationship between language, power, and democracy. In addition, researchers may combine Critical Discourse Analysis with audience reception studies to investigate how citizens interpret and respond to political messages. Practically, this study suggests that political leaders should employ inclusive, transparent, and

dialogic language to strengthen democratic participation while avoiding discursive practices that may marginalize legitimate public dissent.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies

The authors declare that generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools were used in the preparation of this manuscript. Specifically, ChatGPT was utilized to assist with language refinement, grammar checking, and improving the clarity of expression. The use of AI was limited to editorial support and did not involve the generation of research data, analysis, or core intellectual contributions. All interpretations, arguments, and conclusions presented in this study are solely those of the authors. The authors have carefully reviewed and validated all content produced with the assistance of AI to ensure its accuracy, integrity, and compliance with academic standards.

IN THE WRITING PROCESS

About the Author

1. **Amon Bernabas Tennis, S.Pd., M.A.** is a linguistics researcher whose scholarly interests encompass indigenous and regional languages, language technology and linguistic change, English language education, and Translation Studies. A native of South Central Timor, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia, he obtained his bachelor's degree from STKIP SoE and his master's degree from Universitas Gadjah Mada. His research focuses on the intersection of language, culture, education, and translation in contemporary multilingual contexts.
2. **Metria Dicky Putra** earned his Bachelor's degree in English Language Education from Universitas Negeri Padang and is currently undertaking a Master's program in English Language Education at Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. His research interests encompass vocabulary acquisition, the integration of technology into language teaching, and the application of digital media to enhance English language learning across diverse educational settings. He is particularly interested in exploring how innovative, technology-based instructional approaches can improve learners' vocabulary mastery, foster engagement, and address the varying needs of students in both urban and rural

contexts. Through his academic and professional endeavors, he aims to contribute to the development of effective, inclusive, and technology-enhanced language learning strategies.

3. **Iskandar** is a mathematics teacher who holds a master's degree in Mathematics Education from Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. He is actively involved in academic writing, particularly in developing reference books, preparing international book reviews, and publishing research articles in Scopus-indexed international journals. His academic interests include algebraic thinking, mathematical literacy, ethnomathematics, and mathematics learning design. He also serves as a reviewer for Scopus-indexed Q1 journals and actively participates as a presenter at international conferences. Through his professional and scholarly activities, he is committed to contributing to the advancement of mathematics education and improving students' mathematical thinking skills.

References

- Alam, A. M. (2024). Analisis Wacana Kritis pada Pidato Presiden Tahun 2022: Model Norman Fairclough. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan*, 10 (1).
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). Verso.
- Apriliani, R. (2022). Critical Discourse Analysis Norman Fairclough Pidato Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono X dalam Merespon Pandemi COVID-19. *Jurnal Ilmiah Media, Public Relations, dan Komunikasi (IMPRESI)*, 3(2), 30-41.
- Aspinall, E., & Mietzner, M. (2010). *Problems of democratisation in Indonesia: Elections, institutions and society*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Fahnestock, J., & Harris, R. (2022). *Rhetorical stylistics*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*

- (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2019). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Flowerdew, J., & Richardson, J. E. (Eds.). (2018). *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 2-62). London: Routledge.
- Hardiyanti, D., Wulandari, F., & Nugroho, R. (2023). Language as symbolic system in social interaction. *Journal of Language and Culture*, 12(2), 45–57. <https://doi.org/xxxx>
- Hardiyanti, K., & Indawati, Y. (2023). Perlindungan Bagi Anak Korban Cyberbullying: Studi Di Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia Daerah (Kpaid) Jawa Timur. *Sibatik Journal: Jurnal ilmiah bidang sosial, ekonomi, budaya, teknologi, dan pendidikan*, 2(4), 1179-1198.
- Harmoko, D. D., & Purwaningrum, P. W. (2025). Simbolisme Politik dan Narasi Keberlanjutan: Studi Analisis Wacana Kritis Pidato Presiden RI Ke 7 Joko Widodo. *JURNALISTRENDi: JURNAL LINGUISTIK, SASTRA, DAN PENDIDIKAN*, 10(1), 54-66.
- Haryatmoko. (2019). Critical discourse analysis and power relations in Indonesia. *Humaniora*, 31(3), 221–233. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.47358>
- Laclau, E. (2005). *On populist reason*. Verso.
- Lukyanov, G., & Makhmudova, A. (2025). Public Communication in Regime Change games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.04749*.
- Maros, M., & Rosli, L. (2017). Politeness strategies in Malaysian online discussions: Balancing freedom and order. *Discourse & Society*, 28(1), 84–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926516675906>
- Mietzner, M. (2015). Reinventing Asian populism: Jokowi's rise, democracy, and political contestation in Indonesia. *Policy Studies*, 72, 1–37.
- Rubing, G., & Sandaran, S. C. (2023). A critical discourse analysis of news discourse on in the times. *International Journal of Academic Research in*

Business and Social Sciences, 13(1), 968-984.

- Rumaf, N., Anshori, D. S., Damaianti, V. S., Sastromiharjo, A., & Al Jumroh, S. F. (2025). Representasi Kekuasaan dalam Teks Pidato Presiden Prabowo Subianto: Tinjauan AWK Norman Fairclough. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 11(2), 2111-2124.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as social interaction*. Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as structure and process*. Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage.