



## **POWER AND SOLIDARITY REFLECTED IN THE USE OF PRONOUNS PORTRAYED IN HYBRID POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

### **Article History:**

**Submitted:**

18-11-2018

**Accepted:**

19-12-2018

**Published:**

01-02-2019

Muh Fajar

English Education Department

STKIP PGRI Jombang Indonesia

fajarplandi@yahoo.co.id

URL: <https://doi.org/10.32682/jeel.v4i2.991>

DOI: 10.32682/jeel.v4i2.991

### **Abstract**

This research examined power and solidarity reflected in the use of pronouns in President Barack Obama's presidential speech at the University of Indonesia by applying critical discourse analysis. The speech can be called as a hybrid political discourse individual because he was a hybrid, an ex-Indonesian. Power and solidarity in hybrid political discourse can be explored by analysing language usage in speech and wordings in speech texts. Furthermore, the analysis of language usage to examine power and solidarity has a close relation to ideology. Power and solidarity are like two sides of a coin. There will be an ambiguity of determining power or solidarity used by one participant to another in delivering utterances. Power and solidarity were linguistically expressed by President Obama in his speech at University of Indonesia in the use of pronouns. He used power to show America's hegemony toward Indonesia and solidarity to minimize the gap between America and Indonesia. President Obama used power and solidarity in order that Indonesian people will accept him (America) as friend, to show that there is no fight between America (western people/christian) and Indonesia (moslem world). Moreover, Obama applied these expressions to secure the America's politics against terrorism, America wanted that Indonesia will be its friend to fight terrorism and moslem radicals, and Indonesia will be a big new markets for the American's goods. Thus, the phenomenon of solidarity, in this sense, cannot be meant only that President Barack Obama was familiar and close with Indonesia people, but he has another agenda in order that the US interests in Indonesia will be accepted by The Indonesian People. Furthermore, Obama has any concessions that he should do this in order to 'demonstrate' that America would like to teach their moral, their ideas, their values and political leadership in the general public, particularly their central claim to political legitimacy.

**Keywords:** power and solidarity, a hybrid political discourse, critical discourse analysis

### Abstrak

Penelitian ini menguji kekuasaan dan solidaritas yang tercermin dalam penggunaan kata ganti dalam pidato kepresidenan Presiden Barack Obama di Universitas Indonesia dengan menerapkan analisis wacana kritis. Pidato tersebut dapat disebut sebagai sebuah wacana politik *hybrid* karena Presiden Barack Obama adalah seorang *hybrid* atau ex Warga Indonesia. Kekuasaan dan solidaritas dalam wacana politik *hybrid* dapat dieksplorasi dengan menganalisis penggunaan bahasa dalam pidato dan kata-kata dalam teks pidato. Selain itu, analisis penggunaan bahasa untuk menguji kekuasaan dan solidaritas memiliki hubungan yang erat dengan ideologi. Kekuasaan dan solidaritas seperti dua sisi mata uang. Akan ada ambiguitas kekuasaan yang menentukan atau solidaritas yang digunakan oleh satu peserta ke yang lain dalam menyampaikan ucapan.

Kekuasaan dan solidaritas diekspresikan secara linguistik oleh Presiden Obama dalam pidatonya di Universitas Indonesia melalui penggunaan kata ganti. Dia menggunakan kekuasaan untuk menunjukkan hegemoni Amerika terhadap Indonesia dan solidaritas untuk meminimalkan jarak antara Amerika dan Indonesia. Presiden Obama menggunakan kekuasaan dan solidaritas agar orang Indonesia mau menerima Amerika sebagai teman, untuk menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada hubungan yang jelek antara Amerika (orang barat / kristen) dan Indonesia (dunia muslim). Selain itu, Presiden Obama menggunakan ungkapan-ungkapan ini untuk mengamankan politik Amerika melawan terorisme, Amerika ingin agar Indonesia menjadi sekutunya untuk memerangi terorisme dan radikal Muslim, dan Indonesia akan menjadi pasar baru yang besar untuk barang-barang Amerika. Dengan demikian, fenomena solidaritas, dalam pengertian ini, tidak dapat diartikan hanya bahwa Presiden Barack Obama akrab dan dekat dengan rakyat Indonesia, tetapi ia memiliki agenda lain agar kepentingan AS di Indonesia akan diterima oleh rakyat Indonesia. Selain itu, Presiden Obama memiliki konsesi bahwa ia harus melakukan ini untuk 'menunjukkan' bahwa Amerika ingin mengajarkan moral, ide-ide mereka, nilai-nilai mereka dan kepemimpinan politik di masyarakat dunia, terutama klaim sentral mereka untuk legitimasi politik.

**Kata kunci:** *kekuasaan dan solidaritas, wacana politik hibrida, analisis wacana kritis*

### Introduction

There was a sharp-contradictory opinion toward President Obama's arrival in Indonesia, mainly when he delivered his speech at the University of Indonesia on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The University of Indonesia is one of the points he visited in Indonesia where he delivered a speech before the chosen ones that was broadcasted live. The content of the speech stimulated the people of Indonesia to give their opinion differently as can be seen from many comments from religious leaders, public as well as the government whether they agreed with the content of the speech or disagreed. The comments can be seen by the Indonesian people from both printed and electronic media whether his speech showed power or solidarity to Indonesia and the nations throughout the world.

President Obama delivered his speech both directly speaking and using text and the audience can see the way of his speaking and listen to the content and impression he made. He uttered simultaneous expressions started from many kinds of greetings, like: *Assalamualaikum, pulang kampung nih*, and terms like *Bhineka Tunggal Ika, unity in diversity* then sentences, like;

*America has a stake in an Indonesia that plays its rightful role in shaping the global economy, I made clear that America is not, and never will be, at war with Islam, Indonesia has made progress in rooting out extremists and combating such violence, and etc.*

The above utterances in his speech interested the researcher to conduct a research about what he really said. To answer this, it is better to quote what Fiske (1994) said "Our Words are Never Neutral". What we read something or listened to someone's words and asked ourself; "How can they even *think* that way?" and "What are they *really* saying?" From the quotation, it can be concluded that it portrays our social identities, relationships and ideologies. In most interactions, interlocuters bring with them different dispositions towards language which are closely related to their social positioning. Furthermore, it can also be derived into certain sentences; "How can President Obama even *think* that way? And "What is he *really* saying?". The question sentence "How can President Obama even *think* that way?" can be examined from the analysis of process, and the next question sentence "What is he *really* saying?" can be examined from analysis of product. Those can't be separated each other. Thus, we have known two key question words; *How* and *What*. If we talk *how*, it means that when Obama delivered his speech at the University of Indonesia, we must examine these following questions; Who is President Obama? Where is he from? What is his political party in his country? What is his political party's ideology? What is his country's ideology? If we can answer these questions, they can help us analyze why he can think that way and this can also help us analyze what he really said by applying those greetings, terms and sentences in his speech at the University of Indonesia.

President Obama delivered a speech to realize his goals of his visit in Indonesia. In discussing his goals of his speech, the researcher needed to examine how President Obama used language to impress and influence the audiences (Indonesian people and world). To answer these, it needs to know what President Obama said in his speech and how he said it leave an impression on hearers (Sik Hung, 1993). The impression and influence have a relation to power and solidarity. In studying power and solidarity, the next steps are how power and solidarity can be measured, what processes underline the formation of power and solidarity, and how these processes are related to speech features.

Thus, the phenomenon of power and solidarity, in this sense, cannot be meant only that President Barack Obama was familiar and close with Indonesia people, but he has another agenda in order that the US interests in Indonesia will be accepted by The Indonesian People. Thus, what and how he speaks will affect the Indonesian people's thinking way that can be called as the US hegemony toward the Indonesian people. The hegemony, in this sense, can be meant that America would like to gain support for itself from other country (Indonesian people) in taking into consideration "the interests and

tendencies of groups over which hegemony is to be exercised” (Gramsci; 1971:161). Furthermore, President Obama said in his inaugural address, under his administration, instead of relying excessively on military power, the USA would emphasize diplomacy and cooperation with allies. He also reaffirmed this commitment in his June 2009 Cairo address that sought to improve the Islamic world’s perceptions of the USA. (Layne in Parmer and Cox: 2010:51-52).

Based on the description above, this research will explore How are power and solidarity linguistically expressed and reproduced by President Barack Obama’s speech at the University of Indonesia and to what extent do power and solidarity contribute to the revelation of ideologies in President Barack Obama’s Presidential speech at The University of Indonesia in the context of US-Indonesia relations. It was reflected in this study in the form of the examination of President Obama’s utterances in his speech at the UI to uncover a phenomenon or a problem whether his speech referred to power or solidarity to the addressees by adopting a hybrid political discourse study as a part of critical discourse analysis through the exercise of speech features and speaker’s ideologies. Politics is represented by the utterances spoken by President Obama in his speech at the University of Indonesia on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010. This could be seen through ideologies existed in his speech. Critical discourse analysis as the last discipline in this study is used to explore the opaque relationships between President Obama and the hearers as suggested by Fairclough (1993). Furthermore, President Obama could be called as a hybrid to Indonesia because he ever lived in Indonesia when he was a boy. Thus, the form of a transdisciplinary in this study is a hybrid critical discourse analysis. It also increased the awareness of how to relate the goals of employing CDA to particular cases, such as injustice, misuse of power and prejudice. Furthermore, it broadened the pattern of examining power and solidarity in a hybrid critical discourse analysis by integrating the speaker’s ideologies, discourse strategies and separated speech features by employing the speaker’s ideologies both as the member of the certain group and individual because he was a hybrid, an ex-Indonesian.

Critical discourse analysis is a contemporary approach to the research of language and discourses in social institutions. It focuses on how social relations, identity, knowledge and power are constructed through written and spoken texts in communities, schools and classrooms. as Fairclough (1992) states that critical discourse analysis refers to the use of an ensemble of techniques for the research of textual practice and language use as social and cultural practices. It means that critical discourse analysis can be applied to analyze language use to reveal the hidden meaning of communication event in social life.

Thus, CDA is a field of research which has paved the ways for the linguists to find out the hidden ideologies behind seemingly simple and plain words. Language is no longer seen as merely reflecting out reality, but as

central to creating reality. Critical discourse analysis uses analytic tools from these fields to address persistent questions about larger, systemic relations of class, gender and culture. Critical discourse analysis begins from the assumption that systematic asymmetries of power and resources between speakers and listeners, readers and writers can be linked to their unequal access to linguistic and social resources.

CDA aims primarily to identify socio-political inequalities that exist in society. Fairclough (1995: 132-133) defines CDA as the following:

“CDA is the research of often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power.”

Furthermore, He (ibid: 24-6) describes his views on what discourse and text analysis are. He identifies three levels of discourse, these being *firstly*, social conditions of production and interpretation, i.e. the factors in society that have led to the production of a text and how these factors effect interpretation. *Secondly*, the process of production and interpretation, i.e. how the text has been produced and this effects interpretation. *Thirdly*, the product of the first two stages, the text. Corresponding to the three levels or dimensions of discourse, he (ibid : 1989:26) proscribes three stages of CDA:

- a. Description is the stage which is concerned with the formal properties of the text.
- b. Interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction – with seeing the text as a product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation . . .
- c. Explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context – with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation, and their social effects.

### **Power and Solidarity**

Power and solidarity are like two sides of a coin. There will be an ambiguity of determining power or solidarity used by one participant to another in delivering utterances. We cannot say that if one speaker uses common language, it means that he or she is equal with other participants as proposed by Tannen that all linguistic strategies are potentially ambiguous as Tannen (1993:22) states that:

any show of solidarity necessarily entails of power, in that the requirement of similarity and closeness limits freedom and independence. At the same

time, any show of power entails solidarity by involving participants in relation to each other.

From the quotaion above, the researcher can display the ambiguity of closeness as the following:

---

power	solidarity
asymmetry	symmetry
hierarchy	equality
distance	closeness

Figure 1. *Unidimensional model by Tannen*

From the figure 1., the researcher can explain that closeness entails solidarity, then, the power relations between participants can be symmetry and equal.

---

power	solidarity
asymmetry	symmetry
hierarchy	equality
closeness	distance

Figure 2. *Unidimensional model adapted from Tannen (by Fajar)*

From figure 2., the researcher can examine that closeness entails power untill the power relations between participants can be asymmetry and hierarchy. Thus, in this research, the researcher will focus on utterances in President Barrack Obama’s speech that show the power-solidarity dynamics (ambivalence). In order to determine the meaning of utterances, Levinson (1990 in Scollon: 2000) drew four quite general conclusions:

1. Language is ambiguous by nature
2. We must draw ***inferences*** about meaning
3. Our ***inferences*** tend to be fixed, not tentative
4. Our ***inferences*** are drawn very quickly

An inference is a meaning that is suggested rather than directly stated. Inferences are implied through clues that lead the reader to make assumptions and draw conclusions. For example, instead of making a direct statement, “These people are rich and influential,” an author could imply that idea by describing a palatial residence, expensive heirlooms, and prominent friends. Understanding an inference is what we mean by “reading between

the lines," because the suggestion, rather than the actual words, carries the meaning.

Furthermore, Sik Hung Ng (1993: 4) states that people use language to generate *influence* and *control* through influence attempts in the forms of persuasion, argumentation, threats, promises, requests, demands, orders, etc, and we concerns this with the situated use of a language (discourse). To examine power and solidarity; inferences, pronouns, greetings, politeness, President Obama's ideology as a representative of the US.

Pronouns are groups of words that are able to appear in the place of other words, most often nouns, other pronouns or noun phrases. They are used first and foremost as a way for the speaker or writer to avoid being repetitive, by not having to repeat the same words again and again (the Oxford Dictionaries). There are several types of pronouns: personal, reflexive, possessive, indefinite, demonstrative, reciprocal, relative and interrogative (Collins 1990:28). The personal pronouns are used to refer to people or things that the speaker is talking to, or talking about and they can be used as a way for him to refer to himself. There are two kinds of personal pronouns: subjective personal pronouns and objective personal pronouns. The subjective personal pronouns are used to refer to a subject complement or subject of a clause; they include *I, we, you, he, she, it* and *they*. Objective personal pronouns refer to the same people or things as the equivalent subject pronouns (Collins 1990:29). Object pronouns are used as either the object, subject complement or prepositional complement of a clause (Quirk et al. 1972:208). The objective personal pronouns are: *me, us, you, him, her, it* and *them* (Collins 1990:29).

The dimensions of power and solidarity have been fundamental to sociolinguistic theory since Brown and Gilman (1960) introduced the concept in relation to the pronoun system. Tannen (1984, 1986, 1990) has explored the paradoxical nature of these two dynamics and the implications for conversational discourse. In a sense, agreement is an expression of solidarity, disagreement is an expression of power. Power is associated with nonreciprocal forms of address: a speaker addresses another by title-last name but is addressed by first name. Solidarity is associated with reciprocal forms of address: both speakers address each other by title-last-name or first name.

Power governs asymmetrical relationships where one is subordinate to another; solidarity governs symmetrical relationships characterized by social equality and similarity. Tannen (1986) explored the relationship between power and solidarity as it emerges in conversational discourse, claims that although power and solidarity, closeness and distance, seem at first to be opposites, they also entail each other. Any show of solidarity necessarily entails power, in that claiming similarity and closeness limits freedom and independence. At

the same time, any show of power entails solidarity by involving participants in relation to each other.

Moreover, Halliday (1978) stated that language performs three basic metafunctions: the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual. The ideational metafunction refers to talking about people, objects, states, events, etc., i.e., about anything within the extralinguistic reality. The interpersonal metafunction has got to do with the way language both reflects and defines relationships among interactants: the speaker (sender) of the utterance, the hearer (receiver), and the possible audience. The textual metafunction gives language the capacity to refer to itself (as metalanguage) and to signal whether a given text is intended as a lecture, poem, play, or some other type of speech event.

The interpersonal aspect of communication has traditionally been described in terms of two dimensions: power and solidarity. Brown and Gilman (1960) stated power obtains between two persons when one "is able to control the behaviour of the other" ([1972]: 255). This relationship is nonreciprocal and it can have a number of different bases: physical strength, wealth, age, or institutionalized role within the state, family, church, army, and so on, and examples include relations such as: older than, richer than, stronger than, parent of and employer of. The relationship of power is matched by the power semantic, which is also nonreciprocal, and can be illustrated by the non-reciprocal exchange of pronouns and other forms of address.

Solidarity is a relationship which is based on similarity or even sameness of salient characteristics in two (or more) persons. Brown and Gilman ([1972]: 258) cite such relations as "attended the same school or have the same parents or practice the same profession". Such relationships are reciprocal, i.e. they obtain equally for both individuals. The varying aspect of the solidarity dimension is its intensity, or degree of solidarity, ranging from close intimacy to distant reserve.

## **RESEACH METHOD**

This research employed qualitative one and the source of data were taken from presidential speeche by President Barack Obama at The Uniiversity of Indonesia on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and data of the research were his utterances of the speech which comprised power and solidarity. In doing the analysis to reveal the reflections of power and solidarity through the use of pronouns in President Barack Obama's speech at The University of Indonesia, the researcher examined data in President Barack Obama's presidential speech at the University of Indonesia to uncover reflections of power and solidarity. Power and solidarity in political discourse can be explored by analysing language usage in speech and wordings in speech



texts. Furthermore, the analysis of language usage to examine power and solidarity has a close relation to ideology. The workings of language reflect and in part construct particular social ideas, values and meanings. The framework makes use of CDA as the basic approach. Other theories will also be used to develop the analysis of data. Those theories are sentence meaning and speaker's meaning and knowledge of Obama's ideology as a representative of American, the change of attitude of US and Indonesia toward democracy and the change of US Attitude toward muslim world were applied in this research because they can explore the reflections of power and solidarity in President Barrack Obama's presidential speech at the University of Indonesia to achieve goals through speeches and in achieving the goals, he has been influenced by his social positioning. In relation to this sense, the researcher can highlight the main reasons why President Obama chose certain linguistic forms instead of others (adopting systemic functional linguistics by Halliday in the term of ephitet as an instrument to analyze data), which is always determined by the function that those linguistic forms have in context to identify the intended meaning of the text having great impact to whom he intends to.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Exclusive Pronouns to show Power

However, the *others* that are included or drawn into the issue to share the responsibility might not benefit from it or agree with it. This use of *we* makes the *self* smaller, by making it a part of a collective. When *we* is used in political speeches, its main function is to create a group where multiple people are involved, instead of referring to one particular individual (Bramley 2001:76ff). The following examples show whom *we* refers to and who it excludes in these expressions,... *We want more Indonesian students in American schools, and we want more American students to come study in this country. (Applause. (82). .... Today, we sometimes hear that democracy stands in the way of economic progress.(92) But we also know that relations between the United States and Muslim communities have frayed over many years (131).* Those expressions create a togetherness, and a feeling of sharing problems. Using *we* in this context makes him seem like a good politician, because it is a way to express that he cares about the people in Indonesia and that he is involved as seen in the Data 3:

*Let me begin with a simple statement: Indonesia bagian dari didi saya. I first came to this country when my mother married an Indonesian named Lolo Soetoro.(15). And you didn't have all the big highways that you have today. (25). I still remember the call of the vendors.(31). Satay! (Laughter.) I remember that. Baso! (Laughter.) (32). But most of all, I remember the people -- the old men and women who welcomed us with smiles; the children who made a foreign child feel like a neighbor and a friend; and the teachers who helped me learn about this country.(33)*

The use of pronouns ‘*I*’ and ‘*You*’ expresses sociable styles and connotes a higher degree of intimacy and solidarity, as shown in Cameron (2001:132). The combination of ‘*I*’ and ‘*You*’ shows not only strong emotion, but also informal relationship between the speaker and the listener. Moreover, With the skilful use of pronouns and a sociable voice when he said “*I first came to this country when my mother married an Indonesian named Lolo Soetoro.(15) I still remember the call of the vendors.(31) Satay! (Laughter.) I remember that. Baso! (Laughter.) (32) and ...*” or “*And you didn’t have all the big highways that you have today*” , Obama succeeded in expressing his feeling and convinced the listener. Obama not only swayed the audience by establishing a connection between himself and the audience but also narrowed the distance between himself and the audience that made the audience feel that he was standing beside them. Moreover, it seems that Obama was directly talking to them as friends. When he told the story about himself as he was young and how he overcame difficulties, he talked with a friendly way depending on the suitable use of pronouns ‘*I*’ and ‘*You*’ that made the audience feel to be shared.

President Obama used pronoun *I* as a substitute for the speaker’s name; it is the way for him to refer to himself. In political speeches, *I* can be used by the speaker to convey his opinion, it makes the speech more subjective, it shows the authority of the speaker and it can be a way to show compassion with the audience and to narrate a story (Bramley 2001:27). The issue of subjectivity is what might make some politicians avoid using *I* (Pennycook 1993:3). Another function of the first person singular pronoun of *I* in political speeches includes giving a sense of *here and now*, suggesting that *I* captures the moment. *I* can also be used to create a ‘relationship’ with the audience, because using *I* makes the speech seem as if it is on a more personal level. *I* might also be used to show commitment to the audience and personal involvement in issues; *I* gives the speaker a personal voice that distances him from others.

The advantage of using *I* is that it shows personal involvement, which is especially useful when positive news is delivered. The disadvantage is that it is obvious whom to put the blame on when something goes wrong. It can also be seen as an attempt of the individual speaker to place himself above or outside the shared responsibility of his colleagues (Beard 2000:45).

The most motivating reasons for a politician to use the pronoun *I* in his speech is to come across as good and responsible, to describe himself in a positive way and highlight personal qualities. Examples of personal qualities that politicians want to express include being someone with principles, moral, power and who is not afraid to take action when necessary (Bramley 2001:28). The following examples show how *I* is used in the two presidents’ speeches, and the effect it has.

On the other hand, the pronoun *you* usually refers to the person(s) the speaker is talking to. Although, *you* has multiple functions, one of which is to serve as an indefinite (generic) pronoun. The indefinite *you* can be a

replacement for *I* and refer to the speaker, and also be used by the speaker to include himself as a member of a category. It has also been suggested that indefinite *you* is not used to discuss actual experience; instead it is used to discuss 'conventional wisdom'. In this sense, *you* is used to convey common sense or generally admitted truth, with the hope of receiving the agreement of the audience (Allen 2006:13f).

When using the indefinite version of the pronoun *you*, it can be unclear whom the speaker is referring to. It can be used to refer to anyone and/or everyone. The indefinite version of *you* includes the speaker among the referents, even if this is not always the case as seen in this expression "*And you didn't have all the big highways that you have today. (25)*" and "*If you asked me -- or any of my schoolmates who knew me back then -- I don't think any of us could have anticipated that one day I would come back to Jakarta as the President of the United States. (Applause.) (41)*". If the speaker uses the pronoun *you*, it is up to the audience to decide if they view themselves as part of that group or not. The generic *you* can be used by politicians to criticize the opposition by including or excluding them from generalizations (Allen 2006:13f). The following examples of the pronoun *you* show how it can be used to speak to different groups of people as well as a generic pronoun as seen in the Data 4:

*But that's not what I saw on my trip to India, and that is not what I see here in Indonesia. (95) Your achievements demonstrate that democracy and development reinforce one another. (96)*

Those expressions also present the occurrence of pronoun *I* and representation of you '*your*'. The application of pronoun *I* indicating that President Obama put more emphasis on himself as a person who holds a highly influential position in his country that may be due to his belief in the strict individualistic values which makes him distinct from his audience. The application of pronoun '*your*' indicating that likely President Obama has a high authority to judge the successful of the certain country whether it reached achievements or not in developing democracy and national development. From the latest utterance in this unit, it can also be concluded that President Obama showed his '*high power*' as well as '*high solidarity*', this can be seen from the use of phrase '*your achievements*'.

### **Inclusive Pronouns to show Solidarity**

In this section, the researcher employed CDA approach to the analysis of pronouns reflecting power and solidarity In President Obama's speech at the University of Indonesia led to several results as seen in the Data 1:

*So we moved to Menteng Dalam, where -- (applause) -- hey, some folks from Menteng Dalam right here. (Applause.) (27). And we lived in a small house. (28). We had a mango tree out front. (29). And I learned to love Indonesia while flying kites and running along the paddy fields and catching*

*dragonflies, buying satay and baso from the street vendors. (Applause.)*  
(30)

In this macro unit, Mr. Obama applied the pronoun 'we' to refer to informality in terms of an informal register of idiomatic expressions, popular words as an "invitation to intimacy". It means that he wanted his interpersonal involvement signals of "high involvement style". And when he greeted audience by giving jokes 'hey, some folks from Menteng Dalam right here', also his expressions like 'Satay' and 'Baso' that mean he finds interruptions to be more acceptable in an environment where the participants hold a close relationship to be an indicator that he is a speaker who wants to know each other well. This paragraph also refers to use declarative mood when President Obama is sure about the truth of the proposition to show his humility and humble, like, So we moved to *Menteng Dalam*, And we lived in a small house, and others. Furthermore, the application of pronoun *I* indicating that President Obama put more emphasis on himself as a person who had undergone those experiences to show the audiences that he ever lived in Indonesia when he was a child as seen in the Data 2:

*Today, we sometimes hear that democracy stands in the way of economic progress. (92). This is not a new argument. (93). Particularly in times of change and economic uncertainty, some will say that it is easier to take a shortcut to development by trading away the right of human beings for the power of the state. (94)*

This macro unit presents the occurrence of the pronoun *we*. It was observed that the inclusive pronouns of *we* among the highly frequent tokens in his speech to be attributed to the kind of discourse he employed. In fact, in political discourse, the inclusive *we* implies and reinforces solidarity toward Indonesian people. Therefore, President Obama implicitly exercised his solidarity and corporate ideology by speaking on the behalf of their in-group and putting the Indonesian people and the people of USA are in the same group to create unity and solidarity. By employing inclusive pronoun *we*, President Obama used a discursive strategy whose aim was to create identification and rapport between himself as a representative of American people and his audiences from Indonesian people.

*We* is an important pronoun in political speeches in the sense that it expresses 'institutional identity', i.e. when one person speaks as a representative of or on behalf of an institution. *We* is also used to separate *us* from *them*, for example between two political groups, such as political parties. By establishing an *us* and *them* separation the speaker can create an image of the group he belongs to in a positive way and the other group in a negative way. The intention of the *us* and *them* separation is to set one group apart from the other group and their actions, and to include or exclude hearers from group membership (Bramley 2001:76ff).

*We* is sometimes used to convey the image of one political party as a team, and therefore a shared responsibility. The use of the pronoun *we* can be

divided into two categories: the inclusive *we*, which can be used to refer to the speaker and the listener/viewer and the inclusive *we*, that refers to both the speaker and the listener or listeners (Karapetjana 2011:3). *We* is also used sometimes by politicians to avoid speaking about themselves as individuals, and instead suggest that others are involved, perhaps to lead negative attention away from the speaker in question. By using the pronoun *we*, the speaker includes others in the utterance, creating a group with a clear identity, making others responsible for potential issues as well (Bramley 2001: 76ff). The advantage of using the pronoun *we* in political speeches is that it helps share responsibility (Beard 2000:45).

## Conclusion

Based on the analysis, the researcher could conclude power and solidarity reflected in the use of pronouns in Preident Obama's speech at UI can be explored by applying critical discourse analysis. The use of pronouns having meaning of power to show America's hegemony toward Indonesia and solidarity to minimize the gab between America and Indonesia. President Obama used power and solidarity in order that Indonesian people will accept him (America) as friend, to show that there is no fight between America (western people/christian) and Indonsia (moslem world). Moreover, Obama applied these expressions are to secure the America's politics against for terrorism, America wanted that Indonesia will be its friend to fight terrorism and moslem radicals, and Indonesia will be a big new markets for the American's goods. Thus, the phenomenon of solidarity, in this sense, cannot be meant only that President Barrack Obama was familiar and close with Indonesia people, but he has another agenda in order that the US interests in Indonesia will be accepted by The Indonesian People

## References

- Atkins, Andrew. (2002). "Critical Discourse Analysis: A letter to expatriates from the Rt. Hon. Sir Norman Fowler MP". ([www.cels.bham.ac.uk](http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk)) retrieved in February 2007)
- Batstone, R. (1995). *Grammar in Discourse: attitude and deniability*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhael. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. M. Holquist, trans. V. W. McGee. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Barron, Colin. et. al. (2002). *Knowledge and Discourse: Towards an Ecology of Language*. Essex. PearsonEducation Limited
- Batubara, Amrin. (2001). *Ideology of Power Relations Embedded in Barrack Obama's Electoral Speeches: A Pragmastylistic Approach*. Dissertation.UNESA: Unpublished.

- Brown, Roger and Gilman, Albert. (1960). *The pronouns of power and solidarity*. Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T. Press.
- Brown, Roger and Gilman, Albert. (1972). *Language and social context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Muria, Marianne & Olshtain, Elite. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London:Routledge.
- Collins, C (1990) *English Grammar*. London: Collins ELT
- Egins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Pinter: London.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. London: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough & Wodak. (1997). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London. Sage.
- Fiske, J. (1994). *Media matters: Everyday culture and political change*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Translated by Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hassan R. (1985). *Language Text and Context: Aspects of Language in Social Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985a). Systemic background. In J. D. Benson, & W. S. Greaves, Eds. *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse, Volume 1. Selected Theoretical Papers from the 9th International Systemic Workshop* (pp. 1 15). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Halliday, M. A. K.(1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985b). *An Introduction To Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2002). *Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse*. UK: Biddles Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K., and Hasan, Ruqaiya. (1989). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Deakin University.

- Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J. (1992). *Interpersonal underpinnings of request strategies: General principles and differences due to culture and gender*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62 (2), 246-256.
- Irimiea, S. A. *Rhetorical and Comparative Study of the Victory Speeches of Barack Obama and Mircea Geoana*. (2010). Jolie 3. Babes Bolyai University. Cluj-Napoca, Romania.
- Kress, Gunther. (1985). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kristeva, Julia. (1986). *Word, dialogue and novel*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 24-33.
- Martin, JR. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*. Jhon Benjamin Publishing Co.
- Miles, Matthew. B. and Hubermann, Michael A. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage Publication.
- Parmer and Cox. (2010). *Soft Power and US Foreign Policy: Theoretical, historical and contemporary perspectives*. Routledge. London and New York.
- Richardson, Jhon E. (2007). *Analysing Newspaper: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Santosa, R. 1994. *Analisis Tajuk Rencah Kompas ( Sebuah studi Sistem Semiotika dengan pendekatan Linguistik Sistemik Fungsional )*. Fakultas Sastra UNS: Surakarta.
- Tannen, Deborah. (1993). *Gender and Discourse*. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., et al. (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE
- Thompson, Neil. *Communication and Language*. New York: Palgrave macmillan.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. (1997). *Critical discourse Analysis (online)*. <http://www.hum.uva.nl>.

Wodak, Ruth and Meywer, Michael. (2006). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Woods, L.A and Kroger, R.O. (2000). *Doing Discourse Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage