

Interpersonal Meaning in President Prabowo Subianto's National Cooperative Day Speech: A Mood System Analysis

M. Asril Marpaung

Prodi Manajemen Pendidikan Islam, STAI Nurul Ilmi Tanjungbalai
m.asrilmarpaung@staini.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study examines the realization of interpersonal meaning through the Mood system in President Prabowo Subianto's speech delivered during the 2026 National Cooperative Day commemoration. Drawing on the interpersonal metafunction within Systemic Functional Linguistics, the study employed a qualitative SFL-based analysis supported by descriptive frequency counts. The official speech transcript was cross-checked against the corresponding video recording and systematically segmented into ranking clauses and independently functioning minor interpersonal units. Following a full segmentation and coding audit, the finalized corpus consisted of 680 interpersonal analytical units: 598 major clauses and 82 minor interpersonal units. Each major clause was analyzed in terms of its interpersonal grammatical structure and classified as declarative, imperative, or interrogative, while the minor interpersonal units were coded separately according to their interactional functions. The analysis also considered the grammatical characteristics of Indonesian and did not impose an English-type tense-based Finite on clauses without an overt interpersonal realization. The findings show that declarative Mood was dominant, occurring 524 times or 77.06% of all analytical units. Minor interpersonal units occurred 82 times (12.06%), followed by 41 imperative clauses (6.03%) and 33 interrogative clauses (4.85%). The predominance of declarative Mood indicates that the speech was primarily organized through the giving of information, positioning the President as the principal provider of propositions and the audience mainly as information recipients. Minor interpersonal units maintained ceremonial and interactional contact, while imperative clauses directed actions and responses. Interrogative clauses created temporary opportunities for confirmation, reflection, and audience involvement. Overall, interpersonal meaning in the speech was realized through a predominantly speaker-led but interactionally varied configuration of grammatical and interactional resources. The study contributes an audited full-speech account of spontaneous Indonesian presidential discourse, with explicit clause-segmentation criteria, an Indonesian-sensitive treatment of Finite, and a distinction between major Mood types and minor interpersonal units.

Keywords: interpersonal meaning; Mood system; political discourse; presidential speech; Systemic Functional Linguistics



This Is Open Access Article Under The CC Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 License.



INTRODUCTION

Political speeches are not merely vehicles for delivering information; they are strategic forms of communication through which political leaders establish relationships with their audiences, negotiate positions on national issues, and influence public responses. Through carefully selected linguistic resources, political leaders position themselves and their audiences within particular communicative relationships while seeking public support for policies and ideological standpoints (Chilton, 2004; Fairclough, 2003). Consequently, political speeches have become an important site of linguistic inquiry, particularly within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which views language as a social semiotic resource for making

meaning in context (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Among the three metafunctions proposed in SFL, the interpersonal metafunction is particularly relevant to political discourse because it concerns how speakers enact social relationships, negotiate roles, and interact with their audiences through language.

Among contemporary political speeches in Indonesia, President Prabowo Subianto's address delivered during the 2026 National Cooperative Day commemoration attracted considerable public and media attention due to its firm expressions concerning nationalism and public criticism. One of the most notable statements in the speech was, "Yang merasa Indonesia suram, silakan kalau mau cari negara lain" [Those who feel that Indonesia has a gloomy future are welcome to look for another country] (Presiden Republik Indonesia, 2026). Beyond the political reactions generated by such statements, the speech provides a relevant linguistic context for examining how a president organizes interaction with a national audience. Throughout the speech, information, directives, questions, greetings, and other spoken expressions are used to negotiate the relationship between the speaker and listeners. These grammatical choices make the speech particularly suitable for an analysis of interpersonal meaning through the Mood system.

Within the interpersonal metafunction, language functions as a resource for enacting social relationships through exchanges between speakers and listeners. Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) distinguish two fundamental speech roles in an exchange: giving and demanding. These roles may involve either information or goods and services, giving rise to four basic speech functions: statement, question, offer, and command. Through such exchanges, speakers not only communicate propositional content but also position themselves in relation to their audiences by adopting particular speech roles and assigning complementary roles to listeners. In political discourse, these interpersonal exchanges are particularly relevant because political leaders may position themselves as providers of information, seekers of responses, or initiators of action while simultaneously managing their relationship with the audience. The Mood system provides a grammatical resource through which these interpersonal roles and exchanges are realized at the clause level.

At the grammatical level, interpersonal meaning is realized through the organization of the clause into Mood and Residue. In a typical finite clause, the Mood element consists of the Subject and the Finite, whereas the Residue comprises the Predicator, Complement, and Adjunct (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). The Subject identifies the entity on which the validity of the proposition is made to rest, while the Finite contributes to making the proposition arguable by locating it in relation to interpersonal systems such as tense, modality, and polarity. The Predicator specifies the process represented in the clause, the Complement typically realizes an element with the potential to function as Subject, and the Adjunct contributes additional circumstantial or interpersonal information. The configuration of these elements provides a grammatical basis for examining how speakers organize clauses as interpersonal exchanges and position themselves in relation to their listeners.

Different configurations of the Mood system are associated with different Mood types and speech functions. Declarative clauses typically realize statements and are commonly used to give information, whereas interrogative clauses typically realize questions and are generally associated with demanding information. Imperative clauses typically realize commands through which speakers demand goods and services or prompt some form of action or response from listeners (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). These relationships, however, should not be understood as absolute correspondences, since grammatical Mood and speech function may vary according to the interactional context. In addition to major clauses, spoken discourse may contain independently functioning minor interpersonal units, including greetings, calls, acknowledgements, responses, and formulaic expressions. These units do not display a complete Mood structure but nevertheless perform important interpersonal functions. Examining the distribution of the major Mood types together with minor interpersonal units therefore provides a means of investigating how speakers organize interpersonal exchange and manage relationships with their audiences.

The application of the Mood system to Indonesian requires particular attention to cross-linguistic differences in the realization of the Finite. Halliday and Matthiessen's account is primarily based on English, in which tense, modality, and polarity constitute central resources associated with finiteness. These grammatical realizations cannot, however, be transferred directly to Indonesian. Sujatna (2012) questions the direct application of the clause-as-exchange model to Indonesian, arguing that Indonesian does not exhibit a Finite system equivalent to that of English. Patrianto (2021), however, provides a more differentiated account by demonstrating that although temporal Finite realized through grammatical tense in

English does not have an equivalent grammatical realization in Indonesian, other interpersonal resources associated with finiteness may still be realized differently. Indonesian, for example, has resources for modality and polarity, while certain meanings may be expressed lexically or realized within the verbal group rather than through English-like tense inflection. Accordingly, the present study adopts Halliday's Mood system as a functional analytical framework while interpreting its grammatical realization in accordance with the characteristics of Indonesian. It therefore does not impose an English-type tense-based Finite on Indonesian clauses, and the identification of Mood elements is based on their functional realization in the Indonesian data.

Previous studies have demonstrated the usefulness of the Mood system for examining interpersonal meaning in political discourse. Ye (2010), in an analysis of Barack Obama's victory speech, found that declarative clauses predominated and functioned as an important resource for conveying information and establishing interpersonal relations with the audience. Similarly, Fanani et al. (2020) showed that grammatical choices in Donald Trump's political speech contributed to persuasive interaction, with declarative forms playing a prominent role in presenting propositions and imperative forms contributing to audience engagement. More recently, Al Indra and Zulkifli (2026) examined the interpersonal metafunction in President Prabowo Subianto's speech at the United Nations General Assembly by focusing on the Mood and Modality systems. Their analysis reported a predominance of declarative Mood alongside strategic uses of interrogative and imperative forms, demonstrating how grammatical choices contribute to the negotiation of speaker and audience roles in international political discourse.

Taken together, previous studies indicate that Mood choices constitute an important grammatical resource through which political speakers organize interpersonal exchanges and establish relationships with their audiences. However, the studies reviewed above leave several related issues less fully developed. First, existing analyses have largely emphasized the distribution and broad functions of Mood, while providing less detail about how clause boundaries and elliptical spoken forms are operationally determined in an extended, extemporaneous political speech. Second, the application of an English-derived Mood framework to Indonesian raises unresolved questions concerning the identification of Finite and the treatment of clauses without overt tense marking. Third, studies of Prabowo's discourse have addressed international diplomatic contexts, whereas the organization of interpersonal exchange in a spontaneous domestic presidential event remains comparatively underexamined. These issues create a need for an analysis that combines contextual interpretation with an explicit and auditable procedure for segmentation and Mood coding.

The present study addresses these issues through an audited full-speech, clause-level analysis of the National Cooperative Day address. Its contribution is both empirical and methodological. Empirically, it documents how declarative, interrogative, and imperative clauses operate alongside independently functioning minor interpersonal units in a domestic presidential event. Methodologically, it makes the segmentation of spontaneous spoken discourse explicit, records clause-level decisions in a locked coding corpus, applies an Indonesian-sensitive operationalization of Finite rather than importing an English-type tense system, and distinguishes minor interpersonal units from the three major Mood types. This design enables the study to move beyond a simple frequency description and provide a transparent account of how grammatical and interactional choices organize speech roles between the President and his audience.

Against this background, the present study aims to examine how interpersonal meaning is realized through the Mood system in President Prabowo Subianto's speech delivered during the 2026 National Cooperative Day commemoration. Drawing on the interpersonal metafunction within Systemic Functional Linguistics, the study focuses on the distribution and grammatical realization of Mood types and their interpersonal functions in organizing the exchange between the President and his audience. Accordingly, the study addresses the following research question: How is interpersonal meaning realized through the Mood system in President Prabowo Subianto's National Cooperative Day speech?

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative discourse-analytical approach supported by descriptive frequency analysis to investigate interpersonal meaning in President Prabowo Subianto's National Cooperative Day speech. The analysis was conducted within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), particularly the

interpersonal metafunction and Mood system conceptualized by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014). The ranking clause was treated as the primary grammatical unit of Mood analysis, while independently functioning minor interpersonal units were retained as a separate interactional category. Qualitative analysis was used to examine the grammatical realization and interpersonal function of these resources, while frequency counts described their distribution across the speech.

The data consisted of the official transcript of President Prabowo Subianto's speech delivered during the 2026 National Cooperative Day commemoration. The speech was purposively selected as a contemporary instance of Indonesian presidential discourse addressed to a predominantly domestic audience. The transcript published on the official website of the President of the Republic of Indonesia served as the primary textual source (Presiden Republik Indonesia, 2026). Its wording and sequence were cross-checked against the corresponding official transcript published by the State Secretariat (Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia, 2026) and the video recording of the speech (tvOneNews, 2026), particularly where punctuation, repetition, incomplete expressions, or spoken delivery created ambiguity in determining clause boundaries. The spoken wording was preserved without grammatical correction or normalization.

Corpus preparation involved a systematic clause-segmentation process based on the distinction between ranking clauses and embedded material in SFL. Independent ranking clauses were treated as separate analytical units. Dependent hypotactic clauses were also segmented separately when they functioned as ranking clauses within clause complexes, including clauses introduced by conjunctions such as *kalau*, *supaya*, *sehingga*, *sesudah*, *waktu*, and *walaupun*. Projected and quoted ranking clauses were separated from their projecting clauses when they constituted distinct clauses in the discourse. In contrast, rank-shifted clauses functioning as embedded qualifiers within nominal groups were not counted as separate analytical units. Tightly integrated verbal-group complexes were also retained within a single clause when no second ranking clause was independently realized.

The segmentation procedure additionally accounted for characteristics of spontaneous spoken discourse. Elliptical expressions were retained as clauses only when a recoverable proposition or proposal functioned independently in the interaction. Independent greetings, invocations, addresses, responses, and other formulaic or interactional expressions were retained as minor interpersonal units, whereas abandoned false starts without an independent discourse function were not counted separately. Nominal lists and coordinated Complements sharing the same Process were not segmented into separate clauses. Repetitions actually produced by the speaker were preserved, while textual overlap introduced during earlier stages of segmentation was removed. Where written punctuation did not provide sufficient evidence for a clause boundary, the spoken delivery was consulted to determine whether a separate ranking clause or independently functioning minor unit was realized.

The entire segmented corpus was subsequently subjected to a full consistency audit in which unit boundaries were re-examined sequentially against these operational criteria and the source discourse. This audit identified and corrected instances of under-segmentation, over-segmentation, overlapping material, and omitted linguistic material. Following the audit and final quality check, the corpus was locked at 680 interpersonal analytical units, comprising 598 major clauses and 82 independently functioning minor interpersonal units. These units constituted the data for the Mood and interpersonal-function analyses.

Each of the 598 major clauses was then coded for its interpersonal grammatical structure. The analysis identified the Subject, Finite, Predicator, Complement, Circumstantial Adjunct, and Mood Adjunct where these elements were functionally realized. Particular attention was given to the realization of the Finite because Indonesian does not exhibit the same tense-based grammatical system described for English. Following the cross-linguistic considerations discussed by Sujatna (2012) and Patrianto (2021), an English-type present-tense Finite was not assigned to an Indonesian clause solely on the basis of its temporal interpretation. Clauses without an overt interpersonal realization of the Finite were therefore coded without an implicit present-tense element, while overt resources associated with modality, aspect, and polarity were identified where functionally realized. In the operational coding used in this study, forms such as the copular *adalah* and positive existential *ada* were treated as Predicators rather than as English-type tense Finite elements when no overt modal, aspectual, or polar element was present. These operational decisions are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Operational Treatment of Finite and Related Interpersonal Markers in Indonesian

Category	Typical realization	Operational coding decision
Modal and prospective forms	<i>akan, harus, boleh, bisa, mungkin</i>	Coded as Finite when they function interpersonally to express prediction, obligation, permission, ability, or probability.
Aspectual forms	<i>sudah, sedang/lagi, belum</i>	Coded as Finite where overtly realized as part of the interpersonal anchoring of the proposition; <i>belum</i> also carries negative polarity.
Negative and polar forms	<i>tidak, bukan</i>	Coded as overt polarity resources when they function as the arguable negative element of the clause.
Prohibitive form	<i>jangan</i>	Coded as a prohibitive Finite/imperative marker in negative imperatives.
Copular and existential predicates	<i>adalah; positive ada</i>	Coded as Predicators when no overt modal, aspectual, or polar element is present. In <i>tidak ada</i> or <i>akan ada</i> , <i>tidak</i> or <i>akan</i> is coded as Finite and <i>ada</i> as Predictor.
Hortative marker	<i>mari/marilah</i>	Coded as a hortative Mood Adjunct/imperative marker rather than as an English-type tense Finite.
Permissive marker	<i>silakan</i>	Coded in the Finite/imperative-marker position for permissive directives, following its function in the operational coding scheme.
No overt realization	—	No implicit present-tense Finite was supplied. The Finite field was left as an em dash.

These decisions were applied consistently across the locked corpus. They distinguish overt Indonesian interpersonal markers from English-type tense finiteness and make explicit the treatment of imperative markers used in the coding.

After the grammatical elements had been identified, each major clause was classified into one of three major Mood types: declarative, interrogative, or imperative. More detailed structural distinctions, including elliptical, dependent, projected, tagged, negative, inclusive, permissive, polar, and WH-interrogative realizations, were retained in the coding where relevant to the individual clause. The 82 minor interpersonal units were coded separately according to their interactional functions, such as greeting, invocation, address, response, felicitation, acclamation, and acknowledgement. These additional annotations were used to support grammatical and interpersonal interpretation rather than to create further corpus-level Mood types. Speech functions such as statement, question, and command were likewise used as interpretive aids rather than as a separate quantitative analytical system.

The study used a single-coder design. Initial segmentation and clause-level coding were undertaken by one analyst using the operational criteria described above. To minimize coding drift, the analysis proceeded in successive passes: the speech was first segmented, the segmentation was audited and locked, the Mood coding was rebuilt against the locked corpus, and a final corpus-wide audit was then completed. Whenever a unit boundary or functional label remained ambiguous, the relevant passage was rechecked against the official transcript and video recording. All clause identifiers, segmentation decisions, recoding changes, and coding notes were retained in the coding workbook as a documented audit trail.

The final audit examined the assignment of the three major Mood types, the categorization of minor interpersonal units, the interpretation of elliptical and projected structures, the treatment of tagged declaratives and imperative forms, and the consistency of Finite identification across the Indonesian clauses. Frequency totals were generated only after all identified corrections had been incorporated. Because no independent second coder was used, no intercoder agreement coefficient is reported. The reliability claim is therefore procedural rather than statistical, resting on explicit operational rules, repeated full-corpus checking, and the documented audit trail. The clause-level coding workbook was retained to support external inspection and replication.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Distribution of Major Mood Types and Minor Interpersonal Units

The finalized corpus comprised 680 interpersonal analytical units: 598 major clauses and 82 independently functioning minor interpersonal units. Following the interpersonal framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics, the major clauses were classified as declarative, imperative, or interrogative. Minor interpersonal units were reported separately because they did not display a complete Mood structure but functioned independently in the spoken interaction. Table 2 presents the distribution of the three major Mood types and the minor interpersonal units across the speech.

Table 2. Distribution of Major Mood Types and Minor Interpersonal Units in President Prabowo Subianto's National Cooperative Day Speech

Analytical category	Frequency	Percentage
Declarative	524	77.06%
Minor interpersonal units	82	12.06%
Imperative	41	6.03%
Interrogative	33	4.85%
Total	680	100%

Declarative clauses dominate the corpus, occurring 524 times and accounting for 77.06% of the 680 analytical units. This pattern establishes statements as the principal grammatical resource of the speech: the President most often gives information, advances interpretations, and presents positions for the audience to receive. The result is consistent with the declarative dominance reported by Ye (2010), Fanani et al. (2020), and Al Indra and Zulkifli (2026), while extending that pattern to a spontaneous domestic presidential address.

The 82 minor interpersonal units (12.06%) form the second-largest analytical category. Although they lack a complete Subject-Finite structure, greetings, invocations, addresses, responses, felicitations, slogans, and acknowledgements function independently in the interaction. Their frequency highlights the ceremonial and extemporaneous character of the event and shows that the speech is organized not only through propositions but also through recurrent management of interpersonal contact.

Imperative clauses occur 41 times (6.03%), whereas interrogatives occur 33 times (4.85%). Imperatives mark shifts toward directing behaviour, attention, or collective participation; interrogatives invite confirmation, reflection, or immediate response, often rhetorically. The distribution therefore indicates a predominantly proposition-oriented and speaker-led discourse whose declarative flow is periodically opened to audience contact and participation through minor units, directives, and questions.

Declarative Mood: Organizing Information and Speaker Positioning

Declarative clauses constitute the dominant Mood type in President Prabowo Subianto's National Cooperative Day speech, with 524 occurrences or 77.06% of the 680 analytical units. In the interpersonal metafunction, declarative Mood typically realizes statements through which speakers give information and position listeners as recipients of propositions (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Its predominance indicates that the interaction in the speech is primarily organized around the President's presentation of information, explanations, interpretations, and political positions to the audience.

Table 3. Representative Realizations of Declarative Mood

Clause ID	Clause and English translation	Mood structure	Speech function
C022	<i>Arti koperasi adalah kerja sama.</i> [English: A cooperative means working together.]	Subject: Arti koperasi; Finite: —; Predicator: adalah; Complement: kerja sama	Statement

Clause ID	Clause and English translation	Mood structure	Speech function
C053	<i>Kita tidak mencari kesalahan masa lalu.</i> [English: We are not looking for past mistakes.]	Subject: Kita; Finite: —; Predicator: mencari; Complement: kesalahan masa lalu; Mood Adjunct: tidak	Statement
C071	<i>Mandat itu akan saya jalankan sekuat tenaga saya.</i> [English: I will carry out that mandate with all my strength.]	Subject: Mandat itu; Finite: akan; Predicator: jalankan; Circumstantial Adjunct: sekuat tenaga saya	Statement
C437	<i>Saya hapuskan hutang jutaan petani yang mereka tidak mampu bayar.</i> [English: I cancelled the debts of millions of farmers that they were unable to repay.]	Subject: Saya; Finite: —; Predicator: hapuskan; Complement: hutang jutaan petani	Statement
C571	<i>Semua barang subsidi harus disalurkan kepada rakyat melalui Koperasi Desa Merah Putih.</i> [English: All subsidized goods must be distributed to the people through the Red and White Village Cooperatives.]	Subject: semua barang subsidi; Finite: harus; Predicator: disalurkan; Circumstantial Adjunct: kepada rakyat; melalui Koperasi Desa Merah Putih	Statement
C610	<i>Saya presidennya rakyat Indonesia semuanya, Saudara-saudara.</i> [English: I am the president of all the Indonesian people, ladies and gentlemen.]	Subject: Saya; Finite: —; Predicator: — (relational); Complement: presidennya rakyat Indonesia semuanya	Statement

Note: English translations in the example tables are functional author translations intended to preserve the interpersonal force of the Indonesian expressions.

The examples in Table 3 show that declarative Mood supports several discourse functions rather than a single type of information giving. C022 defines the central concept of the event through the relational proposition *Arti koperasi adalah kerja sama*. C053, by contrast, uses the inclusive Subject *kita* and negative polarity to present the avoidance of retrospective blame as a shared position. In both cases, the President offers an interpretation for the audience to accept or evaluate rather than requesting an answer or action.

Declaratives also formulate personal commitment. In C071, the modal Finite *akan* locates the proposition prospectively and presents the execution of the public mandate as a future commitment. The thematic Subject *Mandat itu* foregrounds the entrusted responsibility, while the first-person actor *saya* identifies the President as responsible for carrying it out. The clause therefore combines information giving with explicit self-positioning and accountability.

Policy actions and obligations are likewise realized declaratively. C437 reports the cancellation of farmers' debts as an accomplished governmental action, with *Saya* functioning as the overt source of the proposition. C571 employs the obligation Finite *harus* in a passive clause, construing the distribution of subsidized goods through village cooperatives as a required policy rather than an optional proposal. These examples illustrate how declaratives can present both governmental records and prescriptive institutional positions while retaining statement form.

Near the end of the address, C610, *Saya presidennya rakyat Indonesia semuanya, Saudara-saudara*, constructs presidential identity through an elliptical relational declarative. The first-person Subject and inclusive national Complement position the speaker as president of the entire population rather than of a particular party or group. Thus, declarative Mood is used not only to report conditions and policies but also to define the institutional relationship between the President and the audience.

Across these realizations, declarative clauses provide the propositional foundation of the speech: they define concepts, reject positions, express commitment, report action, establish obligation, and construct political identity. Their distribution across different stages of the address confirms the patterns observed by Ye (2010), Fanani et al. (2020), and Al Indra and Zulkifli (2026), while showing how declarative dominance operates through varied grammatical configurations in spontaneous Indonesian presidential discourse.

Minor Interpersonal Units: Managing Contact and Spoken Interaction

Minor interpersonal units constitute the second most frequent analytical category in the corpus, occurring 82 times and accounting for 12.06% of the 680 units. Unlike major declarative, imperative, and interrogative clauses, these units do not display a complete Mood structure consisting of Subject and Finite. Nevertheless, they function independently within the discourse and contribute directly to the management of interpersonal contact. Their relatively substantial frequency reflects the ceremonial, spontaneous, and interactional characteristics of the speech.

Table 4. Representative Minor Interpersonal Units

Clause ID	Expression and English translation	Interpersonal function
C001	<i>Bismillahirrahmanirrahim.</i> [English: In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.]	Invocation
C002	<i>Assalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.</i> [English: Peace be upon you, and Allah's mercy and blessings.]	Greeting
C027	<i>Saudara-saudara.</i> [English: Ladies and gentlemen.]	Address
C043	<i>Selamat memperingati Hari Koperasi ke-79 kepada seluruh insan koperasi Indonesia di mana pun engkau berada.</i> [English: Happy 79th National Cooperative Day to all members of Indonesia's cooperative movement, wherever you may be.]	Felicitation
C192	<i>Enggak.</i> [English: No.]	Response
C612	<i>Koperasi Berdaya, Indonesia Berjaya.</i> [English: Empowered Cooperatives, a Thriving Indonesia.]	Acclamation/slogan
C673	<i>Merdeka!</i> [English: Freedom!]	Acclamation
C680	<i>Terima kasih.</i> [English: Thank you.]	Acknowledgement

The opening and ceremonial phases rely heavily on formulaic units. C001, *Bismillahirrahmanirrahim*, functions as an invocation, and C002, *Assalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh*, initiates contact through a religious greeting. Recurrent addresses such as C027, *Saudara-saudara*, renew audience attention, while C043 offers a felicitation aligned with the commemorative purpose of the event. These expressions do not exchange propositions, but they establish the social and institutional conditions of the speech.

Short responses such as C192, *Enggak*, and other conversational forms including *Iya* [Yes] and *Oh, iya* [Oh, yes] register the immediate speaking situation. Their dependence on preceding talk and audience activity reflects the extemporaneous character of the address: the President responds not only through complete clauses but also through compact interactional units whose meaning is recoverable from the local context.

Slogans, acclamations, and closing formulae organize collective participation and mark discourse boundaries. C612, *Koperasi Berdaya, Indonesia Berjaya*, condenses the event's message into a slogan; C673-

C675, Merdeka! [Freedom!], and the paired C678-C679, Koperasi Berdaya [Empowered Cooperatives] and Indonesia Berjaya [a Thriving Indonesia], rally the audience through repetition and call-and-response. C680, Terima kasih, closes the encounter by acknowledging the listeners. Their interpersonal force derives from ceremonial placement, repetition, and shared recognition rather than from a complete Mood structure.

The 82 minor interpersonal units therefore complement the declarative organization of the speech by initiating contact, managing transitions, responding to the immediate audience, intensifying ceremonial participation, and closing the interaction. Reporting them separately preserves their contribution to spoken political interaction without treating them as structurally equivalent to major Mood clauses.

Imperative Mood: Directing Action and Negotiating Audience Participation

Imperative clauses occur 41 times, accounting for 6.03% of the 680 analytical units in President Prabowo Subianto's National Cooperative Day speech. In the interpersonal framework of SFL, imperative Mood is typically associated with commands and the demanding of goods and services, including actions, behaviours, or responses expected from listeners (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Although imperative clauses are considerably less frequent than declarative clauses in the corpus, their occurrence marks moments when the President shifts from providing information to directly prompting the audience to act, respond, reflect, or participate in the interaction.

Table 5. Representative Realizations of Imperative Mood

Clause ID	Clause and English translation	Mood structure	Imperative subtype	Speech function
C122	<i>Jangan disimpan dalam hati.</i> [English: Don't take it to heart.]	Subject: implicit listener; Finite: jangan; Predicator: disimpan; Circumstantial Adjunct: dalam hati	Negative imperative	Command
C127	<i>Jangan khawatir.</i> [English: Don't worry.]	Subject: implicit listener; Finite: jangan; Predicator: khawatir	Negative imperative	Command
C164	<i>Yang ragu-ragu silakan duduk di rumah saja.</i> [English: Those who are hesitant, please just stay at home.]	Addressee: yang ragu-ragu; Finite/imperative marker: silakan; Predicator: duduk; Circumstantial Adjunct: di rumah saja	Permissive imperative	Command
C170	<i>Mari kita bersatu.</i> [English: Let us unite.]	Subject: kita; Mood Adjunct/imperative marker: mari; Predicator: bersatu	Inclusive imperative	Command
C171	<i>Mari kita gotong royong.</i> [English: Let us work together through mutual assistance.]	Subject: kita; Mood Adjunct/imperative marker: mari; Predicator: gotong royong	Inclusive imperative	Command
C173	<i>Yang kuat bantu yang lemah.</i> [English: Those who are strong, help those who are weak.]	Addressee: yang kuat; Predicator: bantu; Complement: yang lemah	Imperative with explicit addressee	Command
C331	<i>Jangan mau bakar-bakar itu.</i> [English: Do not resort to setting things on fire.]	Subject: implicit listener; Finite: jangan; Predicator: mau	Negative imperative	Command
C622	<i>Bayangkan.</i> [English: Imagine.]	Subject: implicit listener; Predicator: bayangkan	Lexical imperative	Command

Negative imperatives realized through *jangan* regulate both emotional and behavioural responses. C122, *Jangan disimpan dalam hati*, and C127, *Jangan khawatir*, direct listeners away from offence and anxiety, whereas C331, *Jangan mau bakar-bakar itu*, prohibits destructive conduct. The same grammatical form therefore ranges from interpersonal reassurance to explicit behavioural restriction, positioning the audience as responsible for controlling its reactions and actions.

Permissive and inclusive imperatives negotiate participation in different ways. In C164, *Yang ragu-ragu silakan duduk di rumah saja*, *silakan* formally permits an action while contrasting hesitant listeners with those expected to participate. By comparison, the sequence C170-C172—*Mari kita bersatu* [Let us unite], *Mari kita gotong royong* [Let us work together through mutual assistance], and *Mari kita kerja sama* [Let us cooperate]—uses inclusive *kita* to include the President within the proposed actions, construing unity and cooperation as shared undertakings rather than demands imposed on a separate audience.

Other imperatives specify either the responsible actor or the type of response required. C173, *Yang kuat bantu yang lemah*, assigns an obligation to a named social group, transforming a general cooperative principle into a direct proposal. C622, *Bayangkan*, directs cognitive attention rather than material behaviour by asking listeners to construct a hypothetical situation before the following clause is delivered.

Although imperatives account for only 6.03% of the corpus, their functional range is substantial: they prohibit, reassure, permit, invite collective action, allocate responsibility, and direct attention. This supports the observations of Fanani et al. (2020) and Al Indra and Zulkifli (2026) that imperative forms make a targeted contribution to political audience engagement. Within the present speech, they punctuate the declarative flow with moments in which listeners are positioned as actors rather than solely as recipients of information.

Interrogative Mood: Inviting Reflection and Audience Response

Interrogative clauses constitute the least frequent major Mood type in President Prabowo Subianto's National Cooperative Day speech, occurring 33 times and accounting for 4.85% of the 680 analytical units. In the interpersonal framework of SFL, interrogative Mood is typically associated with questions through which a speaker demands information from listeners (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). In the present speech, however, many interrogatives do not simply seek information that the President does not possess. They function rhetorically, request confirmation, prompt audience reactions, and temporarily create a more dialogic relationship between the speaker and listeners.

Table 6. Representative Realizations of Interrogative Mood

Clause ID	Clause and English translation	Mood structure	Interrogative subtype	Speech function
C103	<i>Benar?</i> [English: Right?]	Subject: elliptical; Finite: —; Predicator: —	Elliptical polar interrogative	Confirmation question
C138	<i>Kapan lagi petani libur ke luar negeri?</i> [English: When else would farmers be able to take a holiday abroad?]	Mood Adjunct: kapan lagi; Subject: petani; Finite: —; Predicator: libur; Circumstantial Adjunct: ke luar negeri	WH-interrogative	Rhetorical question
C180	<i>Untuk apa kita bertikai?</i> [English: What is the point of our quarrelling?]	Circumstantial Adjunct: untuk apa; Subject: kita; Finite: —; Predicator: bertikai	WH-interrogative	Rhetorical question
C188	<i>Presiden boleh ngomong bajingan?</i> [English: Is the President allowed to say 'bastard'?]	Subject: Presiden; Finite: boleh; Predicator: ngomong; Complement: bajingan	Polar interrogative	Request for audience response

Clause ID	Clause and English translation	Mood structure	Interrogative subtype	Speech function
C207	<i>Ini hari jadi koperasi atau udah mulai kampanye ini?</i> [English: Is this Cooperative Day, or has this already turned into a campaign?]	Subject: ini; Finite: —; Predicator: jadi; Alternative proposition: hari jadi koperasi / mulai kampanye	Alternative polar interrogative	Rhetorical question
C352	<i>Masa wasitnya mau digebukin?</i> [English: Would the referee really be beaten up?]	Subject: wasitnya; Finite: mau; Predicator: digebukin; Mood Adjunct: masa	Polar interrogative	Challenging a proposition

Elliptical polar questions such as C103, Benar?, together with Boleh? [May I?], Boleh enggak? [May I or not?], Betul? [Correct?], and Betul tidak? [Is that correct or not?], rely on propositions recoverable from the preceding discourse. Rather than opening new topics, they request confirmation and invite listeners to display alignment, briefly shifting the audience from information recipient to overt respondent.

Rhetorical WH-interrogatives guide evaluation rather than seek unknown facts. C138, Kapan lagi petani libur ke luar negeri?, presents farmers' travel as noteworthy, while C180, Untuk apa kita bertikai?, uses inclusive kita to question the value of conflict and orient listeners toward the implied conclusion that it is unproductive. The interrogative form creates a dialogic opening, but the preferred interpretation remains strongly guided by the speaker.

Other questions arise from the immediate interaction. In C188, Presiden boleh ngomong bajingan?, the modal Finite boleh makes permission negotiable and initiates a call-and-response sequence. C207, Ini hari jadi koperasi atau udah mulai kampanye ini?, humorously reclassifies the event in response to the atmosphere in the venue. Both forms acknowledge the audience's presence and make the unfolding speech temporarily conversational.

Interrogatives also challenge propositions or manage spontaneous delivery. C352, Masa wasitnya mau digebukin?, uses masa to construe the proposed behaviour as unreasonable, while short forms such as Kenapa? [Why?], Gimana? [How?/What do you think?], and Apa namanya? [What is it called?] support clarification, transition, or self-repair in the extemporaneous discourse.

The 33 interrogatives therefore do not principally position the audience as a source of factual information. Instead, they create localized spaces for confirmation, reflection, evaluation, and reaction within a declarative-dominant monologue. This interactional use is consistent with Al Indra and Zulkifli's (2026) observation that interrogatives in Prabowo's discourse can involve listeners strategically rather than function only as genuine information requests.

Overall Interpersonal Pattern of Mood Choices

The corpus presents a clear asymmetry in speech roles. Declarative Mood supplies the main propositional structure and positions the President as the principal source of definitions, interpretations, commitments, policy accounts, and institutional positions. This dominance makes the address predominantly speaker-led and monologic in the distribution of information.

The discourse is nevertheless not interactionally uniform. Minor interpersonal units establish ceremonial contact and respond to the immediate setting; imperatives reposition listeners as actors expected to regulate behaviour, imagine possibilities, or undertake collective action; and interrogatives create brief opportunities for confirmation, reflection, and response. Together, these resources insert dialogic and participatory moments into the wider declarative organization.

In answer to the research question, interpersonal meaning is realized through a functional division of labour among the three major Mood types and the minor interpersonal units. Declaratives organize the President mainly as information provider, minor units maintain contact, imperatives assign the audience roles as actors, and interrogatives position listeners as potential respondents. The Mood system thus

structures both the direction of information and the changing speaker-audience relationship throughout the speech.

CONCLUSION

This study examined interpersonal meaning in President Prabowo Subianto's 2026 National Cooperative Day speech through an audited corpus of 680 interpersonal analytical units, comprising 598 major clauses and 82 minor interpersonal units. Declarative Mood dominated with 524 occurrences (77.06%), followed by the minor units (12.06%), 41 imperatives (6.03%), and 33 interrogatives (4.85%).

The distribution and clause-level realizations indicate a predominantly speaker-led exchange in which the President gives information, defines concepts, reports actions, expresses commitments, and presents institutional positions. Minor interpersonal units maintain ceremonial and immediate contact; imperatives direct emotional, behavioural, collective, and cognitive responses; and interrogatives invite confirmation, reflection, and audience reaction. The audience is consequently positioned mainly as recipient but periodically as addressee, actor, and respondent.

The study contributes an audited full-speech account of spontaneous domestic presidential discourse, an explicit procedure for segmenting extemporaneous data, an Indonesian-sensitive operationalization of Finite and related interpersonal markers, and a structural distinction between major Mood clauses and minor interpersonal units. Its contribution therefore lies both in the empirical description of the speech and in the transparent analytical procedure used to examine Mood in Indonesian political discourse.

The analysis remains limited to one speech, one interpersonal system, and a single-coder design. It does not independently analyze prosody, gesture, audience responses, or other interpersonal resources, and no intercoder agreement coefficient was calculated. Future research should test the coding protocol with independent analysts, compare speeches across settings and speakers, and examine the interaction of Mood with prosody, modality, and multimodal resources.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al Indra, R., & Zulkifli, N. A. (2026). An SFL analysis of interpersonal metafunction in constructing President Prabowo's moral authority at the UNGA. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 14(1), 2806–2814. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v14i1.9126>
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Fanani, A., Setiawan, S., Purwati, O., Maisarah, & Qoyyimah, U. (2020). Donald Trump's grammar of persuasion in his speech. *Heliyon*, 6(1), e03082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e03082>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Patrianto, H. (2021). Penerjemahan finit: Penerjemahan struktur modus dari bahasa Inggris ke bahasa Indonesia. *Medan Bahasa*, 15(1), 35–49.
- Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2026, July 12). *Peringatan Hari Koperasi Nasional ke-79 tahun 2026* [Speech transcript]. <https://presidenri.go.id/transkrip/peringatan-hari-koperasi-nasional-ke-79-tahun-2026/>
- Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia. (2026, July 12). *Sambutan Presiden pada Peringatan Hari Koperasi Nasional ke-79 tahun 2026* [Speech transcript]. <https://setneg.go.id/baca/index/sambutan-presiden-pada-peringatan-hari-koperasi-nasional-ke-79-tahun-2026>
- Sujatna, E. T. S. (2012). Applying systemic functional linguistics to Bahasa Indonesia clauses. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(2), 134–146. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i2.1506>
- tvOneNews. (2026, July 12). *[FULL] Pidato Presiden Prabowo pada Puncak Hari Koperasi Nasional 2026 | Breaking News* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=776b5aE9zMM>
- Ye, R. (2010). The interpersonal metafunction analysis of Barack Obama's victory speech. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 146–151. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n2p146>