

**THE COMPARISON OF INTERPERSONAL MEANING  
IN DIPLOMATIC STATEMENT UTTERED BY  
AN INDONESIAN AND A UKRAINIAN DIPLOMAT  
IN UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Lovitasari Santosa

Project Advisor : Suharno

English Department, Faculty of Humanities

Diponegoro University, Semarang 50275

**Abstract** Penelitian ini akan mendiskusikan mengenai perbandingan jenis *interpersonal meaning* dari diplomat Indonesia dan Ukraina pada sidang umum PBB. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi perbedaan *mood element* antara diplomat Indonesia dan Ukraina pada sidang umum PBB dan untuk menjelaskan jenis *mood system* yang digunakan kedua diplomat. Untuk menjelaskan hasil penelitian, penulis menggunakan penelitian deskriptif dalam melaksanakan penelitian. Penulis mengidentifikasi *mood system* pada setiap klausa dari statemen yang diucapkan kedua diplomat. Hasil dari penelitian ini, peneliti menemukan adanya perbedaan penggunaan subjek dari kedua diplomat. Penulis juga menemukan persamaan antar kedua diplomat yaitu jenis *finite* dan jenis *mood system* yang digunakan, *present* untuk *finite* dan jenis *mood system* deklaratif.

Kata kunci : *interpersonal meaning, subject, finite, type of mood.*

I. INTRODUCTION

At present day, communication that deals with language, for instance speech in front of publics, becomes important in our life (Wulandari, 2011). According to Feng at all (2010), the idea of diplomatic speech is a public speech given by delegates from a country with diplomatical purpose which is trying to clarify the problem happening in a country. According to Matos in Burhanudeen (2006), the form of diplomatic language is used to shape the clarifying aspects of diplomatic in speech. He also said that diplomatic language is a “peace-building, peace-making, peace-promoting force”.

The purposes of this research are to identify the distinction of the mood element between statement of Indonesian Diplomat and Ukrainian Diplomat in the UN General Assembly and to describe the type of mood of both diplomats utterances. The writer has limitation on comparing the mood system that consists of subject and finite of the utterances of Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomat in the UN General Assembly and finds the type of mood of both diplomats.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In discussion about communication as language aspect, there is a theory that underlies the discussion. Systemic Functional Linguistics is a theory proposed by Halliday (1994) that sees language as a system for making meaning. Halliday and Eggins in Wulandari (2011) says that language consists of by three main meanings concurrently; experiential, interpersonal, and textual.

### a. Interpersonal Meaning

In this paper, the writer uses interpersonal meaning to analyze the data. Interpersonal meaning focuses on the MOOD system talking about the clause as an exchange (Gerot and Wignell, 1994). According to Halliday (1994), clause as an exchange is an acknowledgement, meaning that the speakers need to be obligated of what they said (Wulandari, 2011).

Eggins (1994:156) distinguishes two functional constituents of MOOD element in a clause, Mood and Residue (Wulandari, 2011). Mood itself, consists of Subject and Finite, while Residue consists of predicator, complementor, and adjunct (Wulandari, 2011).

### b. Type of Mood

Gerot and Wignell (1994) also distinguish the type of mood, indicative and imperative.

Indicative mood is marked by Subject + Finite. The order of it also marks the declarative and interrogative that belong to indicative mood. Declarative is an indicative mood which gives information and statement. Meanwhile, the interrogative is a question form of indicative mood. Two kinds of interrogative are polar and WH questions. Polar questions consist of finite +

subject, or we commonly know as Yes / No Questions. WH questions consist of querying subject or WH/subject and finite (Gerot and Wignell, 1994).

The second type of mood is imperative. Imperative mood consists of subject + finite, subject only, finite only, or does not have mood element. However, there is always be a predicator in a clause (Gerot and Wignell, 1994).

### III. RESEARCH METHOD

The data was taken from YouTube entitled *Nara Masista Rakhmatia Diplomat Cantik Indonesia Bungkam 6 Pemimpin Dunia* and *Ukraine's statement at the UN General Assembly Third Committee meeting (Advancement of Women)*. The object of this research is the transcript of Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomats statements delivered in United Nation General Assembly.

In collecting the data, the writer used observation method by searching the data in the internet. The writer adapted the observation non participation because she did not participate directly in the event when taking the data. The writer used descriptive research in conducting this research. By identifying each clause in the statement from two representatives of the countries, the writer got the comparison between both representatives and made the transcript of both data. The writer used qualitative method to identify the mood and residue structure that appear in the statements.

### IV. DISCUSSION

#### a. Mood System

First, the writer analyzed the interpersonal meaning by comparing the Mood system. Mood system consists of subject and finite. In this part, the writer analyzed the subject and finite of both diplomats and found the distinction in the usage of subject and finite.

##### 1. Subject

Subject is a nominal group which takes place as an agent in a sentence. After analyzing the mood system of both diplomats, the writer

found that both diplomats have different ways to use subject when they delivered their statements.

**Table of Subject in comparison between Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomat**

Subject	Indonesian Diplomat	Ukrainian Diplomat
Indonesia	11	-
I	-	1
We	3	3
They	2	1
It	4	2
Others	8	21
Ukraine	-	7

From the table above, we can see that both diplomats use kind of subject in different ways. Indonesian diplomat tends to use “Indonesia” as the subject in the statement among the others. The subject “Indonesia” refers to all Indonesia citizens including the government and the society. “Indonesia” belongs to third singular pronoun.

Ukrainian is different from Indonesian diplomat. She tends to use other kinds of subject, so that the subjects she uses have many variations than Indonesian diplomat. For example, Ukrainian diplomat uses phrase “The ongoing challenges”, possessive adjective pronoun “My country”, and some nouns “Women, Plans” as the subject. Beside that, Ukrainian diplomat often uses hidden subject during the statement.

## 2. Finite

Finite is a verbal group which consists of tense markers such as modals and both present and past auxiliary verb. Finite is also the tense marker of present, past, and future.

**Table of Finite in comparison between Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomat**

Finite	Indonesian Diplomat	Ukrainian Diplomat
Present	27	29
Past	3	13
Future	1	-
Modals	2	2

From the table above, we can see that both Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomats tend to use present tense to deliver the speech. They use the kind of present tense such as simple present tense, present continuous tense, and present perfect tense. The present tense indicates that both diplomats give the truth and the fact in statements they delivered. Meanwhile, the past tense could indicate that both diplomat retell the past event that already happened or as politeness expression.

Both Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomats also use kind of modality. Modality has many purposes. They use “would like” in the beginning and in the end of statement that indicates the politeness and respect to the floor.

**b. Type of Mood**

After the writer analyzed the mood system of Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomats statements, it could be said that both diplomats have declarative type of mood.

As Gerot and Wignell (1994) said, the declarative type of mood has the pattern which consists of Subject + Finite. It appropriates with the analysis of the statement from both diplomats that use the same pattern as declarative type of mood. Declarative means that the speaker wants to give explanation to the floor.

**Table 6. The frequency of declarative type of mood in both statements**

Type of Mood	Indonesian Diplomat	Ukrainian Diplomat
--------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Declarative	90%	85%
Others	10%	15%

From the analysing of modality, the writer finds most of the clauses have the pattern as subject+finite. Meanwhile the others here mean that the clauses do not have the pattern as subject+finite. They could have patterns such as finite+predicator.

Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomats tend to deliver speech containing with subject+finite that indicates as declarative type of mood. From the statements delivered, both diplomats want to explain something that happened in their country. It appropriates with the function of declarative type of mood to give information by giving the statements.

## V. CONCLUSION

According to the research that has been done, the writer found that from the mood system analysis, Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomats have the similarities and differences in delivering their statements.

The similarities of Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomats are the use of finite and the type of mood system. Both diplomats tend to use present finite instead of past and modality. They also have the same type of mood that is declarative when delivering the statement to the floor. Meanwhile, Indonesian and Ukrainian diplomats have differences in choosing the subject. Indonesian diplomat tends to use third singular pronoun (Indonesia) as the subject that refers to all Indonesia citizens including the government and the society. Ukrainian diplomat tends to use other kind of subject such as phrase “The ongoing challenges”, possessive adjective pronoun “My country”, and some nouns “Women, Plans” as the subject.

## VI. REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2002). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Azar, S. B. (1989). *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Burhanudeen, H. (2006). *Diplomatic Language: An Insight from Speeches Used in International Diplomacy*. *Akademika* 67: 37-51.
- Feng, H., & Liu, Y. (2010). *Analysis of Interpersonal Meaning in Public Speeches—A Case Study of Obama's Speech*. Finland: *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 1, No. 6, pp. 825-829.
- Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Australia: Antipodean Educational Enterprise.
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=54aPn58WmCY&list=PLfmDakLYDgMxqgjC3SEEGc2T7IqMuKndX> downloaded on October 1, 2016.
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V1Rk8zvSHiQ> downloaded on March 5, 2017.
- Marhamah, R. A. (2014). *Interpersonal Meaning Analysis Of Muse Song Lyrics In Black Holes And Revelations' Album (A Study Based on Systemic Functional Linguistics)*.
- Kusumawardhani, R. (2007). *Interpersonal Meaning in English and Javanese Catholic Daily Prayers (A Comparative Study)*.
- Sudaryanto. (1999). *Metode Dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik*. Duta Wacana University Press.
- Wulandari, N. A. D. (2011). *Interpersonal Meaning Of Barack Obama's Speech At University Of Indonesia: The Study Of Barack Obama's Attitudes And Judgments Towards Indonesia*.