A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS
OF PRESIDENT BIDEN'S INAUGURAL SPEECH

Thanh Tran[1] - Hanh Pham[2]

Abstract: This paper studies the ideologies embedded in President Joe Biden's inaugural speech in 2021 and the realizations of these ideologies through the vocabulary, grammar, and structure of the speech. The speech was systematically investigated based on the dialectical-relational approach proposed by Fairclough (2001) and systemic functional grammar by Halliday (1994) towards critical discourse analysis. There are two major ideologies that President Biden has embedded in his inaugural address through the analysis of the lexical, grammatical features, and structure of the speech. First, the analysis of the text suggested that the speech plainly conveyed a strong message of unity among the US citizens under the democratic administration of President Biden in the hope of addressing the current concerns that the US had been facing. Second, President Biden emphasized the ideology of liberalism, democracy and equality during his speech based on the analysis of linguistic features as he believed that the needs for freedom and social equality are vital. These findings imply that when analyzing Biden's, or others' political speeches, other phonological aspects like stress or intonation should also be employed to help express the desired relationship with the

---

[1] University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam National University, Hanoi
Email: thanhtran200400@gmail.com
[2] University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam National University, Hanoi
Email: thanhtran200400@gmail.com

audience as well as the speaker's authority and credibility towards the citizens.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, systemic functional linguistics, inaugural speech, ideologies.

1. Introduction

Numerous previous studies have been conducted to investigate the hidden ideologies in speeches using the approach (Bayram, 2010; Bello; 2013; Michira, (2014); Sharififar & Rahimi, 2015; Sengu, 2019). In Tran's (2020) study on Senator Elizabeth Warren's presidential campaign announcement speech, the unity among American citizens under Warren's leadership to change America for the better was strongly highlighted within her speech. In another study, Sipra & Rashid (2013) discussed Martin Luther King's Speech from a socio-political perspective, in which King stood with his stance that the blacks and the whites are one nation without any discrimination. Furthermore, other researchers have been conducting studies to find out about the ideologies in inaugural speeches (Biria & Mohammadi, 2012; Chen, 2018; Koussouhon & Dossoumou, 2015;Sharndama, 2015). Stobbs (2012) found that in Obama's first inauguration, he differentiated his ideologies from those of George W. Bush and many of his predecessors, emphasizing culture assimilation and science-religion integration. A study on Trump's inaugural speech by Chen (2018) concluded that Trump prioritized citizens' interests, "*encouraging morale a united whole*" (p. 970). It can be seen that to accomplish the aim of discovering ideologies in political speeches, researchers have resorted to critical discourse analysis (CDA) to investigate the ideologies in speeches.

CDA is an interdisciplinary language study that explains social-cultural problems. Regarding Fairclough (1995), CDA includes the larger sociopolitical and socio-cultural contexts within which

discourse is embedded, revealing the ideological bases of discourse. In other words, CDA is derived from linguistics to produce and reproduce unequal power relations between different personal/individual, professional groups, ethnicities, social classes, ages, nations, parties, etc. The research is not necessarily limited to only politics but diverges in different fields and aspects of life. As there are very few studies on the very recent President of the United States - Joe Biden, this study aims to contribute more to addressing this gap by investigating the ideologies in President Biden's inaugural speech. The findings of this project would make significant contributions to the field of CDA research as they aim to discover ideologies embedded in a speech using CDA. The paper also helps researchers and readers gain a broader view of how ideologies and power are embedded within a speech, so that everyone, both politicians and those interested, should be aware of what needs to be delivered in front of the public press. Finally, this research provides policy makers in countries adequate with insights into understanding political messages, and enables them to employ ideas in national policies more effectively. To accomplish the aims, the following question is given:

What are the ideologies embedded within the President's speech in the discourse?

To answer this question, 3 sub-questions relating to 3 aspects are proposed:

• *How are these values realized in terms of the lexical features of the discourse?*

• *How are these values realized in terms of the grammatical features of the discourse?*

• *How are these values realized in terms of the structures of the discourse?*

2. Literature review

2.1. Ideology

Ideology is "an accumulated and naturalized orientation which is built into norms and conventions to naturalize and denaturalize such orientations in discursive events" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 89). Ideology is the concept that could influence the way that people understand or accept an item of truth or falsity as it is built on social and cultural understanding within a specific context. In other words, ideology, which makes people interpret things in a sense of what they think, what they know, even what they like, may contain beliefs, disposition, expression of feelings, etc. Furthermore, ideologies consist of values that are evaluative and provide the basic guidelines for social perception and interaction (Van Dijk, 2006).

2.2. Power

Power is another crucial concept in CDA. Fairclough (2001) stated that "power exists in various modalities, including the concrete and unmistakable modality of physical force" (p. 3). Basically, power is everywhere when analyzing a text using CDA as power is not evolved from language. On the contrary, language can be used to dispute power and provide a clear view of the differences in power within the hierarchical social structures. Moreover, Van Dijk (1993) claimed that power involves control, namely by one group over (those of) other groups. In other words, such power may be relevant to action and cognition, which means a powerful group may restrict the freedom of action of others, but also affect their mindsets.

2.3. Related studies

A number of researchers have conducted studies on persuasive strategies to find out the ideas hidden, especially presidential candidates. In the study of Sipra and Rashid (2013), they employed Fairclough's DRA (2001) to analyze Martin Luther King's speech

from a socio-political perspective, indicating that there had been a long time since African-Americans aspired for freedom and equal rights regardless of skin color. Another study by Tran (2020) also used Fairclough's Dialectical-Relational Approach (DRA) (2001) to discover Senator Elizabeth Warren within her speech during the US Presidential Campaign in 2019. It was shown that Senator Warren successfully conveyed her hopeful message of unity among American citizens under her administration, from which she wanted to change the US for the better.

A different type of political speeches delivered by presidents has been researched, especially about former President Obama due to his long-term presidency and rich embedded ideologies within his speeches. Wang's (2010) study adopted Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) to analyze Obama's speech. Wang discovered that Obama used colloquial language with simple words and short sentences to reduce ambiguity and shorten the distance between him and the audience. Furthermore, his speech mainly consisted of material processes, illustrating what the government had done and what measures they would take in the long run.

Additionally, inaugural speech is a specific type of political speech, which plays a significant role since it first represents the president's ideologies during his presidential term. In the study of Nguyen (2019) about Trump's inaugural speech, she discovered that Trump tried to construct the ultimate trust, and determination to work together to build up a great country with great encouragement and high expectations from the audience. Another study by Sameer (2017) was about Bush's second inaugural speech. Sameer discovered that only one force in history could end the reign of hatred and anger, expose tyrants' pretenses, and reward the decent and tolerant, the best hope for peace.

To sum up, most studies concerning American political discourse are conducted through Fairclough's DRA to uncover the

embedded ideologies and power. Also, to date, it seems thatno study has investigated President Biden's language features in speeches, let alone from a critical perspective. Therefore, this study aims to address this gap.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design

Fairclough and Wodak (1997) stated that CDA studies language use in its socio-political context and regards language as social practice because CDA necessitates in-depth textual study and, interdiscursive analysis in CDA (looking at how various textual forms such as genres, discourses, and styles) is articulated together with linguistic and semiotic study. In doing CDA, Fairclough (1992) claimed that being critical means "showing connections and causes which are hidden" and "implying intervention" (p. 9).

While there are three approaches to investigate the ideology and power embedded within speeches, the focus of the approaches significantly diverges. Specifically, Wodak's DHA allows researchers to meld the existing knowledge of the historical context with its socio-political backgrounds, especially with a further investigation of how diachronic changes happen towards particular genres of discourse, rather than just the linguistic features of some texts only. On the other hand, the researchers using CDA following the SCA by Van Dijk could study the mental representation of discourse producers, the production and comprehension processes of discourse, and the ideologies shared by the society (Liu & Guo, 2016). In the meantime, DRA by Fairclough gives researchers the tool to evaluate the dialectical relationships between and within discourse structures, and between discourse and other elements of social life to keep hold of the "complex dialectical relations between semiotic and non-semiotic elements which constitute the social, political and economic conditions" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 183). In this paper, the researcher aims to emphasize the linguistic features of the text, based on which

the embedded ideologies will be interpreted and explained. Therefore, Fairclough's DRA is adopted as the primary theoretical framework.

3.2. Research setting

The 21-minute-long inaugural remark was delivered in the United States Capitol on January 20th, 2021. President Biden delivered his speech to all American citizens from diverse backgrounds. Additionally, he was the sole speaker, leaving no chance to interact with the present audience. However, the speech had a follow-up question-answer session, which assisted him in clarifying his ideas more thoroughly. This paper only discussed the main speech that President Biden delivered.

3.3. Data analysis

This research employed Fairclough's three-dimensional framework (2001), in combination with Halliday's systemic functional grammar (1994) to analyze the text. The justification for the employment of Fairclough's framework was provided in the research design section above while Halliday's framework is beneficial for the first stage of Fairclough's framework, which will be elaborated below.

3.4. Fairclough's Dialectical-Relational Approach

3.4.1. Description

Fairclough (1989) claimed that "description is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of text" (p. 21). Basically, this first stage focuses on analyzing only the text and its linguistic features. In the descriptive stage, the research analyzes the linguistic features in the speech - features of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, tum-taking, types of speech act and the directness or indirectness of their expression, and features to do with the overall structure of interactions - as well as examples of nonlinguistic textual features. More specifically, a list of 10 ten questions is suggested by Fairclough

(2001, pp. 92-93) for this stage. For instance, in this paper, the aspects of antonyms, metaphors, voices or pronouns would be considered as linguistic features to be further elaborated in the following stages.

3.4.2. Interpretation

Based on Fairclough's "*Language and Power*" (1989), "interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction with seeing the text as the product of a process of production, and as recourse in the process of interpretation" (p. 26). In other words, the relationship between the discourse and its production should be interpreted. To be more specific, in this stage, context is taken into account. For interpreting situational context, 4 questions given by Fairclough (2001, p. 122) are utilized as useful suggestions about the contents, the subjects, the relations and the connections. In this stage, the paper would elaborate the linguistic features analyzed in the previous stage in combination with the current contexts during which the speech was delivered.

3.4.3. Explanation

According to Fairclough (1989), explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context with the social determination of the process of production and interpretation, and their social effects. In this stage, ideologies and power are thoroughly considered to fully demonstrate the interaction between social-cultural context and the production of discourses. For this final stage, ideologies and hidden messages would be drawn out with reference to the previous elaborations.

3.5. Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics

3.5.1. Ideational Metafunction

Ideational Metafunction expresses people's experience of the outside world and their inner side of consciousness about what is

going on, consisting of logical and experiential function. The logical function deals with the connection among ideas in a combination of clauses (Halliday, 1994) while the other one explains the "content meanings of 'what/ who did what to what/ whom'" (Thompson, 2014, p. 91). This metafunction is grammatically structured in a configuration called transitivity (Matthiessen & Halliday, 1997). The transitivity system explains the experience using a set of process types, namely material process, relational process, behavioral process, mental process, verbal process and existential process.

3.5.2. Interpersonal Metafunction

According to Matthiessen and Halliday (1997), there are three types of mood. The first one is declarative mood, in which the speakers or writers provide the addressees with information. The second type is imperative mood, in which the addressees are demanded to take action. The third type of mood is interrogative mood, in which the speakers or writers ask for information. Modality is the opinion or judgment on the content of the clause. Modality is often expressed through modal verbs (Thompson, 2014), including "can", "could", "may", "might", "shall", "should", "ought to", "must", "have to", "need to", "will", and "would".

All things considered, based on the effectiveness and validity of the framework as it has been utilized in investigating ideologies, this paper chose to employ the three stages following Fairclough's (2001) DRA in combination with Halliday's (1994) SFL as a supplementary tool to analyze linguistic features in the first stage.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Lexical features

4.1.1. Classification schemes

The US has gone through an array of tough fights and changes in the way people behave towards each other in the symbols of the

"Capitol dome" or "the Great Mall" (See table 1 below). Noticeably, the Capitol Dome, during the 19th century, took a significant amount of time to be completed and is now considered a lasting symbol of a nation both solid and unified. Meanwhile, the Great Mall, or the national mall, is where Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., an African-American civil rights activist, and clergyman, gave his iconic "I Have a Dream" speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in 1963. Therefore, President Biden wanted to highlight a long history of struggles that the US has been undergoing to reach its recent glory. This idea is similar to Martin Luther King's speech through the analysis by Sipra and Rashid (2013) in the fact that both Biden and Martin Luther King used references to the events and figures in the past to emphasize the hardships that the US faced and indirectly call for future actions.

Table 1: The US situations in the past and nowadays

US situations in the past	US situations at the present
History of struggles and battles	***The importance of democracy***
… Capitol dome that was completed amid the Civil War, when the Union itself hung in the balance …	This is America's day.
	This is democracy's day.
… the great Mall where Dr. King spoke of his dream.	***Evolutions of women's rights***
Evolutions of women's rights	… we mark the swearing-in of the first woman in American history elected to national office – Vice President Kamala Harris.
… protestors tried to block brave women from marching for the right to vote.	
Commemoration of soldiers and martyrs	***Hardships and burdens***
	This is our historic moment of crisis and challenge, and unity is the path forward.
… where heroes who gave the last full measure of devotion rest in eternal peace.	***We face an attack on democracy …***

Additionally, the women's voting rights revolution has been considered opposed to harsh regulations and prejudices existing during previous times. During such a period in the old time, voting rights had long been denied to women (Flexner & Fitzpatrick, 1996).

Based on this evolution, President Biden wished to express his gratitude towards his ancestors for giving such opportunities to women now that the US has a woman in the national office - Vice President Kamala Harris.

Furthermore, wars led to severe consequences for the US even when they ended. Soldiers, some of whom did not even know the purposes of such fights, "gave the last full measure of devotion" and fully served their countries without any distrust. President Biden wanted to express his sincere empathy towards those who have fought and fallen for the US by stating this. Moreover, he also wished to indicate that violence is not the answer to everything, from which once again he claimed that the will and unity of his people could not be disrupted.

Table 2: The challenges and the suggested solutions

Challenges	Solutions
A once-in-a-century virus silently stalks the country. Millions of jobs have been lost. … a rise in political extremism, white supremacy, domestic terrorism that we must confront and we will defeat. Anger, resentment, hatred. Extremism, lawlessness, violence. Disease, joblessness, hopelessness. Our history has been a constant struggle …. racism, nativism, fear, and demonization have long torn us apart.	… requires more than words. It requires that most elusive of things in a democracy: unity … … bringing America together, uniting our people and uniting our nation. With unity we can do great things, important things … … enough of us came together to carry all of us forward. And, we can do so now. … listen to one another, hear one another, see one another, show respect to one another. We must end this uncivil war …

On the other hand, seeing from table 2, President Biden emphasized the challenges that the US has been facing during this challenging time, including the deadly COVID-19 pandemic, "*political extremism*", racism, nativism and demonization. In order to gain faith from the citizens, in the name of the president, Biden proposed several solutions to handle these long-tiring concerns. Most

importantly, President Biden highlighted the role of "*unity*" as "*the most elusive of things in a democracy*". If the whole country is united, Biden believed that they "*can do great things*" to cease this discourteous fight among the domestic citizens, as well as international conflicts. In previous studies, unity is the ideology of many politicians when delivering their speeches in front of the press, for instance George Bush (Krampa, 2013), Barack Obama (Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014), or Elizabeth Warren (Tran, 2020). These issues would help political speakers to earn citizens' trust as unity is one of the most valuable traits that the US people hope for. To achieve this purpose, President Biden stressed the individual responsibility of each citizen to "*protect the nation*".

4.1.2. Antonyms

First, President Biden depicted the situational context of the US after a long and challenging history in which democracy has been the top priority. With the use of "*fragile*" and "*prevailed*", democracy is demonstrated as a vulnerable factor but has firmly won the citizens' support. In other words, Biden believed that democracy had led the US into a better day, regardless of "*peace*" and "*war*"; especially wars, both "*new*" and "*perennial*", the long-lasting impacts of such concerns carved in the lengthy period that the US has been fighting with.

In addition, antonyms were used to propose the measures and solutions to such problems mentioned above. In other words, "*peril*" and "*possibility*" are used to emphasize the importance of taking action, and the US possesses the ability to do great things with great power to change from "*wrong*" to "*right*". Moreover, the modal verbs "*doesn't have to*" and "*must*" imply the needs of what should be done to change for the better. It also uncovers Biden's ideologies that he would enhance the US and help all the citizens whether they "*support*" him during the presidential campaign. The idea of promising to take actions in the future was also found in Sameer's (2017) study on Bush's inaugural speech. Nonetheless, Bush

employed the use of contrast not from lexical perspectives but at an argument level to demonstrate a preferred position as a superior.

Lastly, Biden also uses antonyms as a call for unity among the US citizens. In particular, the president believed that everyone is others' "*neighbors*" but not "*adversaries*", highlighting the way people see each other and the necessity of standing altogether and addressing the common concerns through "*meet*"; and that without unity, there would be "*fury*". This use of antonym to refer to unity is similar to that in Bill Clinton's Speech (Hovhannisyan, 2016) when he also lists a couple of contrasting objects to link the problem to the need for unity among the US citizens. Moreover, President Biden also mentioned the two political parties in the US: the "*Democratic*" and the "*Republic*". It is well-known that not only in name, platform, and coalitional components, but also in kind, are two parties distinct (Freeman,1986).

4.1.3. Metaphor

Metaphor is a powerful ideological instrument that can be used for the negative representation of some groups and the positive representation of others (Van Dijk, 2006). Therefore, a lot of researchers have investigated the use of metaphor in politicians' speeches as a tool to convey their messages (e.g. Kadim, 2022; Nguyen, 2019). In Biden's speech, this is no exception for the employment of metaphor.

Initially, President Biden used metaphors when referring to democracy when he stated that "*Democracy is fragile*". Normally, fragile is an adjective to describe something visible or touchable. The use of "*fragile*" in democracy, a system of government, here implies a sense of vulnerability, especially during such a hard time with intricacies from both domestic and outside of the US.

Unity is another concept embedded through Biden's use of metaphor. He emphasized that "*unity is the path forward*". From his conscience, Biden believes that only with unity can the people of

America overcome several challenges and that unity is the key to every question that Americans have. President Biden also expects his citizens to be sympathetic, to be helpful and that they should "*stand in the other person's shoes*" when "*we need a hand*".

Besides that, President Biden sent a nation's call for all the people to take action on the hardships at that time and ahead. During that time and the days before, America has encountered a mass array of harsh situations that require much effort to address: "*virus stalks the country*", "*this dark winter*", "*the sting of systemic racism*". All of these metaphors are used flexibly by Biden to depict the harshness and tenseness of the recent events.

Lastly, President Biden also wanted to exhibit that America is a great, unique and proud nation. "*Our better angels*" refers to the US soldiers who bravely went to wars with courage under the name of an American. Biden regards US soldiers as angels because he expresses a great respectful attitude towards them - the fearless troops fighting to protect their country.

4.2. Grammatical features

4.2.1. Pronouns

To begin with, the plural pronoun "We", together with its possessive form "Our", is most predominantly used, at 88 and 44 times of use respectively. By using these, the speaker, President Biden, could narrow the distance between himself and the US citizens, implying solidarity and unification between the speaker and the audience.

Along with "we" comes the first singular pronoun "I", which is used 40 times during the speech with 20 times of its possessive form "my" to demonstrate authority, representativeness, and subjectivity and to personalize his speech and establish credibility.

"***I thank them*** *from the bottom of my heart.*"

Moreover, it is true that this subjectivity contributes to his reliability and persuasiveness:

"*If we do that, **I guarantee** you, we will not fail*"

This idea agrees with Shah et al. 's (2021) findings in which they discovered that the use of personal pronouns helped the Pakistan Premier to demonstrate his confidence with his nation and government when addressing national issues.

Finally, the pronouns "you" and "your" are recorded 12 times in total. The use of the pronoun "you" in the speech emphasized the targeted ideas towards the audience, demonstrating his strong voice and power:

"*I will give my all in **your** service thinking.*"

4.2.2. Voices

The majority of President Biden's speech is in active voice, and only 13 sentences are passive, implying that the agents in most cases are clearly presented.To illustrate this, Biden highlighted the hardships andchallenges that the US citizens had been undergoing:

"*Over the centuries through storm and strife, in peace and war, we have come so far.*"

Moreover, the use of active voice also helps Biden to determine himself in the public work of the US for a better future under his administration:

"*I will fight as hard for those who ....*"

Coming to the passive voice, there are two types: one with the agent(s) of the action, and one with omitted agent(s).

However, in this speech, there is only one sentence with a clear agent:

"*...**I am humbled** by the faith you have placed in us.*"

In this sentence, Biden wants to express his respectful attitude towards those who supported Biden and his side before and during the

presidential campaign, even up till now when Biden has become the president.

The rest of the passive sentences are those without agents of the action. President Biden used these sentences mostly to aware the audience of the challenges the US are facing:

"*Millions of jobs have been lost.*"

This usage of passive voice has been proved effective when political speakers wish to emphasize the objectivity and gravity of their information by relating historical or severe facts in the past or in the present (Liu, 2022).

Moreover, he also wanted to show the audience the vision of a brand new developed nation - the US has been striving to be the best:

"*America has been tested …*"

Finally, the use of passive voice uncovers Biden's ideologies of unity and equality:

"*… we are all created equal …*"

4.2.3. Transitivity

Below is the transitivity analysis of the speech.

Table 3: Transitivity analysis

	Types of process	Frequency	Proportion
1	Material process	93	58,5%
2	Relational process	23	14,5%
3	Mental process	13	8,2%
4	Verbal process	12	7,5%
5	Existential process	12	7,5%
6	Behavioral process	6	3,8%
	TOTAL	**159**	**100%**

4.3. Material process

Material processes appear 93 times in President Biden's inaugural speech, which is used to inform audiences of some message. The same was found in Wang's (2010) study when Obama also employed material processes the most to describe the government's actions and the long-term measures they would take.

This process is appropriate for Biden to depict American accomplishments and moves.

"*Over the centuries through storm and strife, …. we have come so far.*"

Furthermore, it has the potential to arouse viewers' patriotic feelings and inspire them to build a bright future. Americans will trust the government and embrace the new policy if the processes are used correctly. Plus, President Biden discusses America's current condition and makes an impassioned call for togetherness. Through analysis, it is possible to determine that Biden employs these material processes to stress the harshness of the current social situation and to encourage all Americans to unite and stand together for a better future.

"*We can reward work, rebuild the middle class, and make health care secure for all.*"

This findings aligns with Tran's (2020) research paper when she discovered that Senator Warren, in her campaign speech, also used this type of material process to emphasise the interconnected roles that ordinary people and the wealthy may play in determining America's future.

Lastly, the material process demonstrates Joe Biden's strong desire and wish to win people's support to fight against anger, resentment, hatred, extremism, lawlessness, violence, disease, joblessness, hopelessness via common folks.

"*And, we must meet this moment as the United States of America.*"

4.4. Relational process

The second frequently used process is the relational process which creates a sense of objectiveness to some extent. This type of process mostly serves to demonstrate the characteristics of (groups of) people mentioned. The use of relational process highlights the need to be united among US citizens in order to change America for the better:

"*It requires that most elusive of things in a democracy: unity*."

Joe Biden emphasizes that the day he takes office is a day of democracy, history, hope, renewal and resolve, showing great confidence and courage as a new president.

"*This is democracy's day.*"

4.5. Mood

To begin with, the declarative mode is employed when President Biden tells stories and mentions facts about the past and the struggles that the US has encountered nowadays, along with expressing his hope to unify the entire US citizens to overcome such difficulties. This demonstrates his evaluations of each aforementioned group/person, warnings about the wealthy, and the current administration, which can further deepen inequalities.

Regarding grammatical questions, they are used 4 times only:

"*What are the common objects we love that define us as Americans?*"

"*Will we rise to the occasion?*"

"*Will we master this rare and difficult hour?*"

"*Will we meet our obligations and pass along a new and better world ….?*"

The first question is raised when President Biden wants to show the audience what the US means to him and to all the citizens. That is

opportunity, security, liberty, dignity, respect, honor and the truth. These are all the aspects and components that make up the US - the characteristics that each of the US dwellers should have. Coming to the last 3 questions in a row, these are the rhetorical questions that President Biden uses to call for action to make America better regardless of numerous obstacles at that time being.

Lastly, the imperative mode is used 4 times during this speech to help the audience envision a brighter future of the US ahead, also to help Biden promise himself to always protect and cherish his people. This result also aligns with President Buhari's inaugural speech (Koussouhon & Dossoumou, 2015) when he said that he pledged to ensure and secure a true federal system for his people for a better foreseen future.

4.6. Modality

Most of the modality used by Biden in this speech was to demonstrate his feelings and views, which has the same function as in Chen's (2018) study on Trump's inaugural speech. Some of the words are described below.

Table 4: Modality analysis

Auxiliary	Will	Can	Must	May	Need	Have to	Shall
Times of occurrence	29	20	10	5	4	3	1

4.6.1. Auxiliary: will

Among all the auxiliary verbs, "will" is a preferable choice of the speaker with 29 times of appearance, which is unquestionably proper to an inaugural day where the new president needs to exhibit and assure his citizens of a promising upcoming future:

"***We will** press forward with speed and urgency*"

Moreover, the use of "will" also helps President Biden create a sense of unity and solidarity among the US citizens:

"***We will*** *get through this, together."*

Lastly, President Biden utilizes the auxiliary "will" to promise himself as the new president of the US to take future actions for the better:

"***I will*** *always level with you."*

4.6.2. Auxiliary: can

First, "can" is used a great deal of times to display ability, capacity or inability, incapacity of what Biden and his people will do in the future, and the direction that they will follow:

"*We* ***can*** *right wrongs."*

Through this, the ideology of unity is clearly highlighted through the use of this auxiliary, and with unity, fellow American citizens will overcome existing issues and crises.

Besides that, its negative form, "can't", is utilized 2 times, first to stress on the loss and sorrow that the COVID-19 outbreak has brought to the US:

"*A cry that* ***can't*** *be any more desperate or any more clear."*

and second to disclose President Biden's confidence in changing for the better US:

"*Don't tell me things* ***can't*** *change."*

4.6.3. Auxiliary: must

President Biden, when employing the auxiliary "must", evokes a strong sense of responsibility of the US people to fulfill their duty as a citizen.

"*... we* ***must*** *meet this moment as the United States of America."*

4.6.4. Auxiliary: may

The use of "may" in this speech has two functions. First, President Biden wants to indicate an objective possibility of the deadly virus:

"*We are entering what **may** well be the toughest and deadliest period of the virus.*"

Besides, "may" being in the first place of the sentence helps express Biden's hopes and expectations for the best:

"***May** God bless America …*"

4.6.5. Semi-auxiliary: need to

This semi-auxiliary aids to persuade fellow American citizens to take action when encountering such challenges during that time:

"*My fellow Americans, in the work ahead of us, we will **need** each other.*"

4.6.6. Semi-auxiliary: have to

By using the semi-auxiliary "have to", President Biden wants to highlight the unique and the strength of the outstanding America among all the developed nations in the world:

"*My fellow Americans, we **have to** be different than this.*"

4.6.7. Auxiliary: shall

Only one time is "shall" used within President Biden's inaugural speech:

"*And together, **we shall** write an American story.*"

to emphasize the subject "we" - the US people, implying that with unity, they can do great things to make Americans overcome national burdens and open a brighter path for the future.

4.7. Structure

In the first two parts of the speech, President Biden delivered an overview of his ideologies about democracy, together with the past and current US situations and its challenges. This approach helps set the focus of the speech on the audience, thereby making it easier for President Biden to further elaborate his core ideas in later parts. In the next three parts, the challenges and hardships were emphasized to call for unity among the US citizens. This helps Biden gain more faith from the US citizens and more easily to call for common actions to tackle the national issues.

In the next two parts, Biden declared himself to be the US president and expressed his gratitude towards his supporters during his presidential campaign, even towards those who were not. Furthermore, numerous measures to be taken to make the US a better place were proposed by President Biden, which also helps to build the audience's confidence in Biden's future plans. The following part simply shows Biden's empathy towards the COVID-19 victims and their families. In the last two parts, President Biden acts an echoing effect on the audience to once again mention the common concerns and promise himself and hope to change the US for the better. The structure in Biden's speech is different from that in Warren's speech in Tran's (2020) study when she used a rhetorical approach to stress on her backgrounds and visions. This difference could be understood based on the contexts and the roles of speakers, in which Biden was the president delivering an inaugural speech while Warren was in a presidential campaign trying to persuade the audience.

5. Conclusion & Implications

Generally, there are two major ideologies that President Biden has embedded in his inaugural address through the analysis of the lexical, grammatical features, and structure of the speech. First, the speech plainly conveys a strong message of unity among the US

citizens under the democratic administration of President Biden in the hope of addressing the current concerns that the US has been facing. Second, President Biden emphasized the ideology of liberalism, democracy and equality during his speech as he believed that the needs for freedom and social equality are vital. Besides these findings, which are common in any US political speeches, there are other minor ideologies found in Biden's inaugural speech. Some of them are a recall of a long US history and fights with all the burdens and hardships, a call for action to aim for the better, a pride of the great and unique US, and Biden's respect and determination towards his people.

This paper has some limitations that need addressing. Due to the fact that this study involved qualitative analysis, it is unavoidable to include subjectivism as the researcher contributed his own values and beliefs to the analysis. Furthermore, this study has only focused on analyzing certain textual features of the speech; as a result, some prospective aspects remain unexplored. In particular, the phonological aspect of the speech could have been taken into consideration to better understand Biden's ideologies through intonation or stress. Lastly, this is only one of President Biden's speeches among numerous more. As a result, not all of the president's views may be conveyed, and the research findings may not be completely accurate in other circumstances.

There have been a number of suggestions for potential future works. When conducting political discourse analysis, especially from a critical point of view, the need to understand the socio-practical context is recommended. As a result, the reader will be able to fully comprehend the point that the speaker wishes to impart. Another important point is that more discourses in political speeches by President Biden should be analyzed to better explore his ideologies because in different speeches as well as in different time periods, Biden, and other political speakers in general, may deliver a different

set of ideologies. Finally, other aspects like intonations, word stress, body language or facial expressions could also be employed to help express his desired relationship with the audience and his authority and credibility towards the citizens who are under Biden's administration and those who are interested.

References

Bayram, F. (2010). Ideology and political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's political speech. *ARECLS*, *7,* pp. 23-40.

Bello, U. (2013). "If I could make it, you too can make it!" Personal pronouns in political discourse: A CDA of president Jonathan's presidential declaration speech.*International Journal of English Linguistics*, *3*(6), pp. 84-96. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v3n6p84.

Biria, R. & Mohammadi, A. (2012). The socio pragmatic functions of inaugural speech: A critical discourse analysis approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(10), pp. 1290-1302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma. 2012.05.013.

Chen, W. (2018). A critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's inaugural speech from the perspective of systemic functional grammar. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *8*(8), pp. 966-972. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0808.07.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. Longman.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2009). *A Dialectical-relational approach*. Sage.

Flexner, E. & Fitzpatrick, E. (1996). *Century of struggle: The woman's rights movement in the United States*. Harvard University Press.

Freeman, J. (1986). The political culture of the democratic and republican parties. *Political Science*, *101*(3), pp. 327-356. https://doi.org/10.2307/2151619.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.

Hovhannisyan, A. (2016). Context–driven antonyms in political discourse. *World Journal of English Language*, *6*(1), pp. 8-13. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v6n1p8.

Kazemian, B., & Hashemi, S. (2014). Critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's 2012 speeches: Views from systemic functional linguistics and rhetoric. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(6), pp. 1178-1187. https://doi:10.4304/tpls.4.6.1178-1187.

Koussouhon, L. & Dossoumou, A. (2015). Political and ideological commitments: A systemic functional linguistic and critical discourse analysis of president Buhari's inaugural speech. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, *3*(2), pp. 24-34. http://dx.doi.org/10.15640/ijlc.v3n2a3.

Krampa, E. (2013). Language at war: A critical discourse analysis of speeches of Bush and Obama on terrorism. *International Journal of Social Science and Education*, *3*(2), 378-390.

Liu, K. & Guo, F. (2016). A review on critical discourse analysis. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(5), pp. 1076. https://doi:10.17507/tpls.0605.23.

Liu, M. (2022). A corpus-based study on the usage of passive voice in English political speeches on the guidance of text typology. *The Frontiers of Society, Science and Technology, 4(*1*)*, pp. *83-87*. https://doi.org/10.25236/FSST.2022.040113.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. & Halliday, M. A. K. (1997). *Systemic functional grammar: Afirst step into the theory*. Routledge.

Michira, J. (2014). The language of politics: A CDA of the 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign discourse. *International Journal of Education and Research*, *2*(1), pp. 1-18.

Nguyen, T. (2019). *A critical discourse analysis of power in Trump'sinaugural speech*. M.A. Minor Programme Thesis.

Sameer, I. (2017). Rhetorical and linguistic analysis of Bush's secondinaugural speech. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *8*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.1p.44.

Sengul, K. (2019). Critical discourse analysis in political communication research: a case study of right-wing populist discourse in Australia. *Communication Research and Practice*, *5*(4), pp. 376-392. https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2019.1695082.

Shah, M., Ahmad, S., & Danishs, A. (2021). Controversies in political ideologies: A critical discourse analysis of speeches of Indian and Pakistani premiers on Pulwama incident. *Register Journal*, *14*(1), pp. 43-64. http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v14i1.43-64.

Sharndama, E. (2016). Discursive strategies in political speeches: A critical discourse analysis of selected inaugural speeches of the 2015 Nigeria's Gubernatorial inaugurals. *European Journal of English Language, Linguistics and Literature*, *3*(2), pp. 15-28.

Sharififar, M. & Rahimi, E. (2015). Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of Obama's and Rouhani's speeches at UN. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(2), pp. 343-349. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0502.14.

Sipra, M. & Rashid, A. (2013). Critical discourse analysis of Martin Luther King's speech in socio-political perspective. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *4(*1), pp. 27-33. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.4n.1p.27.

Stobbs, J. (2012). *Critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's 1st inaugural speech*. Durham University Express.

Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar.* Routledge.

Tran, A. (2020). *A critical discourse analysis of senator Elizabeth Warren's presidential campaign speech*. VNU Press.

Wang, J. (2010). Critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(3), pp. 254-261. http://doi:10.4304/jltr.1.3.254-261.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *4*(2), pp. 249-283. https://www.jstor.org/stable/ 42888777.

Van Djik, T.A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(3), pp. 359-383. https://doi.org/10.1177/095792650 6060250.