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Abstract

This research paper focuses on the analysis of cohesion and coherence in the remarks made by President Biden during the Joint Statement with Ukraine. The study aims to examine the logical flow, consistency, and clarity of President Biden’s statements in the context of the U.S.-Ukraine relationship. A content analysis approach is employed to analyze the speech delivered by President Biden, including key themes, messaging, and any potential inconsistencies. The findings of this analysis contribute to understanding the effectiveness of President Biden’s communication strategy and the coherence of his administration’s approach toward Ukraine. The analysis presents a comprehensive understanding of the cohesion and coherence exhibited by President Biden in the Joint Statement with Ukraine, offering valuable insights into the U.S. government’s stance towards Ukraine and its broader foreign policy objectives. The findings of this research provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of President Biden’s communication strategy and the coherence of his administration’s approach toward Ukraine. By assessing the cohesion and coherence in President Biden’s remarks, this analysis offers a comprehensive understanding of the administration’s commitment to supporting Ukraine in various domains, including security, democracy, and economic development.

INTRODUCTION

Social relationships in the rapidly changing modern day are shaped by complex dynamics that reflect the intricacies of our technologically advanced, globally interconnected society. The emergence of digital communication platforms, social media networks, and worldwide connections has fundamentally changed how people interact with one another (Heidemann, Klier, & Probst, 2012). Social interactions are shaped by complex dynamics as people move across a wide range of physical...
and virtual settings. A complex web of communication patterns has emerged as a result of the convergence of cultural diversity, technical development, and changing social norms. These patterns have an impact on how individuals interact, connect, and relate to one another. Thus, the urgency to analyze how people shape modern social interactions and how they impact other people’s lives and beliefs emerges to make a better understanding of society, which then affects the mastery of 21st-century skills such as problem-solving and decision-making.

"The beginning point is the ethnographic examination of communication conduct of the community," said Hymes (1974) for the investigation of cultural communication. Under the headings of the speech community, speech environment, speech event, common communicative style, and methods of speaking, Hymes identified six distinct categories. Noy (2017) remarked in a study article titled "Ethnography of Communication" that the SPEAKING acronym offered by Hymes, which stands for Situation, Participants, Ends, Act sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms, and Genres, presents a heuristic grid that works as a means rather than an end. The dimensions to which the acronym refers can alternatively be considered as variables with several values that are overlapped and, at times, interchangeable. In the context of Hymes' SPEAKING model, coherence and cohesion play integral roles in facilitating effective communication within the sociocultural framework because it provides a holistic framework for understanding communicative events.

According to Hasan & Marzuki (2017), even though both Coherence and Cohesion share the same function, that is dealing with how sentences relate to one another, they have some differences. While Cohesion is grammatical and demonstrates the formal syntactic connections between sentences, coherence is rhetorical and focuses on the connections between speech acts rather than forms. Moreover, Knapp & Watskin (2005) argue that Cohesion refers to the tools available to aid in connecting material in writing and assisting the text's flow and coherence. Oshima & Hogue (2006) highlight that "Coherence is achieved when sentences and thoughts are linked and flow naturally together. Each sentence should flow naturally and logically from one to the next after the previous one. There shouldn't be any unforeseen leaps." Exploring coherence and cohesion in the context of Hymes' SPEAKING model offers a thorough lens through which to examine the complexities of speech, investigating the complex field of linguistic analysis that contributes to effective communication.

There are three common kinds of referencing: Exophoric referencing, which includes knowledge in the context of an immediate situation, Endophoric referencing, which includes knowledge that is reclaimed from the text itself, and Homophobic referencing includes knowledge in the context of a culture that is shared information (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Coherence and cohesion can be seen from the Substitution or Ellipsis, which is used when a writer or speaker tends to avoid using a certain word or expression more than once by employing specific syntactic linguistic features to replace that particular phrase or word, Conjunction, which functions as a cohesive link between sentences or clauses to show how they join together in a coherent fashion in the writing, and Lexical Cohesion, which refers to the output of cohesion that is achieved or produced by the choice of words. Two major categories of lexical cohesiveness are collocation and repetition (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Although the SPEAKING model offers an organized framework for examining written and spoken texts, there is a counterargument that the approach may oversimplify the complex processes
that are a part of communication. Umezinwa (2019) said that several factors in the Hymes SPEAKING model contributing to meaning in linguistics are not taken into account. The hypothesis does not account for issues with facial reactions, gestures, motions, and other non-linguistic aspects which are also important indicators. Opponents contend that the complexity and diversity of human contact may be overlooked when communicative events are reduced to just six essential elements. Beyond the parameters of the SPEAKING model, a plethora of factors, including non-verbal cues, cultural nuances, and contextual differences, are frequently involved in communication. However, Hymes (1974) argues that the model serves as a valuable starting point, offering a structured lens to identify and understand key elements within communication. The eight elements are easily observed with fewer multi-interpretations, which usually leaves confusion to novice researchers. Moreover, El-Zaghal (2021) proved the validity and applicability of Hymes' theory to linguistic discourse analysis as well as text studies.

The SPEAKING model by Hymes is an intriguing theory in the analysis of conversation, not just in linguistics but in other related fields as well. A study that investigated the context behind the illocutionary act of the main characters in the Mirror Mirror movie using the context of Hymes' SPEAKING model revealed that those eight aspects occurred, affecting the illocutionary act of the key characters in the movie (Rahayu, Arifin, & Ariani, 2018). Moreover, research by Rahmawati (2021) in the Crazy Rich Asian movie revealed that the types of expressive speech acts that frequently occurred were apologize, thank, and compliment. Hymes' SPEAKING model helped to understand the meaning of the social context, and the purpose of the interaction in detail, and describe them in analysis text. It demonstrates how the characters in the Crazy Rich Asian movie displayed greater consideration and friendliness toward others. Besides movies, all of the context-related elements of Hymes' SPEAKING model also occurred in Theresa May’s Britain, The Great Meritocracy Speech (Puteri, Arifin, & Rahayu, 2020), giving evidence that those eight aspects are also applicable to other types of communication, which approved El-Zaghal’s findings (2021).

Thus, the researchers were interested in analyzing the latest international issues in the media using the SPEAKING model. By extending the analysis to focus on Coherence and Cohesion, this research undertakes a meticulous examination of the interconnectedness and flow of ideas within a speech to clarify how they all work together to enhance spoken discourse communicative competence. The results of this study can provide readers and future researchers insights into the sociolinguistic nuances that underlie effective speech and further our understanding of how people traverse the challenges of spoken communication by aligning Coherence and Cohesion analysis with the SPEAKING model.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This research study examines the cohesiveness and coherence of President Biden's speech during the Joint Statement with Ukraine to identify the logical flow, consistency, and clarity of President Biden's statements in the context of the US-Ukraine relationship. The speech was entitled President Biden Speaks in Ukraine Ahead of the 1st Anniversary of Russia’s Invasion post by ABC News (2023) on their YouTube channel [https://youtu.be/gomOSltbIjo](https://youtu.be/gomOSltbIjo). A content analysis method is used to assess the data since it enables researchers to identify the patterns and trends in the data.
including important themes, messaging, and any potential discrepancies (Mayring, 2015). The main theories applied in this article are Hymes's SPEAKING model (1974) and Halliday & Hasan's cohesion and coherence theory (1976), to provide more context to the speech.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cohesion and Coherence of The Speech

Analysis revealed that the speech’s coherence and cohesiveness are quite strong, demonstrating a logical flow that is smooth from beginning to end. The speech opens with a detailed depiction of the Ukrainian conflict, setting the stage for the conversation between the two leaders that follows. This opening setup is carefully threaded throughout the speech to serve as a thematic anchor. Deeper observations on the speaker's relationship with Ukraine, the larger backdrop of democratic values, and the role of the international community in aiding the country are covered in the sections that follow. A detailed analysis of the Coherence and Cohesion aspects can be seen below.

1. Data: Well, thank you very much, Mr. President
   Social Context: President Biden thanks President Zelensky for opening remarks
   Cohesion: The word "thank you" is included in the collocation, showing cohesion.
   Coherence: This section is a continuation of President Zelensky’s opening remarks
   Interpretation: President Biden did not forget to thank President Zelensky. This was the right choice because if he hadn't done so, it would have seemed strange to the listener.

2. Data: You know, it was — it was one year ago this week that we spoke on the telephone, Mr. President.
   Social Context: President Biden tried to recall past events.
   Cohesion: There is a repetition of the word "it was", so this is categorized as cohesion.
   Coherence: In this section, President Biden immediately changes the topic from his opening remarks (thank you) to a topic related to current events.
   Interpretation: It seems that President Biden forgot a bit about past events because he repeated the word "it was."

3. Data: It was very late at night in Washington, very early in the morning here in Kyiv.
   Social Context: He compared the atmosphere in America with that in Ukraine at that time.
   Cohesion: President Biden does not use conjunctions to connect two different events.
   Coherence: This sentence is still related to the previous sentence about what was discussed on the phone.
   Interpretation: President Biden should have used the conjunction "but", but the message was still conveyed.

4. Data: Russian planes were in the air, and tanks were rolling across your border.
   Social Context: This illustrates that Russia has entered Ukraine.
   Cohesion: The word "Russian planes" was mentioned earlier, so when the word "tank" appeared, it was confirmed that it was a Russian tank.
   Coherence: This sentence is related to the previous sentence and the use of the verb "were" connects the Russian defense equipment that entered Ukraine.
   Interpretation: President Biden economized on the choice of words he used in his speech.

5. Data: You told me that you could hear the explosions in the background.
   Social Context: Recalling past events.
   Cohesion: The "you" here is President Zelensky because President Biden is on the phone with him.
   Coherence: The use of the subordinating conjunction "that" signals that what follows will be the content of the communication. This creates coherence by indicating that the rest of the sentence is a report of what was said.

Interpretation: Biden’s use of the modal verb "could" indicates that the explosions were audible but not necessarily seen or experienced directly. This provides a clear description of the situation being reported.

6. Data: I’ll never forget that.
Social Context: Biden will not forget what Zelensky heard earlier.
Cohesion: The word "that" is Zelensky's experience of hearing explosions.
Coherence: This sentence is still connected to the previous sentence.
Interpretation: The addition of this sentence by Biden shows his sympathy because he will not forget this.

7. Data: And the world was about to change.
Social Context: The changing world is a result of war.
Cohesion: Zelensky's experience made Biden think that the world would change.
Coherence: This sentence is still connected to the previous sentence.
Interpretation: His opinion is exaggerated because it is not only with explosions that the world will change.

8. Data: I remember it vividly because I asked you — I asked you next — I asked you, "What is there, Mr. President? What can I do for you? How can I be of help?"
Social Context: Biden recalls another topic he discussed with Zelensky.
Cohesion: The repetition of "I asked you" creates a cohesive link between the three questions that follow. This repetition signals to the reader that the three questions are related and part of the same idea.
Coherence: This clear progression of ideas also contributes to coherence, as the three questions build upon each other and form a coherent set of inquiries.
Interpretation: Biden used a lot of repetition about the events he experienced with Zelensky.

9. Data: And I don’t know that you remember what you said to me, but you said, and I quote, “Gather the leaders of the world. Ask them to support Ukraine.” “Gather the leaders of the world and ask them to support Ukraine.”
Cohesion: The repetition of the phrase "Gather the leaders of the world" creates a cohesive link between the two sentences, signaling to the reader that the second sentence is a repetition of the first sentence. This repetition also reinforces the importance and urgency of the message, making it more memorable and impactful.
Coherence: The use of repetition helps to make this sentence coherent.
Interpretation: Biden used a lot of repetition about the events he experienced with Zelensky.

10. Data: And you said that you didn’t know when we’d be able to speak again.
Social Context: Zelensky said that he did not know when he would be able to talk to Biden again.
Cohesion: Biden again used references to past events.
Coherence: This sentence is coherent, connecting events that happened before.
Interpretation: Biden used a lot of repetition about the events he experienced with Zelensky.

11. Data: That dark night, one year ago, the world was literally, at the time, bracing for the fall of Kyiv — it seems like a lot longer ago than a year, but think back to that year — perhaps even the end of Ukraine.
Social Context: Biden said that Ukraine could have lost at that time.
Cohesion: Biden uses anaphoric references, with "the dark night" and "the fall of Kyiv," referring back to previously mentioned events and situations.
Coherence: The imagery of the world "bracing" for the fall of Kyiv and the potential end of Ukraine creates a sense of urgency and danger and helps to reinforce the importance of the situation being discussed. This imagery further contributes to coherence by creating a vivid and memorable mental image for the reader.
Interpretation: In this sentence, Biden points out that things have been bad in Ukraine for a long time.

12. Data: You know, one year later, Kyiv stands and Ukraine stands.
Social Context: Biden pointed out that Ukraine is not what it used to be.
Cohesion:
The use of the temporal marker "one year later" helps to provide context and situational awareness for the reader.

Biden connected past events with present events using the words "one year later." Biden used the link between the two events again.

13. Data: Democracy stands
Social Context: A general statement that democracy still exists in Ukraine.
Cohesion: Biden uses repetition of “stands.”
Coherence: This sentence is a continuation of the previous sentence.
Interpretation: Biden showed that Ukraine still has an identity and is supported by outsiders.

Social Context: Biden showed support for Ukraine.
Cohesion: The parallel structure in the sentence is achieved through the repetition of the phrase "stand with you."
Coherence: The repetition of the phrase "stand with you" serves to reinforce the central message of the sentence, that Ukraine is not alone and has the support of both the American people and the world community.
Interpretation: In this sentence, Biden really shows his support, like heart-to-heart.

15. Data: Kyiv has captured a part of my heart, I must say.
Social Context: Biden feels that Kyiv has become a part of him.
Cohesion: Biden emphasized his feelings by using the words "I must say."
Coherence: This sentence shows the connection between American and global support for Ukraine, with Biden expressing his own feelings.
Interpretation: Here Biden began to express his deepest feelings.

16. Data: And I’ve come here six times as Vice President, once as President.
Social Context: Biden is no stranger to visiting Ukraine.
Cohesion: Biden uses the conjunction "and" to add his feelings.
Coherence: Those six visits led him to say Kyiv was a part of his heart. Biden was Obama’s vice president during a previous visit, providing additional support for Ukraine.
Interpretation: That many visits make Biden no stranger to Ukraine.

17. Data: In 2009, as Vice President, when I first came here. Then back in 2014, I came three times in the aftermath of the Revolution of Dignity. And I again came in 2015 to address the Rada about the work of building a strong democracy. And I came in 2017, just before I left office as Vice President.
Social Context: In this sentence, Biden specifically mentions when he has visited Ukraine in the past.
Cohesion: The repetition of the phrase "I came here" establishes a clear link between the different visits to Kyiv and provides a sense of cohesion.
Coherence: He uses chronological markers such as "in 2009," "back in 2014," "in 2015," and "in 2017" to create a clear temporal sequence of events, which also helps to establish coherence.
Interpretation: Many visits make Biden no stranger to Ukraine.

18. Data: I knew I’d be back, but I wanted to be sure.
Social Context: Biden is confident that he will return to Ukraine.
Cohesion: Biden uses reference in "I knew I’d be back" it refers to the speaker's previous visits to Kyiv.
Coherence: After many previous visits, Biden reconnected with this sentence.
Interpretation: This sentence shows Biden's seriousness.

19. Data: Even though we’d — the election was over, Barack and I were out of office, I decided to make one more trip, before the next President was sworn in, to Kyiv.
Social Context: Biden would like to visit again after he completes his term.
Cohesion: Biden uses the conjunction "even though" to connect his decision to make one more trip to Kyiv with the fact that the elections were over and they were out of office.
Coherence: The speaker is explaining why they made one more trip to Kyiv before the next President was sworn in.
Interpretation: Even though he has left office, Biden is still thinking about Ukraine.
20. Data: So, President Zelenskyy, you deeply honor me here in Kyiv with you today to meet with your military, your intelligence folks, your diplomatic teams, community leaders who have stepped up and — to help their country in their hour of need.


Cohesion: The references “you” and “your” refer to President Zelenskyy and his teams and community leaders.

Coherence: This sentence highlights Biden’s respect and appreciation for those who serve their country in different ways.

Interpretation: Biden showed his respect not only to Zelensky but also to the Ukrainian military, community, and people.

SPEAKING Model of the Speech

Scene and setting build the environment of a communication event, involving time and location, is called the setting. The scene would be the “psychological context” or “cultural definition” of a scene, which includes traits like a spectrum of formality and a perception of playfulness or solemnity. President Biden delivered his speech at Mariinsky Palace, the official residence of the Ukrainian president. He began speaking at 10:49 A.M. EET local time. The atmosphere when he spoke was serious, with no one else speaking but President Biden himself. While delivering the speech, he made eye contact with the audience in the room but still looked at the speech text placed on the podium table.

Participant refers to the speaker, hearer, addressee, and addressee, but he said that dialogues may only require two roles—addressor and addressee—whereas other situations may call for speaking or listening on behalf of others. The participants were President Biden himself as the speaker as well as President Zelensky who delivered the opening speech before President Biden delivered his speech. Other parties present were specially invited guests in the form of journalists and President Biden’s staff.

End is the purpose of the speech and the results are two different categories of end-of-speech events. President Biden's speech showed that America fully supports Ukraine in its conflict with Russia. He used the phrase, "The Americans stand with you, and the world stands with you.” He informed that Russia failed in its invasion of Ukraine, "Putin's war of conquest is failing.”

Act Sequence is identified from both form and content, which comes in message-form and message-content patterns. The speaking style is meant by the message rather than an accent or variety. President Biden delivered his message directly to the Ukrainian people using encouraging phrases such as, "You and all Ukrainians, Mr. President, remind the world every single day what the meaning of the word 'courage’ is.”

Key is the general attitude, style, or tone in which an act is conducted. It could be grave, happy, or furious, for instance. The intonation in his speech was delivered straightforwardly, while occasionally speaking casually as if he was talking between two eyes. This is shown by the sentence, "You know, it was - it was one year ago this week that we spoke on the telephone, Mr. President.”

The term "instrument” implies the mode of communication, which can be semaphore, telegraphic, written in the report format, or spoken face-to-face contact. Biden’s presidential speech was delivered orally through a video available on various platforms, so it is considered an electronic speech.
Norm is distinctive into two facets. The first is the social norm, or generally the "Rule," which dictates how participants should perform during a perfect speech event, including who should speak first and when the turn should shift. The second factor is the norm of interpretation, which is influenced by a culture's shared history, ideas, and traditions. Before President Biden delivered his speech, President Zelensky first opened the event with an opening speech. This is the norm where the host delivers his opening remarks to the guest of state.

Genre which is the kind of speaking act or event is classified into the rhythms of sonnets, sermons, poems, myths, tales, proverbs, riddles, curses, prayers, orations, lectures, commercials, and any other ordered routines and styles. It refers to the sort of form delivery. Many different discourses can be referred to using these phrases. President Biden’s communication is considered to be a political speech because it is delivered orally and accompanied by body language.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

After conducting the analysis, the speech demonstrates strong cohesion and coherence, as it flows logically and cohesively from beginning to end. The speech opens with a vivid description of the crisis in Ukraine, with the dialogue between the two leaders setting the stage for the rest of the speech. The subsequent sections of the speech build upon this opening, with the speaker reflecting on his own relationship with Ukraine and its people, as well as the broader context of democratic values and the role of the international community in supporting Ukraine. Throughout the speech, the speaker uses clear transitions and repetition to reinforce key themes and ideas, which contributes to the overall coherence of the speech. The use of personal anecdotes and specific details also adds to the coherence and emotional impact of the speech.

It is advised that future studies on the SPEAKING model and coherence and cohesion analysis investigate how well the model works in a variety of communicative contexts, such as those involving various genres, cultural settings, and communication media. To improve the model's effectiveness in assessing both written and spoken conversation, researchers should think about adding non-verbal clues, cultural quirks, and technology considerations. Furthermore, looking into how coherence and cohesiveness intersect in online and social media communication environments can provide important insights into how language use is changing. Studies should also look at how linguistic diversity affects the model's performance, investigating how it handles code-switching, multilingual environments, and other language variances in an increasingly globalized society.
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