Constructing National Ideology and Values: A Comparative Study of Southeast Asian and Southern African Inaugural Speeches By Leaders in English Using Thematic Analysis

Salila Prasidya Hidayati
Universitas Sunan Gresik, Indonesia
Email: salila.ph@lecturer.usg.ac.id

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
political discourse; national ideology; inaugural speeches; thematic analysis; Southeast Asia; Southern Africa	*This study examines how modern national leaders use inaugural speeches to shape national ideology and express shared values. These speeches, often delivered during crucial political transitions, serve as rhetorical frameworks through which leaders communicate their vision, moral stance, and governing philosophy to both domestic and international audiences. Focusing on four English-language inaugural addresses from Southeast Asia (the Philippines and Singapore) and Southern Africa (South Africa and Zambia), this research applies comparative thematic analysis to identify common and contrasting ideological patterns in postcolonial and developmental-state contexts. Using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase model, the study identifies and interprets recurring themes that illustrate how leaders employ language to establish legitimacy, unity, and moral authority. Reliability was confirmed using Cohen's Kappa (κ = 0.851), indicating a high level of analytical consistency. Findings reveal that while all leaders use optimistic, future-oriented rhetoric emphasizing progress and inclusivity, their underlying value systems differ. Southeast Asian leaders tend to focus on pragmatic governance, economic development, and institutional continuity, whereas Southern African leaders center their messages on moral renewal, democracy, and resilience—reflecting their nations' liberation histories. The study contributes to discourse research by demonstrating how political leaders in non-Western contexts use language as a tool to reproduce ideology and shape collective identity.*

INTRODUCTION

Inaugural addresses occupy a distinct space in political communication. They are not only formal occasions marking the beginning of a new administration but also moments when national identity, unity, and shared values are articulated and redefined (Aremu, 2017; David et al., 2014; Gambarawa & Idris, 2024; Maharazu & Lawal, 2020; "Yar'adua, Umaru Musa (Nigeria)," 2019). Beyond ceremony, these speeches are deliberate rhetorical acts through which leaders establish legitimacy and invite citizens to join a renewed social and moral vision (Biria & Mohammadi, 2012; Olusola, 2020). This makes the inaugural address a key lens for understanding how language reflects leadership ideology and national imagination.

In political linguistics, inaugural speeches are often viewed as performative acts that both narrate and legitimize authority. As Van Dijk (1997) and Fairclough (1995) explain, political language is never neutral—it operates as a means of shaping public consciousness and maintaining social order. Within this context, inaugural speeches go beyond mere policy

announcements. They serve as frameworks for producing and reinforcing ideology, transforming administrative goals into emotionally resonant national narratives (Vassileva, 2021).

Rhetorical features such as metaphors of rebirth, appeals to unity, and moral framing strengthen the persuasive power of inaugural discourse (Altikriti, 2016). By invoking historical struggles or shared triumphs, leaders create a sense of continuity between past and present, positioning themselves as both custodians and innovators of national ideals.

The significance of inaugural addresses lies in their multi-layered communicative purpose. They function as expressions of political philosophy, declarations of governance priorities, and symbolic rituals of unity. In postcolonial settings such as Southeast Asia and Southern Africa, these speeches take on deeper meaning. Leaders must navigate the legacies of colonialism while articulating independent national ideologies rooted in local values and regional identity (Cross-cultural Perspectives, 2025).

A comparative study of these speeches provides insight into how political ideology and leadership identity are conveyed through language across cultures. The focus on English-language inaugurals is deliberate, as English functions as a shared language of governance and diplomacy in many postcolonial nations. This allows for an analysis of how global and local ideologies intersect within political discourse (Canagarajah, 2013; Mukhuba, 2022).
Overall, this research contributes to political discourse studies by demonstrating how leaders in emerging democracies and developmental states use language to project authority, foster unity, and define their nation's moral and political place in a globalized world.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative descriptive design grounded in the interpretivist paradigm, which emphasizes understanding how individuals construct meaning within social and cultural contexts. Within this framework, language is viewed not only as a system of communication but also as a form of social action that shapes ideology and power relations (Fairclough, 1995; Van Dijk, 1997). The study aims to explore how political leaders use inaugural speeches as linguistic tools to construct and communicate national ideology and values.

The research combines comparative discourse analysis with thematic analysis to capture the depth and variation of political rhetoric across different regional contexts. This qualitative approach allows for a detailed examination of how beliefs, values, and moral visions are expressed through language (Hancock & Algozzine, 2016). The design also supports the interpretation of rhetorical patterns and their broader sociopolitical implications (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The comparative nature of this study draws on cross-cultural discourse theory (Scollon & Scollon, 2012), which posits that communication practices are shaped by cultural norms and power structures. By analyzing speeches from Southeast Asia and Southern Africa, the study identifies both linguistic parallels and ideological contrasts in how leaders construct legitimacy and national identity through English-language discourse.

The data for this research consist of four inaugural speeches delivered in English by national leaders from the Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, and Zambia. English was

chosen because it serves as a shared language of governance and diplomacy in all four nations and functions as a postcolonial lingua franca, enabling meaningful cross-regional comparison (Canagarajah, 2013.

The selection process followed several key criteria: (1) Language and Context—each speech had to be originally delivered in English and serve as the leader's first official address upon assuming office; (2) Recency—the speeches needed to be recent or from current heads of state to ensure contemporary relevance; (3) Authenticity—only speeches with verified transcripts or official recordings from government or reliable media sources were included; and (4) Completeness—speeches shorter than 15 minutes or incomplete versions were excluded to ensure sufficient textual material for analysis. The selected speeches are summarized below. The table retains its original structure and content from the study:

Table 1. Data Souce

Geographic Location	Leader	Country	Year	Duration	Source URL
Southeast Asean	Bongbong Marcos	Philippines	2022	25:29	*https://youtu.be/wyXg1OgFQbk?si=OKlgVCB_Aily4Dss*
	Lawrence Wong	Singapore	2024	15:14	*https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fc9VdEBtVlM&t=7s*
Southern Africa	Cyril Ramaphosa	South Africa	2018	15.33	*https://youtu.be/q11UYKrFy1Y?si=C9dl16vpG9w_fDo2*
	Hakainde Hichilema	Zambia	2021	19:51	*https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-6zHevhX-7w&t=557s*

These criteria were chosen to ensure that the dataset was both credible and balanced. The use of four speeches provided sufficient analytical depth while maintaining a manageable dataset for detailed qualitative interpretation (Campbell et al., 2021; Jones et al., 2024; Mackieson et al., 2019). Each speech was transcribed verbatim from official video recordings to ensure accuracy and preserve rhetorical nuances such as emphasis and pacing. The sentence was treated as the primary unit of analysis, following the T-unit principle, which defines a unit as an independent clause together with any dependent clauses (Csomay & Crawford, 2024; Laske, 2020; Mohd Don & Knowles, 2021; Perdana Prasetya et al., 2020). This approach made it possible to analyze the structure of each complete idea within the speech—for example: "We must work together to build an economy that serves our people."

Ambiguous phrases were clarified using standard English dictionaries and political glossaries when necessary. Each transcript was reviewed multiple times to ensure familiarity with tone, context, and rhetorical structure before coding. Both explicit linguistic elements (e.g., pronoun use, declarative statements) and implicit ideological meanings were examined according to the interpretive principles of discourse analysis (Wodak, 2009).

The study applied Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase model of thematic analysis to identify and interpret recurring patterns of meaning across the four speeches. This method was selected because it captures both surface-level (semantic) and underlying (latent) dimensions of discourse—crucial when studying ideology and leadership language.

The six steps included: (a) Familiarization—reading and re-reading each transcript to identify initial observations about tone and structure; (b) Initial Coding—highlighting relevant

words, sentences, and expressions to capture essential concepts; (c) Searching for Themes—grouping related codes into broader conceptual categories; (d) Reviewing Themes—refining themes to ensure internal coherence and distinctiveness; (e) Defining and Naming Themes—labeling each major theme to reflect its conceptual meaning; and (f) Producing the Report—organizing themes into a coherent interpretive narrative explaining how leaders construct ideology through language.

This process was iterative, with codes and themes continually revised to ensure accuracy and relevance. Reflexive notes were maintained throughout to track analytical decisions and minimize bias (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017). To ensure analytical reliability, a second trained researcher independently coded 20% of the data (approximately 110 T-units). The level of agreement between the two coders was measured using Cohen's Kappa (κ), yielding a coefficient of 0.851, which indicates near-perfect reliability (Landis & Koch, 1977).

Triangulation was also used to enhance validity through: (a) methodological triangulation—combining thematic coding with critical discourse interpretation; (b) data triangulation—conducting cross-regional comparison; and (c) theoretical triangulation—integrating interpretive and critical perspectives. Together, these measures strengthened the credibility and consistency of the analysis.

After identifying key themes, each was interpreted within its wider sociopolitical and cultural context. This interpretive step aligns with hermeneutic discourse analysis, which emphasizes understanding both what is said and why it is said in a particular way (Ricoeur, 1981; Wodak, 2009). By combining thematic and contextual interpretation, this study demonstrates how inaugural speeches function as communicative acts that establish legitimacy, define ideology, and reinforce collective identity. This integrative approach ensured that the findings were both conceptually rich and culturally grounded.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
Overview of Thematic Patterns

The analysis revealed that the inaugural speeches of Bongbong Marcos (Philippines, 2022), Lawrence Wong (Singapore, 2024), Cyril Ramaphosa (South Africa, 2018), and Hakainde Hichilema (Zambia, 2021) function as strategic rhetorical platforms for articulating national ideology and shared moral values. Each speech reflects the leader's national history, political philosophy, and developmental vision.

Across the four texts, twenty-one major themes emerged, with the most dominant focusing on visionary governance, moral legitimacy, unity, and renewal. Although similarities existed in tone and rhetorical purpose, clear ideological distinctions appeared between regions. Leaders from Southeast Asia tended to emphasize pragmatic development, social discipline, and institutional continuity, whereas those from Southern Africa focused on moral renewal, reconciliation, and participatory democracy. These findings illustrate broader regional contrasts between Asia's developmental pragmatism and Africa's liberation-based moral politics.

Table 2. Dominant Thematic Categories Identified in the Inaugural Speeches

No	Theme	Sub-Themes	Philippines (2022)	Singapore (2025)	South Africa (2018)	Zambia (2021)
1	Visionary Leadership and National Development	Addressing pressing domestic challenges	31	4	4	29
		Promoting social harmony	15	–	2	3
		Demonstrating administrative capability	10	14	1	2
		Advancing economic resilience	10	2	–	–
		Encouraging participatory governance	7	–	2	–
		Commitment to public service	4	9	3	5
		Inclusiveness in leadership	3	–	–	–
		Establishing effective governance teams	2	1	1	4
		Strengthening diplomatic relations	1	5	–	–
		Continuity of leadership vision	–	2	4	–
		National defense and sovereignty	–	–	–	–
		Mutual respect and solidarity	–	–	8	–
		Upholding constitutional principles	–	–	–	–
		Engaging stakeholders	–	–	1	–
		Reconciliation and forgiveness	–	–	–	4
		Civic celebrations and traditions	–	–	–	–
		Leader's reflection on key issues	–	2	–	–
		Empathy and compassion	–	–	–	–
		Defending democratic values	–	–	–	–
		Subtotal	83	39	26	47
2	National Challenges and Policy Response	Environmental sustainability	7	–	–	–
		Economic recovery and stability	7	2	–	–

No	Theme	Sub-Themes	Philippines (2022)	Singapore (2025)	South Africa (2018)	Zambia (2021)
		Health crisis management	3	2	–	–
		Addressing citizens' welfare	3	–	–	–
		Peace and security concerns	1	–	–	–
		Promoting multicultural coexistence	–	–	–	–
		Policy reform and problem-solving	–	3	1	–
		Poverty alleviation	–	–	–	–
		Political cooperation and negotiation	–	–	2	–
		Anti-corruption efforts	–	–	1	–
		Inclusive education advocacy	–	–	–	–
		Managing ideological divisions	–	–	–	–
		Promoting unity in diversity	–	–	–	–
		Combating racial discrimination	–	–	–	–
		Subtotal	21	7	4	3
3	Personal Leadership Journey	Shared experiences and interactions	9	–	11	–
		Campaign efforts and achievements	6	–	–	–
		Engagement with predecessors and citizens	1	–	–	–
		Work ethic and dedication	1	–	–	–
		Subtotal	17	–	11	–
4	Reflection on Collective Actions	Contributions of former leaders	5	–	–	–
		Civic participation and public support	5	–	–	21
		Contributions of healthcare workers	2	–	–	–
		Governmental initiatives	1	–	–	1
		Opposition and media engagement	–	–	–	5
		Subtotal	13	–	–	27
5		Pandemic recovery	6	–	–	–

No	Theme	Sub-Themes	Philippines (2022)	Singapore (2025)	South Africa (2018)	Zambia (2021)
	Historical and Societal Lessons	Economic restructuring	3	2	–	–
		Democratic progress	3	1	–	–
		Labor issues	1	–	–	–
		Subtotal	13	3	–	–
6	Acknowledgment and Gratitude	Appreciation toward citizens	–	–	9	9
		Tribute to past leaders	–	8	–	2
		Recognition of government officials	–	–	1	–
		Gratitude to collaborators	–	–	3	2
		Subtotal	–	8	16	16
7	Global Engagement and International Relations	Addressing global economic challenges	–	4	–	–
		Energy and sustainability issues	–	2	–	–
		Subtotal	–	6	–	–
8	Political Transition and Renewal	Readiness to assume office	–	–	–	13
		Personal motivation and legitimacy	–	–	3	3
		Humility in leadership	–	–	2	–
		Dedication to service	–	–	–	2
		Subtotal	–	–	5	18
9	Citizenship and Civic Aspirations	Empowered and participative citizens	–	3	–	15
		Youth involvement and potential	–	1	–	1
		Optimism and open-mindedness	–	2	–	–
		Intergenerational hope	–	2	–	–
		Subtotal	–	8	–	18
10	Social Cohesion and Harmony	Collaboration and inclusivity	–	12	–	–
		Mutual respect and unity	–	5	–	–
		Subtotal	–	17	–	–
11	Miscellaneous and Contextual Themes	–	70	17	12	34
Total		217	102	74	160	

Dominant Theme: Forward-Looking Strategy

The most prominent cross-regional theme was Forward-Looking Strategy. This theme captures how each leader projected a vision of optimism, unity, and continuity at the start of their administration. Van Dijk's (2021) concept of ideological futurity is useful here—it refers to how political actors position the future as a shared moral project that validates their leadership.

In the Philippines, Bongbong Marcos frames his message around national discipline, productivity, and civic duty. His rhetoric presents progress not only as a policy goal but also as a moral commitment to collective resilience (Reyes & Sarmiento, 2022; Tadem, 2023). Lawrence Wong (2024), on the other hand, draws on Singapore's tradition of technocratic governance, reaffirming the importance of meritocracy, multiracial harmony, and economic stability. His reference to "keeping the flame of multiracialism burning bright" encapsulates Singapore's pragmatic vision of unity in diversity (Kilfoyle, 2023).

In Zambia, Hakainde Hichilema's speech projects national renewal through participatory democracy, portraying his leadership as a reflection of the people's will. He expresses humility and shared purpose—an approach often described as participatory populism (Chanda, 2023). Cyril Ramaphosa (2018) in South Africa takes a similar direction but grounds his vision in moral continuity. By invoking Nelson Mandela's legacy, he connects past struggles with future aspirations, framing democratic renewal as both a moral and civic responsibility (Mbiti, 2019; Mandela Foundation, 2023).

Across all speeches, forward-looking discourse operates as a unifying device that legitimizes authority by linking leadership to hope and national progress. This rhetorical approach aligns with global traditions of inaugural oratory that blend optimism with moral obligation (Charteris-Black, 2021).

National Issues and Policy Priorities

The second major theme, National Issues and Policy Priorities, focuses on how leaders connect ideological ideals to concrete governance agendas. While these agendas differ by region, all leaders employ moral framing to justify policy direction.

Bongbong Marcos emphasizes government efficiency, agricultural modernization, and social recovery. His tone is pragmatic and managerial, aligning with the developmental-state orientation of the Philippines (Tadem, 2023). Lawrence Wong follows a similar logic, advocating sustainability and innovation as moral imperatives, with climate resilience framed as a shared national responsibility (Ng, 2024).

Cyril Ramaphosa and Hakainde Hichilema, in contrast, foreground moral renewal in addressing corruption, inequality, and public accountability. Ramaphosa's calls for "ethical leadership" position reform as a moral act rather than a purely administrative goal. Hichilema similarly uses moral discourse to frame political reform as the restoration of trust and collective dignity (Mhlambi, 2023).

These regional differences highlight two distinct ideological frameworks: Southeast Asian speeches tend to adopt a rational-technical framing, while Southern African inaugurals favor a moral-ethical framing. Despite these contrasts, both rhetorical styles promote national cohesion through shared responsibility.

Leadership Legitimacy and Collective Legacy

The theme of Leadership Legitimacy and Collective Legacy illustrates how leaders justify their authority by drawing on moral, historical, or institutional continuity. Bongbong Marcos situates his leadership within a narrative of service and national restoration, using humility to counter the controversies associated with his family's political legacy (Burke, 1969). Lawrence Wong establishes legitimacy through the continuity of Singapore's political institutions, emphasizing the People's Action Party's record of stability and competence (Khoo, 2023).

Cyril Ramaphosa and Hakainde Hichilema, meanwhile, derive legitimacy from collective moral histories. Ramaphosa links his presidency to the unfinished work of Mandela's democratic vision, while Hichilema presents his leadership as a moral triumph of unity and perseverance over hardship (Mwamba & Chileshe, 2023). This comparison shows that legitimacy is context-dependent: in Southeast Asia, authority is rooted in institutional credibility and technocratic performance, whereas in Southern Africa, it emerges from moral leadership and historical continuity. Both approaches reveal that legitimacy is constructed through moral persuasion as much as through political authority.

Historical Memory and National Resilience

Another key theme, Historical Memory and National Resilience, demonstrates how leaders use collective memory to legitimize their governance and inspire unity. Bongbong Marcos and Lawrence Wong interpret history as a continuum of adaptation and progress, transforming the past into a source of pride and motivation for future development (Hall, 1996). Cyril Ramaphosa and Hakainde Hichilema, however, treat history as a moral touchstone, recalling liberation struggles and invoking Ubuntu—the philosophy of shared humanity—to remind citizens of their collective strength and civic duty (Mbiti, 2019).

Despite these differences, all leaders use history as a moral compass. By invoking the past, they not only honor national identity but also create continuity between past sacrifice and future progress. This rhetorical strategy reinforces both legitimacy and resilience by situating leadership within the ongoing story of national transformation.

Comparative Discussion: Ideological Construction and Value Systems

The comparative analysis reveals clear regional contrasts in ideological orientation, yet also notable overlaps in purpose and tone. All four leaders rely on rhetoric that emphasizes unity, renewal, and moral vision. However, their approaches diverge in how they define progress and legitimacy

Table 3. Dimension

Dimension	Southeast Asia (Philippines and Singapore)	Southern Africa (South Africa and Zambia
Dominant Ideology	Developmental pragmatism and technocratic governance	Moral renewal and participatory democracy
Core Values	Efficiency, modernization, stability, and harmony	Justice, equality, reconciliation, and solidarity
Legitimacy Source	Institutional performance and continuity	Moral authority and historical inheritance
Citizenship Model	Collaborator and beneficiary of progress	Co-creator and moral agent of transformation
Linguistic Tone	Rational, managerial, and forward-looking	Ethical, emotional, and historically grounded

Southeast Asian discourse leans toward institutional rationality and progress-oriented rhetoric, while Southern African discourse draws heavily on moral conviction and collective renewal. Both, however, reflect leadership styles rooted in historical experience and moral vision. Together, these findings show that inaugural speeches are powerful ideological acts that both reflect and shape the sociopolitical realities of their nations. They blend moral and pragmatic dimensions of leadership to create narratives that define what it means to lead, belong, and move forward as a nation.

CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis demonstrates that inaugural speeches are not merely ceremonial traditions but strategic communicative acts that construct and convey national ideology. Through rhetoric, leaders define moral direction, reaffirm collective values, and establish the legitimacy of their authority. The four speeches delivered by Bongbong Marcos (Philippines), Lawrence Wong (Singapore), Cyril Ramaphosa (South Africa), and Hakainde Hichilema (Zambia) reveal how leaders use language to connect their personal vision with national identity. Despite differences in tone and focus, each address functions as a moral and ideological performance that translates political agendas into shared national purpose.

A common pattern emerges across both regions: leaders employ forward-looking rhetoric centered on unity, progress, and renewal. Yet the ways these ideas are expressed vary. In Southeast Asia, leadership discourse emphasizes pragmatic governance and institutional efficiency, reflecting confidence in technocratic development and social discipline. In Southern Africa, the focus lies on moral renewal, historical continuity, and participatory democracy, echoing the region's liberation histories and ongoing struggles for equality. In all cases, inaugural speeches operate as linguistic blueprints for nation-building. They reaffirm collective identity, articulate the moral obligations of leadership, and reimagine the nation's role within a broader global context. The findings confirm that political rhetoric is both culturally situated and universally strategic—used to inspire hope, frame legitimacy, and align moral ideals with national goals.

REFERENCES

Aremu, M. (2017). Pragmatic analysis of conceptual mappings in inaugural speeches of Nigerian presidents. *Covenant Journal of Language Studies*, *5*(2).

Altikriti, S. (2016). Persuasive speech acts in Barack Obama's inaugural speeches (2009, 2013) and the last State of the Union Address (2016). *International Journal of Linguistics*, *8*(2), 47–66. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v8i2.9274

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

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. University of California Press.

Campbell, K. A., Orr, E., Durepos, P., Nguyen, L., Li, L., Whitmore, C., Gehrke, P., Graham, L., & Jack, S. M. (2021). Reflexive thematic analysis for applied qualitative health research. *The Qualitative Report*, *26*(6). https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.5010

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Chanda, C. (2023). Moral leadership and democratic renewal in Zambia. *Journal of African Political Studies*, *18*(2), 112–129.

Charteris-Black, J. (2021). *Metaphors of leadership: A comparative study of political rhetoric*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Cross-cultural perspectives on postcolonial governance. (2025). Asian Political Studies Institute.

Csomay, E., & Crawford, W. J. (2024). Linguistics, corpus linguistics, and language variation. In *Doing corpus linguistics*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003363309-2

David, W., David, W. T., & Miracle, O. (2014). A pragmatic analysis of victory and inaugural speeches of President Jonathan: A measure for transformation and good governance in Nigeria. *Innovare Journal of Social Sciences*, *1*(2).

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.

Gambarawa, J. A., & Idris, S. (2024). Determinants of entrepreneurial intentions among undergraduate students of Umaru Musa Yar'adua University, Katsina. *UMYU Journal of Accounting and Finance Research*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.61143/umyu-jafr.6(1)2024.008

Hall, S. (1996). *Questions of cultural identity*. Sage.

Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2016). *Doing case study research* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Hichilema, H. (2021). *Inaugural address*. Government of Zambia.

Jones, C. P., Lawlor, E. R., Forde, H., Van Tulleken, D. R. Z., Cummins, S., Adams, J., Smith, R., Rayner, M., Rutter, H., Penney, T. L., Alliot, O., Armitage, S., & White, M. (2024). Parliamentary reaction to the announcement and implementation of the UK Soft Drinks Industry Levy: Applied thematic analysis of 2016–2020 parliamentary debates. *Public Health Nutrition*, *27*(1). https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980024000247

Khoo, L. (2023). Multiracialism and leadership communication in Singapore. *Asian Journal of Political Communication*, *7*(1), 44–60.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, *33*(1), 159–174.

Laske, C. I. B. (2020). Language, functional linguistics and corpus linguistics. In *Law, language and change*. Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004436169_004

Mackieson, P., Shlonsky, A., & Connolly, M. (2019). Increasing rigor and reducing bias in qualitative research: A document analysis of parliamentary debates using applied thematic analysis. *Qualitative Social Work*, *18*(6). https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325018786996

Mandela Foundation. (2023). *Reflections on democratic renewal in South Africa*. Nelson Mandela Foundation.

Maharazu, N., & Lawal, M. T. (2020). Extent of utilization of databases among undergraduate students of Umaru Musa Yar'adua University, Katsina. *International Journal of Research in Library Science*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.26761/ijrls.6.1.2020.1309

Mbiti, J. (2019). Ubuntu and the moral foundations of African leadership. *African Ethics Review*, *14*(3), 201–218.

Mhlambi, L. (2023). Restoring public trust through moral governance. *South African Journal of Governance Studies*, *9*(1), 55–72.

Mohd Don, Z., & Knowles, G. (2021). Language and disciplinary concepts in corpus linguistics: Investigating corpus data. *LSP International Journal*, *8*(2). https://doi.org/10.11113/lspi.v8.17972

Mukhuba, M. (2022). African political discourse in the 21st century. *Journal of Southern African Linguistics*, *15*(2), 88–104.

Mwamba, T., & Chileshe, P. (2023). Civic unity and leadership language in Zambia. *Zambian Journal of Communication Studies*, *6*(1), 33–48.

Ng, S. (2024). Sustainability rhetoric in Singaporean political speeches. *Journal of Asian Environmental Politics*, *4*(1), 15–30.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Perdana Prasetya, E., Dewi Ekawati, A., Sapta Nugraha, D., Marzuq, A., & Saputri Darlis, T. (2020). Corpus linguistics, language corpora and language teaching. *English Journal*, *14*(2). https://doi.org/10.32832/english.v14i2.3845

Ramaphosa, C. (2018). *Inaugural address*. Government of South Africa.

Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences*. Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2012). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Tadem, T. (2023). Philippine technocracy as political ideology. *Journal of Southeast Asian Governance*, *10*(1), 1–22.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as structure and process*. Sage.

Vassileva, M. (2021). A political communication model of the inaugural address speech of President-elect Joseph R. Biden. *Rhetoric and Communications*, *48*, 51–63.

Yar'adua, U. M. (2019). *Yar'adua, Umaru Musa (Nigeria)*. In *The Statesman's Yearbook Companion: The Leaders, Events and Cities of the World*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95839-9_840