

STRATEGIC SPEECH: A FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF CORPORATE STRATEGY DISCOURSE

Indrawaty Asfah¹, Lely Novia^{2*}, Nurwahida³

^{1,2}English Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

³Department of Economics, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: lelynovia@unm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This paper explores how linguistic choices in corporate strategy discourse reflect strategic goals—informing, persuading, and engaging—through the lens of Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics and Jakobson’s Communication Model. Using data from the video “The Great Debate on Corporate Strategy”, the study analyzes how expert speakers deploy ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions (Halliday) alongside referential, conative, emotive, and poetic functions (Jakobson). The findings reveal that corporate discourse is multifunctional, blending technical precision, rhetorical appeal, and stylistic engagement to achieve communicative impact. The paper concludes that integrating both linguistic frameworks offers a comprehensive understanding of strategic speech in professional contexts.

Key Words : System Functional Linguistics, Corporate Strategy Discourse, Multimodal Communication

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary cultivation of business-oriented English, as embodied by Judijanto et al. (2025) and Kurnia et al. (2025), reflects a deliberate alignment of linguistic competence with communicative effectiveness in professional settings, a position resonant with Hasan’s social semiotic stylistics and the functional emphases of Halliday’s metafunctions and Jakobson’s functional spectrum. In corporate communication, language is a strategic asset: speakers use linguistic choices not only to convey information but also to persuade stakeholders and engage audiences. This paper investigates how these choices reflect strategic goals by applying Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics and Jakobson’s Communication Model to expert discourse in the video “The Great Debate on Corporate Strategy.” The study aims to answer three questions: (1) How are Halliday’s ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions manifested in the video? (2) Which Jakobson functions dominate in expert discourse, and how do they interact with Halliday’s metafunctions? (3) What linguistic strategies are used to inform, persuade, and engage the audience?

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The study uses qualitative discourse analysis of selected segments from *“The Great Debate on Corporate Strategy.”* Utterances were coded according to Halliday’s and Jakobson’s functions. The analysis focused on expert segments, moderator transitions, and rhetorical highlights. The goal was to identify patterns in how speakers use language to inform, persuade, and engage, and to explore the interplay between linguistic form and communicative function.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This section presents a detailed analysis of the linguistic functions observed in the video *“The Great Debate on Corporate Strategy”*, using Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics and Jakobson’s Functions of Language as analytical frameworks. The video features a panel of experts discussing various aspects of corporate strategy, including sales enablement, talent management, forecasting, and strategic alignment.

Table 1. Segment Based Functional Analysis

Segment	Dominant Halliday Function	Dominant Jakobson Function	Why it dominates
00:00 – 02:00 Moderator Introduction	Textual	Phatic	Opens the communication channel, sets structure, and welcomes the audience
02:01 – 05:30 Expert 1: Sales Enablement	Ideational	Referential	Focuses on explaining what sales enablement is and how it supports performance.
05:31–07:45 Expert 2: Talent Strategy	Interpersonal	Emotive	Expresses concern and passion for people-centric leadership and culture
07:46–10:00 Expert 3: Forecasting & Metrics	Ideational + Textual	Referential + Metalingual	Explains data models and clarifies technical terms like “pipeline health.”
10:01–12:30 Expert 4: Social Selling	Interpersonal	Conative + Poetic	Persuades audience to adopt digital strategies using metaphors and direct appeals
12:31–15:00	Ideational +	Referential	Explains alignment

Expert Strategic Alignment 5:	Textual	+Metalingual	frameworks and defines key terms for clarity
15:01–17:00 Panel Discussion	Interpersonal	Emotive + Phatic	Panelists engage in dialogue, express opinions, and maintain conversational flow.
17:01–End Moderator Wrap-up	Textual + Interpersonal	Conative + Phatic	Summarizes discussion, thanks participants, and encourages audience reflection.

Through their discourse, the speakers employ a range of linguistic strategies that reflect their communicative goals—namely, to inform, persuade, and engage their audience. These strategies are examined below in relation to Halliday’s three metafunctions and Jakobson’s six language functions.

Halliday’s Metafunctions in the Video Ideational Function

The ideational metafunction, as defined by Halliday, is concerned with representing experience and knowledge. It allows speakers to describe processes, participants, and circumstances in the world around them. In the context of the video, this function is prominently displayed in the way experts convey business knowledge through declarative statements and technical vocabulary. For instance, one speaker explains, “Sales enablement is about equipping reps with the right tools, content, and training.” This clause presents a clear process (“equipping”) and identifies the participants involved (“reps,” “tools,” “content”), which is characteristic of ideational structure.

Throughout the video, ideational meaning is constructed using specialized terminology such as “pipeline health,” “forecasting accuracy,” and “strategic alignment.” These terms are not only domain-specific but also serve to encode complex organizational processes in concise linguistic forms. The use of such terminology reflects the speaker’s expertise and contributes to the transmission of knowledge within the professional community. Moreover, ideational clauses often follow a logical structure, presenting cause-effect relationships, problem-solution frameworks, and comparative analyses. For example, a speaker might state, “When teams aren’t aligned, execution suffers,” thereby establishing a causal link between organizational alignment and performance outcomes.

The ideational function is essential in corporate discourse because it enables the speaker to construct a coherent representation of business reality. It supports the strategic goal of informing the audience by providing them with accurate, relevant, and actionable insights. As Halliday (1978)

notes, ideational meaning is the foundation upon which other functions are built, making it a critical component of professional communication.

Interpersonal Function

The interpersonal metafunction deals with the enactment of social roles and relationships. It reflects the speaker's attitude, judgment, and engagement with the audience. In the video, this function is evident in the way speakers assert opinions, express emotions, and interact with one another. For example, one panelist declares, "I'm deeply passionate about building cultures where people feel valued." This statement conveys a strong personal stance and invites the audience to align with the speaker's values.

Interpersonal meaning is also constructed with modality, evaluative language, and pronoun choice. Modal verbs such as "must," "should," and "need to" are frequently used to express obligation and recommendation. For instance, "You need to rethink your sales strategy" is a directive that positions the speaker as an authority and seeks to influence the listener's behavior. Evaluative adjectives such as "effective," "frustrating," and "transformative" further reveal the speaker's judgment and emotional investment in the topic.

The interpersonal function is particularly salient during moments of debate and disagreement. Panelists often negotiate viewpoints, challenge assumptions, and build rapport through conversational strategies. For example, a speaker might say, "I see your point, but I'd argue that enablement without alignment is ineffective," thereby acknowledging the other's perspective while asserting their own. These interactions reflect the dynamic nature of interpersonal meaning and its role in shaping professional relationships.

In corporate strategy discourse, interpersonal function supports the goal of persuasion. By expressing attitudes, asserting authority, and engaging the audience, speakers seek to influence beliefs and decisions. As Eggins (2004) observes, interpersonal meaning is central to the negotiation of power and solidarity in professional settings.

Textual Function

The textual metafunction organizes language into coherent and contextually relevant discourse. It ensures that messages are structured in a way that makes sense to the listener, using thematic progression, cohesion, and discourse markers. In the video, this function is manifested through transitions such as "Let's move on to the next segment," "To sum up," and "As we discussed earlier." These markers guide the audience through the discussion and help maintain coherence.

Textual meaning is also constructed through reference, repetition, and ellipsis. Speakers often refer back to previous points, repeat key terms for emphasis, and omit redundant information to streamline communication. For

example, a panelist might say, “This tie back to what [another speaker] mentioned about alignment,” thereby creating continuity and reinforcing thematic connections.

The use of visual aids, segment titles, and timestamps further enhances textual organization. These elements support the spoken discourse by providing visual cues and structuring the flow of information. In this way, the textual function extends beyond language to include multimodal resources that contribute to coherence and engagement.

In corporate communication, the textual function supports the strategic goal of engagement. By organizing discourse effectively, speakers ensure that their message is accessible, memorable, and impactful. As Martin and Rose (2003) argue, textual meaning is essential for managing the complexity of professional discourse and facilitating audience comprehension.

Dominant Jakobson Functions

Referential Function

The referential function is oriented toward the context and conveys factual content. It is the default mode of communication in informative discourse and is dominant in the expert segments of the video. For example, a speaker states, “Forecasting accuracy improves when you integrate pipeline health with historical data.” This utterance delivers objective information and reflects the speaker’s analytical approach.

Referential statements often include definitions, explanations, and data-driven insights. They are characterized by declarative syntax, technical vocabulary, and logical sequencing. In corporate strategy discourse, the referential function supports the goal of informing by providing the audience with reliable and relevant knowledge.

This function aligns closely with Halliday’s ideational metafunction, as both focus on representing experience and knowledge. Together, they form the backbone of expert communication, enabling speakers to establish credibility and convey expertise.

Conative Function

The conative function is directed toward the receiver and aims to influence behavior. It includes commands, requests, and persuasive appeals. In the video, this function is evident in statements such as “You need to rethink your sales strategy” and “Challenge your team to adopt a more agile approach.” These utterances seek to prompt reflection and action.

Conative language often uses second-person pronouns, imperative verbs, and conditional structures. It creates a sense of urgency and positions the speaker as a guide or mentor. In corporate discourse, the conative function supports the goal of persuasion by encouraging the audience to adopt new perspectives or practices.

This function corresponds to Halliday's interpersonal metafunction, as both involve engaging the audience and asserting authority. The conative function adds a directive dimension to interpersonal meaning, making it a powerful tool for strategic communication.

Emotive Function

The emotive function expresses the speaker's attitude, emotion, or personal stance. It is evident in exclamations, intensifiers, and affective language. In the video, a speaker remarks, "It frustrates me when strategy is just a buzzword with no execution behind it," revealing emotional investment and inviting empathy.

Emotive expressions humanize the speaker and foster connection with the audience. They often include first-person pronouns, evaluative adjectives, and expressive intonation. In corporate discourse, the emotive function supports the goal of persuasion by enhancing authenticity and credibility.

This function aligns with Halliday's interpersonal metafunction, as both involve the speaker's relationship with the audience. Emotive language adds depth to interpersonal meaning, making it more relatable and impactful.

Poetic Function

The poetic function focuses on the aesthetic and rhetorical qualities of language. It is most prominent in literary texts but also appears in professional discourse through metaphor, parallelism, and stylistic framing. In the video, a speaker states, "Strategy isn't a map—it's the compass that guides every decision," using metaphor to frame strategic thinking in vivid terms.

Poetic language enhances engagement by making abstract ideas more relatable and memorable. It often includes figurative expressions, rhythmic patterns, and stylistic contrasts. In corporate discourse, the poetic function supports the goal of engagement by capturing attention and reinforcing key messages.

This function complements Halliday's textual metafunction by contributing to thematic cohesion and stylistic appeal. Together, they create a discourse that is not only informative and persuasive but also engaging and memorable.

Linguistic Strategies and Strategic Goals

In corporate communication, particularly in high-stakes environments such as strategic debates, language is not merely a tool for transmitting information, it is a strategic resource. The way speakers use language reflects their underlying communicative goals, which typically include informing stakeholders, persuading decision-makers, and engaging audiences. These goals are not pursued in isolation; rather, they are interwoven through multifunctional discourse that blends ideational,

interpersonal, and textual elements, as described by Halliday (1978), and aligns with Jakobson's (1960) six functions of language. This section explores the linguistic strategies employed to achieve these goals, drawing on examples from *"The Great Debate on Corporate Strategy"* and supported by relevant linguistic scholarship.

Informing: Establishing Authority and Clarity

The strategic goal of informing is foundational to corporate discourse. It involves the clear and accurate transmission of knowledge, often in the form of definitions, explanations, data, and procedural descriptions. To achieve this, speakers rely on a set of linguistic strategies that align with Halliday's ideational metafunction and Jakobson's referential and metalingual functions.

One of the most prominent strategies used to inform is the deployment of technical language. Experts in the video frequently use domain-specific terminology such as "sales enablement," "pipeline health," "forecasting accuracy," and "strategic alignment." These terms serve not only to convey precise meanings but also to establish the speaker's credibility and authority. As Koller (2008) notes, the use of specialized vocabulary in business discourse signals expertise and positions the speaker as a knowledgeable insider. For instance, when a panelist states, "Sales enablement is about equipping reps with the right tools, content, and training," the clause encodes a process ("equipping") and participants ("reps," "tools," "content"), thereby constructing a coherent representation of organizational practice.

In addition to technical language, speakers use data and evidence to support their claims. This includes citing statistics, referencing case studies, and drawing on historical trends. For example, a speaker might assert, "Forecasting accuracy improves when you integrate pipeline health with historical data," thereby grounding their argument in empirical observation. This strategy aligns with Jakobson's referential function, which is concerned with conveying factual content. It also reflects the logical structure of ideational meaning, where cause-effect relationships and problem-solution frameworks are commonly employed.

Clarification is another key strategy for informing. Speakers often define terms, paraphrase complex ideas, or check for understanding to ensure that their message is accessible to a diverse audience. This metalingual function is particularly important in interdisciplinary or cross-functional settings, where participants may have varying levels of familiarity with the subject matter. For instance, a speaker might say, "When I say 'predictive analytics,' I mean using data trends to anticipate future sales." This not only clarifies the term but also reinforces the speaker's commitment to transparency and shared understanding.

Together, these strategies—technical language, data-driven reasoning, and clarification—form the backbone of informative discourse in corporate settings. They enable speakers to construct a credible, coherent, and

authoritative message that resonates with stakeholders and supports strategic decision-making.

Persuading: Influencing Beliefs and Behavior

While informing is essential, it is often insufficient on its own. In strategic communication, speakers must also persuade their audience—whether to adopt a new initiative, change a behavior, or support a particular course of action. Persuasion involves more than presenting facts; it requires the speaker to engage the audience emotionally, ethically, and logically. This is achieved through linguistic strategies that align with Halliday’s interpersonal metafunction and Jakobson’s conative and emotive functions.

One of the most direct strategies for persuasion is the use of imperatives. These are grammatical structures that issue commands or requests, often using second-person pronouns and modal verbs. In the video, a speaker urges, “You need to rethink your sales strategy,” a statement that combines directive force with evaluative judgment. The imperative form positions the speaker as an authority figure and seeks to influence the listener’s behavior. According to Fuertes-Olivera et al. (2001), such directive speech acts are common in business communication, where leaders must often prompt action and drive change.

Emotive tone is another persuasive strategy that enhances the speaker’s credibility and fosters trust. By expressing genuine feelings—such as passion, frustration, or optimism—speakers humanize themselves and create emotional resonance with the audience. For example, a panelist might say, “I’m deeply passionate about building cultures where people feel valued,” thereby aligning their personal values with organizational goals. This strategy corresponds to Jakobson’s emotive function and supports Halliday’s interpersonal metafunction by reinforcing the speaker’s stance and relational positioning.

Framing is a more subtle but equally powerful persuasive strategy. It involves presenting information in a way that highlights certain aspects while downplaying others, thereby shaping the audience’s perception. For instance, a speaker might frame a choice as binary—“If you’re not investing in social selling, you’re already behind your competitors”—to create a sense of urgency and contrast. This rhetorical move leverages both logical appeal (logos) and emotional appeal (pathos), encouraging the audience to act in alignment with the speaker’s message. As Fairclough (2003) notes, framing is a key mechanism through which discourse exerts ideological influence and constructs social reality.

These persuasive strategies—imperatives, emotive tone, and framing—work together to influence beliefs and behaviors. They transform the speaker from a neutral informant into an active agent of change, capable of mobilizing support and driving strategic outcomes.

Engaging: Sustaining Attention and Connection

Engagement is the third strategic goal of corporate discourse, and it is perhaps the most complex. While informing and persuading are primarily concerned with content and intent, engagement focuses on the interactional and aesthetic dimensions of communication. It involves capturing the audience's attention, maintaining their interest, and fostering a sense of connection. This is achieved through strategies that align with Halliday's textual metafunction and Jakobson's poetic and phatic functions.

One of the most effective engagement strategies is the use of metaphor. Metaphors allow speakers to frame abstract or technical concepts in relatable terms, thereby enhancing comprehension and emotional resonance. In the video, a speaker states, "Strategy isn't a map—it's the compass that guides every decision." This metaphor not only clarifies the function of strategy but also evokes imagery that is memorable and emotionally charged. According to Charteris-Black (2011), metaphors in professional discourse serve both cognitive and persuasive functions, helping audiences make sense of complexity while reinforcing key messages.

Discourse structuring is another critical strategy for engagement. This includes the use of transitions, summaries, and signposting to guide the audience through the discussion. Phrases such as "Let's move on to the next segment," "To sum up," and "As we discussed earlier" help organize the flow of information and maintain coherence. These textual markers align with Halliday's textual metafunction and support Jakobson's phatic function by signaling the speaker's ongoing presence and attentiveness to the communicative channel.

Phatic cues also play a vital role in maintaining interaction. These include greetings, acknowledgments, and conversational prompts that foster a sense of community and collaboration. For example, the moderator might open the session with, "Welcome everyone, glad you could join us today," or a panelist might interject with, "Can I jump in here for a second?" Such expressions do not convey new information but serve to manage the social dynamics of the conversation. As Jakobson (1960) explains, the phatic function is essential for establishing and sustaining communicative contact, especially in dialogic or multi-speaker settings.

These engagement strategies—metaphor, discourse structuring, and phatic cues—enhance the accessibility, coherence, and relational quality of corporate discourse. They ensure that the message is not only heard but also felt, remembered, and acted upon.

Multifunctionality and Strategic Integration

What emerges from this analysis is that corporate discourse is inherently multifunctional. Speakers do not use linguistic strategies in isolation; rather, they blend them to achieve multiple goals simultaneously. An utterance may inform by presenting data, persuade by asserting a judgment, and engage by

using metaphor—all within a single sentence. For example, the statement “Take these insights and challenge your team to rethink how strategy drives outcomes” informs (by referencing “insights”), persuades (through the imperative “challenge”), and engages (by directly addressing the audience and invoking strategic reflection).

This multifunctionality reflects the complexity of professional communication, where speakers must navigate diverse audiences, competing priorities, and dynamic contexts. It also underscores the value of integrating Halliday’s and Jakobson’s frameworks. While Halliday helps us understand how meaning is constructed through ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions, Jakobson reveals what the speaker intends to do—whether to inform, express, direct, maintain contact, clarify, or stylize. Together, these models provide a comprehensive lens for analyzing the strategic use of language in corporate settings.

Moreover, this integrated approach aligns with contemporary views of discourse as polyphonic and multimodal. As Palmieri and Mazzali-Lurati (2021) argue, corporate communication involves multiple voices, perspectives, and semiotic resources. Functional linguistics offers the tools to navigate this complexity and uncover the strategic choices that shape professional discourse.

Discussion

The analysis reveals that expert discourse in corporate strategy is richly layered. Informative segments rely on ideational and referential functions to convey expertise. Persuasive moments use interpersonal and conative functions to influence behavior. Engagement is achieved through textual cohesion, poetic metaphor, and phatic interaction.

Multifunctionality in Strategic Discourse

One of the most striking findings is the simultaneous activation of multiple language functions within single utterances. Informative segments rely heavily on Halliday’s ideational metafunction and Jakobson’s referential function. These functions are used to present factual content, define business concepts, and explain strategic frameworks. For example, when a speaker states, “Sales enablement is about equipping reps with the right tools, content, and training,” the clause encodes a process (“equipping”) and participants (“reps,” “tools,” “content”), constructing a representation of organizational practice. This utterance also fulfills the referential function by delivering objective information that contributes to the audience’s understanding of the topic.

Persuasive moments, on the other hand, are characterized by the use of Halliday’s interpersonal metafunction and Jakobson’s conative and emotive functions. These functions allow speakers to assert authority, express personal stance, and influence audience behavior. For instance, the directive

“You need to rethink your sales strategy” uses imperative structure and second-person address to prompt action. Similarly, the statement “I’m deeply passionate about building cultures where people feel valued” conveys emotional investment and invites alignment with the speaker’s values. These utterances demonstrate how interpersonal and conative functions work together to shape audience perception and encourage behavioral change.

Engagement is achieved through Halliday’s textual metafunction and Jakobson’s poetic and phatic functions. These functions help organize discourse, maintain interaction, and enhance stylistic appeal. Transitions such as “Let’s move on to the next segment” and “To sum up” guide the audience through the discussion, while metaphors like “Strategy isn’t a map—it’s the compass that guides every decision” stylize the message and make abstract concepts more relatable. Phatic expressions such as “Welcome everyone, glad you could join us today” and “Can I jump in here for a second?” maintain the communicative channel and foster a sense of collaboration among speakers and listeners.

This multifunctionality reflects the complexity of corporate strategy discourse, where speakers must balance the need to inform, persuade, and engage. It also highlights the adaptability of language in professional settings, where communicative goals shift rapidly depending on context, audience, and purpose.

Polyphony and Strategic Voice

The findings support Palmieri and Mazzali-Lurati’s (2021) view that corporate discourse is polyphonic, meaning it involves multiple voices, perspectives, and communicative goals. In the video, each panelist brings a distinct viewpoint—whether focused on sales enablement, talent strategy, forecasting, or alignment—yet all contribute to a shared strategic narrative. This polyphony is managed through linguistic strategies that allow speakers to assert their individual voice while aligning with the collective purpose of the discussion.

Polyphony also manifests in the negotiation of viewpoints. Panelists frequently acknowledge each other’s contributions, build on shared ideas, and respectfully challenge opposing perspectives. For example, a speaker might say, “I see your point, but I’d argue that enablement without alignment is ineffective,” thereby engaging in dialogic interaction that reflects both agreement and dissent. This kind of discourse requires careful management of interpersonal meaning, as speakers must navigate power dynamics, maintain professionalism, and foster collaboration.

The polyphonic nature of corporate discourse underscores the importance of strategic voice—the ability to articulate one’s position clearly while remaining responsive to others. Linguistic choices play a crucial role in shaping this voice, from the use of inclusive pronouns (“we,” “our”) to the deployment of evaluative language (“effective,” “transformative”) that signals

alignment or divergence. As Fairclough (2003) argues, strategic voice is not merely a matter of content but of discourse positioning, where speakers construct their identity and authority through language.

Halliday and Jakobson: Complementary Frameworks

The dual-framework analysis demonstrates that Halliday's and Jakobson's models offer complementary insights into corporate communication. Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics excels at describing how meaning is built through grammatical and semantic structures. His metafunctions—ideational, interpersonal, and textual—provide a comprehensive account of how language represents experience, enacts social roles, and organizes discourse.

Jakobson's Functions of Language, meanwhile, clarify what the speaker intends to do with language. His model focuses on communicative intent and message structure, identifying functions such as referential (informing), emotive (expressing), conative (directing), phatic (interacting), metalingual (clarifying), and poetic (stylizing). These functions illuminate the strategic goals behind linguistic choices and help explain why certain forms are used in specific contexts.

Together, these frameworks enable a holistic analysis of corporate discourse. Halliday helps us understand the internal mechanics of meaning-making, while Jakobson reveals the external motivations and effects of communication. For example, the utterance "Take these insights and challenge your team to rethink how strategy drives outcomes" can be analyzed ideationally (presenting "insights"), interpersonally (issuing a directive), and textually (structuring the message), while also fulfilling referential (informing), conative (persuading), and phatic (engaging) functions.

This integrated approach aligns with contemporary views of discourse as dynamic, multimodal, and context-sensitive. It allows researchers to move beyond surface-level analysis and uncover the deeper strategic logic of professional communication.

Implications for Practice and Research

The findings have important implications for both practice and research. For practitioners—such as corporate leaders, communication specialists, and educators—the analysis highlights the importance of linguistic awareness in strategic discourse. Understanding how language functions can enhance clarity, persuasiveness, and engagement, leading to more effective communication and better organizational outcomes.

For researchers, the study demonstrates the value of functional linguistics in analyzing professional discourse. It shows that language is not a neutral medium but a strategic resource that reflects and shapes organizational dynamics. Future research could extend this analysis to other

genres of corporate communication, such as internal memos, investor presentations, or crisis management statements, to explore how linguistic strategies vary across contexts.

Moreover, the study contributes to the growing field of discourse-based leadership studies, which examines how leaders use language to construct identity, manage relationships, and drive change. By applying Halliday's and Jakobson's models, scholars can gain deeper insights into the rhetorical and relational dimensions of leadership communication.

CONCLUSION

Linguistic choices in corporate strategy discourse are strategic and multifunctional. By applying Halliday's and Jakobson's theories, this study demonstrates how speakers inform, persuade, and engage through layered language functions. The integration of both frameworks reveals the complexity of professional communication and offers valuable insights for linguists, educators, and business leaders. Strategic speech is not just about what is said—it is about how, why, and to whom it is said. Understanding these dimensions is essential for effective leadership and impactful discourse.

REFERENCES

- Bernotienė, L., & Kaprizkinas, A. (2018). LINGUISTIC STRATEGIES OF COMMUNICATIVE FUNCTIONS IN BUSINESS DISCOURSE. *Res Humanitariae*, 24.
- Candlin, C. N., & Maley, Y. (2014). Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the discourse of alternative dispute resolution. In *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 201-222). Routledge.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Springer.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse* (Vol. 270). London: routledge..
- Fuertes-Olivera, P. A., Velasco-Sacristán, M., Arribas-Baño, A., & Samaniego-Fernández, E. (2001). Persuasion and advertising English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(8), 1291-1307.
- Halliday, M. A. (1978). *Language as social semiotic* (p. 136). Arnold: London.
- Jakobson, R., & Sebeok, T. A. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. *Semiotics: An introductory anthology*, 147-175.
- Judijanto, L., Haryani, H., Apriyanto, A., Yahya, M., Khotimah, K., Kurnia, L. I., ... & Asfah, I. (2025). *English for Business Communication*. PT. Green Pustaka Indonesia.
- Koller, V. (2004). *Metaphor and gender in business media discourse: A critical cognitive study*. Springer.
- Kurnia, L. I., Judijanto, L., Setiyana, R., Fidyati, F., Irianto, I., Hisasmaria, A., ... & Sudirman, A. (2025). *Mastering English: From Basic to Intermediate*. PT. Green Pustaka Indonesia.

THE ACADEMIC

Journal of English Language Education
ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: 2988-408X

Volume 10 No. 2 December 2025

- Miller, D. R. (2016). Jakobson's place in Hasan's social semiotic stylistics: 'Pervasive parallelism as symbolic articulation of theme. In *Society in language, language in society: Essays in honour of Ruqaiya Hasan* (pp. 59-80). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Nickerson, C. (2005). English as a lingua franca in international business contexts. *English for specific purposes*, 24(4), 367-380.
- Rubavathanan, M. (2021). A Comparative Study on the Theoretical Development of Functions of Language with Reference to Bühler, Jakobson, and Halliday. *Nobel: Journal of Literature and Language Teaching*, 12(2), 277-291. doi:10.XXXX/NOBEL.2021.12.2.277-291
- SBI TV. (2015). The Great Debate on Corporate Strategy: 5 Experts Weigh In [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FPJpUE407-w>