

Language Style in the International Diplomatic Meeting Between Donald Trump and Volodymyr Zelenskyy: A Sociolinguistics Study

Virlistyanti Dwi Yumardila ^{a,1,*}, Ervina CM Simatupang ^{b,2}

^{a,b} English Department, Widyatama University, Cikutra 204A, Bandung, Indonesia

¹virlistyanti.dwi@widyatama.ac.id; ²ervina.simatupang@widyatama.ac.id

* Corresponding Author



Received 2 November 2025; accepted 22 December 2025; published 31 December 2025

ABSTRACT

This study explored the language styles used in the international diplomatic meeting between U.S. President Donald Trump and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. The objective of this research was to identify and classify the language styles employed during their meeting at the White House on February 28, 2025, which was published on the C-SPAN YouTube channel, as well as to analyze the variations in language. The theories used in this study were Joos's (1967) theory of language style and Holmes's (2013) theory of sociolinguistic factors. Using a qualitative descriptive method, the researcher analyzed 29 utterances from the diplomatic interactions. The results showed that the language styles used in the meeting were frozen (20.7%), formal (27.6%), consultative (13.8%), casual (17.2%), and intimate (20.7%). The most dominant style in the diplomatic meeting was the formal style. The study also highlighted key sociolinguistic factors such as setting, participants, topic, and function that influenced the leaders' stylistic choices. These findings suggested that diplomatic language was both strategic and adaptive, shaped by context, communicative purpose, and audience. Overall, this research contributed to a deeper understanding of how political figures used language to manage perception, build rapport, and reinforce diplomatic roles in international settings.

KEYWORDS

Language Style
Sociolinguistics Factors
Sociolinguistics
Diplomatic Discourse

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) license



1. Introduction

Language is not only a system of signs or grammatical structures but also a tool for communication that significantly influences the social interaction. The researcher views language as a fundamental aspect of human interaction that functions beyond technical elements of phonology or syntax. It carries meaning shaped by culture, context, and human relationships. In everyday life, language phenomena are found in both spoken and written forms, appearing in various situations involving the use of either standard or non-standard language (Budiarso, 2015). From a sociolinguistic perspective, language cannot be separated from its social use because it reflects and reinforces social norms, hierarchies, and group identities.

Sociolinguistics, as a branch of linguistics, focuses on how language operates within society (Wardhaugh, 2021). This study explored how language varies and changes according to social factors such as setting, participants, topic, and function. Within this sociolinguistic perspective, language style serves as a fundamental construct that links linguistic form to social meaning. (Holmes, 2013) argued that language style, a core concept in sociolinguistics, is an essential element in understanding how speakers modify their language to suit different. These modifications are not arbitrary; they are influenced by the speaker's intention, their relationship with the listener, and the expectations of the setting. In formal contexts, particularly in diplomatic and institutional communication, language style is carefully managed to maintain politeness, establish authority and align with strategic goals.



doi:10.32585/ijelle.v7i2.6749



ijelle@univetbantara.ac.id

Language has evolved from simple non-verbal gestures to highly structured verbal systems that form the foundation of human civilization. According to (McNair, Brian 2018) language serves as a crucial social mechanism that allows individuals to express thoughts, emotions, and intentions. In political and institutional settings, particularly in diplomacy, language does more than communicate information; it becomes a strategic tool used to build relationships, assert national identity, and influence international perception (Maley, 2020). The interdependence between language and culture has long been emphasized in sociolinguistic studies (Jiang, 2000).

In this regard, language style plays a pivotal role in shaping communication, especially in formal and high-stakes situations such as international diplomacy. Language style refers to the variation in speech influenced by contextual factors such as the level of formality, the identity of the speaker and listener, and the communicative goals. (Holmes, 2013) explains that language style exists on a continuum, from very formal to highly casual. Speakers tend to shift styles depending on social demands and communicative needs, a process referred to as style-shifting (Pratt, 2023). This phenomenon is particularly relevant in professional, political, and institutional discourse, where speakers must skillfully manage formality, authority, and interpersonal rapport.

Style-shifting, as described in sociolinguistic theory, is not merely a matter of linguistic preference but is rooted in broader social structures (Holmes, 2013; Coupland, 2007; Savski, 2017). In diplomatic contexts, where communication simultaneously fulfills the functions of negotiation and representation, the ability to move between different language styles becomes essential. Diplomatic discourse often requires balancing clarity with subtlety, assertiveness with respect, and tradition with relatability. (Bayram & Ta, 2019) Scholars argue that the stylistic choices leaders make influence not only how their messages are interpreted but also how their persona, values, and intentions are publicly perceived (Bell, 1984; Biber & Conrad, 2009).

A foundational framework for analyzing language style was introduced by Joos (1967), who categorized language styles into five distinct types there are frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. Each style serves a specific communicative function and is suited to particular social settings. The frozen style is the most ritualized, used in settings such as legal proceedings or religious ceremonies, where language is fixed and highly formalized. The formal style is used in structured, one-way communication such as speeches or official addresses. The consultative style allows for limited interaction, typically seen in professional exchanges. Meanwhile, the casual and intimate styles are used in informal or private contexts, where familiarity and personal connection shape linguistic choices.

In diplomatic contexts, this research shows that formal and consultative styles are commonly employed due to the structured and ceremonial nature of political interactions. These styles help maintain institutional protocol, uphold mutual respect, and convey authority. Joos's classification serves as a valuable tool for analyzing diplomatic speech, particularly in understanding how language reflects institutional roles, power relations, and communicative intent. However, this research also observes that diplomatic language is not monolithic, leaders often shift to casual or intimate styles to build rapport, humanize their image, or ease the atmosphere during tense interactions (Sclafani, 2017).

To support this analysis, this researcher refers to Biber and Conrad (2009), who contribute to the understanding of language style by examining its relationship with register. Register, as they define it, refers to language variation shaped by the communicative purpose and the specific context in which interaction occurs. Their multidimensional framework identifies linguistic features such as modality, stance markers, and lexical density that can be used to analyze style in detail. Through this approach, this researcher is able to study how political leaders strategically construct language to project professionalism, maintain politeness, or introduce subtle forms of persuasion and alignment.

Audience, as another critical component, is central to the formation of language style. According to Bell's (1984) Audience Design theory, speakers shape their language based on the identity, expectations, and perceived status of their audience. In diplomatic contexts, the audience extends beyond the immediate participants. Political leaders are often addressing multiple audiences at once fellow politicians, international observers, the domestic public, and the global media. As such, language becomes a performative act designed to manage perception, reinforce credibility, and project authority across diverse platforms.

In line with this theoretical foundation, this research focuses on the diplomatic meeting between Donald Trump and Volodymyr Zelenskyy that took place at the White House on February 28, 2025. This event presented a unique opportunity for language style analysis due to the visibility of the meeting, the high-profile status of the participants, and the global political implications of their dialogue. The meeting, which was broadcast internationally through the C-Span YouTube channel, centered on issues of mutual cooperation, security, and political alignment, especially in relation to Ukraine's sovereignty and strategic partnership with the United States.

Both leaders offer contrasting rhetorical styles. Donald Trump is known for his direct, assertive, and at times informal language, which often departs from traditional diplomatic norms. His speeches frequently include rhetorical exaggeration, humor, and colloquialisms, contributing to a public persona that is both accessible and controversial. Volodymyr Zelenskyy, by contrast, tends to maintain a cautious, respectful, and measured tone, emphasizing clarity and formal expressions that align with diplomatic expectations. This contrast provides a rich source of data for analyzing how language style is used to reflect political identity, cultural background, and strategic intent.

The researcher is particularly interested in how each leader navigates the intersection between language style and diplomatic function. This study seeks to answer the following research questions: (1) What are the types of language style between Donald Trump and Volodymyr Zelenskyy? and (2) What are the sociolinguistics factors that influence their communication? addressing these questions, the researcher aims to explore the linguistic strategies employed by both parties to maintain cooperation, assert authority, and manage public image within the context of an international political event.

To guide the analysis, the researcher employs a qualitative descriptive method, analyzing a set of utterances taken directly from the meeting. These utterances are categorized according to Joos's five language styles, while supporting contextual analysis is conducted using sociolinguistic factors described by Holmes (2013), such as participants, setting, topic, and function. The researcher also incorporates factors sociolinguistics components such as instrumentalities and genre, which further illuminate how and why certain styles are chosen in specific moments of interaction.

Not only does the diplomatic meeting between Trump and Zelenskyy highlight how language style varies across leaders and cultures, but also demonstrates how language is used strategically to navigate international relations. The researcher argues that the use of language style in this context is not only influenced by political agendas but also by personal rhetorical tendencies and audience expectations. Ultimately, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how sociolinguistic theory can be applied to the analysis of real-world diplomatic interactions, offering insights into the interplay between language, power, identity, and global perception.

2. Methods

This research adopts a qualitative descriptive approach to explore the language style and sociolinguistics factors present in the diplomatic meeting between Donald Trump and Volodymyr Zelenskyy. A qualitative approach was selected for its effectiveness in investigating language in real-word social interactions (Creswell & Poth, 2017). In line with sociolinguistics principles, this study view is not only as a medium of communication but as a marker of identity, hierarchy, and intent (Holmes & Wilson, 2022). In order to conduct the research, there were several steps taken. First, the dialogs were collected from the internet site <https://speechnotes.co>. Besides collecting the dialogs, the video was also watched to deepen the dialogues as well as the context of the dialogue. Next, the dialogue contained in the video were selected. Selected dialogues were the dialogues which contain the style of language. Finally, the data were re-examined to be analyzed and classified based on Martin Joos theory for types of language style, Holmes' theory explains the factors that influence language style.

3. Result and Discussion

Following the data collection process, the next phase of this research involves analyzing the obtain information. This section presents various data analysis examples derivied from selected study samples. In addition to the results, discussions based on the findings are provided. The researcher focuses on two main aspect identified in this study. These ascpct are explored by selecting utterances from the conversation between Donald Trump and Volodymyr Zelenskyy that

represent different categories of style. The subsequent section will elaborate on the types of language style and the sociolinguistics factors that influenced their communication.

Table 1. Collecting Data

No	Types of Language Style	Frequency of Language Style Used
1.	Frozen	6
2.	Formal	8
3.	Consultative	4
4.	Casual	5
5.	Intimate	6
Total		29

The table above displayed facts discovered the researcher in order to provide some examples to the readers. According to (Joos, 1967) there are five types of language style that was selected by the researcher. In the international diplomatic meeting between Donald Trump and Volodymyr Zelenskyy, a total 29 utterance, were revealing that the Formal Style was the most frequently used, appearing in 8 utterance. Frozen Style reflecting ceremonial language, appearing in 6 utterance. Intimate Style was expressions conveying emotional or personal sentiments, appearing in 6 utterance. Casual Style often used to inject humor and informal commentary, appearing in 5 utterance. Consultative Style was the interactive exchanges such as invitation to speak or response to the questions, appearing in 4 utterance.

DISCUSSION

3.1 Frozen Style

Data 1

Donald Trump : *“Thank you very much”*
(Youtube, 00:06)

At the beginning of the diplomatic meeting, President Donald Trump of the United States greeted President Volodymyr Zelenskyy of Ukraine with the phrase “Thank you very much.” This utterance functions as a formal gesture of welcome and serves to initiate the exchange within a framework of diplomatic protocol. The expression itself is a conventional form of gratitude, widely recognized across cultures and contexts for its ritualistic and formulaic nature. In diplomatic settings, such phrases are employed not to invite extended interaction or convey personal sentiment, but rather to fulfill a ceremonial role and maintain institutional decorum. The use of this phrase reflects the expected norms of formality and respect in high-level international engagements.

Trump’s position as the President of the United States places him in a role that demands linguistic choices reflecting authority, diplomacy, and adherence to international conventions. His expression of gratitude, though brief and formulaic, aligns with his institutional role and the broader expectations of diplomatic conduct. In such formal settings, the use of frozen style a fixed, rehearsed manner of speech is common and appropriate. It signals the beginning of an event, sets a respectful tone for the interaction, and reinforces the seriousness of the meeting without introducing personal or informal elements. This kind of language is structured not to encourage dialogue, but to uphold tradition and mutual acknowledgment between statespersons.

The formality of the setting further justifies the choice of language style. Diplomatic meetings between world leaders are carefully structured events where every utterance carries symbolic weight. In this context, the phrase “Thank you very

“much” performs the function of ritual politeness, serving as a verbal cue that frames the moment within the established boundaries of protocol. It marks the transition from informal arrival to formal discussion and ensures that the interaction begins with mutual respect. Such linguistic acts are crucial in diplomacy, where language does not only convey information but also symbolizes power, alignment, and the intention to engage cooperatively under shared norms.

Data 2

Donald Trump : *“We’re going to sign the agreement at the conference in the East Room”*

(Youtube, 02:38)

In this particular statement, Donald Trump employs fixed and formal expressions such as “sign the agreement” and makes a specific reference to “the East Room,” both of which signal the highly institutional nature of the event. The utterance carries diplomatic weight and is framed within a ceremonial context, suggesting that the purpose is not to open a discussion, but to declare a decisive and authoritative course of action. The language used exemplifies the frozen style characterized by its rigid structure, formal tone, and predetermined phrasing. Delivered during an official event, the statement is devoid of personal engagement or interactive intent; rather, it functions as a formal declaration aligned with the expectations of political protocol.

As the President of the United States, Trump assumes a role that inherently demands authoritative and ceremonial language, especially in moments of political significance. In addressing both the public and government officials, his linguistic choices reflect his institutional status. Phrases such as “sign the agreement” and references to the “East Room” a space historically associated with state-level announcements highlight the formal setting and reinforce the gravity of the event. The tone is assertive, reflecting the finality of a decision that has already been made, rather than one open to negotiation or commentary.

The context of the utterance is a formal international conference, marked by its ceremonial tone and the presence of political figures and officials. The topic centers around the signing of a political agreement, which signifies the culmination of previous diplomatic processes and the public declaration of a unified stance or policy. In such a context, the function of the utterance is declarative, designed to affirm and formalize an institutional action. The absence of engagement, the elevated formality, and the ceremonial framing of the statement all align with the core characteristics of the frozen language style, where language serves as a symbolic instrument of authority rather than a vehicle for interaction.

3.2 Formal Style

Data 3

Donald Trump : *“We have had some very good discussions with Russia”*

(Youtube, 00:52)

In this utterance, Donald Trump refers to diplomatic engagements with Russia by describing them as “very good discussions.” The phrase is constructed using grammatically correct, conventional language that avoids slang or colloquial expressions, indicating a formal style. This stylistic choice is commonly used in public, institutional, or professional settings where the goal is to convey information with clarity, neutrality, and politeness. The term “very good discussions” is purposefully vague and diplomatically cautious it offers a positive framing without disclosing specific content or commitments. This ambiguity allows the speaker to project confidence and optimism while maintaining strategic flexibility. Notably, Trump refrains from including emotional commentary or personal anecdotes, which aligns with the function of formal style in preserving distance and decorum between the speaker and audience. Such language is characteristic of leaders aiming to balance transparency with discretion, especially when discussing matters of international sensitivity.

As President of the United States, Donald Trump is speaking in his official capacity and addressing a diverse and broad audience that includes the media, political stakeholders, and international observers. His institutional role requires a communication style that upholds

diplomatic formality and avoids overt subjectivity or emotionally charged language. By describing the diplomatic interactions with Russia in neutral and controlled terms, Trump reflects the responsibilities of a statesman, where messaging must be carefully calibrated to maintain international credibility and avoid unnecessary escalation or misinterpretation.

The setting of the utterance is a formal international conference, a platform where every word is scrutinized for its political implications. Given the topic ongoing relations with Russia, the utterance reflects deliberate strategic communication. It functions as a generalized yet reassuring statement, designed to inform the public and diplomatic community of continued engagement while withholding specific details. The reserved tone and structured language reflect the core features of formal style, where the emphasis lies in delivering information that maintains professionalism, avoids controversy, and reinforces institutional authority.

Data 4

Volodymyr Zelenskyy : *“I really count your strong position”*
(Youtube, 03:20)

In this statement, Volodymyr Zelenskyy, serving in his capacity as President of Ukraine, articulates his expectations and trust in the leadership of the United States through the phrase, “I really count your strong position.” This expression is situated within a formal diplomatic register, where language must convey respect, gravity, and professionalism, particularly when directed toward another head of state. The phrase “count on” inherently implies reliance and expectation, yet Zelenskyy frames it in a calm, measured manner that aligns with the norms of intergovernmental dialogue. Rather than expressing personal sentiment or emotional appeal, the utterance emphasizes shared political responsibility and a commitment to international cooperation, maintaining the impersonal yet cooperative tone that is often expected in high-level diplomatic exchanges.

As the speaker, Zelenskyy adopts a formal role that reflects the hierarchical and institutional structure of international diplomacy. Addressing President Donald Trump, his linguistic choices are carefully calibrated to show deference while also communicating political alignment. By stating “I really count your strong position,” he conveys trust and a sense of dependence in a way that is diplomatically appropriate and strategically restrained. The tone remains objective and respectful, avoiding any overly familiar or informal phrasing that could undermine the formality of the occasion. This kind of language ensures the maintenance of political decorum, which is critical when one head of state communicates with another in a public or official context.

The setting of the utterance is an international diplomatic conference, an environment that necessitates the use of formal, institutionalized language to match the seriousness of the occasion. The topic, centered on political trust and support addresses key elements of bilateral relations, particularly in times of strategic collaboration or geopolitical uncertainty. The function of the statement is expressive and strategic, aimed at reinforcing mutual reliance between allied nations while upholding the dignity of both speakers. Zelenskyy’s deliberate use of respectful and affirming language underscores the importance of unity and shared responsibility in diplomatic dialogue, reflecting the core attributes of formal style in political discourse.

3.3 Consultative Style

Data 5

Donald Trump : *“Please like to say something”*
(Youtube, 03:08)

In this brief statement, Donald Trump invites President Volodymyr Zelenskyy to speak during a formal press conference, employing a tone that is respectful yet interactive. The utterance maintains diplomatic decorum while subtly facilitating two-way communication between two heads of state. Although there exists an inherent power asymmetry, Trump being the host and a senior political figure, the language used does not emphasize hierarchy but instead enables collaborative participation. The statement serves as a conversational bridge

within a structured event, embodying the consultative style in which formality is preserved while room for mutual exchange is made available. This type of communication is common in formal settings where the interaction must balance authority with accessibility.

Donald Trump, speaking in his official capacity as President of the United States, adopts a tone that reflects both leadership and diplomacy. By using the phrase “Please like to say something,” he signals a willingness to share the floor while continuing to uphold the ceremonial structure of the event. Though the phrase may appear slightly informal in structure, its intention is unmistakable: to offer his counterpart the opportunity to contribute, thereby sustaining the interactive nature of a joint public appearance. The consultative tone employed here reflects a strategic linguistic choice, acknowledging Zelenskyy’s presence and importance without compromising Trump’s position as moderator of the occasion. The phrasing facilitates turn-taking, a common feature of consultative speech, which supports the progression of formal dialogue while maintaining interpersonal respect.

The setting of this utterance is a formal international press conference, a venue that necessitates adherence to institutional norms and diplomatic courtesy. In such environments, language is carefully shaped by protocol, visibility, and the expectations of both media and public audiences. The topic revolves around joint dialogue and cooperative communication, where the act of inviting another leader to speak is not only polite but symbolically reinforces political equality and shared agency. Trump’s use of consultative language illustrates an effort to create space for his counterpart within a hierarchical event, subtly blending his role as host with the expectations of reciprocal engagement. This approach reflects the communicative conventions of formal political discourse, in which heads of state must skillfully navigate between asserting leadership and promoting collaboration on the global stage.

Data 6

Journalist : *“Will you continue sending military aid to Ukraine?”*
(Youtube, 14:14)

The question posed by a journalist to President Donald Trump during a formal press conference exemplifies the consultative language style, which operates between the formal and casual registers. This style allows for respectful interaction while preserving the structure and decorum expected in diplomatic or institutional settings. The interrogative sentence, “Will you continue sending military aid to Ukraine?” is grammatically correct and appropriately polite, demonstrating a balance between assertiveness and deference. The inclusion of the modal verb “will” serves to soften the inquiry, distinguishing it from a demand or challenge. Though the tone remains neutral, the question aims to elicit specific information regarding a key aspect of U.S. foreign policy, signaling a need for clarity without confrontation.

The participant in this interaction is a journalist addressing the President of the United States within a high-stakes public setting. The journalist, acting in a professional role, must uphold a delicate communicative balance exercising the right to question while showing due respect to the office of the presidency. The phrasing of the question reflects a consultative tone, designed to maintain formality while still inviting an open response. This stylistic approach aligns with journalistic norms in diplomatic contexts, where clarity, neutrality, and public interest converge. The use of structured yet non-confrontational language supports the democratic function of the press, allowing journalists to hold leaders accountable without violating the conventions of international diplomacy.

The setting of the utterance is an international press conference, a formal occasion where questions must remain relevant, measured, and respectful. The topic is military aid to Ukraine holds significant geopolitical implications, thus requiring careful lexical choices to maintain both sensitivity and professionalism. The function of the utterance is to solicit policy clarification, a common objective in journalistic questioning during official events. The consultative style is especially well-suited for this purpose, as it encourages dialogue while safeguarding the institutional integrity of both the speaker and the respondent. By employing structured and respectful language, the journalist adheres to the expectations of formal press engagements, where the interaction must prioritize both informational accuracy and diplomatic decorum.

3.4 Casual Style

Data 7

Donald Trump : *"I'm far superior to George Washington Lincoln? Kidding!"*
(Youtube, 12:48)

In this instance, Donald Trump employs humor and irony by comparing himself to revered U.S. presidents George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, only to immediately soften the statement with the interjection “kidding!” This strategic use of humor signals a deliberate shift in tone from the formal to the informal, marking a momentary departure from the expected seriousness of the diplomatic event. The utterance is delivered with casual linguistic features such as contractions (“I’m”), hyperbole (“far superior”), and rhetorical reversal. These elements collectively contribute to a light-hearted atmosphere that contrasts with the typical decorum of international press conferences. The phrase “kidding” serves as a pragmatic marker to clarify the speaker’s non-literal intent, protecting the utterance from misinterpretation while reinforcing the speaker’s control over tone and audience engagement.

Donald Trump, in his capacity as President of the United States, is addressing a public audience during a formal international conference. Despite the official nature of the event, his language momentarily diverges from institutional expectations. By humorously stating, “I’m far superior to George Washington Lincoln? Kidding!”, he introduces playful self-aggrandizement only to undercut it with a performative disclaimer. This shift from seriousness to levity allows Trump to connect with the audience in a more personal and relatable manner, minimizing hierarchical distance and infusing the formal setting with an element of spontaneity. This rhetorical strategy is consistent with his broader communicative style, which often blends populist appeal with unscripted delivery.

The context of this utterance is a formal press event, where the general expectation is that language will reflect political gravity and diplomatic protocol. However, the topic of self-comparison, framed in a humorous and exaggerated way, invites amusement rather than critical policy reflection. The function of the statement is primarily entertainment, designed to elicit laughter, soften the tone, and humanize the speaker. In doing so, Trump momentarily suspends the frozen and formal styles typically associated with high-level political discourse and instead adopts a casual style characterized by informality, spontaneity, and the absence of rigid structure. This style reduces perceived social distance and enhances audience rapport, reflecting a broader trend in modern political communication where relatability and charisma are often prioritized alongside authority.

Data 8

Donald Trump : *"This is going to be great television"*
(Youtube, 49:18)

The phrase “This is going to be great television,” delivered by Donald Trump during an international press conference, exemplifies the casual language style through its informal, humorous, and unscripted nature. It reflects a communicative strategy that blurs the boundaries between formal political discourse and media performance. Rather than reinforcing the seriousness typically associated with diplomatic events, Trump’s remark functions as a moment of meta-commentary, where he draws attention not to the content of the event, but to its performative and broadcast dimensions. In doing so, he signals an acute awareness of the mediated nature of political communication, acknowledging the presence of a television audience and the spectacle surrounding the event itself.

This utterance is characteristic of Trump’s broader rhetorical approach, in which formal political settings are infused with elements of entertainment and personality-driven communication. By stating, “This is going to be great television,” Trump temporarily redirects the focus from policy substance to audience reception, reinforcing the theatrical dimension of modern leadership. The statement lacks institutional gravity and instead conveys a conversational, media-savvy tone, contributing to a casual register that departs from the expected decorum of diplomatic speech. It demonstrates how casual language can surface even in formal contexts, particularly when a speaker seeks to inject humor, relatability, or commentary on the setting itself.

The participant in this case is Donald Trump, speaking in his official capacity as President of the United States, yet using a tone more aligned with entertainment discourse than conventional diplomacy. His comment stands out within the formal setting of an international press conference, as it minimizes the political stakes of the moment in favor of media self-awareness. The utterance operates less as a policy statement and more as a performative aside, reflecting Trump's tendency to position himself not only as a political figure but also as a media personality.

The setting remains institutional and formal, yet Trump's choice of language subverts the expected norms of statesmanship. Rather than addressing matters of international concern directly, the topic of the utterance is media perception, emphasizing the spectacle over substance. The function of the statement is thus to entertain and provoke reaction, blending the roles of leader and showman. This example illustrates how casual language can be employed strategically within high-profile political events to personalize discourse, reshape audience expectations, and assert control over how a moment is publicly framed. Such linguistic choices highlight the evolving nature of political communication in the age of global media visibility.

3.5 Intimate Style

Data 9

Volodymyr Zelenskyy : *"To save our country our values our freedom"*
(Youtube, 04:10)

In this statement, President Volodymyr Zelenskyy delivers a deeply emotional and evocative appeal through the phrase "To save our country, our values, our freedom." Although the utterance is brief, it is rich with symbolic meaning and emotional weight. The language reflects not only a political stance but a heartfelt expression of collective identity and national devotion. By invoking abstract yet universally resonant concepts such as "values" and "freedom," Zelenskyy appeals to both societal pain and a shared moral purpose. The repetition of the possessive pronoun "our" reinforces a strong sense of belonging and unity, indicating solidarity with the citizens of Ukraine. While delivered in a formal, diplomatic setting, the language departs from detached officialdom and instead adopts an intimate style, not because of private context, but due to the emotional closeness it establishes between speaker and audience.

The participant in this utterance is President Zelenskyy, addressing a broad international and domestic audience during a diplomatic event. His role as head of state requires a careful balance between political authority and emotional resonance. In this instance, he intentionally shifts toward emotionally charged language to emphasize the urgency and personal significance of national struggle. The intimacy in his speech does not arise from personal familiarity with individuals, but from the shared experience of defending a homeland under threat. His use of inclusive language, particularly the repeated "our" serves as a rhetorical strategy to create a collective voice, strengthening the emotional bond between leader and people.

The setting of the utterance is a formal diplomatic platform, yet the topic the defense of national sovereignty and cultural identity necessitates a language style that transcends protocol. Rather than relying solely on technical or policy-driven rhetoric, Zelenskyy's choice of words is deliberately abstract, emotionally expressive, and value-laden. This transforms a conventional political message into a heartfelt call for unity, sacrifice, and resilience. The function of the utterance is thus not only declarative, but also affective: to forge emotional solidarity and reaffirm national ideals during a time of collective hardship. Despite the formal context, the intimate tone arises from Zelenskyy's ability to embody the emotional will of his people, turning political speech into an expression of shared love, duty, and protection toward the nation.

Data 10

Donald Trump : *"I think he's dressed beautifully"*
(Youtube, 23:13)

In this statement, Donald Trump remarks, "I think he's dressed beautifully," offering a personal and aesthetically charged compliment toward President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. The substance of this utterance is non-political and subjective, focusing on personal opinion rather than institutional matters. By commenting on Zelenskyy's appearance using the term "beautifully," Trump introduces an unexpected tone of emotional softness and aesthetic appreciation into an otherwise formal setting. Such language is atypical in high-level diplomatic discourse, which is usually characterized by restraint, objectivity, and political focus. The informality and emotional nuance embedded in this compliment reflect an intimate style, one that temporarily lowers the psychological distance between the speaker and the addressed, signaling interpersonal recognition beyond political roles.

The participant in this exchange is Donald Trump, speaking in his official capacity as President of the United States during an international diplomatic event. Despite the formal context, his choice to comment on Zelenskyy's attire introduces a personal and humanizing dimension to the interaction. The phrase "I think he's dressed beautifully" serves not only as a compliment but also as a gesture of social warmth and engagement. The use of the adverb "beautifully" lends the statement an emotionally positive and almost tender tone, which departs from the traditional language expected in intergovernmental dialogue. It indicates an intention to foster personal rapport and perhaps diffuse the rigidity of the setting through informal observation.

Although the setting remains official a diplomatic conference, the topic of the utterance, being a compliment on physical appearance, is markedly personal. The function of the statement is to humanize the exchange, offering a moment of lightness within a space typically reserved for policy and formal rhetoric. This momentary shift from political content to personal appreciation highlights how intimate language can surface even in the most structured environments. By softening the tone and focusing on interpersonal warmth, Trump's remark reflects how public figures may strategically use informal and intimate styles to build rapport, enhance relatability, or simply lighten the mood during high-profile events. Such linguistic choices reveal the emotional subtext that can accompany formal political communication, providing insight into the interpersonal dynamics between world leaders.

4. Conclusion

Based on the analysis of 29 utterances drawn from the diplomatic meeting between U.S. President Donald Trump and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy, with the objective of identifying the language styles utilized and examining the sociolinguistic factors influencing their use. The findings revealed the presence of five distinct language styles. Specifically, (6 utterances, 20,7%) as frozen, (8 utterance, 27,6%) as formal, (4 utterances, 13,8%) as consultative, (5 utterances, 17,2%) as casual, and (6 utterances 20,7%) as intimate. Among these, the formal and frozen styles appeared most frequently, which is consistent with the institutional roles of the speakers and the ceremonial nature of the diplomatic context.

In addition, the analysis demonstrated that the selection of language styles is significantly influenced by sociolinguistic factors, such as the participants, setting, topic,

and communicative function. These elements play a crucial role in shaping the speaker's stylistic choices, depending on who is speaking, to whom, in what context, and for what communicative purpose be it to inform, persuade, greet, entertain, or build rapport. Consequently, although formal and frozen styles were predominant due to the official status of the event, the presence of casual and intimate styles underscores the adaptive and strategic nature of diplomatic language. These findings contribute to a deeper understanding of how political figures employ language to manage perceptions, establish interpersonal connections, and fulfill diplomatic functions within high-level international discourse.

References

Bayram, A. Burcu, and Vivian P. Ta. 2019. "Diplomatic Chameleons: Language Style Matching and Agreement in International Diplomatic Negotiations." *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research* 12 (1): 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12142>.

Beard, Adrian. n.d. "The Language of Politics."

Bell, Allan. 1984. "Language Style as Audience Design." *Language in Society* 13 (2): 145–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001037X>.

Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conrad. 2019. *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108686136>.

Budiarsa, Made. 2015. "LANGUAGE, DIALECT AND REGISTER IN A SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE." Vol. 1. <http://ejurnal.warmadewa.ac.id/index.php/jret>.

Chambers, J K. n.d. "4 Patterns of Variation Including Change."

Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511755064>.

Creswell, John W.. 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design : Choosing among Five Approaches*. Sage Publications.

Dodgson, Joan E. 2017. "About Research: Qualitative Methodologies." *Journal of Human Lactation* 33 (2): 355–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0890334417698693>.

Holmes, and Janet. n.d. "An Introduction to Sociolinguistics."

Holmes, Janet, and Nick Wilson. 2017. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Title: Colloquial Dutch : the complete course for beginners / Bruce Donaldson. Description: Third edition. | Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315728438>.

Jiang, Wenyi. 2000. "The Relationship between Culture and Language Downloaded From." Vol. 54. Oxford University Press. <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/>.

Joos, M. 1967. *The Five Clocks: A Linguistic Excursion into the Five Styles of English Usage*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Maley, William. 2020. *Diplomacy, Communication, and Peace*. New York : Routledge, 2021. |: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003006947>.

McNair, and Brian. n.d. "An Introduction to Political Communication."

Pratt, Teresa. 2023. "Affect in Sociolinguistic Style." *Language in Society* 52 (1): 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404521000774>.

Savski, Kristof. 2017. "Language Policy at Times of Instability and Struggle: The Impact of Fluctuating Will and Competing Agendas on a Slovene Language Strategy." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 18 (3): 283–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2016.1265280>.

Sclafani, J. 2017. *Talking Donald Trump: A Sociolinguistic Study Of Style, Metadiscourse, And Political Identity*.

Siallagana, Rudi Ebenheizer, and Ervina Cm Simatupang. 2024. "Register on the Documenter 'Becoming': Sociolinguistics Study." *International Journal of English Linguistics*,

Literature, and Education (IJELLE) 170 (2): 2686–5106.
<https://doi.org/10.32585/ijelle.v6i2.5507>.

Wang, Jiayu, Guangyu Jin, and Wenhua Li. 2023. “Changing Perceptions of Language in Sociolinguistics.” *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 10 (1): 91.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01574-5>.

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. 2021. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*.