

Translation Techniques and Pragmatic Shifts in an Indonesian Presidential Press Statement

Yudi Chandri Setiawan

Universitas Nasional Jakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: yudichandri@gmail.com

Hanif Azhar

Universitas Nasional Jakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: hanifazhar.acd@gmail.com

Joseph Jonathan Lucio Turadokend

Universitas Nasional Jakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: jonatura001@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Diplomatic translation must preserve policy content, interpersonal meanings, and institutional reference across languages. This study examines the English translation of an Indonesian presidential press statement delivered at a bilateral meeting with the Prime Minister of India. It combines a quantitative audit of a 40-unit coding matrix with qualitative source–target comparison, drawing on Molina and Hurtado Albir’s translation techniques and House’s functional-pragmatic perspective. The matrix contains 85 unit–technique assignments: established equivalent accounts for 38.82%, modulation 23.53%, borrowing 14.12%, amplification 12.94%, transposition 7.06%, and reduction 3.53%. These percentages describe assigned coding categories rather than independently validated counts of every translated segment. The examples show conventional diplomatic expressions, retained institutional names, and grammatical restructuring alongside substantive shifts in reference and commitment. In particular, relations become mobility, hope becomes a plan, agreements become opportunities, and certainty becomes an expression of opinion. Some additions also introduce evaluative or policy implications beyond explicit source wording. The findings demonstrate that technique identification and equivalence assessment must be treated separately: an established term or retained name does not validate the surrounding sentence. The study contributes a transparent account of coding distribution and a contextual interpretation of pragmatic shifts in a single Indonesian–English diplomatic text pair. It does not infer translator intentions or measure audience responses.

Keywords: Diplomatic Translation; Translation Techniques; Pragmatic Shifts; Presidential Discourse.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Published

October 04th 2026



ARTICLE LICENCE

© 2026 Semiotika
Urban dan Budaya
(Urban and Cultural
Semiotics)

Under the license CC
BY-SA 4.0



1. Introduction

Presidential press statements communicate official policy positions while performing interpersonal and representational functions. Expressions of welcome and appreciation acknowledge diplomatic counterparts, descriptions of cooperation signal commitments, and references to institutions and agreements locate those commitments within established frameworks. Translating such statements therefore requires attention to what is asserted, how firmly it is asserted, and which institutional actors or arrangements are named (Mochammad et al., 2026; Salsabila et al., 2025; Prihandoko et al., 2019).

A target text may retain recognizable terminology while changing another part of the message. A conventional expression such as comprehensive strategic partnership can coexist with a missing honorific, an omitted qualification, or a stronger commitment elsewhere in the same sentence. For this reason, terminological correspondence should be distinguished from equivalence at the level of a complete proposition or communicative function.

Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002) offer a framework for describing translation techniques observable in translated segments. House (2015) provides a functional-pragmatic perspective for considering correspondence between source and target texts. Used together, these approaches support two related but distinct questions: which textual procedures are identifiable, and what consequences do the resulting choices have for meaning and pragmatic force? A technique label alone does not answer the second question (Swandayani et al., 2026; Pratiwi et al., 2026; Tenrisanna et al., 2026).

The present study examines President Prabowo Subianto's press statement at his bilateral meeting with Prime Minister Narendra Modi at Merdeka Palace, Jakarta, on July 7, 2026. The English version is published by the Cabinet Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia (2026). The analyzed matrix provides 40 aligned records, including both complete sentences and clause-level excerpts. It enables a complete audit of the assigned categories and a closer examination of choices involving terminology, institutional reference, and commitment.

The study asks two questions: how are the six assigned translation-technique categories distributed across the 40 aligned units, and which illustrated choices preserve or alter propositional meaning and diplomatic pragmatic force? Its contribution is a transparent relationship between the coding record, the denominator used for percentages, and qualitative interpretations grounded in specific source–target segments. The scope remains a single diplomatic statement; the study does not claim representativeness for Indonesian diplomatic translation as a whole.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Political Translation and the Indonesian Context

Political translation requires attention to communicative function as well as lexical correspondence. Schäffner (2004) relates translation studies to political discourse analysis, providing a basis for examining how institutional settings shape the interpretation of translated political texts. J. Li and S. Li (2015), in their analysis of Chinese political speeches across successive leadership periods, identify increasing accommodation to target audiences. Their findings suggest that changes in political translation can be historically situated; they do not establish that every audience-oriented reformulation preserves the source speaker's commitment.

An especially relevant Indonesian study is Pamungkas (2020), which examines the English translation of President Joko Widodo's inaugural address through Newmark's translation methods. The study identifies semantic translation in the body of the speech and communicative translation in its opening and closing. It provides a local precedent for studying Indonesian presidential discourse, but its focus on overall methods differs from the segment-level techniques examined here. A bilateral press statement also has a different communicative function from an inaugural address: references to agreements, aspirations, and future action require particular attention to their diplomatic implications.

2.2 Institutional Mediation and Speaker Positioning

Studies of press conferences show that translation and interpreting participate in institutional representation. Schäffner (2015) examines speaker positioning in interpreter-mediated press conferences, while Liao and Pan (2018) use a narrative approach to analyze interpreter mediation at a joint political press conference. Together, these studies support analysis of how reformulation relates to the speaker's public position and to the interactional setting. Their interpreting data also involve real-time and interactional constraints that cannot automatically be attributed to a published written translation.

Gu (2019a) examines ideological positioning and alignment in government press conferences through critical discourse analysis and Bakhtinian concepts. Gu (2019b) investigates government interpreters' mediation of discourse about the people in a corpus of televised Chinese political press conferences. Gu and Tipton (2020) extend this institutional perspective by examining self-reference. These studies make participant reference and institutional voice relevant analytical questions. For the present article, however, changes in wording are evidence of textual differences; explanations of translators' motivations require additional process or institutional evidence.

2.3 Modality Evaluation and Diplomatic Commitment

Modality is directly relevant to the distinction between expressing an aspiration and announcing an intended action. Fu and Chen (2019) investigate explicitation of modality in Chinese–English diplomatic interpreting and relate it to interpersonal relations. Pan and Wang (2021) compare interpreted Chinese political discourse in the 1990s and 2010s, identifying greater target orientation through hedging and attenuation of categorical force. These studies motivate close comparison of modal expressions rather than treating fluent reformulation as sufficient evidence of pragmatic equivalence.

Evaluation and engagement provide further ways to examine the interpersonal effects of translation. Wang and Feng (2018) investigate stance-taking at critical points in interpreted political discourse, and X. Li and Zhang (2021) analyze engagement choices in a Chinese foreign minister's press conference in relation to power and solidarity. Gao and Munday (2023) examine the editing of evaluative discourse in simultaneous interpreting, showing how positive and negative evaluations can be differently represented. These approaches complement technique classification by asking whose stance is expressed and how strongly it is communicated.

Corpus research also connects local choices to broader representational patterns. T. Li and Pan (2021) examine how appraisal shifts reshape China's image in English translations of Chinese political discourse. Gao and Wang (2024) analyze the reconstruction of solidarity in Chinese–English interpreting at United Nations general debates, including changes involving commissive discourse and inclusive reference. Their larger corpora permit discussion of recurring patterns. The present single-text study uses these findings to identify relevant dimensions of comparison, without claiming an equivalent corpus-level pattern or an established effect on international audiences.

2.4 Political Speeches Media Translation and Implicitness

Research on translated political speeches demonstrates that evaluation can vary across renditions of the same source. Munday (2018) applies an appraisal model to Spanish interpretations of President Trump's 2017 inaugural address. Phanthaphoommee (2021) compares Thai translations of that speech and examines translators' evaluations. In a different political setting, Phanthaphoommee (2023) analyzes English translations of a Thai prime minister's press interview and national address in relation to face and spoken features. Phanthaphoommee and Munday (2024) focus on pronoun shifts in translations of the Thai prime minister's international statements. These studies support attention to evaluation, participant reference, and genre when assessing political translation.

Media translation introduces additional selection and recontextualization processes. Caimotto (2020) studies the transediting of Trump's inaugural speech in Italian newspapers, while Abualadas (2024) examines explicitation and ideological framing in Arabic–English news translation by MEMRI. These studies show why additions and omissions should be assessed in their wider discursive setting. Their

media contexts differ from an official bilingual statement, so their findings provide analytical questions rather than a direct explanation of the present translation. Zhang (2014), whose study concerns implicitness in diplomatic discourse, further supports examining what is left implicit and how reformulation affects diplomatic interpretation.

2.5 Position of the Present Study

The literature supports a distinction between identifying translation procedures and assessing their effects on meaning, stance, and commitment. This article contributes a focused analysis of one Indonesian presidential bilateral press statement by combining an audit of the supplied technique matrix with contextual comparison of selected source–target units. Its contribution lies in making the counting procedure transparent and identifying consequential pragmatic shifts in a specific text. It does not claim that Indonesian political translation has been unexplored, that technique frequencies alone measure quality, or that textual differences demonstrate ideological intent.

2.6 Translation Techniques

Translation techniques describe procedures in a translation product and should be distinguished from a translator's overall method or problem-solving strategies. Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002) define techniques dynamically and functionally, allowing them to be examined in relation to particular contexts. The six categories assigned in the present matrix are established equivalent, modulation, borrowing, amplification, transposition, and reduction.

Established equivalent uses an expression recognized by dictionaries or conventional usage as a target-language equivalent. Modulation changes perspective, focus, or cognitive category in relation to the source. Borrowing takes a word or expression directly from another language. Amplification introduces information or clarification not formulated in the source, reduction suppresses source information, and transposition changes a grammatical category. These definitions require comparison of corresponding segments rather than an impression that the target sentence sounds natural.

Two distinctions are particularly relevant. First, a lexical substitution that changes the referent or a modal expression that changes commitment cannot be justified as meaning-preserving modulation simply because it is idiomatic. Second, retaining an English-origin expression already embedded in an Indonesian source differs from directly borrowing an Indonesian expression into English. For the quantitative audit, the matrix's borrowing labels are retained as assigned categories; their interpretation is qualified in the qualitative discussion.

2.7 Meaning and Pragmatic Force

Baker (2018) discusses equivalence across lexical, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic levels, while Hatim and Mason (1997) situate translation within communication. These perspectives support analysis of a diplomatic statement as both a representation of policy content and an interpersonal act. The present study considers institutional reference, evaluative meaning, degrees of commitment, and relations between propositions.

House's (2015) functional-pragmatic perspective informs the comparison of communicative meanings in context. This study does not implement the complete translation quality assessment model or claim equivalent audience reactions. It examines textual evidence: whether a source reference remains identifiable, whether an aspiration becomes a plan, whether certainty is weakened, and whether an addition introduces a meaning not explicitly formulated in the source. Actual reader interpretation and translator intentions remain beyond the available data.

3. Method

3.1 Research Design And Data

This study uses a qualitative descriptive case-study design, supported by a descriptive quantitative audit of the existing coding matrix. The analysis combines Molina and Hurtado Albir's (2002) translation-technique framework with a functional-pragmatic comparison informed by House (2015). Technique identification describes local textual operations, whereas pragmatic analysis examines their implications for reference, information content, and degrees of diplomatic commitment. These analytical dimensions are treated separately; technique frequencies are not used as a translation-quality score.

The dataset comprises 40 aligned source–target records, coded D1–D40, and their existing technique assignments. The Indonesian and English quotations are analyzed as reproduced in the matrix. The Cabinet Secretariat's publication (2026) identifies the statement and provides target-text context; discrepancies between the matrix and the published wording are acknowledged rather than silently corrected. The records are termed aligned units rather than sentence pairs because their boundaries are mixed: D23–D24 and D27–D28 divide sentences, while D5 contains an ellipsis. Each record supplies context, and the corresponding word, phrase, or clause provides the basis for interpreting a technique.

3.2 Operational Criteria For Interpreting Technique Labels

The criteria below clarify how the original labels are assessed in the qualitative review; they do not constitute a newly completed recoding of all 40 records. A defensible classification identifies the corresponding source and target spans, the observable operation, and its contextual rationale. A label is not justified solely by target-language

fluency, phrase length, or a general difference in wording. Where the available evidence does not distinguish overlapping categories, the classification is reported as uncertain rather than presented as conceptually confirmed.

Established equivalent concerns an expression conventionally recognized as a target-language counterpart. Modulation concerns a change in viewpoint, focus, or cognitive category. To distinguish them, the analysis asks whether a conventional expression preserves the source perspective or whether an additional perspective change can be specified. Idiomatic wording alone does not establish modulation. Evidence of conventional status should be documented through identifiable dictionary or institutional usage in subsequent validation. Accordingly, the discussion examines whether such pairs as *tonggak bersejarah*–historic milestone support the original modulation label beyond ordinary phrase-level correspondence.

Amplification requires an identifiable detail not explicitly formulated in the relevant source passage. The analysis distinguishes referential clarification recoverable from context from added evaluation, policy specification, or evidential framing. Expanded wording that expresses content already explicit in the source does not by itself demonstrate amplification. Thus, *future-oriented* must be compared with *orientasinya ke depan*, and the establishment of *with* *didirikannya*, before an added-information claim is made. Informational amplification is distinguished from linguistic expansion that introduces no additional detail.

Transposition requires a documented grammatical-category change in corresponding expressions, such as a nominal process realized verbally. Different word order and substitution of one nominal expression for another do not suffice. The grammatical function of an English -ing form must be checked in its construction rather than inferred from the ending alone. Borrowing requires direct transfer of a foreign expression; unchanged international acronyms and English expressions already embedded in the Indonesian source are examined separately as retention. Reduction requires identifiable source information left unexpressed in the corresponding target context, rather than merely fewer words. These operational distinctions are informed by Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002).

3.3 Qualitative Review And Overlapping Categories

The qualitative review examines the relationship between the assigned labels and the reported source–target wording. It considers conventional equivalents, name retention, grammatical restructuring, added or omitted information, and lexical or modal differences. Multiple techniques may be assigned to a record, but each requires a distinct textual basis. A conventional expression and an omitted honorific, for example, concern different features. The same observation is not interpreted as two techniques simply because their descriptions appear to overlap.

Potential classification problems are discussed alongside the original labels. A change from agreements to opportunities is considered a referential concern, and a

change from hope to planning is assessed for altered commitment; neither is automatically accepted as evidence of meaning-preserving modulation. Such judgments qualify interpretation of the original categories without silently replacing the coding distribution. Suggested alternative renderings illustrate meanings requiring preservation and are not added to or substituted for the observed translation data.

3.4 Counting procedure and interpretation of frequencies

The quantitative audit retains the original row-level assignments and counts each distinct technique once per aligned unit. A record assigned three techniques therefore contributes three unit–technique assignments; repeated instances of the same technique within that record contribute only one assignment for that category. The resulting 85 assignments are not 85 independent data units or a count of every word- or phrase-level occurrence. All 40 records are included in this descriptive audit.

The category totals are established equivalent 33, modulation 20, borrowing 12, amplification 11, transposition 6, and reduction 3. The share of assignments is calculated as the category total divided by 85 and multiplied by 100; unit incidence is the same total divided by 40 and multiplied by 100. Assignment shares sum to 100%. This arithmetic audit establishes the distribution of existing labels, not independent confirmation that every label satisfies its theoretical definition.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Distribution Of Assigned Techniques

Table 1. Distribution audited from all 40 aligned records

Assigned technique	Units assigned	Share of assignments (%)	Unit incidence (%)
Established Equivalent	33	38.82	82.50
Modulation	20	23.53	50.00
Borrowing	12	14.12	30.00
Amplification	11	12.94	27.50
Transposition	6	7.06	15.00
Reduction	3	3.53	7.50
Total	85	100.00	Not additive

Table 1 presents the distribution of 85 unit–technique assignments across 40 aligned units. Established equivalent is the most frequently assigned technique, with 33 assignments (38.82%), and is identified in 82.50% of the units. Modulation ranks second, with 20 assignments (23.53%) and a unit incidence of 50.00%. Borrowing accounts for 12 assignments (14.12%) and appears in 30.00% of the units.

Amplification is assigned to 11 units, representing 12.94% of the assignments and a unit incidence of 27.50%. Transposition accounts for six assignments (7.06%) and is identified in 15.00% of the units. Reduction is the least frequently assigned technique, with three assignments (3.53%) and a unit incidence of 7.50%. Overall, established equivalent and modulation occupy the two highest positions in the reported distribution, followed by borrowing, amplification, transposition, and reduction.

4.2 Conventional Expressions And Institutional Reference

Several records contain recognizable diplomatic or technical expressions. In D5 and D8, *kemitraan strategis komprehensif* corresponds to comprehensive strategic partnership. D11 includes high-level visits for *kunjungan tingkat tinggi*, D14 includes capacity building for *pengembangan kapasitas*, and D32 includes ASEAN centrality for *sentralitas ASEAN*. These local correspondences support discussion of conventional equivalents. They do not demonstrate that every expression assigned established equivalent has been independently verified against an official terminology source.

The same record can contain a conventional expression and an omission. In D2, *great honor* corresponds to *kehormatan besar*, but the target does not explicitly retain *kembali* or the honorific *Yang Mulia*. In D3, the state-honor expression remains recognizable, but the full source name *Bintang Republik Indonesia Adipurna* is shortened to *Bintang Adipurna medal*, and the explicit designation *Prime Minister* is omitted. Institutional reference should therefore be assessed alongside, rather than inferred from, terminology alone.

Table 2. Examples of conventional expressions

Code	Source excerpt	Target excerpt	Interpretation
D5	<i>kemitraan strategis komprehensif</i>	comprehensive strategic partnership	Conventional phrase-level correspondence.
D11	<i>kunjungan tingkat tinggi</i>	high-level visits	Conventional diplomatic expression.
D14	<i>pengembangan kapasitas</i>	capacity building	Conventional technical expression.
D32	<i>sentralitas ASEAN</i>	ASEAN centrality	Institutional concept retained.

The borrowing label requires a more specific interpretation. D3 includes an Indonesian state-honor name in English and therefore offers direct evidence of retaining an Indonesian expression. By contrast, D9 retains BRICS, D18 retains English trade-agreement names, and D26 retains people-to-people contact already present in the source. These cases preserve recognizable forms but cannot automatically be treated as identical instances of cross-language borrowing. In D6, *gerakan nonblok* becomes Non-Aligned Movement, while NAM is introduced; the displayed wording supports consideration of an established name and an added acronym rather than an unchanged source expression.

D11 retains Think Tanks and Parliamentary Friendship Groups, but these may identify institutional categories rather than unique proper names. D23 retains Prambanan and UNESCO, and D24 combines the retained personal names Tagore–Dewantara with the translated head noun Year. Such mixed structures show why a technique should be attached to a specific segment. A whole record need not be assigned a single uniform explanation.

4.3 Lexical And Modal Shifts

Table 3. Pragmatic and propositional shifts in units assigned modulation

Code	Source wording	Target wording	Interpretation
D15	Hubungan antara masyarakat keluar negara juga akan semakin erat dengan meningkatnya konektivitas.	People's mobility to other countries will increase as well due to improved connectivity.	Relations become mobility. The source sequence <i>keluar negara</i> also requires checking against the original transcript.
D22	berharap dapat memperluas kesempatan	we plan to provide more opportunities	Hope becomes a plan, strengthening commitment.
D29	kesepakatan-kesepakatan tersebut	these opportunities	Agreements become opportunities, changing the referent.
D35	Saya yakin	In my view	Certainty becomes an expression of opinion, weakening epistemic force.

D15 shifts the central proposition. The source concerns closer relations between people as connectivity improves; the target concerns increased mobility to other countries. Relations and mobility may be connected in context, but they are not the same assertion. The source sequence *keluar negara* is ambiguous and should be verified against the original transcript. This uncertainty does not establish the target proposition as meaning-preserving modulation.

D22 changes the degree of commitment. Hoping to expand opportunities expresses an aspiration; planning to provide them conveys a more definite intended action. A meaning-preserving proposal for the relevant clause is we hope to expand opportunities for doctors, nurses, and other healthcare professionals to strengthen their capacity. The proposed wording is not substituted for the original target data.

D29 replaces agreements with opportunities. This changes the referent of what can be implemented and should be treated as a lexical mismatch rather than justified as a shift toward implementation prospects. A proposed rendering is We believe these agreements can be implemented soon and deliver tangible results and benefits to the

people of both countries. In addition to the noun substitution, the source expression *hasil dan manfaat* is compressed into benefits, requiring separate consideration of information loss.

D35 moves in the opposite modal direction to D22: *Saya yakin* expresses conviction, whereas *In my view* frames an opinion. The shift weakens the speaker's epistemic commitment. Its English continuation, *deepen our trust and values*, also does not clearly preserve the source's distinction between deeper trust and tangible value for both peoples. Grammatical restructuring in the same unit does not remove this equivalence concern.

Other modulation labels are less conclusive. In D7, *tonggak bersejarah* and historic milestone retain a comparable metaphor; the displayed segment does not establish an additional perspective change beyond a conventional equivalent. D20 retains an additive relation through *while* enhancing, and D25's *ikatan peradaban* and civilizational ties remain closely corresponding noun phrases. These examples require stronger evidence before being counted as independently confirmed modulations. D1's moves from *saya ingin menyampaikan* to *allow me to* can be discussed as a change in interpersonal framing, but equivalent politeness effects are not demonstrated by audience evidence.

4.4 Additions And Grammatical Restructuring

D4 provides a clear explicit addition: this medal supplies an object absent from the source unit, drawing on the preceding reference to the award. This can clarify reference. Other additions require different treatment. D5 adds *significant* before *contributions*, D8 adds *various*, D33 adds *enforcement of* before *international law*, D36 introduces *are recognized as*, and D37 adds *officially* and *holds the title*. These additions range from referential clarification to evaluative strengthening, policy specification, and altered evidential framing. Their effects cannot be described uniformly as neutral clarification.

D33 is particularly important in a diplomatic context. Supporting international law and supporting its enforcement are related but not identical policy formulations. Adding *enforcement of* specifies an action not explicit in the source wording. D36 similarly introduces external recognition into a direct assertion about two democracies. D37 introduces official status without the source explicitly invoking an official classification. The analysis identifies these textual effects without judging the factual truth of the underlying demographic or political claims.

Several amplification assignments lack clear evidence of added information. D10's *future-oriented* reformulates the explicit source expression *orientasinya ke depan*. D16 already contains *penghubung strategis*, so *strategic hub* does not by itself establish the addition of a strategic function. D27's *the establishment of* corresponds to *didirikannya*, making that segment a reformulation of explicit content. D21's *capacity-*

building also needs comparison with the source's reference to kapasitas rather than an assumption that capacity has been introduced from nowhere.

Transposition is more clearly supported where a nominal expression becomes a verbal construction. D11 renders peningkatan intensitas pertukaran kunjungan through intensifying high-level visits. D14 renders nominal process expressions through combating and developing, and D35 uses foster and deepen in restructuring descriptions of closer friendship and deeper trust. By contrast, D16's pengembangan dan pembangunan and expansion and development both remain nominal, and D21's exchange remains nominal. These latter segments do not independently substantiate the assigned transposition label.

4.5 Omissions and generalization

Reduction is assigned to D2, D6, and D28. In D2, the omission of kembali removes the return-visit component, even if the general welcome remains. In D6, the compressed wording requires assessment against the source's additional appreciation and the description pelopor dan penggagas. D28's students encompass both mahasiswa and mahasiswi: this is better understood as gender-inclusive generalization or compression than as evidence that a substantive participant group has been lost.

Additional omissions are visible beyond those three assigned labels. D3 shortens the Prime Minister's designation and the honor's name, D7 omits kali ini, D10 does not explicitly retain sangat, and D29 compresses results and benefits into benefits. Thus, the distribution of assigned reduction codes does not establish the overall completeness of the translation. Some losses may be recoverable from context; recoverability should be argued for the particular detail rather than presumed for all omissions.

4.6 Discussion

The coding audit and qualitative review answer different parts of the research problem. The audit establishes the reproducible distribution of labels in the complete 40-unit matrix. The qualitative review shows that the labels vary in how closely they correspond to Molina and Hurtado Albir's (2002) definitions and in what they imply for equivalence. A frequency table is therefore useful only when its unit and denominator are explicit and its conceptual limitations remain visible.

The largest assigned category, established equivalent, is consistent with the presence of conventional diplomatic expressions. However, its numerical prominence cannot be used to establish overall translation accuracy. Likewise, the second-largest category, modulation, contains interpersonal reframing, near-direct correspondences, and substantive shifts in reference or commitment. These should not be combined into a claim that modulation uniformly improves diplomatic communication.

The pragmatic consequences are context-sensitive. Strengthening an aspiration into a plan can imply a firmer intended action, while weakening conviction into an opinion

can reduce certainty. Replacing agreements with opportunities changes the object under discussion; adding enforcement of specifies a policy action. These observations connect local wording to diplomatic communicative functions without inferring that the translator deliberately intended the changes.

The modal differences in D22 and D35 can be interpreted alongside research on modality and stance. Fu and Chen (2019) and Pan and Wang (2021) make clear why the strength of a commitment requires separate examination from its grammatical realization. Wang and Feng (2018) and X. Li and Zhang (2021) provide complementary attention to stance and engagement. In this matrix, hope translated as planning and conviction translated as opinion point in different directions. They therefore support a unit-specific assessment rather than a claim that the translation consistently strengthens or weakens the presidential voice.

The addition of enforcement of in D33 likewise requires consideration beyond its assigned amplification label. Abualadas (2024) shows that explicitation should be examined in relation to framing, while Gao and Munday (2023) and T. Li and Pan (2021) demonstrate the analytical relevance of evaluative shifts. Here, the defensible observation is that the added wording specifies a policy action absent from the reproduced source segment. Whether it was an editorial intervention, contextual clarification, or another process cannot be established from the matrix. The findings thus complement Pamungkas's (2020) Indonesian presidential speech study by making local referential and pragmatic differences explicit within a different political genre.

Institutional name retention also has practical value but must be assessed precisely. Unchanged names can help preserve identifiable reference, yet retaining a name does not validate the surrounding statement. Furthermore, English-origin expressions embedded in Indonesian and Indonesian expressions retained in English represent different directions of transfer. Explicit coding rules are necessary if both are included under borrowing.

The study is limited by mixed unit boundaries, abbreviated quotations, and the absence of independent coding validation. The source–target records are preserved as reproduced in the analytical matrix, which contains minor differences from the published English transcript. A subsequent validated analysis should verify both complete transcripts, standardize unit boundaries, identify coded segments, and reassess disputed labels before making stronger claims about technique prevalence. Audience research or process data would be necessary to test communicative effects or explain translators' intentions.

5. Conclusion

The complete matrix contains 40 aligned units and 85 unit–technique assignments. Established equivalent accounts for 38.82% of assignments, followed by modulation (23.53%), borrowing (14.12%), amplification (12.94%), transposition (7.06%),

and reduction (3.53%). These audited shares correct the inconsistent summary and describe assigned categories rather than independently validated counts of all segment-level techniques.

Qualitative comparison identifies conventional terminology, institutional name retention, and grammatical restructuring alongside lexical mismatches, modal strengthening or weakening, and additions with evaluative or policy implications. The most consequential examples concern relations versus mobility, hope versus planning, agreements versus opportunities, and conviction versus opinion. They demonstrate that fluent reformulation does not necessarily preserve diplomatic meaning.

The study's main implication is methodological and practical: technique classification must be kept distinct from equivalence assessment. Transparent counting makes a distribution reproducible, while contextual source–target comparison establishes what a particular choice retains or changes. A final validated corpus analysis should resolve the disputed classifications and transcript discrepancies before generalizing beyond this single presidential statement.

References

1. Abualadas, O. (2024). Explication and ideology in media translation: The case of MEMRI. *Translation & Interpreting*, 16(1), 76–92. <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.116201.2024.a05>
2. Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
3. Cabinet Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia. (2026, July 7). Press statement of President of the Republic of Indonesia at bilateral meeting with Prime Minister of India during Prime Minister's state visit to Indonesia at the Merdeka Palace, Special Capital Region of Jakarta July 07, 2026. <https://setkab.go.id/en/press-statement-of-president-of-the-republic-of-indonesia-at-bilateral-meeting-with-prime-minister-of-india-during-prime-ministers-state-visit-to-indonesia-at-the-merdeka-palace-special-capi/>
4. Caimotto, M. C. (2020). Transediting Trump's inaugural speech in Italian daily newspapers. *Translation & Interpreting*, 12(2), 76–91. <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.11222.2020.a07>
5. Fu, R., & Chen, J. (2019). Negotiating interpersonal relations in Chinese-English diplomatic interpreting: Explication of modality as a case in point. *Interpreting*, 21(1), 12–35. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00018.fu>
6. Gao, F., & Munday, J. (2023). Interpreter ideology: 'Editing' discourse in simultaneous interpreting. *Interpreting*, 25(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00084.gao>
7. Gao, F., & Wang, B. (2024). Reconstructing solidarity discourse through conference interpreting at the general debates of the United Nations (2008–2021). *The Translator*, 30(4), 553–570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2024.2367275>
8. Gu, C. (2019a). Interpreters caught up in an ideological tug-of-war? A CDA and Bakhtinian analysis of interpreters' ideological positioning and alignment at

- government press conferences. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 14(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.00027.gu>
9. Gu, C. (2019b). (Re)manufacturing consent in English: A corpus-based critical discourse analysis of government interpreters' mediation of China's discourse on PEOPLE at televised political press conferences. *Target*, 31(3), 465–499. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.18023.gu>
 10. Gu, C., & Tipton, R. (2020). (Re-)voicing Beijing's discourse through self-referentiality: A corpus-based CDA analysis of government interpreters' discursive mediation at China's political press conferences (1998–2017). *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 28(3), 406–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1717558>
 11. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. Routledge.
 12. House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
 13. Li, J., & Li, S. (2015). New trends of Chinese political translation in the age of globalisation. *Perspectives*, 23(3), 424–439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2014.983530>
 14. Li, T., & Pan, F. (2021). Reshaping China's image: A corpus-based analysis of the English translation of Chinese political discourse. *Perspectives*, 29(3), 354–370. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1727540>
 15. Li, X., & Zhang, R. (2021). The diplomatic interpreter's negotiation of power and solidarity through engagement choices: A case study of the Chinese Foreign Minister's 2018 press conference. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 39, Article 100459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2020.100459>
 16. Liao, S., & Pan, L. (2018). Interpreter mediation at political press conferences: A narrative account. *Interpreting*, 20(2), 188–203. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00009.lia>
 17. Mochammad, T. P. A., Lukman, L., Said, I. M., & Sosrohadi, S. (2026). Ethic and Emic Perspectives in Cross-Cultural Translation: A Study of Indonesian Folklore into Korean. *Dialectica Online Publishing Journal*, 1(2), 210-217.
 18. Molina, L., & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta*, 47(4), 498–512. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
 19. Munday, J. (2018). A model of appraisal: Spanish interpretations of President Trump's inaugural address 2017. *Perspectives*, 26(2), 180–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1388415>
 20. Pamungkas, M. E. (2020). Translation methods in political speeches: A case study of English translation of President Joko Widodo's inaugural address. *Paradigma: Jurnal Kajian Budaya*, 10(2), 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.17510/paradigma.v10i2.289>
 21. Pan, F., & Wang, B. (2021). Is interpreting of China's political discourse becoming more target-oriented? A corpus-based diachronic comparison between the 1990s and the 2010s. *Babel*, 67(2), 222–244. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.00215.pan>
 22. Phanthaphoommee, N. (2021). Translating “America First” into Thai: Translators' evaluations of President Trump's inaugural speech. *Journal of Mekong Societies*, 17(3), 77–99. <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/mekongjournal/article/view/257152>
 23. Phanthaphoommee, N. (2023). Saving face of the 'saviour': The translations of the Thai Prime Minister's 2015 press interview and the 2020 national address. *GEMA*

Online Journal of Language Studies, 23(1), 328–345. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2023-2301-17>

24. Phanthaphoommee, N., & Munday, J. (2024). Pronoun shifts in political discourse: The English translations of the Thai Prime Minister Prayut Chan-o-cha's statements on the international stage. *Babel*, 70(6), 825–851. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.00388.pha>
25. Pratiwi, N. I., Sosrohadi, S., Rahman, F., Dalyan, M., & Andini, C. (2026). The use of code-mixing by edu-influencers in social media: A communication strategy in sociolinguistic perspective. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, 11(1), 1034-1042.
26. Prihandoko, L. A., Tembang, Y., Marpaung, D. N., & Rahman, F. (2019, October). English language competence for tourism sector in supporting socio-economic development in Merauke: A Survey Study. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 343, No. 1, p. 012170). IOP Publishing.
27. Salsabila, N., Sosrohadi, S., Sukirnoa, S., & Anjani, S. D. (2025). The Representation of Personal Resilience in Ghea Indrawari's Song Terima Kasih Sudah Bertahan: A Semiotic Analysis. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 8(1), 81-90.
28. Schäffner, C. (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(1), 117–150. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.3.1.09sch>
29. Schäffner, C. (2015). Speaker positioning in interpreter-mediated press conferences. *Target*, 27(3), 422–439. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.27.3.06sch>
30. Wang, B., & Feng, D. (2018). A corpus-based study of stance-taking as seen from critical points in interpreted political discourse. *Perspectives*, 26(2), 246–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1395468>
31. Swandayani, N. E., Rahman, F., Sulastri, T., & Sosrohadi, S. (2026). The Use of Language Styles in Multimodal Texts on the Facebook Account æHTæ. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, 11(1), 447-456.
32. Tenrisanna, R., Andini, C., Mulyani, M., Rugayya, S., Raviah, S., & Yuriatson, Y. (2026). Reading in the Digital Age: Teaching Cyber Literature through Social Media-Based Learning. *Dialectica Online Publishing Journal*, 1(4), 452-459.
33. Zhang, J. (2014). From interpersonal to international: Two types of translation in the making of implicitness in diplomatic discourse. *Perspectives*, 22(1), 75–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2012.718354>