



REPRESENTATIVE SPEECH ACTS PERFORMED BY THE DEBATERS IN AN ENGLISH DEBATE COMPETITION

Karlinda Orin✉ Yuliasri Issy

English language Education, Graduate Program, Semarang State University, Indonesia.

Article Info

Accepted 3 August 2016
Approved 25 August 2016
Published 20 November 2016

Keywords: speech acts, representative speech acts, debate competition, debaters, a speech act analysis to discourse

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the types of representative speech acts performed by the debaters, the opponents' responses to representative speech acts in debate and the contribution of the representative speech acts to the development of argument in debate. This study used spoken discourse analysis especially speech act theory proposed by Schiffrin (1994) for data analysis. The object of this study is English debate performed by the debaters. The result of this study shows that there are twelve types of representative speech acts in the debate (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985). The analysis on the opponents' response result shows that the highest opponents respond is "arguing" acts than other acts. It meant that the debaters try to embrace and persuade the hearers so the hearers can comprehend and believe speakers' feelings. The last, the representative speech acts to the development of argument in debate shows that the highest frequency distribution of representative speech acts is explaining 46.1%. It is followed by exemplifying 19.4% and tie-back 18.1%. The small frequency distribution of representative speech acts in arguments' structure is labeling 16.3%. Thus, the speaker of the affirmative team successfully exploits the favorable contexts of their speech to persuade the hearers.

© 2016 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉Correspondence:
Kampus Unnes Bendan Ngisor, Semarang, 50233
E-mail: karlindaorin@yahoo.com

p-ISSN 2087-0108
e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

Naturally, people use language to communicate. It indicates that the primary function of language is for communication. By using language, the aims of communication will be easy to achieve. Every human speech contains different meaning and intention, some people speak only to inform something, and some want the hearer to agree with the speech and some also intimidate another with speech. This phenomenon is known as speech acts.

According to Bach (2003) "a speech act is quintessentially pragmatics because it is created when speaker makes an utterance to hearer in context and must be interpreted as an aspect of social interaction." Owens (2000:57) gives a statement related to speech acts. He states that "a speech act is a unit of linguistic communication expressed according to linguistic rules that convey a speaker's conceptual representations and intentions."

Searle (1968) as quoted by Mey (1993:131) proceeds to a classification of speech acts. There are five classes of acts: representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. Representative speech acts are a kind of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be true or false. In Jary, Mark (2010:9) representative speech acts are called assertive speech acts. In addition, O'Keeffe, Anne et al (2011:97) gives a statement that the indicator of representative acts is the term of attitude it expresses: belief, as opposed to desire, intention, gratitude, sorrow, etc. It means that in analyzing representative acts, it relates to the belief of the speaker. Paradigmatic cases include asserting, claiming, reporting, stating, reminding, disclaiming, predicting, criticizing, admitting, arguing, informing, suggesting, rebutting, complaining (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985: 182-192).

There have been a number of researches concerning with the phenomena of speech acts. One of the studies is conducted by Josiah and Johnson (2012). Their research was about pragmatic analyses of President Goodluck

Jonathan's and President Barack Obama's inaugural addresses. The result shows that the speeches are relatively alike because each speaker speaks for his entire nation, regardless of his political party, and both speeches show a preponderance of 'representatives' and 'commissives'.

Another study is conducted by Oladimeji & Esther (2012) about contextual acts in President Goodluck Jonathan's declaration of presidential candidacy under the People's Democratic Party. From the president's utterances, key illocutionary acts which are direct and indirect, in the categories of Assertives, Commissives, Expressives, Directives and Verdictives are noticed. About (50%) of the acts were Commissive acts while the assertive acts constitute thirty (30%). The declarative and expressive acts record ten percent (10%) each while the vindictive record zero percent (0%).

However, this current study is different from those other previous studies of representative speech acts. The current study identifies representative speech acts performed by the debaters in Grand Final of Indonesian Varsity English Debate /IVED 2014 and it also identifies the kinds of representative speech acts in detail and analyzes the relationships between utterances, actions, and conditions. They are: asserting, claiming, stating, arguing, rebutting, informing, reminding, predicting, suggesting, admitting, criticizing, reporting, disclaiming, and complaining (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985).

Debate has a relationship with speech act theory because debate contains the act of arguing. The occurrence of argumentation is not restricted to the category of statements; it may appear in response to any speech act (Jackson and Jacobs in Rytel, Jolanta: 2014) and there are more parts of speech acts that those contain in debate like rebutting, arguing, claiming, suggestion and etc. Based on the theories and the explanation above, the writer is interested to conduct the study on representative speech acts performed by

the debaters in an English debate competition (Grand Final Indonesian varsities English debate/IVED 2014 performed by Gajah Mada University and University of Indonesia).

Thus, according to those explanation, the writer is interested to (1) identify the types of representative speech acts performed by the debaters in Grand final IVED 2014, (2) to explain the opponents respond to representative speech acts in a debate competition, (3) explain the contribution of representative speech acts to the development of argument in debate competition.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, the writer used qualitative method to study the problem. The writer chose a speech acts analysis to discourse (Schiffrin, Deborah, 1994: 88) because this is the most appropriate design to analyze the relationships between utterances and actions. The object of this study is the utterances of English debate competition performed by the debaters in Grand Final Indonesian Varsity English debate/IVED 2014. The data is taken from www.youtube.com. This debate's length is one hour five minutes forty seconds and the topic "This House Believes that developing Nations That Receive Aid & Have Uneven Levels of Development (such as India & China) Should Not Be Providing Developmental Aid to Other Countries".

The steps used in collecting the data of the study are as follows: First, the writer searched for the video of the Grand Final of Indonesian Varsity English Debate/IVED 2014, and then the writer chose the video of Grand Final of IVED 2014 performed by Gajah Mada University and University of Indonesia. Next, the writer watched the video of Grand Final of IVED 2014 performed by Gajah Mada University and University of Indonesia. Last, the writer conducted the analysis of

representative speech acts performed by the debaters in an English debate competition.

The steps used in analyzing the data are as follows: (1) transcribing, (2) identifying (the writer identified to representative speech acts which performed by the debaters) (3) classifying (the representative speech acts which had been identified were classified based on the types of representative speech acts (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985). And (4) comparing (this comparing started with calculating all the representative speech acts produced by debaters). Next, (5) Interpreting (in this process, the interpretation was done in order to explain and describe the problems of this study). The last, drawing conclusion (this drawing conclusion process was the last process of overall data analysis process in this study). In this study, the writer used the triangulation of theory/perspective. In this type of triangulation, the witer used some theoretical perspectives to examine and interpret the data. Those theoretical perspectives are: theory of type's representative speech acts Searle & Vanderveken (1985) and O'Keeffe, Anne et al (2011), a speech acts analysis to discourse by Deborah (1994), debate proposed by and Quinn (2005) and D'cruz (2003).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

To analyze the types of representative speech acts by the debaters, this study applied Searle and Vanderveken (1985). There are twelve types of representative speech acts that performed by the debaters in Grand Final Indonesia Varsities English Debate (IVED) 2014. They are: asserting, arguing, informing, claiming, predicting, suggesting, stating, criticizing, rebutting, reminding, admitting, and complaining. The table below presents the finding of types representative speech acts are performed by debaters in IVED 2014.

Table 1. the types of representative speech acts performed by the debaters

No	Kinds of Representative Speech Acts	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Asserting	18	4.7
	Arguing	131	34
	Informing	23	6
	Claiming	2	0.5
	Predicting	45	11.2
	Suggesting	73	19
	Stating	65	17
	Criticizing	14	3.6
	Rebutting	11	2.9
	Reminding	3	0.7
	Admitting	1	0.2
	Complaining	1	0.2
	Disclaiming	0	0
	Reporting	0	0
Total		386	100

Based on the table above, it can be seen that arguing acts held the highest frequency of occurrence or the most frequently used by the debaters in Grand Final IVED 2014. The debaters used 34% out of the total number of the utterances in debate. There is no disclaiming and reporting act used by the debaters in Grand Final Indonesian Varsities English Debate/IVED 2014.

Arguing is to argue something with essential some reasons to support it (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985). Arguing is a kind of representative used to express an opposite opinion. Arguing is also used to give reasons for or against something especially with the aim of persuading somebody to share one's own opinion.

For example:

(23) The first speaker of the affirmative team Mr. Romario

Because first of all, even though the aid has its image, it only covers certain sector; it is not cover all the sectors.

The negative utterance, "it is not cover all the sectors", produced by Mr. Romario is also

the indication of arguing something. Mr. Romario's utterances indicate that he has an opposite opinion with negative team. Mr. Romario performs representative act by arguing what he believes that the aid just for image and cannot cover all sectors. For all arguing acts can be seen in appendix 2 the types of representative speech acts performed by the debaters in the Grand Final of IVED 2014.

The Opponents' Responses to Representative Speech Acts in Grand Final IVED 2014

In this debate, there are three speakers each on each team. The writer focused on the opponents' respond to representative speech acts in Grand final IVED 2014.

Based on the data analysis, the highest opponents respond to representative speech acts in Grand final IVED 2014 is arguing act 37 data performed by the third speaker of affirmative team Miss Indriani which is contained 91 number of data or 23%. For example:

(54) First speaker of negative team Miss. Elvia

Table 2. the opponents' respond to representative speech acts in Grand final IVED 2014.

Speakers	The opponents' response to representative speech acts												Total
	Ass	Inf	Sta	Arg	Cl	Pre	Sug	Cri	Rem	Reb	Com	Adm	
The first speaker of affirmative	3	3	8	27	1	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	50 (13%)
The first speaker of negative	2	1	3	17	0	4	0	3	1	3	0	0	39 (10%)
The second speaker of affirmative	2	4	10	37		16	7	8	0	1	0	1	91 (23%)
The second speaker of negative	2	4	10	29	0	8	2	0	0	1	1	0	57 (14.9%)
The third speaker of affirmative	2	6	11	16	0	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	44 (11.4%)
The third speaker of negative	1	1	7	30	0	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	46 (12%)
The Replay speaker of affirmative	2	2	3	8	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	16 (4.1%)
The Replay speaker of negative	0	1	3	12	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	33 (8.7%)

We agree right now is the top of the most perfect mission that is always progress toward better in the future.

In this utterance Miss Elvia expressed that her team agree with Mr. Romario as the first speaker of affirmative team. The word of “agree” is categorized as agreeing and it is indicated that Miss Elvia gave the agreeing expression directly. It is realized Miss. Elvia lose facing to the opposite team. The second highest opponents respond to representative speech acts is predicting 16 data produced by the third speaker of affirmative team Miss Indriani. The third highest opponents' respond to representative speech acts is stating 11 data performed by the third speaker of affirmative team Miss Indriani. The lowest percentage opponents respond to representative speech acts are admitting and complaining.

The Contribution of the Representative Speech Acts to the Development of Argument in Debate

Based on Freely & Steinberg (2008:6) debate provides reasoned arguments for and against a proposition. In this style, there are two teams. Each team uses two basic types of argument to support for its side of the topic. First, there are substantive arguments. These are prepared arguments in favor of a team's side of the topic. Second, there is rebuttal. Rebuttal is your attack on your opposition's arguments. The difference between substantive arguments and rebuttal is the distinction between showing why your team is right and showing why your opposition is wrong. Structuring a speech by using arguments is a great start. Ideally, each argument itself needs structure. According to Quinn (2005: 68) describes four points of structure arguments to provide good and valid argument. They are: label, explanation, example, and tie-back. This following table

presents the representative speech acts contribute to develop of arguments.

Table 3. Distribution of representative speech acts in arguments' structure.

Speakers	Arguments' structure in debate competition							
	Labelling		Explaining		Exemplifying		Tie-backing	
	F	P/%	F	P/%	F	P/%	F	P/%
First speaker of affirmative (A1)	10	16	20	11.4	13	17.4	8	11.2
First Speaker of negative (N1)	8	13.4	18	10.9	10	14	8	11.2
Second speaker of Affirmative (A2)	14	23.4	51	29	12	16	14	20
Second speaker of negative (N2)	9	15	29	17	9	12	6	8.6
Third speaker of affirmative (A3)	6	10	10	6	14	18.7	11	15.8
Third speaker of negative team (N3)	7	11.7	16	9	11	14.7	13	18.7
Reply speaker of negative (RN)	1	1.6	13	7.8	1	1.4	1	1.5
Reply speaker of affirmative (RA)	5	8	14	8	5	6.8	9	13
Total	63	100%	178	100%	75	100%	70	100%

Based on table below, the first highest distribution of representative speech acts in arguments' structure is explaining 29 % that performed by second speaker of affirmative team which is used arguing acts 30% in table 4.1.2.1.2 and 178 out of total number of data. The second highest that performed by third speaker of affirmative team is exemplifying 18.7 % and the second dominant representative speech acts contribute to develop of arguments is suggesting 18%. The third highest argument's structure is tie-backing and the third dominant representative speech acts contribute to develop of arguments is stating 14%. The lowest argument's structure is labelling 63 out of total number of data. The next dominant representative speech acts contribute to develop of arguments is suggesting 7%. The lowest frequency representative speech acts contribute

to develop of arguments are admitting and complaining (0.2%).

Mr. Revaldi as the third speaker of the negative team spent 8 minutes 25 seconds. Here, the third speaker of negative team criticize the lacking points of the opponents and provide a better analysis.

For example:

(291) *So what we argue in the first is the money is not enough to irrigate property.*

Based on the number of data 291, Mr. Revaldi convinced the affirmative team or audience that her argument is correct. He produced the argumentation in number of data N3.286 - N3.332. To know how the representative speech acts contribute to the develop arguments the writer used structure of argument. There are four points: label, reasoning/explanation, evident/examples, tie-back. In number of data N3.326 - N3.332, the

speaker does not deliver tie-back to the develop arguments in debate.

Miss Indriani as the reply speaker of the affirmative team spent 4 minutes 20 seconds. The job of reply speaker of the affirmative team must deliver case enhancement. Case enhancement can be in a form of analogy or a comparison between the strengths of their team and the weaknesses of their opponent team. For example:

(358) *Actually is inconsistent because they say the third speaker say that you this it double to... is too small whether the second and first speaker agree that is a big.*

In data 358, the speaker described about the weaknesses of negative team. The reply of affirmative team Miss. Indriani produced argumentation in number of data RA. 349 - RA.382. Each her argument delivered the four points of structure argument, such as, label, explanation, example and tie-back. It means those structures can be valid.

CONCLUSIONS

The representative speech acts performed by the debaters in competition debate tend to be mainly twelve types of representative speech acts proposed by Searle and Vanderveken (1985) through the act of asserting, arguing, informing, claiming, predicting, suggesting, stating, criticizing, rebutting, reminding, admitting, and complaining. The writer could not found "disclaiming" act and "reporting" act. It can be seen from the way of the speakers' respond. The finding of the data indicates that the arguing acts are the most frequent performed by the debaters in Grand Final of Indonesian Varsity English Debate/IVED 2014.

The next conclusion is the opponents' responses to representative speech acts in debate competition. The most dominant opponents' respond to representative speech acts in Grand Final of Indonesian Varsity English Debate/IVED 2014 is "arguing acts" performed by the third speaker of affirmative team Miss Indriani. This means that Miss Indriani as the third speaker of affirmative team not only

attacked the opponents' argument. She also rebutted these arguments from a different perspective and adding more examples in her own rebuttals. So, Miss Indriani dominates than others.

The most frequently distribution representative speech acts in arguments' structure is explaining performed by second speaker of affirmative team which used "arguing" acts 30%. Here, the second speaker of affirmative team evaluates the overall stance taken by the negative team and provide critique on the general approach taken by the opponents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my grateful appreciation to Drs. Ahmad Sofwan, MA, Ph.D who has guided me patiently, encouragement since the beginning until the end of this thesis and suggestions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bach, K. 2003. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy Entry. In <http://online.sfsu.edu/~kbach/spchacts.html>. [Accessed on October 2010].
- Denzin, N. K. 1978. *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- D'Cruz, Ray. 2003. *The Australia-Asia Debating Guide*. North Melbourne: Australian Debating Federation.
- Jary, Mark. 2010. *Assertion*. England: Palgrave Macmillan
- Josiah, U.E. & Johson, S.E. 2012. Pragmatic Analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's and President Barack Obama's Inaugural Addresses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 2, No. 1, PP 261-278.
- Leongkamchorn Suporn. 2010. *Speech Act Analysis of British and American Poetry*. Master of Arts, National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA).

- Mey, J.L. 1993. *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- O'Keeffe, Anne, Clancy, Brian, and Adolphs, Svenja. 2011. *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. Canada: Routledge
- Oladimeji, Olaniyi K.. 2008. A Pragmatic Analysis of President Umar Yar Adua's Inaugural Speech of 29th May, 2007. *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association (JNESA)* 13:2.
- Owens, Jr. Robert E. 2000. *Language Development: An Introduction*. Fifth Edition. New York: State University of New York Genesco.
- Quinn, Simon. 2005. *Debating*. Australia: Brisbane Queensland
- Rytel, Jolanta. 2014. The nature and development of argumentative skills in children: Current research. *Journal* vol. 1, No. 1. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/>. [Accessed on July 2015].
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell publishing
- Searle, J. 1968. *Speech Act*. London: Cambridge University Press
- Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. California: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. & Vanderveken, Daniel. 1985. *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Newyork: Cambridge University Press.