

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is about finding and discussions that the researcher thinks those finding are important to be analyzed furthermore match with the theory from chapter II. The finding is on the form of category and the kinds that the researcher finds those data are similar. The analysis is in the section of the description.

#### **A. Research findings**

Based on the methodology that the researcher chooses the researcher has found some language realizations that performed by the debaters in the beginning in the middle or in the last speech. Those utterances are spread through their speech in 7 minutes proximately. Basically, their agreement and their disagreement are performed when they agree or against the motion or the other debaters' statement. So, to show the context of their language realization the researcher also shows the statement before and followed by the utterances.

In order to know the context of utterances, the researcher provides the run of debate in the form of a resume to the reader. And the findings later show the statement weather from what they agree or what they disagree first. Then the researcher collects the finding and listing the data. Then the last process is giving

description as the final process. These processes are needed to find valid data and to make sure the data becomes saturated.

The way to make the data more valid the researcher chooses triangulation and helped other researchers to collect the data until the data are provided into the description in the section of the discussion.

There are four types of agreement that performed in this debate and the researcher finds those types of agreement are intensifier, synonym, repetition, and token. The intensifier is a kind of variety performing the agreement. The way how it works is by giving stressing(Leech, 2014). A synonym is also another variety that shows agreement as well by saying the synonym of the statement before(Leech, 2014). Repetition is the response that shows the agreement by repeating the same statement(Brown,1987). And the last is token, the token is an additional word that represents the agreement. (Brown,1987).

There are some varieties for showing disagreement also those are by avoiding disagreement, indirect objection, and objection. Avoiding disagreement is the type of language realization that twisting agreement into disagreement(Brown,1987). An indirect objection is a type of showing disagreement to reduce the conflict (Leech,2014). The objection is the kind of common objection that performed by people.

## 1. Language Realizations

In this video of debate, the researcher finds that some language realizations related to the theory that proposed by Leech and Brown in the different books are performed.

### a. Intensifier (Agreement)

The intensifier is words that give additional meaning in the context of emotional stressing. This definition had explained before in chapter II as the base of theory in this thesis. The finding that indicates intensifier are :

Data 1(30:30-30:32)

“I like to know that all the collaboration on the whole case is valuable and **extremely** important.”

This statement or utterance was performed by the deputy of opposition. This statement, **extremely** showed agreement by putting imperative. This speaker used the word “extremely” to specify that the collaboration is valuable.

This utterance appeared to show agreement to the first speaker of opposition that mentioned that the collaboration is very important to the house.

Data 2 (41:35-41:42)

“For those reasons I am **very** proud to purpose this motion.”

This statement was still the statement from the fifth speaker. This speaker was a member of the government. This

speaker used an intensifier to show his agreement. The word “**very**” was intensifier and stressing his position, agreed with the government.

Data 3 (34:27-34:35)

“When we think of the character of this regime, what is the intensive for them to cooperate with them the minority? the opening government **correctly** characterize these, the one who had economic capital.”

Moving to the fifth speaker and this speaker was called by the member of the government. This speaker used an intensifier to show the agreement. This speaker agreed with the government by saying **correctly**.

Not only that the statement from the previous speakers were also repeated as well. Then it gave his stand and his agreement through the opening government team.

#### **b. Synonym (Agreement)**

There is no finding in this section because the speakers do not give synonym of what they heard from previous speakers. Probably the debaters cannot remember the words from the speaker before and can not find the synonym if they can not remember the exact word. Instead of finding the synonym the speakers choose repetition. In the theory that provided by Leech and Brown in the different book synonym can be found in the interaction that

required fast response. But, in the debate even they have to interact with other debaters and response with other debaters, their speech can be categorized as a monolog. Further explanation is in the next discussion section.

**c. Repetition (Agreement)**

Repetition according to Leech and Brown in the different book is the statement that given by hearer or responder in this context, to the speaker before in the form of a repetition statement. This section is the most finding in the term of quantity. One of the reason is that by repeating the statement the speaker seems correlated with their team and make the speaker seems empowered the stand and domination of the team. Further explanation is in the section of the next discussion.

Data 1 (18:18-18:37)

“**The collaborators are not the average person** or the average citizen but the greater and more powerful person.”

**The collaborators are not the average person** ,this could be classified as an agreement. Specifically, could be categorized as repetition. This worked by repeating the leader’s statement before. This statement basically has been mentioned and stringent by this speaker as his job as the deputy of the prime minister that supported the leader of the government.

The stamen mentioned “**the collaborators are not the average person**” is originally come from the leader of government or prime minister.

Data 2 (8:40-8:41)

“Under every reason (before), **we proudly purposed.**”

This included an agreement. This statement showed agreement to the motion just like the statement before but in different terms. This statement not only purposed the agreement by mentioned “**we proudly purposed**” but also can be classified as repetition.

The repetition is shown in the utterance “**under every reason before**”. This statement mentioned that before agreeing with the speaker has to remain that there were some statements that made the speaker agreed with the motion.

Data 3 (18:37-18:45)

“**My partner has told you** the intensive of this structure(collaboration) is for this evil regime.”

This statement still was performed by the deputy of the prime minister, by repeating the leader’s statement before, **My partner has told you**. This can be categorized as an agreement performance. And as like before this speaker repeated the statement.

The statement that has been repeated was the intensive of the collaboration is for the benefits of the evil regime.

Data 4 (22:02-22:11)

“The second point is the point that **the point from my speaker said and never been negated**, being collaborative means giving the sources and in a massive quantity. “

This statement still was performed by the deputy of the prime minister, by repeating the leader’s statement before, **the point from my speaker said and never been negated**. It seems for the debaters agreeing gave the benefits to support, strength and agreeing at the same time.

Data 5 (25:36-25:44)

“I am going to elaborate more from **what already gave (leader of the opposition) you.**”

This speaker was the fourth speaker and called the deputy of opposition. The way of showing agreement was repetition, **what already gave (leader of the opposition) you**. This speaker was going to repeat the statement from the leader of the opposition. The purposed is the same to show his stance on the debate.

This speaker agreed of what the leader of opposition and repeated that statements first. After this speaker repeated the statements then this speaker continued to his own original statements.

Data 6 (28:32-28:39)

“In the first place, they(evil regime) are collaborating with you not resentencing you **which brought to you by Anita**”

This speaker was still the fourth speaker and called the deputy of opposition. The way of showing agreement was repetition, **brought to you by Anita**. This speaker was going to repeat the statement from the leader of the opposition. The purposed is the same to show his stand on the debate the leader of the opposition.

Repetition in this speaker was showed in the statement of “**which brought to you by Anita**”. Anita is the name of the leader of the opposition.

Data 7 (30:41-31:45)

“When **Anita (leader of the opposition) told you** this not the way(fight back the evil regime) to preserving the minority.”

This statement or utterance was performed by the deputy of opposition. This agreement could be categorized as repetition. This speaker was going to repeat the statement from the leader of the opposition.

The statement from the leader was surviving is the best way to put the identity group in the safest place. And the collaboration is the way to survive as well. And these statements were mentioned before indirectly and repeated in his speech, in the purpose to



strengthen and agreeing with the statements of the leader, **Anita told you.**

Data 8 (42:25-42:33)

“**Opening opposition showed us** why the collaboration will mean less harmful.”

This speaker was the sixth speaker and was called a member of the opposition. This speaker stands on the opposition line. This statement performed repetition by repeating the statement of the very first speaker of the opposition team. The statement that categorized as repetition was **Opening opposition showed us.**

This speaker believed that the opening government provided the best solution and he agreed with that by repeating the statement. The purpose of doing this was to show his stand and agreement of what the opposition mentioned.

#### **d. Another agreement**

This section is not included in the theory provided by Brown and Leech before. This section is made because there are some agreements that performed without indicating or using characteristics of intensifier synonym and repetition.

Data 1 (7:46-7:49)

“**We think** this is worth it.”

This utterance shows Agreement. **We think** is an utterance that shows the agreement of the motion. The motion before purposed to reject collaboration with Nazis and the house should avoid and the motion stated some example of the collaboration that happens in the past during the world war three.

This speaker performed an agreement with the motion. To show his agreement the speaker added the utterance “we think” means that it shows indirect agreement and strengthen with the statement worth it.

**e. Avoiding disagreement**

Is one of the way of performing disagreement. The way how to avoiding disagreement is by twisting agreement into disagreement. It seems the speakers agree with the statement before but actually they disagree. The characteristics of this type is the speakers first repeat the statement from the opposite team and agree with that statement but in the last they object the statement.

Data 1 (2:44-2:47)

“Being the collaborator (with the evil regime) will make the identity group be better. **This is a liar.**”

This disagreement was purposed by the first speaker and the leader of the government. The purpose was to show what would be happened is not real.

This speaker disagreed by performed the disagreement of indirect or twisting disagreement. It seemed this speaker agreed and after that, he said “**This is a liar**”.

Data 2 (26:32-26:38)

“**Even when the privileged get benefits** (from this collaboration) still these privileged minority will lead and organize the identity group in the future.

This speaker performed a twisting agreement. This speaker seemed agreed with the statement of the government mentioned that only the privileged would get benefits, **Even when the privileged get benefits**. But this speaker mentioned that the privileged would lead the identity group as well and not abandoning the identity group.

Data 3 (48:09-48:11)

“The second issue, why **fighting against will be better** when they are a collaboration because it will empower the regime by getting resource easier **but personally we don’t think this will empower the regime.**”

This was performed by the member of the opposition. This speaker disagreed and twisting the agreement. It seems he agreed of the idea of the government but at the last, he was twisting it.

The utterance of “**fighting against will be better**” was the statement that agreed with the government but the utterance “**but**

**personally we don't think this will empower the regime**" was the utterance of disagreed.

Data 4 (19:30-19:50)

"What really we need to recognize the selfishness appeared in the spectrum. **They may help the people but** They do not have the majority of the identity group."

This was a twisting disagreement or indirect disagreement. First, he agreed, **They may help the people**. This might help identify group but it did not represent all the identity group he said.

This was performed by the deputy of the prime minister to present his disagreement and his stand and believe against the opposition team.

Data 5 (7:32-7:37)

"**We agree** in the short term the regime will see as a treat **but** the risk is between they will survive and or betray us."

This disagreement was performed by the leading speaker. This disagreement characterized as a twisting disagreement. The words were **We agree, But**. It had meant that this speaker resembled agreed but in the last, he turned that.

In the first word the speaker agreed that the regime will fight the house as a treat for not collaborating but if they collaborate they have a chance to colonize and abuse the house in the long term.

Data 6 (8:32-8:40)

“**We accept** if it possible ends with the fail, it is still **better** then die as a slave.”

This disagreement was performed by the first speaker. This disagreement classified as a twisting disagreement by saying **We accept, better**. It had suggested that this speaker looked accepted but in the last, he rotated that

The twisting disagreement had suggested that the speaker accepted that their discollaboration will be possible to fail and cost dead for the member of the house but it was better than die as a slave.

#### f. Indirect objection

this type of disagreement is the type of objection that performed without pointing the point or statement from the speaker before. This can be analyzed from the utterance “I think” or “I don’t think”(Leech,2014). These are the type of indirect objection.

Data 1 (5:03-5:09)

“The meaning is something inherent within every collaboration to get oppressed and abused. **We think** it is **extremely, extremely** limited.”

This was a kind of indirect objection and intensifier. “**We think**” remained the hedges to perform disagreement and “**extremely, extremely**” was the utterance of the intensifier.

This speaker stressed his disagreement furthermore to the opposition by showing intensifier.

Data 2 (5:23-5:27)

(POI) **“I think** it is highly uncomperative.”

This was a variety of Objections. **“I think”** is the expression of disagreement. This utterance was confirmed to show disagreement. This also performed by the first speaker before.

Data 3 (9:33-9:50)

“First thing why this (survive with the collaboration) **is better in reality and the most effective alternative.**”

This speaker was the second speaker or the leader of the opposition. This speaker performed disagreement. This speaker showed the disagreement by declaring her opposite belief and stand as well. The words were **“is better in reality and the most effective alternative”**.

Data 4 (10:15-10:21)

**“They told me that the beneficiary to the best-connected part of the identity group** we tackle down this by the reality. The reality this collaboration will also beneficial to identity group to survive.”

This speaker was the second speaker or the leader of the opposition. This speaker performed disagreement. This speaker delivered repetition disagreement. Her statement was led by the government statement before and repeated. The words were **They**

**told me that the beneficiary to the best-connected part of the identity group.**

Data 5 (11:26-11:41)

**“Second, they said that they have to fight for their freedom.**

This is not the collaboration that can get you in reality. In reality, they will survive for the collaboration.”

This utterance, **they said that they have to fight for their freedom** or statement could be categorized as repetition. This speaker of the leader of opposition showed disagreement. Her statement was led by the government statement repeated and rebutted in the same time to show her disagreement.

Data 6 (13:43-13:45)

**“Why we think not doing anything is not the thing that we buy.”**

This speaker of the leader of opposition registered disagreement. Her announcement was disagreement **not the thing that we buy**: disagreement by rejected the government's statement. This was strengthened by the word “not the thing that we buy”.

Data 7 (36:18-36:32)

**“If the reason is just they are different culture it can be defined as something dangerous. I don't think France and Nazi are the same.”**

This speaker tried to perform disagreement. This speaker used indirect objection. This speaker decided to rebate by

providing his opinion and his viewpoint. This speaker indirectly performed disagreement by saying” **I don’t think**”. This utterance showed unconvincing statement before.

Data 8 (37:01-37:02)

“**I don’t think** this will be effective **at all**”

This speaker delivered disagreement. This disagreement could be categorized as an intensifier: this speaker stressed the ineffective solution by saying “**at all**”. It had suggested that this speaker stressed his statement about the effectiveness solution of the previous speaker.

Data 9 (39:38-39:42)

“That is why it is going to be **massively horrible**.”

The speaker performed disagreement specified in intensifier. This speaker stressed and showed emphasizing the ineffective solution by saying “**massively**”. It showed the solution is very bad. And this speaker disagreed with that.

Data 10 (42:51-42:56)

“**I think** this is **exactly** you think for yourself.”

This disagreement could be categorized as an intensifier. And the word “**exactly**” is the word to giving stress and show the disagreement in this context. He disagreed the selfishness from the previous speaker.



Another disagreement was performed by the utterance “I think”. I think was categorized as an indirect object. It showed an unconvinced statement. This statement was performed by the member of the opposition.

Data 11 (44:00-44:01)

“**We don’t think** that it is exactly betraying your own people like giving information.”

This speaker presented indirect objection. This happened sometimes if there is a conflict with the opinions. “**I think**” or “**I don’t think**”.

#### **g. Objection**

Objection is the performance of disagreement that has no correlation with politeness or the theory of agreement and disagreement. These data are the data that still a type of disagreement but performed without and can not be categorized in the theory of Brown and Leech.

Data 1 (1:51-1:55)

“In WW2 France was controlling Nazi by their collaborating. **These are the behavior that we against.**”

This was a kind of disagreement. This disagreement was through the disagreement that would be purposed by the opposition. And there was no twisting agreement.

This purposed by the first speaker of the government. This speaker disagreed with the idea of what would be purposed by the speaker of opposition. And his disagreement strength by utterance “ **we against**”.

Data 2 (4:02-4:07)

“Even if we push less and less discrimination and abuse, it is **impossible** the regime ever follow you.”

This speaker disagreed and practiced the Intensifier to performed his disagreement. “**Impossible**” is the variety of intensifier.

Data 3 (13:06-13:19)

(POI) “If your regime is empowered, **how do you believe they will always prioritize the house?**”

Here was the realization of disagreement and categorized as the objection, disagreement by questioning. This question was delivered by the government team, **how do you believe they will always prioritize the house.**

Data 4 (18.55-18.58)

(POI) “Is the character of the individual ( powerful collaborator) **as same as your description?**”

This was the realization of disagreement and categorized as the objection, disagreement by questioning. This question was performed by the opposition team, by saying **as same as your**

**description.** The objection was questioning the judgment from the deputy prime minister.

Data 5 (47:15-47:35)

(POI) “**Don’t you think** this cooperation itself has an inherent risk for you to be tortured and leaking information?”

This was the realization of disagreement and categorized as the objection, disagreement by questioning. This question was performed by the government team, **Don’t you think.**

Data 6 (27:49-27:59)

(POI) “**Tell me** that incentive of this oppression to just simply listen to a minority when they still have the ability to kill them

This speaker was from an individual deputy of government criticism. This speaker of government was debating by examination and questioning, **Tell me.**

Data 7 (56:37-56:40)

(POI) “**Isn’t** selling information signaling that you are surrendering?”

This was the performance of disagreement and categorized as the objection, disagreement by questioning. This question was performed by the government team, **Isn’t.**

Data 8 (25:50-26:01)

“**The first thing they said** the beneficiary of the collaboration will always be the privileged class **but** they did not rebate in a good

way because they characterized the oppressor as someone or some group like an animal.”

This performed by the deputy of opposition. The performance was the objection. The speaker object and disagreed about what the government said before, **The first thing they said.** This kind of objection was performed the disagreement and repeated the statement of the team of government first.

Data 9 (32:39-32:31)

“**We say the modern alternative is the (best) way** that should be taken without encouraging physical violence in order to moderate the collaboration”

This declaration of the deputy of opposition was characterized as disagreement: objecting the government’s idea. The utterance of “**We say the modern alternative is the (best) way**” was the statement to object or disagreed and compare the idea from the government side.

Data 10 (35:11-35:22)

“**It is not enough for the opposition** there are some potential scenario will be protecting the minority they need to prove why this the most effective one.”

This speaker was performed with disagreement and giving direct objection, **It is not enough for the opposition.** This speaker tried to explain and compare, also disagreed with the opponent

team. By saying “It is not enough for the opposition” this speaker arguing and manifest disagreement.

Data 11 (53:22-53:24)

“**That is not a good study case.**”

It showed and performed by the whip of opposition the performance was disagreement. The disagreement could be categorized as an objection. This speaker performed an objection to the previous speaker, **That is not a good.**

## 2. Politeness Strategies

The politeness strategy has been used by the debaters to make respectable objection. These can be found in the data:

(POI) “**Isn’t** selling information signaling that you are surrendering?”

This was the performance of negative politeness strategy by using questioning.

“**We don’t think** that it is exactly betraying your own people like giving information.”

This speaker presented hedging to performed negative politeness strategy.

“**We agree** in the short term the regime will see as a treat **but** the risk is between they will survive and or betray us.”

This disagreement was performed as an opinion.

## **B. Research discussion**

This section is about the further analysis that can be categorized as primer finding and secondary finding. The primer finding is the finding that answered any research problems that have been written at the beginning of the research. The research problems are the state that primarily used by the researcher to be discussed furthermore in order to collaborate the finding. And the analysis is provided with the description as mentioned in chapter III as well. Not only that the previous study is included and collaborated as well with this finding of the research.

1. What is linguistics realization of agreement and disagreement used by debaters in WUDC 2019?

Language realization is the Linguistics Realization is simply a synonym of tokens, hedges, utterances and any attributes that accrued when the speaker delivering their agreement and disagreement. But in the theory of Brown and Leech this realization is specified with an intensifier, synonym, repetition and indirect objection (Brown,P& Levinson. 1987. These realizations are so far appeared and performed well with variety from every speaker.

The first speaker performed an agreement only with the motion. The motion is a statement from the debate competition refilled in the first time before the debaters start to debate. Before the first speaker, there is no other statement except the statement from the motion. The first speaker is from the government team and as the government team, they have to support the motion. The

realization of agreement and disagreement from these speakers is mostly an agreement. But even the speaker never heard any other speaker's statement he makes guessing on the next speaker's idea or what people think oppositely through his opinion. So then this guessing can be categorized as disagreement.

The next speaker performed mostly disagreement. The reason is simple, because she is the first speaker from the opposite team. This opposite team should perform opposing or disagreeing to the government's statements. So this finding is unique because there is no agreement at all. The reason is that the speaker at this time does not have any argument or statement to be connected.

The next speaker is from the speaker from the government team. The realization language that performed by this speaker is agreement and disagreement as well. In the comparison of the quantity they are the same. The reason is he has to support or agree with the argument from his speaker before in the same team and rebut or perform disagreement at the same time to the opposite team.

The fourth speaker is from the opposite team performs agreement and disagreement with at the same time. But the rebuttal is directly performed with POI. This POI has also appeared in the next speaker's performance. This direct objection cannot be included in the type of agreement and disagreement that purposed by Brown and Leech. The quantity of agreement and disagreement in this performance are the same.

The fifth speaker is from another team but in the same stand as the government. This speaker is from different teams that possibly reject the argument of the team from the government before. So, this team is called the member of the government and the whip of government. But this speaker performs the agreement with the government team and directly performs disagreement with the opposing team. The quantity is almost the same.

The sixth speaker is a member of the opposition speaker. This speaker performs disagreement and agreement at the same time. The order of agreement and disagreement are seemed not a problem. This speaker performs disagreement in the first and agreement in the last as the conclusion

The seventh and the eighth speakers are called whip and the job of these speakers to make a conclusion based on their version. But most of their speech are objection and disagreement with the team that they against.

2. What politeness strategies performing agreement and disagreement are used by debaters in their speech?

Positive politeness is the theory that has been appeared a decade ago. Positive politeness is one of the strategies to save face. Face here does not mean literally a face that we have in our bodies. It is more likely a position of us or our self-image that we want people to be seen( Brown,1987 ). In every country in the world, every human is demanding to be treated politely. Then to fulfill this desire



human need a strategy to treat human politely in order to save the speaker face or self-image (Leech,2014).

Some times in arguing with someone in the common conversation Brown believes the speaker uses this strategy to make a positive face. The strategy when the speaker states agreement and disagreement. In the debate, there is a lot of data that states agreement and disagreement since they have to argue with each other (Brown,1987).

The politeness strategy here is not really performed well. The reasons probably are less feedback between speakers. Even the speaker interacts and giving feedback but every speaker gives monolog speech. So politeness is not necessarily needed. Another reason the speakers are demanded to perform the necessary opinion to destroy or defend every statement.

This discussion is not focused on the research problem anymore. This finding is not the most priority in this research. But, the researcher finds this is quite important to write. And hope these findings and analyses can be used.

The first is in this research there is no performance of argument performed by showing synonym. Instead of giving synonym the speaker likes to retell the statement of the other speaker. The reason is also that synonym is performed in the direct conversation like Leech and Brown show in their example.

Example:

A: This is a beautiful day, isn't it?

B: Yes it's gorgeous.

The second is the variety of agreement and disagreements are quite complicated for the students. But the basic is almost the same. What the researcher means is even the way to show agreement and disagreements are complicated but the patterns are the same. In most situations the way they agree and disagree is repetition. They repeat the statement from the previous speaker and directly strengthen which in this context agree or they rebate or in this context disagreeing.

The third is every speaker seems always perform agreement and disagreement in the very first of the speech and the last of the speech. They spare their speech, one third for support or agree with their mate team or disagree or rebate the opposite team. The rest is their opinion themselves originally. The order of agreement first or the disagreement first does not matter.

Previous research revealed that the debaters have fluency and creativity in performing speech (Doody, O & Condon M. 2012). Well, it is truly the same as the data. It can be seen how well their variation of performing agreement and disagreement at the same time in their speech. Their way of performing agreement and disagreement is not simply just say "yes, I agree" or "no, I disagree". It seems this is really trained before. And this research chooses the debate in EFL class so then the background of the most read is almost the same, as people who use English as a foreign language.

Previous research that focuses on agreement and disagreement but in different contexts is quite not the same. The data from the previous study shows the language realizations that performed from its object are fulfill well. But in this research, there is some performance that is not performed like a synonym. And in this research, the finding or language realizations are more complicated since this is not a normal conversation and this more like monologue that correlate with agreement and disagreement. So, the feedback is very slow to be called feedback.