

## **CHAPTER V**

### **DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents the novel ideas of the researcher in interpreting the research findings, especially interpreting the relations among patterns, categories, and dimensions found in data analysis.

In this study the researcher finds that the debaters performed Face Threatening Acts towards both addressee and addresser's positive and negative face. In this case, threatening addressee's positive face are often performed by the debaters in 41 times. Then it is followed by threatening addressee again that is negative face in 23 times. The first and second positions are positioned by threatening addressee. It is happened because everyone has the basic desire/needs that they want to satisfy, so that is way the debaters are often threatened addressee's face rather than addressee because they want to satisfy their own face through threatening their addresser's face.

Besides, the debaters often threaten addressee's positive face rather than negative face. As explained by Brown and Levinson in (Choyimah, 2015 : 45) Positive face is someone's desire to be respected, connected, and well thought of by others, while negative face is someone's desire to be free from imposition. It is happened because debate is about competing arguments where each position wants to win the debate. By doing the act of accusing, insulting, disagreeing, and criticizing are considered that they can kill their rival.

By doing those acts, hopefully the reader will vote the debaters to win the debate because the debaters positioned themselves higher than their rival and proposing better arguments by criticizing, disagreeing and accusing their rival's arguments by doing those acts of threatening addressee's positive face.

The second rank is threatening addressee's negative face because by threatening other's negative face such as suggesting, ordering, imposing, etc is considered given less contribution to the debaters to win the debate because it cannot show the reader that their arguments are stronger than their rival.

The debaters only sometimes threaten their own face because basically they want to satisfy their own face. In this case, the debaters have done FTA towards their own face because they do not find other ways to stand in their position and finally they threaten their own face through satisfying other's face. The second reason is because by threatening their own face is considered doesn't give contribution to strength the position.

Based on the second research question, not all FTA performed by debaters are minimized by using politeness strategy. The debaters performed both positive and negative politeness strategy. According to Brown and Levinson in (Choyimah, 2015 : 45) Negative politeness strategy is the strategy to counteract the FTA which is oriented to hearer's negative face while positive politeness strategy to counteract

the FTA which is oriented to hearer's positive face. In this research findings, the debaters often threaten addressee' positive face rather than negative face, but they more often do negative politeness strategy rather than positive politeness strategy.

According to (Quinn, 2005:141) Debating is about the clash of arguments and how we present our arguments doesn't directly relate to the arguments at all. However, how we present is a vital part of speaker's overall presentation and hence a vital part of debating. This is because how the speakers present is an important aspect of a speaker's credibility and a speaker who seems more credible will be a speaker who is more convincing. Good debate strategy is considered by three aspects, they are manner, matter and method. As stated by Arifin (2013: 8) Manner is the presentation of the speech. It is the style a member uses to further his or her case and persuade the audience. Manner is likely related to style. Language is one of the elements of style. Language should be clear and simple. The speakers who use language which is too verbose or confusing may detract from the argument if they lose the attention of the audience. The use of impolite languages also can badly affect the adjudication by the audience. Insulting the opponents is also a violation. Debaters can only attack opponents' arguments not opponents themselves. Just like what has been stated by Dilara to her opponent "*Muslim are stupid*

*people? you can't even speak English!*". In this case show that the debater attacked opponents themselves not the opponents' arguments.

Logically, when we do face threatening acts to the opponents it can show our weakness to the opponent. Instead, stay calm and keep our written expression neutral. This makes it much harder for the opponent to find what buttons they can press to make you trip up. By performing face threatening acts, this can be seen as a sign that our arguments are not very good, plus it makes people defensive and much less willing to read our arguments or want to agree with what we deliver. So that is way, being respectful and performing politeness strategy will more convince the readers to vote. But this manner aspect about language seems ignored by the debaters. It has been showed based on the findings of politeness strategy performed by the debaters, the debaters has done politeness strategy only in 13 times. It has been happened because basically manner is about the way we speech which can persuade the readers of debate online because language is only a little part of manner.

Language which is included in manner aspect seems ignored by the debaters because basically manner is talking about the way we convince to audience. So, language is just the little part of these three aspects. The debaters are less concern in this part because method and matter are not talking about what language we use while arguing our arguments, and on how we behave to the opponents because we don't

need to convince our opponents but we need to convince the judges (readers) but those two aspects focus on what we deliver and how we organize our speech in delivering arguments so our arguments will be delivered in effective way and can be understood well by the judges (readers). Then, Manner is actually talking about the way we convince the judges (readers) through our style which may affect the effectiveness of the presentation.

The second aspect of doing good debate strategy is matter. Matter describes the arguments that you present both in their general strength and in the way that you support and explain them. (Quinn, 2005:5). Besides, Matter includes arguments and reasoning, examples, case studies, facts and any other material that attempts to further the case. Matter also includes positive (or substantive) material and rebuttal (arguments specifically aimed to refute the arguments of the opposing team). (Arifin, 2013:7). In this research, the researcher found Face threatening acts towards addressee's positive and negative face performed by the debaters more often than addresser's positive and negative face. FTA towards addressee's negative and positive face are performed in 64 times while FTA towards addresser's positive and negative face are only performed in 21 times. This happened because the act of threatening, warning, suggesting, ordering, imposing, accusing, insulting, disagreeing, criticizing which are proposed towards the opponents are considered can help and support them in

delivering their arguments and rebut their opponents so the readers will vote them to be the winner rather than threatening their own positive face such as expressing thanks, agreeing, self humiliating, apologizing, and so many others. This is considered because threatening their own face will give no contribution in their position in maintaining their position. But it can be happened because the debaters are truly in a position where they cannot maintain their position anymore.

The act of criticizing, suggesting, accusing, and insulting, disagreeing are the debaters' strategy in giving the reason in why their own arguments are better than their opponent. They want to show their strength to his/her opponent. Because criticizing is about the act of evaluating others mistake. By showing others mistake or weaknesses can bring their arguments to be better than their opponent. Because matter aspect is about describing the arguments that we present both in general strength and in the way we support and explain them.

The act of threat/warning and imposing are also considered as the debaters' first strategy before going to further debate. By proposing the rule, hopefully the debaters will find the place where they can maintain their arguments while their opponents will only have a little space to give the rebuttal. Because in matter aspect the debaters have to be able to stand, support and propose better

arguments so they give a little space to the opponents and get larger space for them to stand in their position.

Some of FTAs towards addressee's positive and negative are considered give no more contribution instead. They are performed only no more than twice by the debaters because they cannot support their arguments to be stronger than before. They are ordering, annoying and asking to stop doing an activity. The act of ordering can threaten addressee's negative face to be from imposition such what is stated by vi\_spex "*my point is they are both imaginary, tell me this, which force caused the apple to fall?*". Asking to tell to him/her about further explanations doesn't support his/her case because matter aspect is about the way we present better and stronger arguments. It indicates that she/he isn't be able to catch what has been explained instead. The act of asking to stop of doing an activity and annoying also don't relate with their arguments or rebuttal. They only related with the technique of how they communicate while debating. So that is way, they only do this kind of acts in a few times.

The last aspect which is considered as good debate strategy is about method. (Quinn, 2005:5) stated that "Method describes the *structure* of your speech." It is the aspect of debating that makes a debate different to a collection of speeches. It is vital that the debater can react to the way that the debate has gone before his/her speech and make changes to that speech while the debate is going on. For

example, if the speaker before conceding one of the major points, then there is no point spending half the speech trying to make it, as it has already been conceded. A good debater can note this, and adjust their speech at the last minute to allocate that extra time to his/her remaining points. Similarly, it is important that each debater can recognise, when they start their speech what is the crucial issue or issues in the debate at that point in time. The speech (and especially your opening) should reflect this understanding - there is never a better opportunity to undermine the opposition's most valuable argument than in the first sixty seconds of your speech. This is the aspect of debating that new debaters have the most trouble with, since it requires the ability to see the debate as a battle, and to make important strategic decisions on the run that can have important consequences for our position.

Based on the research findings, the debaters have also done this method. It can be seen from the act of threat/warning and imposing the opponents. Those two acts are the strategy of the debaters to structure their speech. Like what is stated by Thememan909 "*First round is acceptance only, or you automatically forfeit*", moneystack "*First round is simply for acceptance*", UlyssesWake "*Round one is for short premise explaining why you have taken position on this topic*". Those acts are done by the debaters in order to get more space at very first beginning to show their



strength and give the little space towards the opponents to show their strength because our speech (and especially your opening) should reflect this understanding - there is never a better opportunity to undermine the opposition's most valuable argument than in the first sixty seconds of your speech. Best of all, the most important aspect is matter because matter is talking about the arguments that you present both in their general strength and in the way that you support and explain them. The readers will more concern on what we deliver rather than the way we deliver although it also one of the strategy in doing good debate.

Based on the data, Dilara, Pimpmaster, and Blezzing Rodent are the debaters who are successfully enough in convincing the judges (readers) because they win the debate because they get more vote than their opponents. Based on the data, they perform some face threatening acts as their strategy in convincing the judges and show their better arguments and rebuttal than their opponents more often than their opponents.

