LingPoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research

Appraisal Attitude Analysis of Debate Verbal Adjudication

Desmery Natalia Tarigan[1], Tengku Thyrhaya Zein[2], Yulianus Harefa[3]*

[1,2,3] *Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia*

Abstract. This research investigates the appraisal attitudinal framework to identify the level of attitude (affect, judgment, and appreciation) in debate verbal adjudication conducted through descriptive qualitative method. The theories supporting this thesis are the ones proposed by Martin & White, Halliday, and Austin J. Freeley. The primary data sources in this thesis were five verbal adjudications of debate adjudicators from preliminary rounds of AEO 2020. The data in this study were lexical resources and phrases for appraisal attitudinal framework. The steps passed in this analysis are collecting the data by transcribing the recorded debate verbal adjudication into text, identifying the lexical resources and phrases, and concluding the analysis. The result of this thesis shows the score obtained for appraisal attitude resources in five debate verbal adjudications. The results present that the Appreciation score obtained was 59.1% in average, Judgment score obtained was 33.2% in average, and Affect score obtained was 7.7% in average. Thus, the level of appraisal attitudinal framework in debate verbal adjudications account for higher attitude of language evaluation. It is also demonstrates that the appraisal attitudinal element plays pivotal role in terms of directing evaluation towards the debater's performance.

Keyword: *Appraisal Theory, Attitude, Debate Verbal Adjudication*

1   Introduction

Debate has been a popular platform in the 21st century in the terms of conveying ideas, knowledge, evaluating certain issues by logically and systematically examining the problem, the evidence and the solution. Queen [1] states that debate is defined as an activity involving two groups of people on the affirmative side and opposition side discussing an agreed topic in the specific agreed rules, the adjudicators listen and evaluating the arguments in the both side, choosing the winning team based on the logical reasoning and evidence provided. Thus, debate is ultimately the process of presenting ideas or opinions which two opposing parties try to defend. In Indonesia, debate is getting popular which starts from junior high school to varsity level. It is observed that there are numerous debate competitions either on local, regional,

---

* Corresponding author at: Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

E-mail address: desmerynatalia98@gmail.com

national and international scale has been conducted for years. For instance, at the international level, Asian English Olympic (AEO) is one of the annual debate competitions. The competition consists of the Main Draw and Novice category.

Fundamentally, debate is an activity that offers both debater and adjudicator a massive opportunity to engage with a variety of controversial issues. In academic debate, it is necessary to have debate adjudicators in the chamber as they are the one that in charge in evaluating the debate. The judge has a pivotal role to examine the performance of every team related to the ideas and logical analysis outlined by the speakers. On top of that, in adjudicating, the debate adjudicator should have an average understanding and capacity to evaluate and provide constructive assessment of the debate. This involves keeping track of the information each team has delivered. Therefore, the adjudicator has an accurate point to weigh up the winning bench and losing bench in the chamber [2]. Thus, adjudicators have a supremely important role in debate, considering the fact they need to be able to construct their verbal adjudication and lay out their objective analysis regarding the debate in the round.

Freeley & Steinberg [2] confirms that verbal adjudication consists of critical evaluation throughout the debate and the teams winning rank. The verbal adjudication is a direct approach of the judge to criticize and to give constructive feedback for the debaters in the chamber. Due to its crucial approach, in providing verbal adjudication, the adjudicator is required to be able to construct their assessment with the appropriate lexicogrammatical which covers lexis and grammar in directing their judgment. Either a beginner or a professional adjudicator, they use a variety of language that will show their neutral position. As a result, their choice of lexicogrammatical patterns that will undoubtedly influence the debater's interpretation is being challenged. The complexity of appraisal and attitude (affect, judgment and appreciation) in the verbal adjudication are supremely important and can be seen through selected lexical items and phrases used by the adjudicator.

The example of Appraisal Attitude representation in the judge's speech;

The Appraisal Attitude representation

I.e: ***Thanks*** *for the debate.* ***I appreciate*** *the debate happened in this chamber.* ***I can*** *see the* ***clear engagement*** *and responses in both benches. But, before going to the* ***details****, I'm going to divide my verbal adjudication into two parts; the first would be the* ***general*** *comment in this debate and the second would be the verdict and the justification. So, the* ***general*** *comment for this debate, I think this debate has* ***successfully*** *answered the basic BOP (Burden of Prove) at three levels. The first is about 'what does the portrayal of multiparty system based on Indonesia's political realm?' the second is 'what does happen with the SQ right now?', and the third is about the justification on whether or not we* ***regret*** *the multiparty system in Indonesia.*

*Yet, I notice there is still **not enough clarity** at some points in this debate. For example; **none of the teams** from the government side propose the counter mechanism under this debate and also there is **insignificant** portrayal of what system do we need to apply outside this multiparty system.*

Based on the data taken from USU Society for Debating (USD), the Appraisal Attitude representation above represents that there are six positive appreciations (thanks, really appreciate, clear engagement, details, successfully, three levels), three negative appreciations (not enough clarity, none of the teams, insignificant), one negative affect (regret) and three positive judgments (can, general, general). It means there are thirteen appraisal items in total, and using Martin (2005) original method, the affect would be 7.7%, the judgment would be 23.1%, and the appreciation would be 69.2% in total.

There are nine appreciation resources, accounting for the biggest proportion of 69.2%. The adjudicator uses many appreciation resources at the beginning of their speech to express their appreciation. Appreciation refers to views of language users toward certain people, things and behavior according to aesthetic standards (Su, 2016). With these appreciation resources, the judge expresses their evaluation about the whole debater performances, their capacity in discussing the basic BOP in the debate, the engagement and responsiveness happened in the debate. Under the preliminary data above, it can be seen how the appraisal attitudinal framework plays the important role in the discourse. Therefore, it needs to be discussed and understood by debate adjudicator.

In research, the researcher is interested in analyzing the verbalization data through debate adjudicating which generates content of rationale judgment, decision and comparative merits of each bench in the debate chamber. Evaluating the debate and making decisions should be based on the debate itself - that is, on the comparative merits of the arguments and the evidence provided (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009). With this intention, the writer took a concern about how the adjudicator constructed their verbal argumentation better in terms Affect, Judgment and Appreciation through Appraisal Attitudinal Framework. Appraisal is a theoretical framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics which is defined as a system of interpersonal meaning which concerns evaluation of the kinds of attitudes that are negotiated in a text, the strength of, the feeling involved and how values are sourced and readers aligned (Martin & Rose, 2007).

Appraisal is a tool for analyzing the language of evaluation that speakers use to express thought. Relevant research questions broadly fall into the Attitude area with the subjective presence of writers/speakers in texts as they adopt stances towards both the material they present and those with whom they communicate (Martin & White, 2005). It is concerned with how writers/speakers approve and disapprove, applaud and criticize, and with how they position their readers/listeners to do likewise.

On top of that, the current issues that debate adjudicators face approximately in constructing verbal adjudication are somehow they found disturbance to characterize or identify the politically correct attitude in uttering criticism towards the debater. That is to say, the writer intends to investigate the form of appraisal and its categories that emphasize the positive and negative form of evaluation in debate verbal adjudication. Based on the explanation above, it can be said that appraisal attitude framework is important to be analyzed as it represents the level of evaluation that is needed in constructing a debate verbal adjudication in verbal adjudication. Thus, the study focuses only on analyzing the appraisal attitude in debate verbal adjudication. The study only focuses on analyzing the appraisal attitude in debate verbal adjudication of AEO 2020.

2   Literature Review

A.   Systemic Functional Linguistics

In today's global landscape, the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) approach is used world-wide, especially in the language education for numerous purpose like discourse analysis. As Halliday and Matthiessen [3] stated, SFL is a linguistic theory that considers language as a part of social system and a meaning- making resource. This explains that language has a pivotal role in terms of how people use language to establish and generate meaning to fulfill their communicative purpose in social contexts. Moreover, with regards to data, SFL does not tackle the manner of language representation or process in the human brain, but would rather try to see discourses generated in the form of written or oral language and what is contained in the texts that are produced. Due to the concern of SFL with the use of language, great importance is placed on the function of language, such as what language is used for, rather than what language structure is all about and the manner by which it is composed [3]. On top of that, SFL analyzes the text in four ways which are Context, Semantics, Lexicogrammar, and Phonology. SFL also identifies three modes of meaning which operate simultaneously in all utterances – the textual, the ideational and the interpersonal [4]. The Interpersonal metafunction is concerned with the interaction between speaker(s) and addressee(s). It is used to establish the speaker's role in the speech realm and relationship with others. It is found that one of its main grammatical systems is Mood and Modality [3].

B.   Appraisal Attitudinal Framework

Appraisal is well-known as a system in the discursive semantic stratum proposed by J.R. Martin and P. White [4] discovered a way of categorizing interpersonal meaning. As Martin and Rose [5] points out Appraisal is concerned with evaluation - the kinds of attitude that are negotiated in the text, the strength of the feelings involved and the ways which values are sourced and readers aligned. In a general concept, Martin &White (2005) introduces the three main systems in appraisal which are Attitude, Graduation and Engagement. In this research, it focuses on the

Attitude system which is classified in three types of attitudes - beginning with Affect, then Judgment and finally Appreciation. Thus, in linguistic research, it utilizes the resources of appraisal for negotiating our social relationship, by telling our listener(s) or reader(s) about how we feel and defined things or people (attitude). Attitude can be positive and negative and can be seen implicitly or explicitly throughout the discourse. Overall, attitudes have to do with evaluating things, people' character and their feeling.

C. Debate

Concerning debate, Freeley and Steinberg [2] state that debate is the process of inquiry and advocacy a way of arriving at a reasoned judgment on a proposition in order to reach a decision in their own minds; alternatively, individuals or groups use it to bring others around to their way of thinking. Debate provides reasoned formed arguments for and against a proposition. The purpose of a debate is not for two disputing parties to leave the room in agreement. Instead, through the debate between them, others will form a judgment about which of the two to support [6]. Debate requires two competitive sides engaging in a bipolar clash and support in certain issue. Since, it requires the listeners and opposing advocates comparatively assess and evaluate competing ideas, debate demands critical thinking [2]. In addition to decision making process, debate may take in interpersonal communication, in which systematically demand us to weigh the pros and cons of an important decision in our own minds, in which we listen to arguments intended to influence our decision or participate in exchanges to influence the decisions of others.

D. Debate Adjudicator

In every debate tournaments, it is required to have debate adjudicator around as the one that will eventually evaluate the debate. The skill of adjudicating the debate is something relatively different compare to debating, yet speaking and judging are two inter-related skill set that complement each other extremely well [7]. The judge in debate chamber is characterized into three categories; The Chair, The Panel, and the Trainee judge. In academic debate, judges have three functions: (1) decision makers, (2) critics and (3) educators. As decision makers they have to discern which team did the better debating, and therefore which team won the debate; as critics they have to report their decisions and the rationale for them in an educationally useful manner; and as educators they must consider the pedagogical implications of their work as debate judge [7]. The decision, as part of the educational process of debate, should be reported in a way that will contribute to the students' educations. This reporting may be done either by means of an oral critique (verbal adjudication) or ballot.

With regard to verbal adjudication, the judge has a few minutes to review his or her notes before presenting the critique. The effective critique should contain of several elements, such as: (1) Review the progress of the debate, (2) Cite examples of effective application of the principles

and the practical argumentation and debate, (3) Offer positive constructive feedback for improvement, (4) Explain the factors most significant in determining the judge's decision, (5) Announce the decision with comparative analysis from the fourth rank to the first rank, (6) Offer an opportunity for questions and interaction with the debaters right after the verbal session end.

3   Research Method

This research is conducted by using descriptive qualitative research. By utilizing descriptive qualitative research, the phenomenon on its context could be analyzed clearly and described deeply. The primary data of this study are lexical resources (content words) and phrase in the adjudicator's verbal adjudication. Lexical resources and phrases are used to analyze the appraisal attitudinal elements. The source of data is taken from the adjudicator's recorded debate verbal adjudication in five preliminary rounds in Asian English Olympic (AEO) Debate Competition 2020. The AEO 2020 was held in Bina Nusantara (BINUS) University on February 9th 2020. The five different initial judges were coming from different respective institution and were judging the round with its different debate motion in the debate round. . The procedures of the data collection were transcribing and analyzing the transcript then selecting and marking the utterances which contains appraisal attitudinal framework. The technique of analyzing the data in qualitative research is preparing, understanding, presenting and translating the data according to Cresswell [8]

4   Findings and Discussion

The term Appraisal Attitude framework refers to proportion of Appraisal lexical items (verb, noun, adjective, and adverb) and phrases to the total amount of running words in a text. In the following analysis, it is found that debate verbal adjudication in the first round with the initial judge DB has 136 Appraisal items, the judge in the second round with initial BAR has 272 Appraisal items, and the judge in the third round with the initial judge AM has 162 Appraisal items. In addition, the judge in the fourth round with the initial judge FH has 218 Appraisal items, and the fifth round with the initial judge DK has 199 Appraisal items.

Table 1 Appraisal Attitudinal Resources in 5 debate verbal adjudications

No.	Adjudicator's Verbal Adjudication	Affect (%)	Appreciation (%)	Judgment (%)
1.	Judge in the 1st round	3	73	24
2.	Judge in the 2nd round	11.1	49.6	39.3
3.	Judge in the 3rd round	6.2	62.3	31.5
4.	Judge in the 4th round	8.2	58.7	33.1

5.	Judge in the 5ᵗʰ round	10	51.8	38.2
	Average Score	7.7%	59.1%	33.2%

5   Conclusions

After analyzing the Appraisal Attitude Resource from debate verbal adjudication from round one until round five in AEO 2020, the researcher concludes that Appraisal attitude resources in five debate verbal adjudications surpass the average score 59.1% for appreciation resources, 33.2% for judgment resources and the least 7.7% for affect resources. The highest appreciation resources used among the five debate verbal adjudications is found in Round 1 verbal (73%), while the lowest appreciation resources is found in Round 2 verbal (49.6%). Besides, the highest judgment resources used among the five debate verbal adjudications is found in Round 2 verbal (39.3%) in comparative with the lowest used judgment resources is found in Round 1 verbal (24%). It also shows that the highest affect resources used among the five debate verbal adjudications is found in Round 2 verbal (11.1%), in contrast with the lowest, round 1 (3%) is considered as the lowest round which utilizes this resources. It's also demonstrates that the appraisal attitudinal element plays pivotal role in terms of directing evaluation towards the debater's performance.

REFERENCES

[1] Quinn, S. (2005). *Debating* (S. Quinn (ed.); first edit, Vol. 1, Issue 9). Brisbane, Queensland. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

[2] Freeley, J. A., & Steinberg, D. L. (1991). Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making. By Austin J. Freeley. In *Argumentation and Advocacy* (Vol. 27, Issue 3). https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.1991.11951518

[3] Su, T. (2016). Positive Discourse Analysis of Xi Jinping's Speech at the National University of Singapore under Appraisal Theory. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *7*(4), 796. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0704.2

[4] Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. . (2005). The Language of Evaluation. In *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie* (FIRST EDIT, Vol. 6, Issue 2). PALGRAVE MACMILLAN. https://doi.org/10.31468/cjsdwr.238

[5] Martin, J. R. (2002). 3. Meaning Beyond the Clause: Sfl Perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 52–74. https://doi.org/10.1017/s026719050200003x

[6] Su, T. (2016). Positive Discourse Analysis of Xi Jinping's Speech at the National University of Singapore under Appraisal Theory. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *7*(4), 796. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0704.22

[7] Oteíza, T. (2017). The appraisal framework and discourse analysis. *The Routledge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics*, *February*, 457–472. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315413891

[8] Zein, T. T., Sinar, T. S., & Yusuf, M. (2020). *Assessing Complexity in the Introduction Part of Bachelor ' s Theses : A Systemic Functional Linguistic Framework*. *12*(1), 2100–2111.