

TV Football Commentary of Indonesia U23 Against South Korea U23 Match:

An analysis of lexical and syntactic features

Eri Kurniawan*, Ruswan Dallyono, Janriko Abdussalam Sadiq
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Bandung, Indonesia

*erikurn@upi.edu, dallyono@upi.edu, janrikoabdussalam@student.upi.edu

Abstract—This qualitative study examines lexical and syntactic features in a commentary of Indonesia U23 against South Korea U23 match. Elan 5.2 software was utilised to identify the features. The data were analysed metaphor using Lakoff and Johnson's and syntactic features using Ferguson's. The results show that there are three types of lexical features: structural, orientational, and ontological metaphors and five types of syntactic features: simplification, inversion, result expression, heavy modifiers, and routines that are deployed in the commentary of the match. The findings show that syntactic features were used mainly to save utterance time, while lexical features were used as analogy for other concepts. The findings suggest that this study affirms to ideas of using metaphor that football is war and omitting subject, or predicator, or object in commentaries. In addition, in Indonesian context, there is a kind of simplification, that is subject plus predicator plus object deletion in an utterance, and there are only two patterns of result expression: noun phrase and verb construction.

Keywords—lexical features; syntactic features; football commentary

I. INTRODUCTION

Football unquestionably has become an entertainment form. With the increase of the number of media, the spread of this kind of sport has been commercialised, viewed by million people and become culture [1]. Football contracts, merchandise, sponsorships as well as multi-billion television contracts have undergone commercialisation in terms of football development [2]. Because of football development, the role of a commentator is essential. Not only do they talk about stories, but also they talk about analyses, statistics, and updates about what is going on in the world of football.

A football commentary is a commentary or analysis during a football match. It aims to find the right balance between describing the action, to find information, and to add drama in the name of entertainment [3]. It always occurs when a football match is on-going to bring and shape the sense of entertainment [4]. Besides entertainment, football commentary also conveys unknown previously information and updates to audience [1].

As a way of informing data, a commentary usually uses unusual talk to convey information related to the game because

audiences or spectators do not have to hear everything that is happening because they are watching it on television [5]. In this part, unusual linguistic features usually occur because of some reasons. It is because the commentators have to be communicative in delivering what they are saying in a short period without any planning before [4], or to chunk condensed information into several parts. However, because the research issue is visual-aided commentaries, required skill of TV commentators will differ from other types of commentaries, such as keep silent to avoid unnecessary drama reporting in a right moment [3]. As a result, the commentator should use some linguistic such as lexical and syntactical features which were discussed in this study.

A football commentary was selected as the main subject of this study because it contains some interesting linguistic features in its delivery. First, football is a worldwide sport thanks to media contribution, especially television. Second, football commentary is usually formed in ungrammatical patterns, but people accept it. It is different when people read articles or news; they will be bothered when they find any grammar mistakes on it. However, people enjoy football match commentary without any complain to the syntactic structure when it is structurally wrong. Also, the commentator always tries to match his/her speech with the on-screen football match. Third, there is no restricting rule for commentators to convey their speech of football match. They can create or modify the patterns of their commentary during a match regarding to the condition of the match.

Hadi Gunawan, the commentator of the match, often uses unusual expressions when he is commenting a football matches. 'Ahayy!', 'Serangan Tujuh Hari Tujuh Malam', 'Kurnia Meiga Cantik Sekali' become his famous jargon heard by many football television broadcast spectators in Indonesia. Many people consider his commentaries unique. Moreover, Indonesia U23 versus South Korea U23 football match was selected as the object of the research because of the tension of the match. This means that both team played an offensive strategy, resulting in important situations the commentator had to report.

Particularly, this study aims to discover lexical and syntactic features used in the commentary of analysed football match.

II. METHOD

This research employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive method since the present study revealed and examined the use of lexical and syntactic features in football commentaries. Qualitative research is quality investigation of relationships, activities, situations, or materials. As commentary is a kind of activity done by commentators, qualitative method is considered suitable for this research. Moreover, there are descriptive statistics provided to show each feature that the commentator used. The data were obtained from Youtube [6], and annotated by using Elan 5.2. Then, the data were classified and their structure and meaning were also analysed. Descriptive statistics was also used to serve the frequencies of features.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned before, this study aims to discover lexical and syntactic features used in the commentary of Indonesia U23 against South Korea U23 football match. As can be inferred by the way the commentator of the match expressed particular situations in the match, lexical features in the form of metaphors and syntactic features were deployed. In sum, there are 699 occurrences found. The data were analysed its lexical features by using Lakoff and Johnson's [7] metaphors: structural, ontological, and orientational, and syntactic features using Ferguson's [8] simplifications, heavy modifiers, routines, result expressions, and inversions.

These identified features are indicated in terms of frequency and percentage in the following table:

TABLE I. DATA OF FEATURES OCCURRENCES

| | No. | Types of Features | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|------------------|-----|------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>Lexical</i> | 1 | Structural Metaphor | 43 | 6.15 |
| | 2 | Ontological Metaphor | 7 | 1 |
| | 3 | Orientalional Metaphor | 5 | 0.72 |
| | No. | Types of Features | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
| <i>Syntactic</i> | 4 | Routines | 411 | 58.80 |
| | 5 | Simplification | 107 | 15.31 |
| | 6 | Result Expression | 54 | 7.73 |
| | 7 | Inversion | 38 | 5.44 |
| | 8 | Heavy Modifiers | 34 | 4.86 |
| Total | | | 699 | 100 |

A. Types of Lexical Features

There are three types of metaphor found based on Table 1. Moreover, each type of metaphor has its own various analogies in the spiel.

TABLE II. STRUCTURAL METAPHOR

| No. | Structural Metaphors | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Football is war | 11 | 23.91 |
| 2 | Threat is dirt | 9 | 19.57 |
| 3 | Taking ball is crime | 6 | 13.04 |
| 4 | Attack is stick | 4 | 8.70 |
| 5 | Threat is rubbish | 3 | 6.52 |
| 6 | Dribble is reptile | 3 | 6.52 |
| 7 | Pass is food | 2 | 4.35 |
| 8 | Kick is cotton | 2 | 4.35 |
| 9 | Football is music | 1 | 2.17 |
| 10 | Win is fruit | 1 | 2.17 |
| 11 | Attack is book | 1 | 2.17 |
| Total | | 43 | 100 |

TABLE III. ONTOLOGICAL METAPHOR

| No. | Ontological Metaphors | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Defence is fence | 2 | 28.57 |
| 1 | Wings are player | 1 | 14.29 |
| 2 | Colours are human beings | 1 | 14.29 |
| 3 | Counter attack is human being | 1 | 14.29 |
| 4 | Fence is player | 1 | 14.29 |
| 5 | Stadium is spectators | 1 | 14.29 |
| Total | | 7 | 100 |

TABLE IV. ORIENTATIONAL METAPHOR

| No. | Orientalional Metaphors | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Player movement is side | 2 | 40 |
| 2 | Danger is forbidden | 1 | 20 |
| 3 | Distance is quality | 1 | 20 |
| 4 | Performance is in | 1 | 20 |
| Total | | 5 | 100 |

There are 11 analogies deployed. Meanwhile, 5 analogies belong to orientational and 4 to ontological metaphor. Structural metaphor owns the largest occurrences in the data since it is the easiest and most understandable analogy to express situation in the match. In detail, structural metaphor *football is war* has the most occurrence number in the data. On the other hand, orientational metaphor occurs the least since Bahasa Indonesia recognise different expressions of particles. Using metaphors also let the commentator increase the nerve of reporting to the audience.

B. Types of Syntactic Features

There are five types of syntactic features in the commentary. Each type has its own distinctive construction.

TABLE V. ROUTINES

| No. | Routines | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Verbalisation of names | 166 | 40.39 |
| 2 | Verbalisation of result | 43 | 10.46 |
| 3 | Verbalisation of area | 42 | 10.22 |
| 4 | Verbalisation of jargon | 30 | 7.30 |
| 5 | Verbalisation of recent failure | 20 | 4.87 |
| 6 | Verbalisation of shoot | 14 | 3.41 |
| 7 | Verbalisation of danger | 13 | 3.16 |
| 8 | Verbalisation of goal | 12 | 2.92 |
| 9 | Verbalisation of characteristics | 8 | 1.95 |
| 10 | Verbalisation of score | 3 | 0.73 |
| Total | | 411 | 100 |

TABLE VI. SIMPLIFICATION

| No. | Simplification | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------|--|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Predicator deletion | 38 | 35.51 |
| 2 | Predicator + object deletion | 24 | 22.43 |
| 3 | Subject deletion | 12 | 11.21 |
| 4 | Subject + predicator deletion | 11 | 10.28 |
| 5 | Subject + object deletion | 8 | 7.48 |
| 6 | Object deletion | 8 | 7.48 |
| 7 | Subject + predicator + object deletion | 6 | 5.61 |
| Total | | 107 | 100 |

TABLE VII. RESULT EXPRESSIONS

| No. | Result Expressions | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------|--------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Noun phrase construction | 31 | 57.41 |
| 2 | Verb construction | 23 | 42.59 |
| Total | | 54 | 100 |

TABLE VIII. INVERSION

| No. | Inversion | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Predicator + Subject | 38 | 100 |
| Total | | 38 | 100 |

TABLE IX. HEAVY MODIFIERS

| No. | Heavy Modifiers | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Appositional noun phrases | 28 | 82.35 |
| 2 | Non-restrictive relative clauses | 6 | 17.65 |
| Total | | 34 | 100 |

The data show that routines occur the most. It is seemingly because routines let the commentator to use small number of fixed syntactic patterns repetitively, leading to a result of time-saving strategy. This notion also applies to result expressions. Besides routines and result expressions, simplifications also were deployed by the commentator to inform situations in a short time without omitting its meaning. Inversions were

deployed in order to specify the focus of the utterance. The last, heavy modifiers were deployed to give further information about the clubs, players, or events related to the match if there is sufficient time.

IV. CONCLUSION

Having discussed the findings above, it can be deduced that the commentator of Indonesia U23 against South Korea U23 deployed lexical features (structural, ontological, and orientational metaphors) and syntactic features (routines, simplifications, result expressions, inversions, heavy modifiers). Lexical and syntactic features share different function to the commentary.

Regarding lexical features, it was found that the commentator of Indonesia against South Korea deployed 3 types of metaphors in his commentary. In addition, there are 21 metaphors combined in expressing moments in the match. In particular, the pervasive use of structural metaphors provided him with a means of informing moments by using a concept of another. It can be inferred that he tends to use connotation meanings to explicate what is happening on the pitch since making analogies through metaphor is an easy means of elaborating moments. Also, metaphors made the commentary more interesting and livelier.

Regarding syntactic features, they were used mainly as time-saving strategy. Because live a football commentary is a real-time spiel that allows a short time to commentator to talk, syntactic features were the means to overcome the short time matter. Besides a time-saving strategy, syntactic features were also used to put spectators' attention to particular utterances, and to give further information about something related to the match.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Humpolik, *Language of football commentators: An analysis of live English football commentary and its types* (Bachelor Diploma). Masaryk University, 2014.
- [2] G. Bergh and S. Ohlander, "Free kicks, dribblers, and WAGS. Exploring the Language of "The People's Game"," *Moderna Sprak*, vol. 106, no. (1), pp. 11-46, 2012.
- [3] T. Müller, "An important type of unplanned spoken language: A brief history of football commentary in England and Germany," *Brno Studies in English*, vol. 34, no. (1), pp. 63-78, 2008.
- [4] E. Kurniawan and I. Fadilah, "An analysis of lexical and syntactic features in English and Indonesian radio football commentary," *Prosiding seminar tahunan linguistic 2015*, vol. 10, no. (12), pp. 165-172, 2015.
- [5] T. Lindholm, F. Yellin, G. Bracha, and A. Buckley, *The Java virtual machine specification*. Pearson Education, 2014.
- [6] YouTube, 2018. [Online]. Retrieved from: www.youtube.com/watch?v=q0QAJvJgYU [Accessed on August 8, 2018].
- [7] G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- [8] C. Ferguson, "Sports announcer talk: Syntactic aspects of register variation," *Language in Society*, vol. 12, no. (02), pp. 153-172, 1983.