

# Face Threatening Acts Used by Debaters in the NUDC 2021 Lambung Mangkurat University

Cinthya Kesuma Adistana<sup>1\*</sup>, Noor Eka Chandra<sup>2</sup>, Yusuf Al-Arief<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> *Lambung Mangkurat University*

\*Corresponding author. Email: [1710117320011@mhs.ulm.ac.id](mailto:1710117320011@mhs.ulm.ac.id)

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to discover the Face Threatening Acts and FTAs most often used by the debater in the NUDC (National University Debate Championship) 2021 at Lambung Mangkurat University. In general, the debate is arguing and giving reason about something from the person who is debating. It is clear that people will take steps by taking Face Threatening Acts against their interlocutor in order to get their goals and argument accepted. In this case, the researcher is interesting in researching the title because in Eastern culture especially Indonesia it uphold the ethics of politeness so that when talking to other people it is recommended to be polite, including in terms of arguing and this is very important in the scope of education because in the scope of character education of course it is also formed. This research is a descriptive qualitative and uses instruments in the form of observation, interviews, and documentation where the subject are debaters who takes part in NUDC 2021 at Lambung Mangkurat University and the results show that debaters used Face Threatening Acts to threaten the Face of interlocutor and most often used Positive face in FTA even though there are some Negative face related the context. The researcher hopes that further researchers who will conduct research on FTAs continue this research and that further researchers are interested in conducting research on this theory using other subjects. The researcher suggests for future researchers to combine other related theories and by using other types of data.

**Keywords:** *FTA, NUDC, debater, face.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Being polite is difficult in any language setting which it means acting with due regard to the norms prevailing in society. We can show our feelings towards others as a force of solidarity, distance, respect for familiarity, as well as our awareness of social mores. Moreover, every culture has certain and different rules so it is necessary to apply politeness when communicating.

Face Threatening Act (FTA) is an act that challenges the wishes of the face of the interlocutor. Actions that threaten the face of the speaker or the face of the hearer, and then threaten the face of positive or negative faces [17]. Everything we dare to say will affect not only the faces of our listeners, but also our own faces.

This view illustrates the importance of politeness in language life, culture and politeness is reflected in all human interactions above. In certain cases there are times when someone speaks threatening faces.

The face has two types, a positive face and a negative face. Positive face is the desire of each member

that some people least want from others. Meanwhile, negative politeness is the desire of every 'competent adult' member whose actions will not be hindered by others [17].

It is important to know and learn about Face because face is a positive public image that social interactions seek to build [5]. When meeting other people, the desired face or image is different from each individual, for example a child who is curious, polite, and articulate and a child who is quiet and speaks very little will have a different image in other people's judgments.

In the world of education such as lectures, competitions in various organizational fields, educational activities are always carried out the same way as NUDC (National University Debating Championship). National University Debating Championship is always carried out annually by the national achievement center of the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia which is held in various universities where it aims to encourage the development of students' critical and innovative thinking and develop soft skills well.

In general, debate is arguing and giving reasons toward certain issue. In this case, it is clear that people will take steps by taking face-threatening actions (FTA) against their interlocutors in order to get their goals and arguments accepted.

The face threatening act is chosen because in Eastern culture, especially Indonesia, it upholds the ethics of politeness so that when talking to other people it is recommended to be polite, including in arguing. This issue of being polite is essential in the scope of education particularly to build students' characters that represent the nation characters. Hence, it is important to have research on the Face Threatening Act in a debate competition which involves interaction between debaters in a formal debate competition which require them to argue, think critically, find solutions to a problem, and persuade others to accept their points of view.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

This study utilizes some theories to help the data analysis which comprised of pragmatic, face, and Face Threatening Acts (FTA/positive faces and negative faces).

### **2.2 Context in Pragmatic**

Context defines as the physical environment in which a word is used and it is linguistic material that helps understand an expression [21].

Context is a linguistic part of the environment in which an expression used. It is very important because context influential on the situation being discussed, related to communication and interaction between one another. Communication using language will not be perfect if it does not involve context as an extra-lingual element that should not be ignored in an utterance.

Context is very important to do with pragmatics, because communication that involves context can make communication more communicative, effective, and efficient. Furthermore, learning use of human language as this is determined by the context of society [9]. Pragmatic means that the context of society is very important to understand in language and then pragmatic relates to the study of the speaker or writer the meaning and interpretation of the listener or reader [21].

It can be concluded that context has a big influence on language and communication since context can make communication more communicative, effective, and efficient because a word can mean many things depending on the context to avoid misunderstanding.

### **2.3 Definition Face**

This study focuses on Face Threatening Acts in the National University Debate Championship among students. Therefore, to define the FTA, it is necessary to clarify what is meant by the face-to-face concept. It is important to note that the debater plays both speaker and hearer roles.

Face is a positive public image that people want to build in social interactions [5]. Everyone has facial needs. Positive and negative faces need to be associated with one's belief system, cultural values such as honor, virtue, shame, and redemption. The two kinds are types of fighting each other.

To conclude, face is a picture or image of a person who is emotionally related and wants to be appreciated by his circumstances, social environment and place of residence where this makes a person behave to be accepted in a group.

### **2.4 Face Threatening Acts**

Face threatening is an action that challenges the face of an interlocutor [21]. The speaker said something that represented a threat to other individuals' expectations about self-image. There are two kinds of actions that threaten the face, positive and negative faces [17].

It is generally better for conversation participants to avoid FTA, and unless their intention "to carry out the FTA with maximum efficiency" they needs try to "minimize the threat" [5]. The speaker is in the conversation might take the face-saving act of saying something that lessens the threat face the listener's face.

It can concluded that the Face threatening Act is an act that has the potential to hurt someone's face, either the hearer or the speaker through natural speech acts, so we are needs to be a good strategy in using it.

## **3. METHODOLOGY**

This study uses a qualitative descriptive method because the data sought are in the form of words, speech that does not involve numbers in it and the process is natural with natural settings that occur without any manipulation.

This research was conducted at Lambung Mangkurat University as the research site. The subjects of this study were taken from 12 students who took part in the NUDC debate which consisted of three rounds where in each round there were eight participants involved and due to limited time and researcher could only be involved in one group in each round, the researchers chose one room randomly per round when the debate takes place. In this study, the researchers focused on the utterances, words generated through interactions that occurred in debating, defending opinions when debaters were debating, and the data obtained by observation.

The instruments in this study were observation, interview guidelines, and recording (documentation). Observations were made to find out the actual or factual situation of the debate process, especially at the final stage where the debaters bring out their maximum abilities related to Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) and researchers prepare observation sheets in the form of lists when collecting data.

In collecting data, the researchers attended the debate in person and used mobile phone and laptop to

**4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**4.1. Findings**

The findings are displayed based on the types of FTA and sub types of FTA.

**Table 4.1.** Face Threatening Acts

Types of Face Threatening Acts		Sub-FTAs
<b>Positive Hearer</b>	<b>Face as</b>	a. Disapproval b. Criticism c. Complaints d. Accusations e. Contradictions f. Disagreements
<b>Negative Hearer</b>	<b>Face as</b>	a. Apologies b. Self-Humiliation c. Self-Contradicting d. Responsibility
<b>Positive Speaker</b>	<b>Face as</b>	a. Apologies b. Rejecting Offers c. Confession
<b>Negative Speaker</b>	<b>Face as</b>	a. Expressing Thanks b. Excuses c. Acceptance Offers

**Table 4.2.** FTAs most often used

FTA'S	DEBATER	TOTAL
<i>PF.HF2</i>	YH, NN, SA, DN, DNA, AL, DI, GG	19
<i>PF.HF3</i>	YH, SA, DS, DI, DN, EM, GG	11
<i>PF.HF4</i>	YH, SA, DN, SA, DI, YH, GG	10
<i>PF.HF6</i>	YH, NN, SN, DNA, DI, GG	8
<i>PF.HF5</i>	NN, SA, DN, GG	7
<i>PF.HF1</i>	SH, SN, DI, GG	6
<i>NF.HF5</i>	SA, GG	3
<i>NF.HF4</i>	SA, DN	2
<i>NF.HF1</i>	OA	1
<i>NF.SF1</i>	All	12
<i>PF.SF5</i>	NN, DN, SN, SA, AL, OA, GG	9
<i>NF.SF3</i>	YH, NN, DI, SA, DNA, OA, YH	8
<i>NF.SF4</i>	SA, SN, EM	3
<i>PF.SF4</i>	DI, GG	2
<i>PF.SF1</i>	YH, NN	2

This result was accordance with Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory which classifies Threatening

record the debate process and took pictures for documentation while completing the observation list. The observation checklist was a list of things that be seen by observers when observing related with the NUDC debate and as a supporting instrument the researcher conduct interviews with debaters to clarify and strengthen the data that has been obtained to get valid data result for avoid bias.

Actions into two types, namely Positive Face and Negative Face, both of which include FTA as Hearer Face and Speaker Face and consist of various subtypes Disapproval, Criticism, Complaints, Accusations, Contradictions Disagreements (positive face as hearer), Apologies, Self-Humiliation, Self-Contradicting, Responsibility (negative face as hearer), Apologies, Rejecting Offers, Confession (positive face as speaker) and Expressing Thanks, Excuses, Acceptance Offers (negative face as speaker).

Based on the data obtained, there are FTAs used by debaters in the form of positive face (PF) and negative face (NF) and the sub types Hearer Face that uses code HF.1 are disapproval, apologies; HF.2 criticism, HF.3 complaints, HF.4 accusations, self-humiliation, and self-contradicting; HF.5 contradictions, responsibility; HF.6 disagreements while for the Speaker Face subtypes used by debaters are SF.1 apologies, expressing thanks; SF.3 excuses, SF.4 rejecting and acceptance of offers; and SF.5 confession.

**PF.HF.1, NF.HF 1 (Disapproval, Apologies)** there were six utterances from the debater where participants SA, SN, DI and GG used disapproval in their debate in the positive face type and one apologies from OA as a negative face in FTAs as the Hearer Face.

**PF.HF.2 (Criticisms)** there were 19 utterances from the YH, NN, SA, DN, DI, DNA, AL, and GG debaters used criticisms in their debates that fall into the positive face type in FTAs as Hearer Face.

**PF.HF.3 (Complaints)** there are 11 utterances from the YH, SA, DS, DI, DN, EM and GG debaters where they used complaints that fall into the Positive face category in FTAs as Hearer Face

**PF.HF.4, NF.HF4 (Accusations, self-humiliation, self-contradicting)** there were 10 accusations based on the utterances of the YH, SA, DN, DI, and GG debaters in the debate that included in the positive face type in FTAs and there were two utterances from SA and DN participants regarding self-humiliation and three utterances about self-contradicting from NN participants, AL, and DNA where self-humiliation and self-contradicting are classified as negative faces in FTAs as Hearer faces.

**PF.HF.5, NF.HF5 (contradictions, responsibility)** where participants NN, SA, DN and GG used

contradictions as many as seven utterances in their debates which included the positive face type in FTAs and there were three utterances regarding responsibility from the SA and GG debaters which included the negative face type in FTAs as Hearer faces.

**PF.HF.6 (disagreements)** there were eight utterances from the YH, NN, SN, DNA, DI and GG debaters who used disagreements which included the positive face type in FTAs as a Hearer face.

**NF.SF.1, PF.SF.1 (Expressing Thanks, Apologies)** there were 12 utterances from the debater YH, NN, SA, DNA, DS, DI, SN, DN, EM, AL, OA, and GG used expressing thanks in their debate which included in the negative face type and two utterances from YH and NN in the type positive face on FTAs as Speaker face.

**PF.SF5 (confession)** there were nine utterances from the NN, DN, SN, SA, AL, OA and GG debaters used confession in their debates which are included in the positive face type in FTAs as Speaker face.

**NF.SF3 (excuses)** there were eight utterances from the YH, NN, DI, SA, DNA, and OA debaters used excuses in their debates which are included in the negative face type in FTAs as speaker faces.

**NF.SF4, PF.SF4 (acceptance offers, rejecting offers)** there were three utterances regarded the acceptance of offers from the SA, SN and EM debaters which are included in the negative face type and two utterances that use the rejecting offers from the DI and GG debaters which are included in the positive face type in FTAs as Speaker face.

The FTAs most often used by debaters were PF.HF.2 (positive face and subtypes are criticism) with a total of 19 utterances, then NF.SF.1 (negative face and subtypes expressing thanks) with a total of 12 utterances, then PF.HF.3 (positive face and its subtypes are complaints) with a total of 11 utterances and PF.HF.4 (positive face and its subtypes are accusations) with a total of 10 utterances.

## 4.2 Discussion

Communication is something that we may give understanding to the other person. It is a process to build social interaction both speaker and hearer to find out what the other person wants and needs in a relationship. In this point, the writer discusses the significance of the theoretical and practical research used by the researcher in this study.

This research took action to threaten the face as a theory using the NUDC 2021 Lambung Mangkurat University debaters as a subject. Face-threatening acts are actions that in some way threaten self-esteem or self-image as speakers and listeners [17]. The act of threatening face is an act of challenge to attract the

wishes of the interlocutor [21]. Writer conducted research focusing on the types of face-threatening actions and face-threatening actions that were most often used by participants in the 2021 NUDC debate [17]. Based on the analysis conducted by researchers using a descriptive qualitative approach.

In finding data, observation transcripts, interview transcripts, videos, and documentation were obtained through the process of researchers conducting direct observations and interviews via zoom due to the pandemic.

The data showed that FTAs that were most often used by Debaters in NUDC 2021 were two types namely Positive Face as speaker or hearer and Negative Face as speaker or hearer. First, positive faces as hearer can be identified from several sub-types used by debaters as follows: disapproval, criticism, complaints, accusations, contradictions, and disagreements while the negative face as hearer that used by debaters as follows: apologies, self-humiliation, self-contradiction and responsibility. Second, positive faces as speaker can be identified from several sub-types used by debaters as follows: apologies, rejecting offers, and confession while the negative face as speaker that used by debaters as follows: expressing thanks, excuses, acceptance offers.

It was found that the most often used by debaters in NUDC 2021 Lambung Mangkurat University was negative face which includes criticism, complaints, and accusations. Meanwhile, for positive face, the most often used was expressing thanks.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data analysis, there are two types of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) used by debaters in NUDC 2021 namely Positive Face and Negative Face as speaker or hearer. The positive faces as hearer are in the forms of sub-types used by debaters which consist of disapproval, criticism, complaints, accusations, contradictions, and disagreements. Meanwhile, the negative face as hearer that are used by debaters comprised of apologies, self-humiliation, self-contradiction, and responsibility. Moreover, the positive faces as speaker can be identified from several sub-types used by debaters namely apologies, rejecting offers, and confession while the negative face as speaker that are used by debaters are expressing thanks, excuses, and accepting offers. These findings suggest that further investigation is needed to explore the types of speech acts performed by debaters in other type of formal debate competition to enrich the data on speech acts.

## AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Author 1 contributed to the review of literature, research design, research instruments, data collection, and data analysis. Author 2 contributed to the design of the research, data analysis, and writing report. Author 3 contributed to enriching the literature review and the writing format.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Hernawan, F. N. Yusuf, English Competitive Debating Challenges Teachers' Voices, in: Proceedings of CONAPLIN2020, vol.546. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.007>
- [2] D. Amaroh, Tindakan Pengancaman Muka Dan Strategi Kesopanan Dalam Rubric Pembaca Menulis Di Harian Jawa Pos, UNS, 2010. [digilib.uns.ac.id](http://digilib.uns.ac.id)
- [3] P. Brown, S. C. Levinson, Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [4] D. Firmansyah, E.E. Valatansa, Improving the students' speaking skill through debate technique, in: Proceedings of Professional Journal of English Education, vol.2, no.6, 2019. pp.891-895.
- [5] E. Goffman, On Face work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements Social Interaction, in: Proceedings of Psychiatry, Vo. 18, no.3, 1955, pp. 213-31.
- [6] Handayani, D. (2015, January 05). Strategi Kesantunan FTA (Face Threatening Act) ungkapan maaf dalam serial drama "Risou No Musuko". Neliti, 77. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/205225-none.pdf>
- [7] K. Tiasadi, Debating practice to support critical thinking skills: Debaters' perception, in; Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra (AKSARA), vol.21, no.1, 2020, 1-16.
- [8] Leech, g. (2014). The Pragmatics of Politeness. United States of America: Oxford University Press
- [9] Mey J.1993. Pragmatics, An Introduction. Blackwell. Oxford UK and USA Cambridge, in: Jurnal ilmiah edu research, vol.2, no.1, 2012.
- [10] Maunuaho, K. (2019). Face Threatening Acts in Sports Interviews. University of Jyväskylä.
- [11] Moh Nazir. (2019). Metode penelitian (Jakarta : Ghalia Indonesia, 1999), p. 234

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers would like to express gratitude to the subject of the study that makes this research possible.

- [12] M. Syahputra, S. Chaira, The Cultivation of Students' problem solving skill through Asian Parliamentary Debate System (APDS), in: Proceedings of Journal GEEJ, vol.7, no.1, 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46244/geej.v7i1.1047>
- [13] A. F. Nasution, The usage of face threatening act in princess diaries 1 and princess diaries 2: the royal engagement movie, Indonesia, State University of Surabaya, 2013.
- [14] N. Leech, Principles of Pragmatics, London: Longman, H 250pp, 1983.
- [15] H. Noble, R. Heale, Triangulation in research, with examples, in: Proceedings of Evidence-Based Nursing, vol. 22, no. 3, 2019, pp. 67-68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/ebnurs-2019-103145>
- [16] Paramitha, A. Students' Speaking Performance Using Logical Thinking Skill in Speaking for Debate Class, in: Proceedings of RETAIN, vol.7, no.1, 2019, pp. 147-154.
- [17] S. C. Penelope Brown, Politeness. New York, Melbourne, the Press syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1987. [https://www.academia.edu/26395652/Politeness\\_Some\\_universals\\_in\\_language\\_usage](https://www.academia.edu/26395652/Politeness_Some_universals_in_language_usage)
- [18] M. V. Redmond, Face and Politeness Theories: English Technical Reports and White papers, USA, Iowa State University, 2015.
- [19] R.F. Lubis, English Debate, in: English Education, vol.1, no.1, 2013, pp.15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24952/ee.v1i1.6>
- [20] E. Septiani, Face Threatening Acts in the First Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton on 26th September 2016, A Study of Pragmatics, E Prints. 2018.
- [21] G. Yule, Pragmatics. New York, Oxford University Press, vol.2, no.1, 2016, pp.6
- [22] Z. Zulfahmi, Factors that Affect Students' Success in English Debates, in: Proceedings of English Education Journal, vol.8, no.2, 2017, pp. 137-148.