The Degree of Assertiveness in Speeches Delivered by Debaters on NSDC 2020 Final Round

Azhar Maulana Maghribi Sidiq ✉, **Sri Wuli Fitriati , Widhiyanto Widhiyanto**

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
	Considering the crucial roles of interpersonal meaning in argumentative speech, the study evaluated the use of interpersonal meaning using Halliday's theory (2014) in debate speeches. It aimed to find out the use of mood and modality in the speech of debaters and how mood and modality realize assertiveness. This research used a qualitative research design with the data from spoken language, especially the final round of the National School Debating Championship 2020. The result of the study on 6 high school debaters showed that there are 1061 mood systems found; they are classified as declarative, interrogative, and imperative mood systems. The most occurred mood in the speech was the declarative mood, which is 999 clauses and categorized as a statement that contains information for the debater to present their idea. The presented ideas were used in an attempt to justify the team's stances. The modality system found that the most common type of modality in speech was the inclination modality, which is 40 clauses. It indicates that the debater wants to show their determination on how the debater deals with the motion. By analyzing the speech using interpersonal meaning, the highest number of declarative mood and inclination modalities indicates the assertiveness in every debater's speech.

INTRODUCTION

Debate is the way which aims to build students' competitiveness and increase communicative competence, and it is also the spirit of the implementation curriculum 2013. According to Al-Mahrooqi and Tabakow (2015), the debate has a general meaning as an argument or discussion about specific issues that evoke differences of opinion, calling to mind intense verbal exchanges in political contests.

Nowadays, debate competition has become a prestigious competition in Senior High School. The Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture annually conducts the National School Debating Championship (NSDC). Schools send their students to join the selection to represent the province. However, many high school students still struggle to compose argumentative texts in debates (Rahmatunnisa, 2014). Argumentative text aims to influence people's actions and opinions so that they will follow what the speaker tells (Keraf, 2007).

In debate, it does not only build their logical and critical argument, but the debaters must build their interpersonal relations. It is in line with the function of language, which enables the users to engage interpersonally and exchange their points of view (Fauziah & Cahyono, 2022) and those related to interpersonal meaning. In interpersonal meaning, we do not merely aim to make another person understand our thoughts and feelings when we use language, but we also subtly use language to define our interpersonal relationships with one another (Wardhaugh in Kondowe 2014).

Currently, many sectors adapted to use ZOOM as their media for communication; moreover, it is not only just for casual activities but also for conducting a meeting or an event such as debate competitions. A debate is usually conducted face-to-face between six debaters in the same room with judges in front of them, but it is conducted through ZOOM.

Debating virtually is a challenge for the debater on how debaters should build their interpersonal meaning without physically meeting their fellow rivals or even their group.

Moreover, in debating, the speaker must interact with another debater; the debater sometimes will act as an expert who understands the discussed motion. By acting out a role, debaters may also create a desirable role for other debaters, for instance, by asking questions and responding to previous debaters' statements. In fulfilling them, debaters should be assertive in delivering their arguments to avoid being too aggressive yet submissive.

Studies investigating interpersonal meaning have been widely conducted, Feng and Liu 2010; Yipei and Lingling 2013; Kondowe 2014; Sari 2014; Esmer 2017; Firmansah 2015; Nur, 2015; Mafruchatunnisa, 2016; Sukma 2017; Yuliana and Imperiani 2017; Puwanto, 2018; Rui and Jingxia, 2018; Gunawan 2019, they investigated interpersonal meaning, especially the use of mood in a speech. Mostly, they found that the speakers used declarative moods in their speech because the declarative mood functioned to give the information and show their statements. Moreover, the interrogative and imperative moods had the least occurrences. In their research, they mostly did not discuss the use of modality. However, it is crucial to analyze the modality itself in interpersonal meaning because it refers to the speaker's attitude toward something discussed (Halliday, 2014). Therefore, this research discusses not only the mood system but also the modality to know more about the speaker's attitude.

Ye (2010) investigated Barrack Obama's victory speech entitled "Change has come to America.". Barack Obama affirmed his victory, and he announced it in front of 150,000 people at his election party. It investigated the speech from the Interpersonal Metafunction point of view, mainly including analysing mood, modality and pronoun. The finding shows that in terms of the Interpersonal Metafunction, the speech is dominated by positive declarative; then the second is followed by imperative clauses; "will", "can", and "must" become the frequently modal verbal operators carrying on the modality in the speech; the first personal pronoun and its anamorphous turn up mainly in Barack Obama's Victory Speech, and the second personal pronoun

"you" come after it. Using the same theory, there is also another research investigated using two speeches. It was done by Tehseem (2018), who analysed U.S. President Barrack Obama and Pakistani Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani's speeches. The research found that both speeches used declarative mood because declarative is always loaded with the information provided to the audience. It shows that both speeches frequently used judgment by raising particular issues in their speeches. However, from those researches, there is a difference where Tehseem (2018) employed appraisal theory to get a more profound analysis. This research will also have an extension after analysing the mood and modality the result will bridge with assertiveness.

To be more specific to this research, there was a research that investigated interpersonal meaning in argumentative and debate. Agatha (2015) researched mood employed by a teacher at Theresiana Senior High School. The data was a video from the XI IS 1 immersion class. She found that teachers used declarative and imperative moods in teaching. It can be inferred that the teacher had a role as the initiator since she gave information about the material and had a dominant role and power in the class seen by the use of imperative mood. Moreover, Yuyun (2014) investigated arguments in a private high school debate club to identify the degree of assertiveness. She uses mood and modality theory by Halliday to assess an assertiveness degree in verbal communication. This research used a debate competition called the National School Debating Championship 2020 to get more of an authentic setting.

In fact, studies investigating interpersonal meaning in the argumentative text in a debate setting have been few conducted. Mainly, some research focused on the ideational meaning concerning the content of the substantive argument, which consists of a set of reasons to persuade the adjudicators. However, in reality, it is often that many debaters forget to focus on the manner in which they build their interpersonal relations; many debaters focus only on how they build their argument and how the argument has a strong logical and critical reason that the

adjudicators can accept. As a result, many of them deliver their speech too aggressively or even harshly. Therefore, it is very relevant to explore more on how the debaters build their interpersonal relations by seeing their interpersonal meaning metafunction.

Based on those perspectives, this study aims to fill the gap on how there still needs to be more studies on interpersonal metafunction on how the debater establish their interpersonal interaction. Specifically, this research focused on mood and modality employed in debaters' speeches in the National Students Debating Championship 2020 final round. By achieving the extensive analysis, this study was conducted to explain the use of mood in the speech of each debater, the use of modality in the speech of each debater, and the realization of interpersonal meaning in assertiveness.

METHOD

The design of this study was a descriptive qualitative study that aimed to examine the use of interpersonal meaning to realise the assertiveness of debaters' speeches at the National Debating Championship (NSDC) 2020. The data were taken by observing the video and transcribing speeches of the final round of NSDC 2020, which was conducted using Zoom Meeting.

After having 6 transcriptions from the debaters' speech, the transcriptions were identified and classified based on interpersonal meaning, especially the mood and the modality using Halliday's (2014) theory.

To ensure the research is valid and reliable, the researchers conducted investigator triangulation by engaging with experts to validate the data analysis.

This study engaged in analyzing interpersonal meaning within the utterances produced by each debater in the NSDC 2020 final round that was run using Zoom Meeting.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This part elaborates on the result of data analysis to support the research problems. From

the analysis, the use of interpersonal meaning in the debaters' speech of the NSDC 2020 final round by high school students was found.

The analysis found that there were three types of mood systems, declarative, interrogative, and imperative, and two types of modality systems; modalization and modulation. They are probability, usuallity, obligation, and inclination. To get a more extensive explanation, the result and discussion will be displayed as follows:

The Use of Mood in The Speech of Each Debater

The results of the analysis are presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1. The Result of the Mood Analysis

Category	Type	Frequency
Mood Type	Declarative	999
	Imperative	10
	Interrogative	52
Total		1061

In the mood system, it was found that 999 clauses indicate a declarative mood. It was exercised by all debaters in the final round. Then, interrogative mood occupies 52 occurrences, and the least frequent is the imperative mood which has only 10 occurrences.

To better understand the mood finding, this part presents the mood system used by each debater in the final round of NSDC.

Table 2. The Result of the Use of Mood Analysis of Each Debater

No	Debaters	Declarative	Interrogative	Imperative
1	Prime minister	167	6	2
2	Deputy prime minister	160	9	4
3	Government whip	149	6	1
4	Leader of opposition	160	12	1
5	Deputy leader of the opposition	176	10	1
6	Opposition whip	187	9	1
	TOTAL	999	52	10

Based on table 2, shows the mood system that each debater used in their speech. As displayed in a table, it is found that the government team's debaters used the mood systems as follows: the prime minister used declarative, 167 occurrences, 6 interrogative, and 2 imperatives; in the deputy prime minister's speech, it is found 160 declarative, 9 interrogative and 4 imperative occurrences, and the government whip used 149 declarative, 6 interrogative and 1 imperative. On the side of the opposition, the leader of opposition exercised 3 types of mood; those are 160 declarative, 12 interrogative, and 1 imperative. Then, the deputy leader of the opposition used 176 declarative, 10 interrogative, and 1 imperative mood systems, and the last speaker, the opposition whip, used 187 declarative, 9 interrogative, and 1 imperative mood systems.

TheDeclarative Mood Used in the Debater Speech

Declarative mood is identified as a clause containing information and functions as a medium for delivering a statement. It can be proven that all the debaters exercised high numbers of declarative moods. In the analysis, it is found that there are 999 occurrences of declarative mood, which is distributed by Prime Minister 167 occurrences, Deputy Prime Minister 160 occurrences, Government Whip 149 occurrences, Leader of the Opposition 160

occurrences, Deputy Leader of the Opposition 176 occurrences and Opposition Whip 187 occurrences.

The excerpt related to declarative mood can be seen in the following clause.

"Secondly, we are also going to make sure that the people who are going to be able to bid in these areas are a legitimate company, right."

Based on the above excerpt, it can be seen that the prime minister tried to define the motion by explaining that the government will ensure that the bidder (third party) which can take the bid is a legitimate company. It is a company possessing some criteria which the government needs.

As the prime minister, it is required to set the background and parameters of the debate by defining the motion. By exercising the declarative mood, he gave information about the motion because the declarative mood is used to exchange information (Eggins, 2004). Moreover, the second debater also used a declarative mood to respond to the topic given after the Prime Minister's speech to the Leader of the Opposition. As a Leader of the Opposition, the debater should take a stance on whether the opposition will challenge the government parameter or not. In this debate, the Leader of the Opposition tried to rebut the government's statement as follows.

"What government failed to notice is that making sure that someone has the right to govern over your certain country means you sell your sovereignty."

From the excerpt above, the leader of the opposition tried to challenge the government team by showing the lack of the government debate speech. He emphasised that giving a third party the right to govern the land means selling the sovereignty. Because sovereignty is one of 4 country's primary elements that govern the country, it is essential for a country. It also shows the government's incapability to govern the land by itself. The excerpts above can be detail identified as declarative on how the leader of the opposition wanted to state some facts that the government has already failed to talk about the country's sovereignty, even though the beginning of the clause is started with the word 'what,' it is

not included in the interrogative because the composition of declarative mood is subject + finite (Liping, 2017) and its position is as a subject.

After the Leader of the Opposition presented his speech, the Deputy of the Prime Minister delivered the third speech. The role of the Deputy of the Prime Minister is to extend the Prime Minister's arguments and bring another perspective to support the government's stance. Here is the excerpt of the declarative mood from the Deputy of the Prime Minister extending the previous debater's information.

"We think that the urgency right now is to gain more money as fast as possible."

The mood in this clause is considered as a declarative mood because the Deputy Prime Minister tries to extend her teammate's arguments which is the way for her to attach more information about the necessity to get fast money. It is in line with the function of declarative mood, which is to expand the information to be developed and argued (Schleppegrell, 2008).

Interrogative Mood Used in the Debater Speech

In the interrogative, the speakers request or give some questions to the hearer; moreover, they also demand an answer from the interlocutor or the hearer.

In the analysis, it is found that there are 6 occurrences of declarative mood, which is distributed by Prime minister 12 occurrences, Deputy Prime Minister 9 occurrences, Government Whip 10 occurrences, Leader of the Opposition 10 occurrences, Deputy Leader of the Opposition 6 occurrences and Opposition Whip 9 occurrences.

Here, it is the excerpt that contains an interrogative mood.

"Firstly, regarding why our side of the house can actually develop the area so much better?"

Based on the excerpts above, it can be seen that the Prime Minister used interrogative sentences to interrogate the reasons why the opposition side of the house could actually develop the area so much better.

Furthermore, the Leader of the Opposition also used the interrogative sentence to get reasons for why this was done. Like the quote below:

"Ladies and gentlemen, then why would investors and why would certain countries want to buy these areas in the first place?"

Based on the quote above, it is known that the Leader of the Opposition, in his speech, also invited the audience to be involved and question the opponent's stance. As a strategy, she used the WH question, which is "why", to demand an explanation from the government side of the house (Rahmawati, 2021).

Then, the Deputy Prime Minister emphasised the reasons and objectives of his speech with questions to answer questions from the hearer.

"On why is our site more aligned to the interests of developing countries and the government itself?"

The quote above shows that the Deputy Prime Minister used interrogative sentences before answering what was asked by the hearer. In order to convey doubt in this mood, a question is asked. A condition or a potential scenario is expressed using the conditional mood.

Imperative Mood Used in the Debater Speech

Imperative mood may be used to convey a command. Thus, the use of imperatives can indicate that the writer or speaker is in a position of greater power than the readers or listeners. In the analysis, it is found that there are 10 occurrences of the imperative mood, which is distributed by Prime minister 2 occurrences, Deputy Prime Minister 4 occurrences, Government Whip 1 occurrence, Leader of the Opposition 1 occurrence, Deputy Leader of the Opposition 1 occurrence and Opposition Whip 1 occurrence.

Here, it is the excerpt that contains an imperative mood.

"So, let's move on to the second argument."

The sentence is expressed as a sign that the discussion of the previous topic has been completed and has discussed the next topic.

The Leader of the Opposition also used an imperative mood to ask for further explanation.

"And moreover, they have to explain to us."

From the excerpt above, it can be inferred that the Leader of the Opposition commanded the opponent to elaborate more on their statements.

Lastly, the Deputy Prime Minister also used imperative mood to give a sign that the previous topic has been completed and discussed the next topic.

"But now let's move on to my second clash, in which parties better develop the areas."

It shows that the Deputy Prime Minister exercised an imperative mood. It can be seen that there is an infinity verb at the beginning of the sentence. It indicates that the Deputy Prime Minister instructed for the audience to continue listening to the following discussion.

Modality System Used in the Speech of Debater

In this research, the researcher also analysed the types and values of the modality system. According to Halliday, modality is divided into two, which are modalization and modulation. Modalization consists of probability and usuality, and modulation is obligation and inclination (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). In this research, the researcher identified that the debaters used modality in their speech. Furthermore, in this research, the researcher also analysed the value of the modality. It is divided into three values: high, medium, and low. The use of modality value is to portray how strong language is used.

After identifying the data, the researcher found that the debaters used a modality system in their debate speech in the final round of NSDC. These findings are based on the theories of Halliday and Martin (1981) and Halliday (1994), whereas the debaters used 4 types of modalities and all the values of modalities.

The researcher found that all debaters exercised 124 times of modality which are 24 times probability, 26 times usualty, 34 times obligation, and 40 times inclination modality. There is no significant kind of modality which dominates the kind of modalities that the debaters use. However, the Inclination modality has the highest percentage (35%).

Probability Modality system used in Debaters' speech

Probability type occurs when someone states a condition or situation and something as a prediction that will happen in the future. In the analysis, it is found that there are 23 clauses which contain probability modality. They are 2 high values, 3 median values, and 18 low values of probability.

"Because on the side of the proposition, the policy certainly will be changing as a bit change right."

The excerpt above shows a high value of probability type of modality on a level of certainty of the plan or commitment. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to ensure that the government team raises a proposal that will not sustain, and by using the high value of probability's word "certainly", she showed her confidence and high belief in her statement.

Moreover, the analysis also found some median values of probability type of modality in this debate speech. It was found in Prime Minister 3 times. Here, the excerpt related to median values of probability type of modality could be seen in the following clause.

"Most probably, we are going to choose underdeveloped lands."

The word "most" gives a superlative attribution in order to give more certainty. However, the word "probably" makes the certainty of the statement decrease. The probability of the clause remained unquestionable to his statement and likely to be true. Besides, the low value of probability modality was also found in the analysis, as shown in the sentences below.

Table 3.

Category	Type	Sub-Type	Total
Modality Type	Modalization	Probability	24
		Usuality	26
	Modulation	Obligation	34
		Inclination	40

"Realize, how this can actually create a much better image for our country at the end."

The word "can" shows little or weak certainty in his statement. It is a range between 'yes' and 'no'; that is, the validity is whether it can be true or it cannot be true. Besides being part of probability, "can" is also a part of the obligation.

Usuality Modality Used in the Debaters' Speech

Usuality type occurs in a situation or condition that shares degrees of oftenness. It shows the frequency of the events. The analysis found that the occurrence of usuality modality is 26 times, consisting of 9 high, 2 median, and 15 low values.

"They always have the continuous reason to fund their life."

The sentence above shows the usage of high values of usualty modality. It indicates that the use of "always" gives an attribute to the investor that they constantly have a reason to invest. Moreover, the median value of usualty in this debate speech is also found.

"That often has an earthquake."

The excerpt above contains median values of usualty modality, which is "often". Here, the Government Whip tried to elaborate on his team's stance on the reason Indonesia needs a fund from the investor or help from a third party. He said that Indonesia is very prone to many earthquakes. The word "often" in his statement indicates that earthquake happens often. Lastly, here below is the instance of low values of usualty modality.

"Realize, how these lands have literally never been used by the government or have been like poorly developed by the government."

From the excerpt above, it can be seen that the use of "never" shows that the place which the debaters talked about is not even touched yet by the government.

Obligation Modality system used in Debaters' speech

Obligation type occurs when someone states a condition or situation and something to ask or demand others to do something, for instance, permission, direction, demanding, and suggestion. It requires the responsibility and demand of the speaker to the hearer (Rui & Jingxi, 2018). In the analysis, it was found that 30 clauses contain obligation modality. They are 28 high values, 3 median values, and 1 low value of obligation.

"The company has to tell you."

In the debate, it is shown a high value of obligation modality by using "have to". It expresses something that the speaker must do. The medium values of obligation are also found expressed by the words "will", "would", "should", and "shall". The analysis also found that "should" and "would" were used by the debaters; the related excerpt can be seen below.

"Ladies and gentlemen, then why would investors and why would certain countries want to buy these areas in the first place?"

Moreover, the usage of the word "would" expresses something that is expected to do or to be done. He questioned why the investor would give their money to build the areas if they do not have any significance for them because investors will expect some benefits from the land. Lastly, the low value is shown in the sentence below.

"When they realise, they could not win was."

A low degree of obligation implies that the speaker has a low belief or weak certainty in a statement of the speaker toward the topic. The use of "could" in the opposition whip speech shows the ability.

Inclination Modality System Used in Debaters' Speech

Inclination is the readiness of the speaker to do something or the ability to do something. It is found that there are 40 occurrences of inclination modality; however, there are only two values degrees categories found, which are 36 occurrences of medium values and 4 occurrences of low values. Here, it is the excerpt which contains inclination modality.

"We will want to let third parties like, for example, private companies or like entrepreneurs actually govern these areas."

The first clause comes from the Prime Minister, who explained that the third party will get permission to develop the areas they handle. It is because Indonesia has a big area, and many of them are abandoned. Therefore, they thought they wanted to allow the third party to govern the area. In this case, she exercised a median value of inclination modality by using the words "want to". It indicates that the speaker has a desire to do with what they stated.

"They are willing to exploit."

Then, the first low value of inclination modality came from the Leader of the Opposition, who stated that the third party's motive to get the right to govern was willing to exploit the land. He used the low values of inclination modality to indicate someone's desire ready to do something. He expressed the modality by using "willing" to show that the third party intends to exploit the land.

The Realization of Assertiveness in the Debate

Debater tends to do their best to persuade the adjudicator to choose their team as a winner. Debaters presented their argument as a medium to send some reasons and ideas to the audiences, and the way the debaters present should be firm, forcefulness and dominance, but it should not be too aggressive and harsh; therefore, they should be assertive in delivering the arguments. In a declarative mood, a message can be delivered instantly without forming a misunderstanding that the audience might receive. It is in line with

Gervasio's (1987) stated that speakers are taught to be direct in assertiveness. This kind of mood is different from that of interrogative or imperative, which is used to ask questions, demand information, or even sometimes as derision or sarcasm. In Debate, debaters sometimes use derision or sarcasm. However, it is not the main assessment of the adjudicators to decide the winner.

In this study, the debater used the declarative mood to lay a philosophical ground of the argument as statements of fact to present as many facts and evidence as possible to support the main argument. Moreover, it is because a declarative mood is naturally used to make a statement of fact. Generally, the debaters presented the facts which relate to the motion talking about whether the government gives a bid for third parties to develop some undeveloped land in Indonesia or not. The debaters competed to present as many facts and arguments as possible in their debate speech to be able to give a persuasive debate speech.

The government team brings a case that, as a developing country, Indonesia does not have the capability to develop all its land. It is because Indonesia is a large country; therefore, it is urgent to let third parties work on the undeveloped land within some regulations. Firstly, they give a fact that Indonesia should develop all the areas equally, but unfortunately, the status quote shows that there are still development gaps in Indonesia, especially in Borneo and Papua islands. Secondly, seeing the rapid development in the world, Indonesia also needs the urgency to have the fastest way to develop those untapped lands. Moreover, the lack of money in a developing country like Indonesia makes Indonesia incapable of building any infrastructure; for that reason, the government team states that giving the land to a third party is the fastest way for Indonesia to get funding.

While the opposition also presented their speeches by stating some facts and evidence that giving third parties to work on Indonesia's land is too risky. First, they said that it would endorse exploitation because, as third parties, they will absolutely think and focus on their own interest and will do any way to advance their plan. As a government, they should have the moral obligation to protect their people from third parties. Second, by letting the third party fully develop their land, it is a kind of selling sovereignty that cannot be accepted. People have already given their trust in the government to run the country, but the act of the government is violating the trust.

From the brief summary of the discussion in the debate above, we can see that both the government and opposition teams tried to present some arguments that explain the stance of their team. In an argument, the author provides a point of view and tries to convince the audience that their viewpoint is correct (Shulman, 2004). Quinn (2009) points out that the speech structure in the debate should contain an explanation in which the speaker needs to justify how and why their argument is valid. Moreover, the explanation should contain some facts to make the justification more valid. The declarative moods that present facts indicate the application of a logical-empirical strategy of persuasion.

Furthermore, a persuasive speech cannot be separated from how the speaker exercises assertiveness in the speech. In a debate competition, in order for the audience, in this case, the adjudicators, can have the same beliefs as the speakers, it is essential for the debaters to be concerned about how they exercise assertiveness. In a debate setting, According to Riddle (2008), assertiveness is the ability to take the initiative and reply in a manner that supports reasoning and persuasion in a debating situation (Braga & Marques, 2004). Regarding the realisation of assertiveness performed by both of the teams, the significant use of declarative mood proved that most of the utterances operated as assertiveness about something clearly as the speakers shared their beliefs with the audience when the arguments could be delivered clearly by the debaters so the statement of facts that the speaker believes to be true could convince the audience to believe the same thing.

In a debate competition, in order for the audience, in this case, the adjudicators, can have the same belief as the speakers, it is essential for

the debaters to show their earnests and willingness as their earnest on the motion. Besides declarative mood, inclination modality was also analysed as the measurement of strong willingness in their statement that can be indicated as assertiveness. Moreover, the inclination modality explained clearly what side the speaker stands on. The dominant use of inclination in the findings is expected as the speech contains the team's optimism and promises to carry out many actions and put in much work to make Indonesia better. This dominance also implies that they, in this case, the government and opposition, will be actively involved in their mission to develop the land with a third party or not.

CONCLUSION

The use of interpersonal meaning in the debaters' speeches has been discussed in this research. In general, this research has three main findings. Firstly, the finding concerns the use of the mood system in the final round of the National School Debating Championship debaters' speech. From the speeches, there were three kinds of moods employed by the debaters, which are declarative, imperative, and interrogative. Declarative mood has the highest number of occurrences. There were 999 clauses that employed declarative mood. It indicates that all the debaters attempted to present a statement containing facts or information to justify their team's stance. However, there are only a few imperative and interrogative moods. It happened because the debater wanted to avoid the ambiguity that might happen when they exercised an interrogative and imperative mood. Secondly, the finding concerns on the use of modality systems in debaters' speeches. From the speeches, 124 clauses contained modality. There are 24 probability, 26 usualty, 34 obligations, and 40 inclination modalities. It shows that there is no significant number kind of modality which dominates the speech. However, the inclination modality has the highest number of occurrences. It indicates that the debater wants to show their determination on how the debaters deal with the

topic. Lastly, the debaters can achieve assertiveness through the use of declarative mood, which indicates that they competed to present as many as possible and argument in their debate. Moreover, it is essential for the debater to concerns about how they exercise assertiveness.

REFERENCES

Agatha, A. F. (2015). Mood types analysis of teaching and learning process in immersion class of Theresiana 1 senior high school. Phys.

Al-Mahrooqi, R. I., & Tabakow, M. L. (2015). Effectiveness of debate in ESL / EFL-context courses in the arabian gulf : A comparison of two recent student-centered. *21st Century Academic Forum C, 5*(1)

Braga, D. & Marques, M. A. (2004). The pragmatics of prosodic features in the political debate. In Speech Prosody 2004, International Conference. ISCA Special Interest Group on Speech Prosody

Eggins, S. (2004). *Introduction to systemic functional inguistic* (2nd ed.). A&C Black

Esmer, E. (2017). Interpersonal metadiscourse markers in turkish election rally speeches delivered by pro-turkish and pro-kurdish leaders. *Athens Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(4), 367-384.

Fauziah, H., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2022). Prevalent beliefs in learning styles myths: Indonesian research trends on learning styles. *Issues in Educational Research, 32*(4).

Feng, H., & Liu, Y. (2010). Analysis of interpersonal meaning in public speeches - A case study of Obama's speech. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(6).

Firmansah, A. (2015). Interpersonal meaning in Netanyahu's speech. *English Review: Journal of English Education, 4*(1), 103.

Gunawan, Y. P., Fitriati, S., & Yuliasri, I. (2018). Students' gambits and debate structure in national university debating championship (NUDC) 2018 of West Java. *English Education Journal*, 9(1), 1-10.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (1981). *Readings in systemic linguistics*. London: Trafalgar Square Publishing.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford University Press

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.

Keraf, G. (2007). *Argumentasi dan narasi*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Kondowe, W. (2014). Interpersonal Metafunctions in Bingu wa Mutharika's Second-Term Political Discourse: A Systemic Functional Grammatical Approach. *International Journal of Linguistics*.

Liping, C. (2017). Mood, Modality and Polarity Analysis of Winston S. Churchill's Speech on Hitler's Invasion of the U.S.S.R. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 4*(1), 195–202.

Mafruchatunnisa, I. (2016). Interpersonal meanings in michelle obama's speech at memorial service for dr. Maya Angelo (A descriptive qualitative study). ELT Forum: *Journal of English Language Teaching of Semarang State University, 5*(1). Retrieved from

Nur, S. (2015). Analysis of interpersonal metafunction in public speechers: A case study of Nelson Mandela's Presidential inauguration speech. *The International Journal of Social Science, 30*(1), 52-63.

Puwanto, S. (2018). Reader's positioning in rechard mann's plots and schemes that brough down soeharto (PSBDS): A study on interpersonal meaning. CELT, 8(2), 124-136.

Rahmatunnisa, W. (2014). Problems faced by Indonesian EFL learners in writing argumentative essay. *Journal of English Education*.

Rahmawati, E. et al. (2021) The patterns of adjective phrase in bahasa Mentawai: An analysis of X-Bar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia 6*(2)

Rui, Z., & Jingxia, L. (2018). The study on the interpersonal meanings of modality in micro-blogging English news discourse by the case of "Donald Trump's Muslim Entry Ban". *Advances in Language and Literacy Studies, 9*(2), 110-118. DOI:

Sari, I. P. (2014). The interpersonal meaning of the speech produced by minister for foreign affairs of indonesia. *LANTERN (Journal on English Language, Culture and Literature), 3*(3).

Schleppegrell, M. (2008). The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective. Routledge.

Snow, C. E. (1983). Literacy and Language: Relationships during the pre-school years. Har

Sukma, B. P. (2017). Interpersonal metadiscourse markers as persuasive strategies in Barack Obama's 2012 campaign speeches. *Aksara, 29*(2),

Tehseem, T. (2018). Building interpersonal relations: A grammar for construing socio-political persona. *NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry, 16*(2).

Ye, R. (2010). The interpersonal metafunction analysis of barack Obama's victory speech. *English Language Teaching, 3*(2).

Yuliana, D. & Imperiani, E.D.A. 2017. The realization of interpersonal meaning in course newsletters: A systemic functional linguistic perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(1), 181-188.

Yuyun, I. (2014). A study of assertiveness in a debate setting. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 3*(2), 140–153.