

AUTHORIAL AND NON AUTHORIAL AFFECT IN SPEECH An Appraisal Theory Approach

Dwi Meisyitah Ananda¹⁾, M.R. Nababan²⁾, Riyadi Santosa³⁾

Universitas Sebelas Maret
Indonesia

[1](mailto:dwimeisyitahananda@student.uns.ac.id)dwimeisyitahananda@student.uns.ac.id, [2](mailto:amantaradja@yahoo.com)amantaradja@yahoo.com;
[3](mailto:riyadisantosa@staff.uns.ac.id)riyadisantosa@staff.uns.ac.id

Abstract

This study deals with authorial and non-authorial affect in speech. The aim is to find out the types of affect, graduation and engagement. This study used descriptive qualitative approach. The data were obtained through content analysis from speech transcript. The data was analyzed by using domain, taxonomy, and componential analysis. The result shows that there are 10 types of affects found in authorial affect, 13 types of affects found in non-authorial affect, and 10 types of affects found in authorial-non-authorial affect. Authorial affects and combinations are used more frequently than non-authorial. It indicates that the speaker as first person often expresses his/her own feelings and also expresses his/her and others' feeling upon something.

Keywords: authorial affect, non-authorial affect, graduation, engagement, appraisal, speech

Introduction

Public speaking is a specific skill that concentrates on learning how to speak in front of public. One of the topics learned in public speaking is about speech (Lucas, 2012). Like novel and newspaper, speech contains attitude. Considering this shared similarity, it is deemed suitable to analyze the speech by using appraisals approach. Previous studies that have been done so far concentrate on the changes of attitude and the comparison analysis (Hendrastuti, 2013; Umam, 2014; Alsina, Espunya, Naro, 2017; Zhang, 2015), types of appraisal and attitude used (Hidayani, 2006; Endah, 2008, Adi, 2013), the faithfulness of target text toward source text (Xiaoping, 2013; Qian, 2017), and message contained in the appraisal used (Nur, 2016).

In appraisal theory, another theory is proposed by White (1998; 2001) about 1st, 2nd and 3rd person point of view. The 1st person point of view is called authorial affect where she/he is emotionally involved in expressing affect, while the 2nd and 3rd person point of view is called non-authorial affect where 1st person merely expresses affect from 2nd or 3rd person; in other word, 1st person is not emotionally involved.

Regarding the studies on authorial and non-authorial affect, there are few studies that had been done and they were limited to news and academic writing as the source of data and appraisals theory was not used as the research approach while the studies on authorial and non-authorial affect which had used appraisal theory as its research approach were also limited to the tabulation on the adverbs, adjectives and nominalization effects (Afshin, 2016; Scott, 2008), and they only discussed a bit on the authorial and non-authorial as it was not the object of the research (Endah, 2008).

Based on the review above, the gap found by the researcher was the rarity of the study focuses on authorial and non-authorial affect with appraisal as its research approach.

Methodology

This research used descriptive qualitative approach and also embedded case study. The source of data was the speeches taken from online news media. The data were authorial and non-authorial affect found in the speech. The speeches taken were the speeches presented by famous public figures such as Barack Obama, Michelle Obama, Donald Trump, Joko Widodo, Meryl Streep, Malala

Yousafzai, and Severn Suzuki. The data were analyzed by using content analysis in order to distinguish between data and non-data. Afterwards, the data were analyzed by using domain, taxonomy, and componential analysis proposed by Spradley (in Santosa, 2017).

Findings and Discussion

Based on the analysis done, the study reveals that *affection* was mainly found affect in authorial affect with 13,79 % from total percentage, whereas *desire* was mainly found in non-authorial affect and the combination with 17,31 % in non-authorial affect and 44,34 % in combination. The details could be seen in the following below.

Table 1. Authorial Affect

No	Affects	Grad	Eng	Σ	%	
1	Irrealis	Fear	Sharp/Raise	Mon	2	3,45
2			Desire	Sharp/Raise	Mon	3
				Het	3	5,17
3	Realis	Misery	Sharp/Raise	Mon	3	5,17
4			Cheer	Sharp/Raise	Mon	6
				Het	5	8,62
5	affection	Sharp/Raise	Mon	8	13,79	
				Het	3	5,17
6	confidence	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,72	
				Het	1	1,72
7	Trust	Sharp/Raise	Mon	5	8,62	
				Het	7	12,07
8	distrust	Sharp/Raise	Het	2	3,45	
9			peace	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1
10	admiration	Sharp/Raise		Mon	7	12,07
				Het	1	1,72
			Σ	58	100	

From the table: Grad – Graduation, Eng – Engagement, Sharp – Sharpening, Mon – Monogloss, Het – Heterogloss.

With *affection* as the mainly used affect, it indicated that the speaker often expressed his/her loving or affection towards someone or something. For example:

Data 50:

And I *love* this country.

The *affection* in the example above was experienced by speaker, Donald Trump, who expressed his love for United States of America during his inauguration speech. He personally felt the affection and expressed it to the audiences and his supporters.

As for non-authorial affect, the mainly found affect was *desire* with 17, 31 % from the total percentage. The details could be seen in the following below.

Table 2. Non-authorial affect

No	Affects	Grad	Eng	Σ	%	
1	Irrealis	fear	Sharp/Raise	Mon	3	5,77
				Het	4	7,69
2		desire	Sharp/Raise	Mon	9	17,31
				Het	3	5,77
3	Realis	misery	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,92
				Het	1	1,92
4		antipathy	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,92
5		cheer	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,92
				Het	1	1,92
6		affection	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,92
				Het	3	5,77
7		confidence	Sharp/Raise	Mon	5	9,62
				Het	2	3,85
8		trust	Sharp/Raise			
				Het	2	3,85
9		distrust	Sharp/Raise	Het	1	1,92
10		ennui	Sharp/Raise	Mon	2	3,85
11		displeasure	Sharp/Raise	Mon	2	3,85
				Het	3	5,77
12		interest	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,92
				Het	1	1,92
13		admiration	Sharp/Raise	Mon	2	3,85
				Het	3	5,77
				Σ	52	100

From the table: Grad – Graduation, Eng – Engagement, Sharp – Sharpening, Mon – Monogloss, Het – Heterogloss.

With *desire* as the mainly used affect, it indicated that in non-authorial affect, the speaker expressed *desire* felt by the 2nd and 3rd person without being emotionally involved as well. For example:

Data 126:

Muslims the world over **aspire** to live with dignity and a sense of justice.

The *desire* in the example above was expressed by speaker, Barrack Obama, who expressed *desire* from 2nd and 3rd person referred with the word *Muslims*. He referred to muslims citizen all over the world who, in reality, aspired or desired to live with dignity and a sense of justice without being branded and often thought as terrorists by others.

The third one is the combination of authorial and non-authorial affect. It is found in the speech that sometimes the speaker expresses his/her affect as well as the affect from 2nd or 3rd person by using plural pronoun *we*. In other words, speaker or first person is also emotionally involved like 2nd or 3rd person. Following the theory proposed by Scheibman (2014) on *we* inclusive and *we* exclusive, the researcher decided to analyze the rest of data as the combination of authorial-non authorial affect as they could not be grouped to either authorial or non-authorial affect. The details could be seen in the following below.

Table 3. The combination of authorial and non-authorial affect

NO	Affects	Grad	Eng	Σ	%
1	Irrealis fear	Sharp/Raise	Mon	2	3,45
2	Realis desire	Sharp/Raise	Mon	26	44,83
			Het	2	3,45
3	cheer	Sharp/Raise	Mon	2	3,25
			Het	5	8,62
4	affection	Sharp/Raise	Mon	4	6,90
			Het	4	6,90
5	Suprise	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,72
6	confidence	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,72
			Het	2	3,45
7	trust	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,72
			Het	4	6,90
8	ennui	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,72
9	displeasure	Sharp/Raise	Mon	1	1,72
			Het	1	1,72
10	admiration	Sharp/Raise	Het	1	1,72
			Σ	58	100

From the table: Grad – *Graduation*, Eng – *Engagement*, Sharp – *Sharpening*, Mon – *Monogloss*, Het – *Heterogloss*.

The table showed that the mainly used affect was also desire with 44, 83 % from the total percentage. It indicated that the speaker expressed *desire* felt by him/ her as well as desire felt by the 2nd and 3rd person. For example:

Data 4:

We want agreement that is a great deal for the Israelis and a great deal for the Palestinas.

It could be seen from the example above that the speaker, Donald Trump, used *want* to show his desire as well as the desires of 2nd or 3rd person; their desire to had an agreement that meant a great deal for Israelis and Palestinas; a deal that would be able to bridge the great divide between two different countries.

Conclusions

From the analysis above it can be concluded that the speech contained more authorial affect and the combination. This indicated that the 1st person or speaker preferred to express his/her own affect to show his/her personal feeling on something and also expressed both his/her affect and 2nd or 3rd person to show that both him/her and others felt the same. It was to show that their shared feeling meant their unity as one.

References

Adi, Sutrisno. (2013). *Analisis Ungkapan Ungkapan Sikap Tokoh Utama dalam Novel The Body in the Library karya Agatha Christie dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Kualitas Terjemahan*. Thesis: Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Alsina, Victoria, Espunya, Anna dan Naro, Maria Whirf. (2017). *An Appraisal Theory Approach to Point of View in Mansfield Park and Its Translations*.

- International Journal of Linguistics and Literary (IJILL)*, 6(1), 1-28.
- Afshin, Sanaz. (2016). Evaluative Language in Political Speeches: A Case Study of Iranian and American Presidents' Speeches. *Macrothink Institute: International Journal of Linguistics*, 8(4) 166-183.
- Endah, Puji Lestari. (2008). *The Use of Attitude as a Part of Appraisal System in The Al Jazeera News: Iraq Wars*. Tesis: Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Hidayani, Selnistia. (2006). *Appraisals Used in the Dialogue of Oscar Wilde Drama "The Importance of Being Earnest"*. Tesis: Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Lucas, Stephen. (2012). *The Art of Public Speaking*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing.
- Martin, J.R. dan David Rose. (2007). *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.
- Qian, Hong. (2017). Investigating "Unfaithful" Translations via the Appraisal Theory: A Case Study of Public Notices. *AWEJ for Translation and Literary Studies*, 1(1) 187-200.
- Scheibman, Joanne. (2004). Inclusive and Exclusive Patterning of the English First Person Plural: Evidence from Conversation. *Language, Culture and Mind: CSLI Publication*, 377-396.
- Scott, Claire. (2008). Reporting Armistice: Authorial and non-authorial voices in The Sydney Morning Herald 1902-2003. *Proceedings of ISFC 35: Voices Around the World* (pp. 131-136).
- White, P.R.R. (1998). *Telling Media Tales: the news story as rhetoric*. Thesis: University of Sydney.
- White, P.R.R. (2001). *Appraisal: An Overview*. Available at: <http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/> a guide (accessed on 7th October 2017).
- Xiaoping, Wu. (2013). Evaluative Semantics and Attitudinal Positioning in News Translation. *Projections* (2), 139-163.
- Zhang, Xiaolin. (2015). Comparative Study on the Appraisal Resources of China Daily's Disaster News. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(10), 2118-2130.