



Organization, reasoning, and persuasive communication strategies in privilege speeches of Filipino senators

Christie Elise C. Cruz & Alejandro S. Bernardo

Published: December 2015

Abstract

Corresponding author
Christie Elise C. Cruz
*Faculty of Arts and Letters,
University of Santo Tomas,
Philippines*
christieacruz26@gmail.com

Alejandro S. Bernardo
*Faculty of Arts and Letters,
University of Santo Tomas,
Philippines*

©2015 The Author(s).
Published by the UST
Department of English,
University of Santo Tomas
Manila, The Philippines

Persuasive privilege speeches are heavily relied upon by Filipino senators in dealing with their constituents and fellow politicians. Through a privilege speech, Filipino senators promote their advocacies, defend their work and reputation, and generally attempt to influence their listeners. However, despite the central and highly public role that privilege speeches play in the Philippine sociopolitical arena, no study has, thus, far attempted to scrutinize the structure, reasoning, and persuasive strategies present until this paper. This study, therefore, used the theories by Wood and Goodnight (1996); Froemling, Grice, and Skinner (2011); and German, Gronbeck, Ehninger, and Monroe (2010) to examine 58 privilege speech transcripts featuring 12 Filipino senators obtained from the official website of the Senate of the Philippines. Through this paper, it was revealed that Filipino senators present their points and claims in such a way that the audience would feel the relatable and personal nature of the issues tackled. It was also shown that the Filipino senators favor structuring their speeches by presenting the issue or necessity, proposing a solution, and then appealing for action. The study was also able to highlight how Filipino senators applied a combination of logical and emotional appeals to establish, maintain, and raise credibility.

Keywords: Persuasion, reasoning, structure, public speaking, persuasive communication

1. Introduction

Persuasion is a facet of language that is deeply embedded into its nature. It “can attempt to influence a person’s beliefs, attitudes, intentions, motivations, or behaviors,” (Seiter & Gass, 2010, p. 33) which is one of the most basic purposes of communication. As an essential tool in the pursuit of personal gain, Froemling, Grice, and Skinner (2011) equate the concept of persuasion with influence. Speakers attempt to influence their audience to adopt the advocated position. This effect relies not upon the speaker’s power because the audience will always have the freedom to reject the message, but it does mean that change may be brought about by effective speakers whether or not power – political, social, or financial – is wielded.

In the context of this study, however, senators truly wield enough clout to effect change through the legislation and advocacies they promote during their term. Hence, it can be said that

persuasive power is an important asset for senators since it plays a key role in negotiation and political maneuvering. Specifically, in the Philippine sociopolitical arena, one avenue by which senators can exercise this power is through privilege speeches in which they may request the privilege to speak for one hour on any matter of public interest during senate sessions and use the opportunity to bring attention to issues affecting the country (De Leon, 2011).

Since privilege speeches may be about “any matter of public interest,” this implies that not all privilege speeches are persuasive. In fact, some senators give informative speeches, like Senator Loren Legarda, a member of the Nationalist Coalition of the Philippines and an outspoken environmentalist, who used one of her privilege speeches in May 2014 to recap the World Economic Forum. Some may even use a privilege speech to entertain, like Senator Ramon Revilla Jr., an actor and former governor of Cavite, who used his speech in June 2014 to include his own music video. However, this study shall be limited to exploring privilege speeches that are persuasive in nature.

There are two types of persuasive speeches according to Duck and McMahon (2010): the first affects the audience’s thinking, while the other affects the audience’s behavior. Froemling, Grice, and Skinner (2011) later added a third type, which affects the audience’s feelings. However, Richmond and Hickson (2002) assert that no matter what the speaker intends to affect, since types may be combined, all persuasive speeches only intend to do one thing, and that is *influence* the audience as a whole.

Barnet and Bedau (2011) also define persuasion as the act of attempting to change the audience’s values, beliefs, and behaviors through blending facts with emotional language to convince the listener that the speaker is right. It often heavily relies on opinion, anecdotal evidence, or half-truths, and may also be clouded by flowery prose, which could be expected from a persuasive privilege speech since it is primarily an avenue through which a senator further promotes his aims.

Since these privilege speeches play a vital role in the Philippine sociopolitical arena, and audience impressions of politicians are heavily reliant upon speech content (Nagel, Maurer, & Reinemann, 2012), and many of the Senate’s decisions regarding legislature are made through persuading relevant authorities and fellow senators for their consent to reject or pass bills, it is clear to see that persuasion is of paramount national importance. Thus, it would be of particular interest for this study to discover how Filipino senators present their ideas as they attempt to influence their audience through their speeches’ structure, reasoning, and persuasive communication strategies.

However, previous studies on privilege speeches have been much too sparse despite its central and highly public role in the local sociopolitical arena. In fact, very few researchers have attempted to delve into such topics, like Farida (2012), who studied steps in the moves of keynote speeches in launching events; Dillard, Weber, and Vail (2007), who delved into the relationship between perceived and actual effectiveness of persuasive messages; and Nagel, Maurer, and Reinemann (2012), who studied how verbal, visual, and vocal communication shape viewers’ impressions of political candidates.

Furthermore, there is still a dearth of research geared to address purely reasoning or persuasive speech strategies. Hence, additional studies exploring persuasive communication are

needed, such as this particular investigation. It is intended that this paper would give insights not only on how Filipino senators express themselves in front of the press, fellow government officials, and their constituents, but also how they react to issues in their political career.

Hence, this study aims to examine persuasive privilege speeches delivered by Filipino senators. Specifically, it seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What is the structure of Filipino senators' persuasive privilege speeches? How do Filipino senators present their points and claims in persuasive privilege speeches?;
2. What reasoning strategies are employed in persuasive privilege speeches?;
3. What strategies for persuasive communication do Filipino senators use in their persuasive privilege speeches?

1.1 Sequencing Structure, Reasoning Strategies, and Strategies for Persuasive Communication

1.1.1 Sequencing Structure

Privilege speeches are often written beforehand to minimize errors and ensure the coherence of ideas to be presented; and so, the researcher believes that Monroe's Motivated Sequence (German, Gronbeck, Ehninger, & Monroe, 2010; Froemling et al., 2011), an organization technique specifically for persuasive speeches, is applicable to answer the first research question. The Motivated Sequence consists of the following five steps:

Attention aims to gain interest, respect, or foster goodwill. This may be done with a quote, a call for attention, a challenge, or a question at the start of the speech. This step can be signalled by sentences such as, "*There is a saying that goes this way: [followed by the quote]*" or "*An African proverb says...*" But speakers can also opt to straightforwardly begin with a chosen challenge or question for the audience to ponder such as, "*Man, woman, and child - what do they all have in common? All are affected by breast cancer, as a victim, a husband, a daughter or a son.*"

The next move, **Need**, presents the objective or problem in such a manner that the audience is overcome with concern or interest. This is exemplified by pointing out what is wrong or emphasizing the relevance, timeliness, or urgency of the issue. This step is at the core of speakers' persuasive purposes; thus, the *need* is made known to the audience in a variety of ways – either through signaling such as, "*I am concerned, Mr. President, because...*" or direct statements of problems such as, "*A few months ago, most areas in Metro Manila suffered from a water crisis. Areas covered by Maynilad experienced water rationing or rotating supply interruptions.*"

The third move, **Satisfaction** suggests, mentions, or calls for a possible solution to the problem or a way to achieve the objective specified. This may be done by requesting support for a course of action, mentioning a belief or preference for an option, or a necessity

to do something to act on the problem. This may also include actions already undertaken to achieve the objective. Similar to the previous moves, this step becomes evident through signaling such as, “*Mr. President, in our oversight capacity, may I recommend the following actions...*” or “*If I may suggest...*,” and it may also be directly stated such as, “*We are optimistic that we will very soon establish a People’s Survival Fund, proposed by no less than the Senate President.*”

The penultimate move, **Visualization**, intensifies the audiences’ desire to implement the solution proposed by vividly describing what would happen if the proposed solution is done or not. This move is often introduced by conditional statements such as, “*If this situation is allowed to continue....*,” “*The picture may even worsen if...*,” or “*If we wish the poor to enjoy their rightful share of the fruits of development, then...*”

And finally, the fifth move, **Action**, clinches the speech with a specific appeal for response. This may be done by a brief reiteration of the ideas proposed, a request for others to join the speaker in doing the action suggested, or a final plea for a course of action corresponding to the speech’s intentions. The presence of this move can be identified by the signalling phrases and clauses it begins with such as, “*I sincerely hope that...*,” “*I urge this august body...*,” “*I appeal for...*,” “*I invite my fellow senators...*,” and “*I ask you, Mr. President, distinguished colleagues, to join me...*”

1.1.2 Reasoning Strategies

Delivering a persuasive privilege speech usually garners media and public scrutiny, so this kind of speech will have to be meticulously prepared. To ensure that the speech is interpretable and to offer a sound rationale for the requested change in audiences’ beliefs and attitudes (Verderber, 1985), there must be some kind of reasoning strategy employed. According to K. Verderber, R.F. Verderber, and Sellnow (2011), reasoning strategies seek to offer support for a claim. A claim is an assertion, which must be proven, and a support consists of evidence that the claim mentioned is factual (Copi, Cohen, & Flage, 2007).

According to Froemling et al., (2011) there are five reasoning strategies. **Argument by Example** first offers multiple relevant pieces of evidence in order to support one general claim. In contrast to this, **Argument by Deduction** is the reverse because it first posits one general claim followed by its supporting ideas. **Argument by Analogy** enforces one idea by juxtaposing two concepts to assert similarity – that what is true for one will also be true for the other. **Argument by Cause** asserts that one event produced or led to another, thus, connecting two ideas or concepts in one claim, usually identified through signal phrases like, “*As a result of this...*” or “*Due to the...*” Finally, **Argument by Authority** uses verified testimonies to turn the audience to the speakers’ side, often signalled by phrases such as, “*Findings by experts warn...*,” “*According to the [name of credible organization]...*,” or “*[Name/Title] records clearly indicate that...*”

1.1.3 Strategies for Persuasive Communication

A privilege speech must also employ persuasive strategies to effectively accomplish its goal of influencing the audience. Wood and Goodnight (1996) suggest these persuasive communication strategies. The first is **forecasting**. Starting the speech by giving an overview of the discussion will make it easier for the audience to understand; and so, speakers often make explicit mention of their purpose such as, “*I stand once more advocating...*,” “*I rise on a matter of personal privilege to express...*,” or “*I rise to speak about...*” Another strategy is **signposting**, which tells what is going to be said as key points of the speech. Instances of this strategy can be introduced through clauses such as, “*Let me now share the findings of...*” or “*Another issue that I want to bring up, Mr. President, is...*” The last strategy is **summarizing**, which helps solidify the major ideas in the listeners’ minds as the speech ends. This strategy is identified through phrases like, “*In conclusion...*” or “*In closing...*”

This study aimed to explore three different facets of persuasive speeches through a detailed analysis of the sequencing structure, reasoning strategies, and strategies for persuasive communication. By matching the Filipino senators’ privilege speeches to this particular pattern and finding explicit instances of the strategies, it is hoped that commonalities in structure and preferences in persuading would be revealed, which would further characterize the previously unexplored privilege speeches and give insights as to how Filipino senators organize and present their ideas while at the podium. Hence, this study attempted to explore this selected sample of Philippine political discourse.

2. Method

2.1 Study Corpus

The study analyzed transcripts of privilege speeches posted on the official website of the Senate of the Philippines from Filipino senators who were part of the 15th and 16th Congress. These speeches were delivered from July 2010 until the end of October 2014, with a total of 15 senators who delivered at least one privilege speech. Seventy-nine (79) privilege speeches were delivered in total during this period of 51 months, with the majority being delivered by Senator Loren Legarda, who accounted for 30 speeches, and Senator Vicente Sotto III, who had 19.

However, since seven senators only chose to deliver one speech during their term, it was decided that, for representation purposes, each senator must have a speech that would become part of the corpus, as long as these criteria were met: (a) The privilege speeches must be delivered by Filipino senators who were part of the 15th and 16th Congress of the Philippines; (b) The privilege speeches must be persuasive in nature; and (c) The privilege speeches must be between 500 and 3,000 words.

Thus, 58 transcripts in English, Filipino, or a mixture of both that strictly match these criteria were obtained to make up the study corpus. They were used in this study unedited, but with translations by the researchers when necessary.

2.2 Research Procedure

This study analyzed the occurrences of reasoning and persuasive strategies along with the structure of Filipino senators' persuasive privilege speeches from July 2010 to October 2014, employing a mixed method of qualitative and quantitative approaches. Each transcript was examined thoroughly, and the researchers looked for explicit instances of reasoning strategies as detailed by Froemling et al. (2011) and persuasive communication strategies as mentioned by Wood and Goodnight (1996). These instances were usually introduced by expressions such as, "As a result of..." for *cause* reasoning, or "Today, I wish to discuss..." for *forecasting*. Then, once all the strategies used in each speech were determined, all speeches were matched to German et al.'s (2010) Motivated Sequence to ascertain if they employed moves that would follow a common pattern. The frequencies and percentage distributions of occurrences were also calculated to identify the total number of strategies evident in the speech transcripts and the number of speeches that followed or deviated from the Motivated Sequence.

Presented in Table 1 is the representation of senators in the study corpus along with their respective number of persuasive privilege speeches that matched the study criteria.

Table 1
Representation of senators in the study corpus

Senator	Number of Speeches	Percentage
1. Loren Legarda	26	44.83%
2. Vicente Sotto III	12	20.69%
3. Juan Miguel Zubiri	4	6.90%
4. Pia Cayetano	4	6.90%
5. Juan Ponce Enrile	3	5.17%
6. Joseph Victor Ejercito	2	3.45%
7. Teofisto Guingona III	2	1.72%
8. Ralph Recto	1	1.72%
9. Ferdinand Marcos II	1	1.72%
10. Aquilino Pimentel III	1	1.72%
11. Sergio Osmeña III	1	1.72%
12. Alan Peter Cayetano	1	1.72%
Total	58	100%

It is notable that the speeches of Senator Loren Legarda and Senator Vicente Sotto III comprise more than half of the corpus at a combined 65.52%. Clearly, there is a noticeable imbalance among the representation of senators. However, as mentioned previously, this is unavoidable as privilege speeches may only be delivered upon formal request. Choosing only one speech from each senator for equal representation would result in a corpus too small to

reliably analyze, and randomized sampling would also result in a much more imbalanced corpus because of the likelihood of senators being left out. The criteria were, therefore, imposed; and 58 speech transcripts were obtained as the study corpus.

Furthermore, to validate the results and ensure the overall reliability of the study, two intercoders assisted in the analysis. These intercoders are master's degree holders who have conferred with the researchers and reached agreement in cases of a few differences in categorizing and counting. There had only been one major disagreement among the coders as regards the sequencing of one particular speech by Senator Alan Peter Cayetano, which seemingly had a double occurrence of the attention move. Although the speech is discussed in more detail later in the paper, a longer excerpt of the first few paragraphs is given below:

“For I know the plans I have for you, says the Lord, plans to prosper you, and not to harm you, plans to give you hope and a future.” Mr. Senate President, distinguished colleagues, at sa lahat ng ating mga guro sa buong bansa, isang pagbati sa inyo ng magandang hapon, at Happy Teacher's Day.

In Jeremiah 29:11, it talks about plans to prosper us. And when we talk about plans of prosperity, we talk about the future. What future do we have to choose from? Do we choose this picture of a future where the family is together, where people are graduating, where people have jobs? Or, do we choose an alternative future - a future of poverty, of flooding, of people without jobs, and of children having to beg for food?

I don't believe in crystal balls, in asking people to read your palms to know the future, Mr. President. But I do know that there is a means for us to find out what kind of future we will have. If we look at the teachers today, we will have our answer. The kind of society we'll have tomorrow will depend on the kind of teachers we have today.

In this excerpt, there is a bible verse and a set of rhetorical questions for the audience that may be interpreted as two occurrences of the *attention move*. But after careful deliberation, it was determined and agreed upon by the coders that only the bible verse in the beginning could count as an instance of *attention* because of the fact that the questions, while intended to make the audience think critically about the future, were not primarily aimed at capturing their interest away from distractions and onto the speaker, but it was instead used to emphasize and support one of the main ideas of the speech – that the future of the society is strongly affected by the quality of teachers employed.

In addition, after strategy and move occurrences in the speeches had been agreed upon, the first manual attempt at separately tallying and totaling the numbers of occurrences had some mismatches among the coders. The counting was then rechecked multiple times until a common total number was consistently reached and finally encoded into a spreadsheet program, which can accurately obtain total sums and percentages.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Structural Organization

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage distributions of the structural patterns present in the speeches.

Table 2
Structural patterns employed in Filipino senators' persuasive privilege speeches

Pattern	Frequency	Percentage
N-S-Act	30	51.72%
N-Act	9	15.52%
Att-N-S-Act	7	12.07%
N-S-V-Act	5	8.62%
N-V-S-Act	4	6.90%
Att-N-S-V-Act	1	1.72%
Att-N-V-S-Act	1	1.72%
S-N-V-Act	1	1.72%
Att-N-S-V-Act	1	1.72%
Total	58	100%

Interestingly, out of the 58 persuasive privilege speeches, only one (1) completely follows the Motivated Sequence in the exact order specified (*Attention-Need-Satisfaction-Visualization-Action*, which will be referred to as *Att-N-S-V-Act* in the succeeding tables), which is demonstrated in Extract A. There was one other speech that also had all five moves present, but it had the *visualization* move presented before *satisfaction*.

The most common structure present in the speeches is one that only contains the Need-Satisfaction-Action moves (N-S-Act). Thirty (30) speeches out of 58 or 51.72% of the study corpus follow that particular pattern. This suggests that N-S-Act is the dominant persuasive speech structure employed by Filipino senators. This result does not appear to happen because of time constraints, as the one-hour limit strictly imposed is more than enough. In fact, the average word count of the study corpus is 1,102 words, which, when delivered, often does not even move past the half-way mark of the time limit.

Table 3 shows the frequency and percentage distributions of the moves in the persuasive privilege speeches. It is notable that in all 58 speeches delivered by the Filipino senators, the *need* and *action* moves are the only constants. Froemling et al. (2010) claimed that a speaker's objective is to establish a need and provide evidence of the problem for the listeners to be more likely to do what is requested of them, and then at the end of the speech, follow up with an *action* move so that the audience's memory of the speech will linger on a

strong appeal for response. Hence, this may indicate that these moves are the only necessities in a persuasive privilege speech and are tied together as such. At this point, a query may be raised as to how the lack of the other three moves may impact the persuasiveness of the speeches. The researchers believe that, for this question to be answered in concrete terms, there must first be a way to accurately measure the effect or the persuasiveness of all the speeches, and through comparisons, be able to determine if speeches that conform to the entire Motivated Sequence are more persuasive than the speeches which employ fewer moves, or vice versa. Unfortunately, there is no available method yet. In addition, it is likely that there are other factors that may influence the level of persuasiveness outside of the structure of the speech itself, such as the reputation and expertise of the senator, the timing of the delivery, the target audience, or even opposing senators. Hence, no claims can be made yet as regards which combination of move patterns is most or least impactful, but perhaps future studies may attempt to investigate this.

Table 3
Occurrences of individual moves found in Filipino senators' persuasive privilege speeches

Move	Frequency	Percentage
Attention	9 out of 58	15.52%
Need	58 out of 58	100%
Satisfaction	51 out of 58	87.93%
Visualization	12 out of 58	20.69%
Action	58 out of 58	100%

As for the moves themselves, remarkably, it is the *attention* move meant to get the audience to listen that has the least amount of occurrences, appearing in only nine (9) out of the 58 speeches. This may be attributed to the setting of a privilege speech. Once a senator stands at the podium after being granted permission by the Senate President, it is automatic that the attention of spectators, press, and fellow politicians would already be drawn to the center, especially since the Senate staff carefully monitors the audience and escorts them out if they are noisy or sleeping. This kind of situation tends to render the attention-getter obsolete. It may still have its use as a way to boost interest early on, but the public nature of the privilege speeches already ensures media coverage, and thus, national interest.

Extract A below shows how the complete Motivated Sequence (German et al., 2010) is used in Senator Pia Cayetano's (SPC) speech in October 2013, which discusses how the Reproductive Health Bill can improve women's chances of prevention, early diagnosis, and better treatment for breast cancer.

Extract A

Speech by Senator Pia Cayetano – October 21, 2013

Move	Extract	Remark
Attention	<i>Man, woman, and child - what do they all have in common? All are affected by breast cancer, as a victim, a husband, a daughter or a son.</i>	SPC starts her speech with a question meant to rouse interest and make her audience listen.
Need	<i>It is a tragic fact that countless Filipinos know the pain of losing someone they love to cancer. The past decades have seen a significant increase in the incidence of cancer, with more Filipino families carrying the burden of losing a loved one, or facing the difficulties of battling this disease head-on.</i>	The problem is stated and presented in such a way that it makes her listeners concerned and emotionally invested in the issue.
Satisfaction	<i>In fact, our collective efforts to improve women's health services, specifically the passage of the Reproductive Health Law and the amendments to the PhilHealth Law, address key public health issues particular to Filipino women. The RH Law expressly states that the treatment of breast and reproductive tract cancers and other gynecological conditions and disorders is an important element of reproductive health care.</i>	A solution is presented, implying that if it is accomplished, then the problem presented would be prevented from getting worse.
Visualization	<i>There will be more survivors when we acknowledge that breast cancer is not only a health issue, but also a women's issue. For many years, women's health issues have largely been ignored and relegated to the backseat of national policy.</i>	A positive consequence about what would happen if the solution suggested is done is stated to convince the listeners to support the cause. In contrast, it is also implied in the next statement that the problem was caused by not implementing the solution earlier.
Action	<i>These issues need to be addressed by specific and well-formulated programs, which can only be achieved through responsible policy-making and budget planning. Let us remember that the way we handle women's issues echoes how we, as a nation, look upon and treat our women. It is high time for us to shift the national perspective towards true gender equity. Thank you.</i>	A final plea for reflection and for action concludes her speech.

Extract B

Speech by Senator Vicente Sotto III – May 10, 2011

Move	Extract	Remark
Need	<i>I should have really no problem with this, Mr. President, but I have realized that not only are present funds misappropriated; there is also obvious corruption in its implementation and the House of Representatives version will institutionalize it.</i>	The problem is presented strongly in a straightforward manner, stating that ‘corruption’ is obvious and implying that the House of Representatives is condoning it.
Action	<i>In the light of all the foregoing, Mr. President, I now seek referral of these information to the appropriate Senate Committee for their investigation and proper inquiry. Thank you, Mr. President.</i>	Once the problem has been presented, there were no suggestions of actions to be done on his part, just a request for referral and investigation on the parties responsible.

Extract C

Speech by Senator Juan Ponce Enrile – January 21, 2013

Move	Extract	Remark
Need	<i>The personal conflict between me and four members of this Chamber has triggered a venomous, malevolent and sustained campaign against me. This was spurred by my decision to grant them only P600,000 each as additional MOOE last November and to hold the release of the additional MOOE granted to the other Senators, except to my own office, last month. The persistent attacks of my adversaries, whether they be my loud and bitter critics, or those lurking in the shadows for lack of courage to come out in the open, abetted by some elements in the media, have successfully poisoned the minds of the public. The criticisms are based on outright lies, distorted information and deliberately misleading phrases such as “cash gifts,” “Christmas bonuses,” and worst of all, “bribes”- all at the expense of taxpayers’ money.</i>	SJPE immediately opens his speech by describing the conflict in a negative manner. The problem is portrayed as a personal and unwarranted attack on someone innocent, which is a way to draw the listeners to be on his side of the conflict, deflect blame, and imply that his detractors are cowardly liars.
Satisfaction	<i>I therefore move that the position of Senate President be declared vacant. I ask that my motion be immediately put to a vote to pave the way for Madam Miriam Defensor Santiago, Senator Antonio Trillanes, any of the Cayetano siblings, or anyone else here who may share the same sentiments against my leadership and who may be secretly interested in this job the chance to be nominated and to seek the majority’s support to be elected as the new leader of the Senate.</i>	A motion to vacate the Senate President position is made as a solution to stop the mentioned people from challenging his leadership.

Extract C continued...

Action	<i>Let us not allow ourselves to be further derailed and distracted. Replacing me does not have to take so much effort, planning or plotting. This seems to be the pre-occupation of some people in this Chamber and a constant fodder for the rumor mill, and it is such a waste of time and energy. Let us settle this matter once and for all, and let us not tarry so that in the very few remaining days we still have left, we can get on with the business of urgent legislation. Time is of the essence and we owe it to the people to perform our duty. With that, Mr. President, I reiterate my motion to declare the position of Senate President vacant.</i>	He ends his speech by commenting on the urgency of the matter and reiterating his motion.
--------	--	---

Upon further examination of Extract C, SJPE portrays himself as innocent, saying that all criticisms against him were ‘outright lies’ which ‘poisoned the minds of the public.’ Clearly, this is an attempt to establish or regain credibility and defend his image. A speaker’s first source of persuasion is credibility or *ethos*. Credibility is the speaker’s reputation that helps determine how listeners will evaluate and discern what is said (Froemling et al., 2011). Establishing credibility would help raise the chances of the audience being persuaded (Benjamin, 2007 as cited in Froemling et al., 2011).

But to let the matter of conflict rest and perhaps avoid more attacks against his image, SJPE immediately moves to vacate his position as Senate President. He says to his audience, which includes his detractors, “*Replacing me does not have to take so much effort, planning or plotting.*” and “*Time is of the essence, and we owe it to the people to perform our duty.*” He presents his requested action in a somewhat positive light, which may be interpreted as, “*My detractors also have a duty as senators, but they are taking up too much time trying to get me out of the way. As for me, performing our duties to our constituents is more important than staying in power.*” This is yet another move by SJPE to add to his own credibility and defend his image, as it may endear himself to the audience, while simultaneously lowering his detractors’ credibility by implying that they are too involved with petty conflicts to do their jobs. It can, therefore, be said that, in this case, a senator may defend himself by attempting to lower the detracting party’s credibility so as to make their attacks less effective and deflect blame.

Another pattern that was employed is Attention-Need-Satisfaction-Action (Att-N-S-Act). It lacks the *visualization* move, which is intended to intensify the listeners’ desire to attempt the requested action. The following extracts show how this pattern is used in Senator Alan Peter Cayetano’s (SAPC) privilege speech on World Teacher’s Day 2011:

Extract D

Speech by Senator Alan Peter Cayetano – October 5, 2013

Move	Extract	Remark
Attention	<p><i>“For I know the plans I have for you, says the Lord, plans to prosper you, and not to harm you, plans to give you hope and a future.” Mr. Senate President, distinguished colleagues, at sa lahat ng ating mga guro sa buong bansa, isang pagbati sa inyo ng magandang hapon, at Happy Teacher’s Day.</i></p> <p>(and to all our teachers around the country, I greet you a good afternoon and Happy Teacher’s Day)</p>	SAPC opens his speech with a quote from the Bible and a jovial greeting for the occasion.
Need	<p><i>I like this quote that goes “A good teacher is like a candle. It consumes itself to light the way for others.” Unfortunately, in our country, this is both figuratively and rhetorically true.</i></p> <p><i>Ibig sabihin, Your Honor, ibinibigay ng isang guro ang sarili niya sa pagtuturo.</i></p> <p>(This means, Your Honor, that a teacher gives herself wholly to teaching.)</p> <p><i>This is the dismal situation of our teachers, while the great minds of our country owe their greatness to the teachers who gifted them with the knowledge to reach beyond what is average, our teachers struggle to live a decent life.</i></p> <p><i>Your Honor, ang kinikita ng isang guro ngayon ay sapat lamang para buhayin ang sarili niya. Pero hindi po kaya ng isang sweldo ng teacher na buhayin at pag-aralin ang kanilang mga anak.</i></p> <p>(Your Honor, what a teacher earns is only enough to sustain herself. But that salary does not let teachers sustain the life and education of their children.)</p>	The problem is presented through an analogy and followed up by a vivid description of the situation. There is an emotional appeal implied when the audience’s debt to their own teachers is brought up, which is aimed to provoke a sympathetic reaction in the audience.

Extract D continued...

Move	Extract	Remark
Satisfaction	<p><i>I know that our committees are working overtime to make sure that the teachers get their benefits.</i> <i>Alam ko ang DBM, DepEd, naghahanap ng pondo.</i> (I know that the DBM and DepEd are looking for funds.) <i>But, Mr. President, why can't we see to it that what's in the Magna Carta alone the basic rights of public school teachers, are upheld?</i> <i>Sa K+12 program, bakit natin pinayagan na kumuha ng ganoon kadaming preschool teachers kung ang ibibigay lang ay P3,000 na allowance?</i> (In the K+12 program, how come we condoned the hiring of so many preschool teachers if we will only compensate them with P3,000 as an allowance?) <i>From the government's point of view, naiintindihan ko na walang pera ang DepEd para paswelduhan ng tama ang ating mga guro. Pero hindi ko din maintindihan kung bakit ang gobyerno na dapat pumoporotekta ng karapatan ng teachers ang siya na ring nagva-violate nito sa pamamagitan ng pagbibigay ng P3,000 lang na allowance.</i> (I understand that the DepEd does not have adequate funds to pay the salary of our teachers correctly. But I do not understand why the government that's supposed to protect teachers' rights is also violating them by only giving them P3,000 as allowance) <i>Why can't we find the money to pay them correctly?</i></p>	The current methods are criticized for their risk and lack of practicality, which now presents the solution suggested as the more sensible option.
Action	<p><i>Teachers are the backbone of our country's future. Today on teacher's day, I urge the Senate to work overtime and to look at the plight of our teachers.</i> <i>Hanapin natin--maging monetary or non-monetary--ang mga benepisyo pa na puwedeng maibigay sa ating mga teachers.</i> (We must find - whether monetary or nonmonetary - benefits that we can give to our teachers) <i>Again. Mr. President, we're not doing this only for the teachers. We're doing this for ourselves and for the future of our country. The kind of future that we want to have tomorrow will be determined by the kind of teachers we have today.</i></p>	The speech is ended by reiterating the importance of the given plight, imploring the listeners to help the cause urgently, and giving assurances that prompt action would be beneficial for the country and its

A closer look at all these extracts may give the idea of persuasion being rooted in emotive language or *pathos*. Words become more impactful when they can generate emotional appeals (Froemling et al., 2011). For example, in Extract A, SPC begins with *'Man, woman, and child - what do they all have in common? All are affected by breast cancer, as a victim, a husband, a daughter or a son.'* The statement makes it relatable and personal which enhances the emotional impact of her speech, thus, making the audience more likely to believe and support her cause.

Another example is Extract D. *'This is the dismal situation of our teachers, while the great minds of our country owe their greatness to the teachers who gifted them with the knowledge to reach beyond what is average, our teachers struggle to live a decent life.'* The mentioned lifestyle contrasts remind the listeners of the debt owed to their teachers while bringing to mind the struggles that teachers go through in order to hone the minds of future

generations. *'We're doing this for ourselves and for the future of our country.'* Again, the statement is relatable and personal, which may lead the listeners to be more emotionally invested in the aims of the speech.

3.2 Reasoning Strategies

Table 4 reveals the frequencies and percentages of the reasoning strategies explicitly employed in the persuasive privilege speeches. The most commonly used reasoning strategy is *authority*, which comprised 42.4% of the occurrences. This may be attributed to the vital role that credibility plays in persuasion. Hence, senators prefer that their claims be backed up by authority figures that have credibly established their reputation in order to make their claims seem more valid.

Table 4
Occurrences of reasoning strategies in Filipino senators' persuasive privilege speeches

Reasoning Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Authority	53	42.40%
Deduction	31	24.80%
Cause	24	19.20%
Example	12	9.60%
Analogy	5	4%

The following extract from Senator Juan Miguel Zubiri's (SJMZ) privilege speech in September 2010 about the water crisis and the threat of an unprecedentedly strong earthquake that might strike the Greater Manila Area demonstrates how senators use this strategy:

Findings by experts warn that that the main dike of the Angat Dam sits on the West Valley fault which is part of the Marikina Fault Line System. No less than the Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology (PHIVOLCS) confirm that in the last one thousand (1,000) years, the Marikina Fault Line recorded four strong earthquakes nearing magnitude 7 on the Richter scale.

To support the main idea that the Angat Dam may be a threat to national security, SJMZ brings up the point that it rests on an active fault and mentions that this is a fact coming from the leading national authority in seismology, PHIVOLCS. This makes the danger that he is warning about much more real in the minds of the listeners because it comes from an established and credible source. Most of the listeners cannot just do research on their own to prove this because the only people who are proficient in utilizing and have access to fault monitoring equipment by which to validate this claim are at PHIVOLCS. Therefore, it can be said that since this information comes only from experts in a highly specialized field and that average citizens do not have the means to verify this by themselves, the likelihood of listeners accepting this statement could increase.

The strategy least used by senators is *analogy*, which only had five (5) instances out of 125. The extract below from Senator Vicente Sotto III's (SVS) speech in February 2014 about the dangers of marijuana shows how analogies are used in persuasive privilege speeches.

"The proposal to legalize marijuana is misleading. It is camouflaged under the term "medical marijuana". You don't declare a nuclear bomb legal just because a small component of the bomb can be used to light up your house."

Here, there is a comparison of marijuana to a nuclear bomb. SVS highlights the dangers of allowing "medical marijuana" to be legal. It is implied that allowing medical marijuana in the country can lead to worse consequences than mere treatment and that its positive use does not outweigh its dangers. The greater degree of danger that a nuclear bomb poses gives the audience a higher sense of caution toward the linked concept of medical marijuana, thereby, aiding SVS in his attempt to turn his audience against legalizing marijuana for medical purposes.

Comprising a significant part of the occurrences of reasoning strategies is deduction, which is 24.8% of the instances. In *deduction*, there is a premise that is followed by supporting claims, moving from general to specific ideas. The following extract from Senator Loren Legarda's (SLL) speech in December 2011 regarding the dangers of climate change shows how a deduction strategy is used:

We are fully aware of the threats of the climate crisis. Beyond our shores, more and more countries are also reeling from disasters of unprecedented magnitude--this year Cambodia, Thailand, and Bangladesh went through devastating floods, which are among the worst in their history; Pakistan is suffering from severe inundation since last year; giant floods in Australia in December 2010 have affected 3.1 million people; torrential rains in South Africa in January 2011 have claimed the lives of 70 people and forced the evacuation of some 8,000 citizens; floods and mudslides in Brazil early this year have killed at least 791 individuals.

SLL begins with a general claim and supports it with related sentences, which help prove the claim. This, evidently, is another attempt at building the credibility of her statements. By citing real instances in which the climate crisis has affected the neighboring Asian countries, it is implied that those are also likely to happen to the Philippines. This implication may elicit strong concern from her audience, as they are the ones to be affected if these calamities ever happen. Aside from the *ethos* or credibility, the *logos* or logical appeal is also applied in which facts are described and connected to previously learned knowledge to enhance the impact of the speech on the listeners (Froemling et al., 2011).

Another reasoning strategy employed is *example* or *induction*, which had almost 10% of the instances. It is the opposite of the *deduction* strategy because instead of the claim being mentioned first, it is presented at the end – from specific to general. An extract from another speech by SLL in September 2013 regarding Philippines' adaptation to the new norm of climate change shows how such a strategy is used.

Stranded commuters, long queues in public transport stations, students wading in flood waters, stalled cars, highways and streets inundated by flood waters, bancas in city streets as a mode of transportation--this has become a usual scenario as the new normal weather events bring voluminous rains, causing floods of various levels in the metropolis.

Underlined in the extract is the claim SLL makes after the preceding examples that prove it. SLL vividly describes common situations nowadays as turbulent weather disturbances happen more often. These instances are specifically mentioned because they are all experienced or seen by most of her listeners, and thus, undeniable, which lends more credibility to her speech and has the added effect of making her audience feel more involved. These events mentioned all happened and will continue to happen to them if the preventive actions SLL suggests in the rest of her speech are ignored. Thus, the audience is even more inclined to be persuaded.

The final reasoning strategy employed in the privilege speeches is *cause*, which had 19.2% of instances. Senator Ferdinand Marcos Jr.'s (SFMJ) speech in May 2011 about opposing the synchronization of the ARMM elections with the National Elections in 2013 demonstrates how the said strategy is used.

There have been many instances in the past of cheating, abuse and violence in the electoral process in ARMM. Because of that, it was deemed that the ARMM elections should be held separately, so all resources of government could be brought to bear in the ARMM region to ensure peace and fairness during elections.

SFMJ explains the reason behind the decision to separate the ARMM elections by citing past instances of unfortunate events that led to it. The *logos* or logical appeal is also seen here because there is an example of causal reasoning. The two events are clearly linked in the statements, and it is implied that if the elections continue to be separated, the chances of cheating, abuse, and violence would be lessened.

3.3 Strategies for Persuasive Communication

In Table 5, the frequencies and percentages of the strategies for persuasive communication employed in the Filipino senators' privilege speeches are shown. There are 74 instances of persuasive communication strategies in total. The instances were identified by the phrases (such as "in closing...") or clauses (such as "what I would like to show here is that...") that explicitly introduce them. These occurrences mostly comprised of *signposting*, which had 59 occurrences or 79.73%. Signposting is exemplified by giving the listeners a preview of what is to be said as key points in the speech (Wood & Goodnight, 1996).

Table 5
Occurrences of persuasive communication strategies in Filipino senators' persuasive privilege speeches

Persuasive Communication Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Signposting	59	79.73%
Forecasting	9	12.16%
Summarizing	6	8.11%
Total	74	100%

An extract from Senator Juan Miguel Zubiri's October 2010 speech about strengthening the country's anti-rape legislations demonstrates the use of signposting.

Let us ensure and do our part that a life of amity and security is still possible, for after peace comes the most awaited progress we are all hungry of. Mr. President, allow me to end this humble call for peace and justice by a quote from Martin Luther King, Jr. "Law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice and when they fail in this purpose they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress."

As his speech comes to a close, emotive language such as 'humble call for peace and justice' is used to draw the concern and empathy of the listeners to the cause or advocacy being spoken about. The words 'Mr. President, allow me' give a sense of politeness which supplements the emotional appeal.

Another example is from a speech by Senator Loren Legarda (SLL) in August 2014 to promote the sustainable use of the country's wetlands.

The main message that I want to impart is this: We all live in one Earth, and climate change is now teaching us the hard way that we do not own the planet, but are mere dwellers and stewards of its resources. And as such, we must be responsible for and respectful of Mother Nature.

As the introductory paragraphs finish, SLL explicitly mentions that the following words about to be said detail her main idea. This is clearly a signposting strategy as it mentions a key point in the speech and highlights it among the rest of the paragraphs.

Another persuasive strategy used is *forecasting*, which had nine (9) out of 74 instances or 12.16%. It provides a brief look into what is going to be said at the start of the speech so as to entice the audience to listen. This extract containing a *forecasting* strategy comes from a speech by Senator Vicente Sotto III (SVS) in August 2014 regarding the properties of marijuana.

Mr. President, colleagues, I rise to speak about a plant formally named as cannabis; commonly known as marijuana but carries a variety of street names. Let us see its true nature, so we can make reasoned judgments in the light of recent developments urging legalization of marijuana use, ostensibly for medical reasons.

SVS defines his subject, cannabis, his purpose, which is to discuss its properties, and his reasons for speaking about it, which is to see if it is too dangerous to legalize regardless of its medical benefits. It effectively gives his audience an overview of his speech as it begins.

The last persuasive communication strategy used is *summarizing*, which had the least amount of instances at six (6) out of 74. It clinches the speech by refreshing the main points in the minds of the audience. The following example is from Senator Loren Legarda's (SLL) speech about disaster response on the anniversary of Typhoon Ondoy's onslaught in September 2010:

In closing, Mr. President, we can no longer deal with disasters and calamities on an ad-hoc basis. In carrying out our rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts, and our preparedness programs, we need to reckon with facts, figures, and expert advice. Rehabilitation and reconstruction are necessary; but risk reduction is a MUST. Our disaster risk reduction and management system needs to be more proactive, coherent, and effective. The quality of scientific data available to government agencies and local government units for predicting and forecasting disasters requires urgent improvement. We therefore need to strengthen them. Government needs to provide political leadership that will facilitate and synchronize efforts of government with those of non-government organizations, donors, and civil society. Standing against the background of Ondoy, Pepeng, and Santi, we all know what we want. We want to be able to say: "We will be prepared the next time around." Mr. President, distinguished colleagues, this is not a matter of choice. This is a matter of survival.

SLL mentions 'In closing' which signals the end of her speech, and follows it up with her main idea. The supporting ideas that comprised the body of the speech are briefly reiterated. Finally, SLL ends her speech on a serious note, focusing the attention of the audience to herself by addressing them directly "Mr. President, distinguished colleagues," and stressing the urgency and necessity of acting.

It may be interesting to note that of the six (6) instances in which the *summarizing* strategy was used, all of them were speeches delivered by SLL, which may also just indicate a preferred personal public speaking style, much like Senator Vicente Sotto III's preference for the Need-Action pattern.

On the whole, the overarching theme that seems to tie all these speeches together in persuasive power is the importance placed by the senators on establishing and maintaining credibility (or *ethos*) and rapport with their peers, and through the media coverage in the sessions, their constituents.

According to Franz (2004), political discourse, for the purposes of persuasion and rational agreement, requires the channeling of emotions and conflicts into constructive arguments or claims. Persuasive privilege speeches, then, as an example of political discourse, embody this. Through a combination of applying *pathos* and *logos*, (or emotional and logical appeal) in various patterns with a plethora of strategies by which to reason out and persuade, Filipino senators present their points and claims in such a way that the audience is shown that the issues and objectives presented are easily relatable and for some, personal in nature.

Furthermore, a clear preference for the use of emotional appeals is evident. Emotional appeals in leadership aid in the development and maintenance of strong affective ties and, consequently, trust (van Winden, in press). He adds that the more powerful and likeable the speaker comes across, the stronger the impulses to trust his or her word. In the context of this study, it is, therefore, reasonable to deduce that this tendency to use emotional appeals links back to the high regard for securely establishing credibility by the senators. A recent study (Szczyrek, Monin, & Gross, 2012 as cited in Ten Brinke & Adams, 2015) supports this as it was found that people who notably lack emotion while speaking or those who show a deviant response to emotional situations (such as happiness during apologies) tended to be judged more harshly than the people who conform to socioemotional norms.

4. Conclusion

This study aimed at examining persuasion, particularly as to how it is used by Filipino senators in privilege speeches and how it is evident in the structure and reasoning present. The data, although limited to only 12 individuals with an unequal number of speech distribution, show that Filipino senators, who are part of the 15th and 16th Congress, prefer to structure their persuasive privilege speeches by presenting an objective or problem first, suggesting a solution, and then pleading for or demanding action.

It was revealed that Filipino senators, as politicians who aim to use their influence to build and maintain rapport, place a very high value on establishing and defending their credibility, which is a crucial element in their career as public servants. This is reflected in the way they use reasoning strategies. It is observable that claims backed up by established authority figures are the most favored, for these claims are less likely to be challenged and more likely to be accepted, thus, seeming more reliable to the audience.

The study also found that Filipino senators somewhat prefer using the *signposting* strategy in which the speaker gives a brief preview of key points in the speech. These are supplemented by emotive language that affects the audience to be more sympathetic toward the action requested, thus, enhancing the speech's persuasive power.

Pedagogical implications can be drawn from this study. In the Philippine ESL classroom setting, persuasive communication is a critical element that should be developed as it can be used in student debates and discussions. Being aware of how to structure a speech and properly use reasoning and persuasive communication strategies can help ensure that students become critical thinkers and eloquent speakers.

Furthermore, since this study has given more details about persuasive speeches as used in public and political settings, students with oral presentations or those campaigning for positions in student councils may appreciate learning how to present their claims effectively.

However, a limitation of this paper was that only explicit instances of reasoning and persuasive strategies, those that are plainly seen on public transcripts, were examined, and so it is recommended that further research on implicit persuasion be done, as it is possible that prosodic features (such as stress, intonation, pausing, and rhythm) in addition to nonverbal behavior (such as posture, mannerisms, eye contact) during the speech delivery – aspects that this study did not explore – may affect audience perception of credibility and persuasiveness.

Further studies may also focus on how other models of persuasive structure can be applied, like *direct method pattern*, *refutation pattern*, or *causal pattern* (Watt & Barnett, 2013). Other researchers may also look further into privilege speeches by studying how Filipino senators use hedging devices in presenting their claims, or how their persuasive power translates to actual effectiveness.

References

- Barnet, S., & Bedau, H. (2011). *From critical thinking to argument: A portable guide* (3rd ed.). Bedford St. Martin's.
- Copi, I.M., Cohen, C., & Flage, D.E. (2007). *Essentials of logic* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- De Leon, H. (2011). *Textbook on the Philippine Constitution*. Rex Publishing.
- Dillard, J., Weber, K., & Vail, R. (2007). The relationship between perceived and actual effectiveness of persuasive messages: A meta-analysis with implications for formative campaign research. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 613-631.
- Duck, S., & McMahan, D.T. (2010). *Communication in everyday life*. SAGE Inc.
- Farida, A.N. (2012). Steps in the moves of keynote speeches in mobile phone launching events as pointers for teaching public speaking. *English Education Journal*, 2(2), 169-176.
- Franz, D. (2004). Discourse and democracy. *THR: Contemporary reflections on contemporary culture*. University of Virginia.
- Froemling, K., Grice, G., & Skinner, J. (2011). *Communication: The handbook*. Pearson Education.

- German, K.M., Gronbeck, B.E., Ehninger, D., & Monroe, A.H. (2010). *Principles of public speaking* (17th ed.). Old Tappan, Pearson.
- Nagel, F., Maurer, M., & Reinemann, C. (2012). Is there a visual dominance in political communication? How verbal, visual, and vocal communication shape viewers' impressions of political candidates. *Journal of Communication*, 62(1), 833-850.
- Richmond, V.P., & Hickson, M. (2002). *Going public: A practical guide to public talk*. Pearson Education.
- Seiter, R.H., & Gass, J. S. (2010). *Persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Ten Brinke, L., & Adams, G.S. (2015). Saving face? When emotion displays during public apologies mitigate damage to organizational performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 130(1), 1-12.
- van Winden, F. (in press). Political economy with affect: On the role of emotions and relationships in political economics. *European Journal of Political Economy*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2015.05.005>
- Verderber, R.F. (1985). *The challenge of effective speaking* (6th ed.). Wadsworth, Inc.
- Verderber, K., Verderber, R.F., & Sellnow, D. (2011). *Essential speech*. Cengage Learning.
- Watt, S., & Barnett, J. (2013). Persuasive speaking. *Public Speaking Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.publicspeakingproject.org/>
- Wood, R., & Goodnight, L. (1995). *Strategic debate* (5th ed.). National Textbook.