

# **CHAPTER I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1Background**

Communication is important aspect in human life. It is used by people to socialize either in daily life or in front of public. Communication in public is used to convince people, influence people and spread new information. The process of communication in front of public usually attended by a lot of people as the audience. For examples discussion, dialogue, presentation, speech, and debate.

As one of the forms of communication, debate can improve the ability to speak and express the opinions. It can also be interpreted as brainstorm about a thing by giving each other reason to be maintained. According to Dipodjojo (1982,p 59) Debate is a process of oral communication that is expressed in language to defend opinions. It held by two parties. They are government team and oppotition team. Both of them provide the argument and give some reasons in order to make the listener support and believe in their argument.

Nowadays English debate competition already becomes the need in Indonesia. It is proven by the existance of various English Debate Competitions held annually by various types of educational institutions and attended by almost all universities, such as, National Polytechnic English Debating Olympic (NPEO), National University Debating Championship (NUDC), World University Debating Championship (WUDC), and many else. Those competitions must be competitive in universities level. In this case, it can be done as a game with clear rules between the fourth parties, each parties supporting and opposing a statement. The winner of the competitive debate is the team that can manage and show the knowledge and ability of the better debate by using clear communication. In this case, the debate is conducted by obeying the rules and the results of the debate can be generated through the decisions of adjudicators.

One of the key factors to determine the debaters' success in reaching their goals and winning the consensus in this continuous power struggle is the strategy used as their ability to persuade and impress the adjudicators. In English Debate Competition, the way of delivering opinion in their speech is important. According to Teittinen (2000.p.1), the winner is a party whose language, words, terms and symbolic expressions are dominant and the contexts have been defined clearly. The wrong methods or strategies in delivering arguments can cause complete difference in meaning, so it can impact to the result of winning decision of English Debating itself. Therefore, the debaters have to study certain aspects of the strategies to justify and persuade the adjudicators in English Debating and make their arguments can be understood easily. In this case, it can be done by using van dijk framework to know about it. It is better for debaters to used van dijk frameworks to make their argument become valid, strong and correct so that is why they can convince adjudicator with their argument. Unfortunately, in current condition there were some debaters that did not really implement van dijk framework so that is why they can not convince adjudicator with their arguments.

Based on the statement above, the writer is interested to do Critical Discourse Analysis in English debating about the strategies especially the way how to justify and persuade the adjudicators. According to O' Halloran (2005), Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the right place to perform an autopsy on the discourse, spoken or written, in order to find out about the ideologies underlying it. In fact, CDA, as an important branch of Discourse Analysis (DA), tries to focus on relations between ways of talking and ways of thinking, and highlighting "the traces of cultural and ideological meaning in spoken and written texts". This study investigates how the debaters of each team try to justify their ideas and persuade their adjudicators by utilizing subtle ideological discourse structure in their speech by using van Dijk's framework.

In this study the writer took the debate videos from National Universities Debating Championship 2015 as the main data to find out and discuss about it. it

was the debate among Atmajaya University, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia University and Brawijaya University over the motion of This House Believe That Indonesia should Establish a Truth and Reconciliation Commission for the 1998 tragedy. This debate was in British Parliamentary Debate System. the title for this study was **“The Analysis of Critical Discourse using Van Dijk Framework on National Universities Debating Championship 2015”**

## **1.2 Research Focus**

The research focus of this final report is focuses on a critical discourse analysis of the student’s debate in National Universities Debating Championship 2015 between Atmajaya University, Gadjah Mada University , Indonesia University and Brawijaya University over the motion of This House Believe That Indonesia should Establish a Truth and Reconciliation Commission for the 1998 tragedy.

## **1.3 Problem Formulation**

The problem formulation of this research were:

1. What is a critical discourse analysis of each team ( atmajaya university , Gadjah Mada university , Indonesia university and Brawijaya university) in final round of National University Debating Championship 2015 ?
2. Based on van Dijk’s (2010) framework, how do the debaters in each team justify themselves and persuade the adjudicators in order to win the debate?

## **1.4 Research Purpose**

The purposes of this research were :

1. To investigate the critical discourse analysis of student debate in National University Debating championship among Atmajaya University, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia University, and Brawijaya University.

2. To investigate how the debaters persuade the adjudicators and justify themselves to win the debate based on Van Dijk's framework.

### **1.5 Research Benefit**

Through this final report the readers can enrich their knowledge about the debate itself, especially if they join English Debate Competition. It is intended for the debaters especially as the readers to know more about the strategies or the ideologies of how to justify themselves and persuade the adjudicators in delivering speech especially in giving some ideas or arguments in order to win the debate.