CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter the writer presents the definition of critical discourse analysis, Van Dijk's Ideology, Van Dijk's conceptual and theoretical concept, Van Dijk's framework, the definition of debate and argument, the type of debate system, and the situation over the motion.

2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is an important branch of Discourse Analysis. According to O' Halloran (2005), CDA is the right tool to perform an analysis of spoken or written discourse, in order to find out about the ideologies underlying it. According to Fairlough (1995), Discourse Analysis (DA) has developed since 1970s into substantial sub-areas, notably Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) which sees discourse as a form of social practice and argues that all linguistic usage encodes ideological positions, and studies how language mediates and represents the world form different points of view. CDA focuses on relations between ways of talking and ways of thinking, and highlight "the traces of cultural and ideological meaning in spoken and written texts". It is connection between ideas, language, power and the ordering of relationship within society that is important for those involve in critical discourse analysis.

CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way of social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political contexts. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts takes explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality(Van Dijk, 2007).

To understand spoken and written discourse, Van Dijk (1985) develops methods which are more focused on cultural and social contexts. The methods are based on four categories: action, context, power, and ideology. He holds that ideologies "indirectly influence the personal cognition of group members" (Van Dijk 1995,p.19) and they are manifested through discourse.

2.2 Van Dijk's Ideology

Van Dijk (1985) holds that speeches or texts are not used just to inform us of a reality. They additionally bring with them the ideologies and standpoints of the person, organization, involved in their production, and reality construction. CDA tries to reveal the sources of dominance, inequality and ideology observed in the society by analyzing texts (written or spoken). The ideological strategy is manifested by Us versus Them dimensions, in which people of one group are likely to use positive terms to describe themselves while they present others in negative ones. Besides ideology, power issue is also one of the major goals which CDA emphasizes.

There are various definitions of ideology. Mc Closky (1964,p.362) defines ideology as set of belief by which one integrate causal and moral actions to explain and justify various organized actions, and specifically political power or action, with the aims to preserve, amend or rebuild a given social order.

"Systems of belief that are elaborated,integrated, and coherent,that justify the exercise of power, explain and judge historical events, identify political right and wrong, set forth the interconnections (causal and moral) between politics and other spheres of activity" (McClosky1 964: 362).

2.3 Van Dijk's Conceptual and Theoritical Concept

The basic conceptual and theoretical concepts worked out and used by Van Dijk (2000) in his CDA studies are as follow: Macro versus Micro-power as control; access and discourse control; context control; the control of text and talk and mind control. The micro level comprises language, discourse, verbal interaction and so on, while macro level has to do with power relation, such as inequality and dominance and CDA integrates these two levels, since in actual interaction one cannot separate them from each other; social power, in this approach is viewed as a means of controlling the mind and actions of other groups. The social power by itself may not be negative, but what in fact is of

significance to CDA is the inappropriate use of power, which would bring about inequality in the society. Van Dijk (2002) takes ideologies as the attitude a group of people hold towards certain issues; hence the analysis of ideology is one of the main concerns of discourse analysis. In order to uncover ideology generated in discourse, Van Dijk resorts to social analysis, cognitive analysis and discourse analysis of the text.

2.4 Van Dijk's Framework

Van Dijk as cited in Rashidi & Souzandehfar (2010)proposes a conceptual framework that can be used to analyze oral and written discourse in term of ideological. The total of conceptual framework is 27. The framework consists of two main discursive strategies of positive self-representation (semantic macro-strategy of in-group favoritism) and negative other-representation (semantic macro-strategy of derogation of out-group) which are represented in discursive moves such as actor description, authority, burden , categorization, comparison, consensus, counter factuals, disclaimer, euphemism, evidentiality, example/illustration, generalization, hyperbole, implication, irony, lexicalization, self-glorification, norm expression, number game, polarization, US-Them, populism, presupposition, vagueness, victimization.

Van Dijk (2005) also drew a new theory of the way knowledge is managed in discourse processing as well as a new theory of context. Knowledge is defined pragmatically and socio-cognitively as 'shared beliefs satisfying the specific (epistemic) criteria of an (epistemic) community' (p.73) and the way knowledge in discourse production and comprehension is seen as a function of context. Van Dijk argues that social context and text are linked by a 'context model' (Van Dijk 2001; Wodak 2000), "the mental representation of the participants interact, and produce and comprehend text or talk" (p.75). One of the crucial properties of such context models, he suggests is the knowledge of language users, which is a cognitive device named the K-device that can used to analyze , about the knowledge of the recipient. Because this K-device is crucial for the control of many important aspects of discourse, speakers need a number of K-device

strategies of context models to manage in discourse production and comprehension of various kinds of knowledge. The overall K-device strategies are simple according to Van Dijk, but more specific strategies are needed for special cases despite the presupposition of a common ground of shared general and socio cultural knowledge. He argues that K-strategies can be associated with CDA in the sense that "symbolic elites may impose their own beliefs as generally accepted knowledge, marginalize large audience segments by presupposing knowledge that is now generally know, or conversely by infravalorating non-dominant groups as ignorant" (p.96).the K-strategies that can be associated with CDA especially in written or oral disourse are 17 strategies. positive self-representation (semantic macro-strategy of in-group favoritism) and negative other-representation (semantic macro-strategy of derogation of out-group) and 15 more detailed are actor description, authority, categorization, consensus, disclaimer, evidentiality, hyperbole, implication, irony, lexicalization, national self-glorification, number game, polarization, presupposition, vagueness, victimization.

In studying linguistic, social and political information, Van Dijk (2004) framework has been approved to be a comprehensive and precise conceptual framework in providing the researcher with the nuances of ideological manipulation and it has become a thorough and useful interdisciplanary design withmultiple purpose functions.

Considering the explanation above, this final report selected Van Dijk framework to analyze the material of debates. In analyzing the disccourse, the writer used the model of Van Dijk's model with its emphasis on rhetorical and semantic strategies, could be considered as an attempt to fulfill the demand and to know how the debaters justify and persuade the adjudicators in order to win the debate.

Besides the general strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation, van Dijk introduced 15 detailed and subtle ideological discourse structures. There are actor description, authority, categorization, consensus, disclaimer, evidentiality, hyperbole, implication, irony, lexicalization,

national self-glorification, number game, polarization, presupposition, vagueness, victimization. These framework can be associated with CDA especially in written or oral disourse. The selected key terms of the framework are defined in the following:

Actor description: The way we describe actors or members of a particular society either in a negative or positive way.

Example : in France that there is a hate speech toward <u>Muslim students that done by non Muslim students, just by stating Bissmallah in the bus then this student is being mocked by other students</u>, it is because of the terrorist issue that exist or even in another case that hate speech happens because of <u>a girl who is a fat in England then this student is being mocked by other students</u>, even in status quo some cases admit they did suicide, and it's just like criminal conduct if we see the effect of hate speech.

(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1st Speaker)

Authority: Mentioning authorities to support one's claims.

Example : we believe this is justifiable for Government to interfere. We believe this case happens in public university which <u>owned by the Government, funded by Government, start from facilitation even Government gives scholarship to this public university</u>. So this is how Government can regulate the public university. For example, start from curriculum, Government sets the tuition fee it shows that Government has authority to this public university.
(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1st Speaker)

Categorization: Assigning people to different groups.

Example : this is how there is more hate speech toward the Muslim society, this is how the clash between <u>Muslim students and non Muslim</u> students exist and this is how the effect from the hate speech.
(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1st Speaker)

Consensus: Creating agreement and solidarity

Example : ladies and gentlemen <u>our goal is simple that we want to reduce the hate speech itself.</u>
(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1st Speaker)

Disclaimer: Presenting and idea as something positive and then rejecting it by the use of terms such as 'but' in the second sentence.

Example : <u>even if this is the freedom of speech but it is not measurable</u>, how can they measure it is not harming people or benefiting them.
(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 3 Transcript of 3rd Speaker)

Evidentiality: Using hard facts to support one's ideas.

Example : the case of <u>Charlie H,</u> there is a respond from Christian toward the boarding of Charlie H and send a messages Charlie in the office.
(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 2 Transcript of 2nd Speaker)

Hyperbole: A device for enhancing and exaggerating meaning

Example : even if there is an interacting it create a <u>massive rejection or create massive attacking each other.</u>
(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 2 Transcript of 2nd Speaker)

Implication: Deducing or inferring implicit information.

Example : so this is the responsibility of Government and University to give the second chance responsibility to give them knowledge not only Math, Science and Physic but also the behavior, you should be good in your behavior.
(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 2 Transcript of 2nd Speaker)

Irony: Saying something and meaning something else.
Example : Oh great! Now you have broken my new camera
(source: https://literarydevices.net/irony/)

Lexicalization: an overall ideological strategy for negative other-representation through the semantic features of the work
Example : we believe that our proposal to meet each other, the counterpart does the <u>handshake each other, to warn</u> them meaning we give them mean we give them a second chance.
(source: State Polytechnic of Manufacture Bandung as the Negative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1st Speaker)

National Self Glorification: A device to create positive self-representation by glorifying one's country.

Example : China is the example of country who success implement death penalthy to corruptor.

(Source : Sriwijaya University , Text 1 Transcript of 1ˢᵗ Speaker)

Number Game: Using numbers and statistic to appear credible.

Example : 80% case of corruption comes from politician.

(Source : Sriwijaya University , Text 1 Transcript of 1ˢᵗ Speaker)

Polarization: Categorizing people as belonging to US with good attributes and THEM with bad attributes.

Example : people in Europe country have mindset that white people is more educated rather than black people in Africa.

(Source : State Polytechnic of Manufacture Bandung as the Negative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1ˢᵗ Speaker)

Presupposition: The common shared knowledge between people or the ideas taken for granted in a proposition.

Example : This motion is about the hate speech so we bring this case to those countries that actually hate speech already become an illegal thing in these countries, where actually it becomes controversy in Western Liberal democratic countries, such as France, United States, England and so on.

(source: State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya as the Affirmative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1ˢᵗ Speaker)

Vagueness: Creating uncertainly and ambiguity.

we can't over generalize when you mock people is committing as the hate speech that you are simply will be expelled by university.

(Source: State Polytechnic of Manufacture Bandung as the Negative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1ˢᵗ Speaker

Victimization: Telling bad stories about people who do not belong to US.

Example : in status quo those students that do the hate speech, <u>they just get a</u> <u>warning from public university</u> and we believe this warning is not enough. It's because this warning doesn't give any deterrence effect, in the second time the students or even in the worse condition, they are being discoursed from the university.

 (source: State Polytechnic of Manufacture Bandung as the Negative Team, Text 1 Transcript of 1st Speaker)

2.5 Debate and Argument

Language is one of the most important aspects or elements in communication especially in this globalization era. On its journey language is not only used for communication, but it is also used to deliver an opinion (argument) and put forward a solution to solve the problem. Debate is one of media that frequently used to deliver an argument.

A debate usually involves two sides talking about a topic (often called a motion). As a competition, the teams attempt to show the adjudicators that they have the best debating skills. Being the best debaters does not mean that the debater's opinion has to coincide with that of the adjudicators. According to Darby (2007), debate can be defined as an old teaching-learning that presupposes an established position, either pro or con, on an issue, assertion, proposition, or solution to a problem.

According to Monash Association of Debaters (2010,p.06), debating is a form of formalized argument where the winner is the team that most effectively persuades the adjudicators.The argumentation in a debate is a process whereby humans use reason to communicate claims to one another(International Debate Education Association, 2003,p.08). According to this definition, the focus reason becomes the feature that distinguishes argumentation from other modes of

rhetoric. When people argue with one another, not only do they assert claims but they also assert reasons they believe the claims to be plausible or probable.

During the debate, a debater assembles and organizes effective arguments, persuades and entertains an audience, and use the language to convince the audiences especially adjudicators that his/ her arguments outweigh his/ her opposition's. Debating is not about personal abuses, irrational attack or purely emotional appeal, debate is an activity to ensure the judges that their arguments are stronger than the opposites and also by showing some evidences to justify and persuade them which are valid or correct in order to win the debate. Debate is a method of formally presenting an argument in a disciplined manner and with the good strategies.

Argumentation is a primary tool of debate, but it serves other activities as well. Argumentation is, for instance, an important tool in negotiation, conflict resolution, and persuasion. Debate is an activity that could hardly exist without argumentation. According to Muhammadiyah Parepare University English Debating Community (2013) a debate is an activity to struggle for arguments by delivering strong evidences and relevant arguments in order to make the team wins and to convince the adjudicators that their arguments are valid, strong, and correct.

2.6 Debate System

The following description about a debate is based on Monash Association of Debaters (2010,pp.16-20). A debate format consists of a description of the teams in the debate and the order and times for the speeches that make up that debate. The British Parliamentary debate format[1] differs from many other formats because it involves four teams rather than two. Two teams, called the "First

---

[1] British Parliamentary debate sometimes is referred to as Worlds-style debate or simply four-team debate.

Proposition" and the "Second Proposition" teams, are charged with the responsibility of supporting the proposition while two other teams, "First Opposition" and "Second Opposition," are charged with opposing it.

Two speakers represent each of the four teams and each speaker gives a speech of seven minutes. The following chart describes the basic format and time limits

British Parliamentary Debate Format

Speaker	Time
Prime Minister 1st speaker for 1st proposition:	7 minutes
Leader of Opposition 1st speaker for 1st opposition:	7 minutes
Deputy Prime Minister 2nd speaker for 1st proposition:	7 minutes
Deputy Leader of Opposition 2nd speaker for 1st opposition:	7 minutes
Member of Government 1st speaker for 2nd proposition:	7 minutes
Member of Opposition 1st speaker for 2nd opposition:	7 minutes
Government Whip 2nd speaker for 2nd proposition:	7 minutes
Opposition Whip 2nd speaker for 2nd opposition:	7 minutes

As can be seen from the table above, the first four speeches are delivered by the First Proposition and the First Opposition teams then the last four speeches are delivered by the Second Proposition and Second Opposition teams. Therefore, the First Proposition and First Opposition teams generally are responsible for the first half of the debate and the Second Proposition and Second Opposition teams have the responsibility for the second half.

The table above describes all of the formal speeches but it does not describe one of the most important and dynamic parts of the debate: points of information. Points of information provide opportunities for members of each team to interact with members of the teams defending the opposite side of the motion.

Points of information can be requested after the first minute of a speech and prior to the last minute of the speech. The first and last minute of each speech is "protected" against interruption. The point of information can last no more than fifteen seconds and may take the form of a question, a statement, or an argument.

Only a debater defending the opposite side of the proposition as the speaker can request a point of information. In other words, the debaters for the proposition can request points of information of members of the opposition teams and vice versa. To request a point of information, a debater rises and politely says something like "point of information please," or "on that point."

The debater giving the speech has the authority to accept or to refuse the request for a point of information. In general, debaters should accept a minimum of two points during their speech so that the judges and the audience will know they are able to answer points quickly and directly. Accepting more than one or two points is not advisable because to do so may have the effect of disrupting the speech. To refuse a point of information, the debater may say something like "No thank you" or "not at this time," or may simply use a hand gesture to indicate the person should take return to their seat.

If the request for a point of information is accepted, the person who has requested the point has a maximum of fifteen seconds to make the point. As stated earlier, the point can be a question, a statement, or an argument.

Sometimes points of information are made to force an opponent to clarify a position but more commonly, they are made to attempt to undermine an argument being made by the speaker.

After accepting a point of information, the speaker should answer the question directly. The person offering the point of information is not allowed to follow-up with additional questions. Points of information are among the most important and most interesting parts of British Parliamentary debate because they introduce an element of spontaneity to the debate and give each debater the chance to demonstrate critical thinking skills.

Although points of information are a common occurrence in every speech in the debate, each speech contains elements that are unique to that speech. The following table explains the basic responsibilities of each speaker in British Parliamentary debate. Following the table is a fuller explanation of the responsibilities of each speech.

Speaker Responsibilities for British Parliamentary Debate

Speaker	Speaker Responsibilities
Prime Minister 1st speaker for 1st proposition:	Defines and interprets the motion Develops the case for the proposition
Leader of Opposition 1st speaker for 1st opposition:	Accepts the definition of the motion Refutes the case of the 1st proposition Constructs one or more arguments against the Prime Minister's interpretation of the motion.
Deputy Prime Minister 2nd speaker for 1st proposition:	Refutes the case of the 1st opposition Rebuilds the case of the 1st proposition May add new arguments to the case of the 1st proposition

Deputy Leader of Opposition 2nd speaker for 1st opposition:	Continues refutation of case of 1st proposition Rebuilds arguments of the 1st opposition May add new arguments to the case of the 1st opposition
Member of Government 1st speaker for 2nd proposition:	Defends the general direction and case of the 1st proposition Continues refutation of 1st opposition team Develops a new argument that is different from but consistent with the case of the 1st proposition (sometimes called an extension).
Member of Opposition 1st speaker for 2nd opposition:	Defends the general direction taken by the 1st opposition. Continues general refutation of 1st proposition case Provides more specific refutation of 2nd opposition Provides new opposition arguments
Government Whip 2nd speaker for 2nd proposition:	Summarizes the entire debate from the point of view of the proposition, defending the general view point of both proposition teams with a special eye toward the case of the 2nd proposition Does not provide new arguments.
Opposition Whip 2nd speaker for 2nd opposition:	Summarizes the entire debate from the point of view of the opposition, defending the general view point of both opposition teams with a special eye toward the case of the 2nd opposition Does not provide new arguments.

The following sections briefly describe the speeches given by each of the eight speakers listed in the previous table. These are very brief descriptions that will be expanded in later chapters.

Prime Minister

The debate begins with a seven-minute speech by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has two basic responsibilities: to define and interpret the motion and to develop the case for the proposition. The first of these responsibilities is to define and interpret the motion for debate. The definition and interpretation is particularly important because it sets the stage for the entire debate. Remember, the Prime Minster has the right to define the motion and the responsibility to do so in a reasonable fashion. Therefore, if the Prime Minister's interpretation is a poor one, the likely result will be a poor debate.

In order to properly define and interpret the proposition, the Prime Minster should do the following:

1)   Define any ambiguous terms in the proposition.

2)   Show how these definitions are reasonable ones.

3)   Outline a model that will be used by all teams in advancing the debate.

More will be said about these three points in Chapter 5 on constructing a case for the proposition.

The second responsibility of the Prime Minister is to construct a case for the proposition. Simply stated, a "case" consists of one or more arguments supporting the Prime Minister's interpretation of the motion. Therefore, the Prime Minister will outline the arguments supporting the interpretation and begin to develop each of those arguments. The Prime Minister need not present all of the arguments for the First Proposition team. In many cases, the Prime Minister will state that the First Proposition team will have a certain number of arguments and that some will be presented in this speech and the Deputy Prime Minister will present the rest.

Leader of the Opposition

The Leader of the Opposition has three primary responsibilities: to accept the definition and interpretation of the proposition, to refute part or all of the

Prime Minister's case, and to present one or more arguments in opposition to the Prime Minister's interpretation of the motion.

First, in most ordinary situations, the Leader of the Opposition should explicitly accept the definition and interpretation of the motion as presented by the Prime Minister. In extraordinary cases, when the definition is completely unreasonable as to preclude meaningful debate, the Leader of the Opposition has the right to reject the definition. The problem with rejecting the definition is that such an action will ultimately lead to a very bad debate and the First Opposition team likely will get the blame. Therefore, even in the event of an unreasonable definition, the Leader of the Opposition should point out to the judge and the audience that the definition and interpretation presented by the Prime Minister is unreasonable and then should go ahead and accept the definition for the purposes of the current debate.

Second, the Leader of the Opposition should refute part or all of the Prime Minister's arguments for the motion. Because of the limits of time, the Leader of Opposition cannot reasonably expect to refute all of the Prime Minister's arguments. The proper goal is to select and refute the most important arguments presented by the Prime Minister.

Finally, the Leader of the Opposition should present one, two, or three arguments directed against the Prime Minister's interpretation of the motion. These arguments are different from those arguments offered in refutation. They should consist of the most persuasive reasons that the Leader of the Opposition can present to convince the audience to reject the proposition.

Deputy Prime Minister

The Deputy Prime Minister has three primary obligations: to defend the case presented by the Prime Minister, to refute any independent arguments presented by the Leader of the Opposition, and to add one or more arguments to the case presented by the Prime Minister.

First, the Deputy Prime Minister defends the case presented by the Prime Minister by engaging any refutation presented against the case by the Leader of

the Opposition. This task needs to be accomplished in a very systematic fashion. The Deputy should take up the Prime Minister's argument one by one and defend each argument against any refutation by the Leader of the Opposition. Thus, at the end of this section of the Deputy's speech, the audience should see that the case originally presented by the Prime Minister still stands as strongly as it did when initially presented.

Second, the Deputy Prime Minister should refute any of the independent argument presented by the Leader of the Opposition. Like the Leader of Opposition, the Deputy should not try to refute all arguments, just the most important ones.

Finally, the Deputy Prime Minster should add one or two arguments to the case presented by the Prime Minister. The reasons for adding new arguments in this speech are two-fold: First, the Prime Minister may not have had adequate time to develop all of the arguments that the First Proposition team wishes to present and second, presenting these additional arguments gives the judges and audience a way to judge the ability of the Deputy Prime Minister with respect to the ability to construct arguments.

Deputy Leader of the Opposition

The duties of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are similar to those of the Deputy Prime Minister. The Deputy Leader should 1) defend the refutation offered by the Leader of Opposition, 2) defend the arguments offered by the Leader of the Opposition, and 3) add one or more new arguments to those being offered by the First Proposition team.

First, the Deputy Leader should defend the refutation offered by the Leader of the Opposition. The Deputy Prime Minister will have engaged the refutation presented by the Leader of Opposition. At this time, the Deputy Leader needs to show that the original refutation is still sound.

Second, the Deputy Leader should defend the arguments presented by the Leader of the Opposition. The task of the Deputy Leader is to make sure that these arguments still stand firm in the mind of the judges and audience. To do so, the Deputy leader needs to consider each argument one by one, engage any refutation offered by the Deputy Prime Minister, and therefore rebuild each argument.

Third, the Deputy Leader should present one or more arguments against the proposition. These arguments can be similar to those arguments raised by the Leader of the Opposition, yet they should be new ones to give the judges and audience the ability to judge the Deputy Leader's argument construction skills.

Member of Government

The Member of Government initiates the second half of the debate. The Member of Government needs to defend the general direction taken by the First Proposition team but needs to offer a new perspective from the Second Proposition team. In other words, the Member of Government needs to defend the thesis of the First Proposition team while doing so for different reasons. The obligations of the Member of Government can be summarized as follows: 1) Defend the general perspective of the First Proposition team, 2) Continue refuting arguments made by the First Opposition team, 3) Develop one or more new arguments that are different from but consistent with the case offered by the First Proposition team.

The first responsibility of the Member of the Government is to defend the general direction of the debate as started by the First Proposition team. In so doing, the Member of Government demonstrates a sense of loyalty to the other debaters defending the proposition. This part of the Member's speech is important but need not be time consuming. One or two minutes devoted to this aspect of the speech will probably be sufficient.

Second, the Member of Government should continue refuting arguments made by the First Opposition team. The Member of Government should not use the same refutation as provided by debaters of the First Proposition team, but

should introduce new points of refutation unique to the Second Government team. To the extent possible, the refutation should focus on the arguments presented by the Deputy Leader of the Proposition.

Finally, the Member of Government should develop one or more arguments that are different from but consistent with the arguments offered by the Prime Minister. These new arguments sometimes are referred to as an "extension." This extension is one of the most important elements of the Member of Government's case as it provides an opportunity to distinguish the Second Proposition team from the First Proposition while simultaneously remaining consistent with their overall approach.

Member of Opposition

The Member of Opposition begins the second half of the debate for the Opposition side. Like the Second Proposition team, the goal of the Second Opposition team is to remain consistent with the First Opposition team while presenting a unique perspective of their own. To accomplish this goal, the Member of Opposition needs to fulfill three obligations: 1) Defend the general direction taken by the First Opposition team, 2) Continue the refutation of the case as presented by the First Proposition, 3) Provide more specific refutation of the arguments introduced by the Member of Government, and 4) Present one or more new arguments that are consistent with, yet different from, those presented by the First Opposition team.

First, the Member of Opposition should defend the general perspective taken by the First Opposition team. This need not be a time-consuming enterprise, but the Member of Opposition should make clear that the Second Opposition team is being loyal to the arguments of the First Opposition team.

Second, the Member of Opposition should briefly continue the refutation of the case presented by the First Proposition team. Again, this continued refutation should be brief and should involve new points of refutation not yet considered by members of the First Opposition team.

Third, the Member of Opposition should present more specific refutation of the arguments introduced by the Member of Government. Refutation of the Member of Government's arguments is an important task because these are completely new arguments supporting the proposition side and have not yet been joined by the opposition side.

Finally, the Member of Opposition should present an extension—an argument consistent with, yet different from that presented by the First Opposition team. Like the Government's extension, this is an important responsibility of the Member of Opposition because it allows the Second Opposition team to show its loyalty to the First Opposition team while clearly differentiating themselves form the First Opposition.

Government Whip

The whip speakers for both teams have the responsibility to close the debate for their respective sides. The Government Whip should accomplish three goals: 1) Refute the extension offered by the Member of Opposition, 2) Defend the extension offered by the Member of Government, and 3) Summarize the debate from the perspective of the Proposition side.

The first responsibility of the Government Whip is to refute the extension offered by the Member of Opposition. This extension has yet to be discussed by the Proposition team and doing so is an important responsibility of the Government Whip.

Second, the Government Whip should defend the extension offered by the Member of Government. The Member of Government's extension is a very important party of the Second Government's case and in all likelihood has been refuted by the Member of Opposition. Therefore, defending this extension is an important responsibility of the Government Whip.

The final, and perhaps most important responsibility of the Government Whip is to summarize the debate from the perspective of the Proposition side. The summary may be accomplished in a number of ways. One of the most effective ways is to identify the most crucial issues in the debate and discuss how each side

has dealt with each. The summary should, of course, be made from their side's perspective while being and appearing to be fair-minded. Similarly, the summary should be fair to the First Proposition team but should focus on the arguments pursued by the Second Proposition team.

Opposition Whip

The responsibilities of the Opposition Whip are almost identical to those of the Government Whip except they are accomplished from the perspective of the Opposition side rather than from the Proposition side. Again, the Opposition Whip should 1) Refute the extension offered by the Member of Government, 2) Defend the extension offered by the Member of Opposition, and 3) Summarize the debate from the perspective of the Opposition side.

The details of this speech are exactly like those of the previous speech except that they focus on the Opposition side of the debate rather than the Proposition side. Once again, the primary goal of this speech is to summarize the debate from the perspective of the Opposition side, particularly from the point of view of the Second Opposition team. This summary should fairly support the Opposition side of the debate while focusing on the accomplishments of the Second Opposition team.

Summary

This then is the basic format of British Parliamentary debating: four teams of two persons each engage one another through a series of seven-minute speeches interspersed by points of information. The teams from each side attempt to maintain loyalty with one another while simultaneously demonstrating the unique qualities of their own arguments.

2.7 The Situation over the Motion

In the National Universities Debating Championship 2015 , Atmajaya Univerisity , Gadjah Mada University , Indonesia University and Brawijaya University debate a motion entitled " Indonesia should Establish Truth and

Reconciliaton of 1998 tragedy ". In this study the debaters in each team tried to justify their claims and persuade the adjudicators in order to convince the adjudicators. The strategies they utilized in their speech were laden with their pattern of their ideologies. Using Van Dijk's framework, this study investigated how the debaters of each team justified their ideas and persuaded their adjudicators by utilizing subtle ideological discourse structure in their speech.