

**Disagreement Strategies in Rebuttal of Australian Parliamentary**

**Debate at 5 Vocational High School Surabaya**

**THESIS**

**Submitted as Partial Fullfilment as the Requirements for the Bachelor  
Degree in English Department Faculty of Arts and Humanities State Islamic  
University Sunan Ampel Surabaya**



By:

Denisa Dinda Herdiana

Reg. Number: A73214074

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

## DECLARATION

The undersigned,

Name : Denisa Dinda Herdiana

Reg. Number : A73214074

Department : English Department

Faculty : Arts and Humanities

Declares that the thesis under the title *Disagreement Strategies in Rebuttal of Australian Parliamentary Debate at 5 Vocational High School Surabaya* is my original scientific work which has been conducted as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Bachelor Degree and submitted to the English Department, Arts and Humanities Faculty of State Islamic University Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Additionally, it does not incorporate any other text from the previous experts except the quotations and theories itself. If the thesis later is found as plagiarism work, the writer is truthfully responsible with any kind of suitable rules and consequences.

Surabaya, July 2<sup>nd</sup> 2018

The Writer,



Denisa Dinda Herdiana

This thesis been approved and accepted by the Board of Examiners,  
English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities,  
State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya, on July 23<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

**The Dean Arts and Humanities Faculty**



**Dr. H. Agus Aditoni, M.Ag**  
NIP: 196210021992031001

**The board of examiners are :**

**Examiner 1**

**Murni Fidivanti, M.A.**  
NIP: 198305302011012011

**Examiner 2**

**Endratno Pili Swasono, M.Pd.**  
NIP: 197106072003121001

**Examiner 3**

**Dr. A. Dzouf Milal, M.Pd.**  
NIP: 196005152000031002

**Examiner 4**

**Machfud Muhammad Sodik, Lc. MA**  
NIP: 196912162007011028

DISAGREEMENT STRATEGIES IN REBUTTAL OF AUSTRALIAN  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE AT 5 VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL  
SURABAYA

By: Denisa Dinda Herdiana

A73214074

Approved to be examined

Surabaya, July 2<sup>nd</sup> 2018

Thesis Advisor



**Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag**

**NIP: 196909251994031002**

Acknowledge by:

The Head of English Department



**Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag**

**NIP: 196909251994031002**

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

2018



KEMENTERIAN AGAMA  
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA  
PERPUSTAKAAN

Jl. Jend. A. Yani 117 Surabaya 60237 Telp. 031-8431972 Fax.031-8413300  
E-Mail: perpus@uinsby.ac.id

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI  
KARYA ILMIAH UNTUK KEPENTINGAN AKADEMIS

Sebagai sivitas akademika UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama : Denisa Dinda Herdiana  
NIM : A73214074  
Fakultas/Jurusan : Adab dan Humaniora / Sastra Inggris  
E-mail address : denisodindah@yahoo.com

Demi pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan, menyetujui untuk memberikan kepada Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif atas karya ilmiah :

Skripsi  Tesis  Disertasi  Lain-lain (.....)

yang berjudul :

Disagreement Strategies in Rebuttal of Australian Parliamentary Debate at 5 Vocational High School Surabaya

beserta perangkat yang diperlukan (bila ada). Dengan Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif ini Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya berhak menyimpan, mengalih-media/format-kan, mengelolanya dalam bentuk pangkalan data (database), mendistribusikannya, dan menampilkan/mempublikasikannya di Internet atau media lain secara fulltext untuk kepentingan akademis tanpa perlu meminta ijin dari saya selama tetap mencantumkan nama saya sebagai penulis/pencipta dan atau penerbit yang bersangkutan.

Saya bersedia untuk menanggung secara pribadi, tanpa melibatkan pihak Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, segala bentuk tuntutan hukum yang timbul atas pelanggaran Hak Cipta dalam karya ilmiah saya ini.

Demikian pernyataan ini yang saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Surabaya, 08 Agustus 2018

Penulis

(Denisa Dinda Herdiana)  
nama terang dan tanda tangan













As the human, doing disagreement is a habit to win the discussion. So disagreement will always used by the human.

There are several previous studies about disagreement strategies. The first previous study is written by Mulyani (2011). The title of her research is *Disagreement Strategies in the First Presidential Debate between Barack Obama and McCain*. The writer of this research uses qualitative descriptive research. The researcher uses eight categories of expressing disagreement by Locher. She analyzes disagreement strategies that used by Barack Obama and McCain and also the differences and the similarities of expressing the disagreement. The result of this research, Barack Obama used hedges, giving personal and emotional reasons for disagree, objection, the use of but, repetition of an utterance and non-mitigating disagreement. Then McCain used hedges, giving personal and emotional reasons for disagree, modal auxiliary, the use of but and non-mitigating disagreement. The researcher uses a formula to find the result of the differences and the similarities of expressing the disagreement. The weakness of this research is the researcher gives the examples not based on the discussion.

The second previous study about disagreement strategies is a thesis with the title *Verbal Disagreement Strategies used by Greg toward his Father and his Future Father-in-law in Meet the Fockers Movie* by Arofa (2015). Here, the writer investigates same like the Mulyani research. The researcher also uses eight categories of expressing disagreement by Locher. The weakness of this research is she had been like do nothing because the statement of problems and also the methodology really same with Mulyani research. She just changes the data source.

The third previous study is a dissertation with the title *Verbal Disagreeing Strategies and Responses in the Doctorate Classroom Discussion Context at the State University of Malang* by Rohmah (2005). This dissertation tells about the students when expressing disagreement during discussions. The researcher also analyzes the response to the disagreement and also the context of the disagreeing strategies. There are five main strategies used by the researcher. The five strategies are aggravating disagreement, expressing disagreement baldly, acknowledging peers during disagreement, asserting vulnerability during disagreement, and disagreeing indirectly. The researcher takes the data from the students of English Program in the Doctorate Classroom at State University of Malang while they speaking to other participants. This research is so clear, but there is a gap that can be filled by the next researcher. The gap of this research is the researcher focus on disagreement in classroom discussion.

So from the explanation above makes the researcher interest to fill the last previous study gap by analyzing the disagreement strategies in rebuttal of Australian Parliamentary Debate. The researcher wants to analyze it because she wants to know how is the difference between disagreement in classroom discussion and disagreement using a rule. The aim of this research is the researcher wants to make the reader know about rebuttal and also Australian Parliamentary Debate which analyze use disagreement strategies. The researcher analyzes rebuttal use disagreement strategies because they correlate each other. The correlation is rebuttal itself uses to rebut or attack the weak argument of opposition team, and disagreement strategies is the way to express our discontentment with other opinion. The researcher does not analyze the

differences and the similarities of expressing disagreement in this research because we need so many data to analyze then percentages that data to know the result of differences and similarities whereas the data of this research is in average.

The researcher brings rebuttal in Australian Parliamentary Debate because this style of debate is the simplest than the others. Australian Parliamentary Debate is the Australian style of debate. The rule of this debate is parliamentary procedure. Every parliamentary debate always discuss a motion. Motion is also known as the topic (Meany & Shuster, 2002:10). According to West (2007: 12) parliamentary debate is often called as competition of knowledge, strategy and oratory.

The researcher takes 5 Vocational High School Surabaya as the data source because this school have the good achievements in debate. This school ever be the first winner of LKS SMK Jatim, the first winner of EDSO CHALLENGE Airlangga University, the first winner of ENGLISH WEEK Unesa University, the first winner of STIKOM ENGLISH DEBATE COMPETITION and many more. So, because of their achievements make the researcher believes to do a research about disagreement in rebuttal of Australian Parliamentary Debate at 5 Vocational High School Surabaya.























































































































that statement because he assumes that government just talk about the financially than thinking the impact to the society.

After read the findings above, there are a different focuses among my research and the others research done before. Mulyani (2011) analyzes the types of disagreement use Locher's theory and the result of the differences and similarities of expressing disagreement. Then Arofa (2015) analyzes her research really same with Mulyani (2011) research. She just changes the data souce. The last is Rohmah (2005) research. Here she uses different strategies. The strategies that she use are aggravating disagreement, expressing disagreement baldly, acknowledging peers during disagreement, asserting vulnerability during disagreement and disagreeing indirectly. She uses those five strategies to analyze the student of english program in the doctorate classroom at State University of Malang while they speaking to the other participants. She analyzes the types of disagreement, the response to the disagreement and also the context while do disagreeing.

This present study gives new result in disagreement field. The researcher proves it by bring the data source that never be analyze using disagreement. The data souce is the rebuttal in Australian Parliamentary Debate. There is no disagreement research that brings the type of parliamentary debate. The context analysis of this present study also different from the previous research above. She uses the Hymes's theory to analyze the context of situation.











