

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the findings on the data gathered. The discussion will cover the analysis based on the transcribed recordings as well as the interview sessions. Overall, there were six recordings as well as six interview sessions.

In this chapter, the researcher has divided the discussion to three areas of importance:

- a) the communicative strategies,
- b) code-switching and code-mixing
- c) duetting and philharmony
- d) non-verbal communication

From the data of this study, 10 major strategies and 20 sub-strategies have been found and categorised. These strategies were classified through the transcribed recordings as well as interviews with the students for this study. The following table lists the major strategies and their sub-strategies:

No	Strategies	Sub-strategies
1	Supporting and agreeing	i) the use of personal name ii) echoing
2	Appealing	i) the use of "you know" ii) the use of " <i>lah</i> "

3	Disagreeing and Repair	i) the use of “ <i>lah</i> ”
4	Emphasising	i) the use of “ <i>lah</i> ”
5	Eliciting and Providing Feedback	i) the use of “ <i>ya/ yeah</i> ” ii) the use of “no” iii) the use of “okay” iv) the use of “okay-okay”
6	Summarising information	i) the use of “so”
7	Reformulation	i) the use of “so”
8	Generating discussion	i) the use of “so” ii) the use of “okay”
9	Seeking agreement	i) the use of “right?” ii) the use of “okay?”
10	Indicating dominance	i) the use of “so” ii) the use of “so what?” iii) the use of “what for?” iv) the use of “what?”

Table 1 The overall communicative strategies used by private students during group discussion

It was also interesting that the research revealed how the adoption of strategies had a lot to do with the speakers' ability to lead, and eventually dominate the discussion. Thus, it was important to note the total number of words used during the recorded discussions. The following table features the total number of words used by each speaker.

TRANSCRIPTION	Students / Speakers	Total number of words used	No of words used in %	Total number of words uttered for each discourse
Transcript 1	A	812	40	2037 (23.3%)
	Y	554	27	
	E	671	33	
Transcript 2	F	570	47	1211 (13.8%)
	H	253	21	
	L	207	17	
	R	117	10	
	K	64	5	
Transcript 3	O	22	3	1008 (11.5%)
	D	750	74	
	B	12	2	
	G	65	6	
	M	104	10	
	N	55	5	
Transcript 4	P	349	23	1486 (17.0%)
	S	349	23	
	Q	681	46	
	C	107	8	
Transcript 5	Z	176	13	1423 (16.3%)
	S	303	21	
	I	944	66	
Transcript 6	T	555	35	1588 (18.1%)
	U	167	10	
	V	577	36	
	W	120	8	
	X	169	11	
TOTAL		8753	100%	8753 (100%)

Table 2 The total number of words used by each student as they appeared in the discourses

Based on Table 2, it was discovered that speakers A, F, I, D and Q were among the speakers who dominated the discussions with larger total number of words (more than 40%) used in a discussion. The break down for total words used by these speakers (in percentages) is as shown below:

Transcript	Speaker	Total number of words used (%)
1	A	40%
2	F	47%
3	D	74%
4	Q	46%
5	I	66%

Since the focus of this research is to look at how speakers use communicative strategies to make their discussion successful, the use of the strategies in relation to the number of times used by each speaker to indicate dominance will be discussed in detail, concurrently, by looking at each strategy in the next paragraphs.

4.1 Communicative strategies

In the following paragraphs, the sub-strategies are discussed in detail with support and evidence from the transcriptions and interviews.

4.1.1 Supporting and Agreeing

Strategies for supporting and agreeing	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) personal names	6	3	0	1	0	3	13
ii) echoing	8	2	3	0	1	12	26

Table 3 Total number of strategies used for supporting and agreeing

From the data, two strategies were found under this heading. They were the use of personal names and echoing.

i) The use of personal names

From the data gathered, it was found that this strategy was used 13 times. The use of personal names was found, particularly when a speaker wanted to generate more discussion or elicit feedback from the other group members. Below are some examples and the discussion will follow.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

8. A : in fact he can / you know / survive if he find a job on his own / hmm /

do you think if he should receive **E** ?

9. E : Eh / yeah / he should not receive the heart / but from this / aaa / *maklumat*

apa ? ah this information / he has 7 children.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

42. F : so I think I choose survivor number 5 / can I know / who / who vote for

survivor number 5 ? **H** ?

43. H : I might change my mind again //

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 2)

69. F : so okay / how about the singer / do you think she should join the crew ?

70. L : **H** ?

71. R : **H** / *lah*

72. H : you want me to repeat how many times ?

@ < leering >

73. F : can you please refresh our minds with your ideas

74. H: I repeat / the chief's pregnant wife / okay / and for that / I think for the singer /
right / it's a mistake and now / I choose survivor number 6 / so end of story

In examples 1 and 2, it was observed that the speakers adopted this strategy in order to establish rapport with the other speakers or participants. In the first example, this happened when E responded to A's question, resulting in the two of them creating a bond. It was evident from the transcription that later in lines 15 to 20 in the same discussion, both speakers were agreeing with one another.

In the second example, both speakers F and H were assumed allies and maintained harmony in the discussion. From the interview, both speakers admitted that this strategy helped them to gain attention from the speakers as well as to create rapport (Appendix 11).

In most of the occasions, the use of personal names created a more positive and harmonious premise for discussion. However, there were some instances whereby it resulted in a negative tone in the discussion. This was noticed in the third example, where H was observed to be annoyed and unhappy when L and R were nominating him to contribute the next point. Thus, he remarked, "you want me to repeat how many times?" and leered at his friends. Through the interview, he admitted that he was annoyed and "angry when cornered by them" (Appendix 11).

ii) Echoing

The second strategy used to show support and agreement was echoing. It was used 26 times (refer to Table 3). When echoing, the speaker expresses his or her agreement with

another speaker by either repeating all or just parts of the sentence used (Jamaliah, 2000: 123).

In this study, it was discovered from the data gathered that the echoing took place when there were repetitions of words or phrases. Below are the examples followed by the discussion.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 2)

76. L : in a sense / uninhabited means no living things

77. K : yeah

78. L : so why should we have a protector / **what for ?**

79. K : **yeah what for** ? from the sea

In this first example, K said “yeah” in line 77 to show support for L. Later, she agreed with L’s comment on the definition of the word “uninhabited” with the use of “yeah, what for?”. This strategy helped L to feel more confident since she had already successfully gained support from another member in the group. Prior to these utterances, a bond had already been created between speakers L and K in lines 53 to 57 (Appendix 2), where both were completing each other sentences with K ending the argument with “ah” to indicate agreement. Thus, this act of echoing by K re-strengthened the bond between these two speakers.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

108. F : so / we have come to a conclusion whereby we choose doctor / university
professor / the alcoholic scientist / the chief and also the pregnant woman =
109. H : = **plus the religious man**
110. F : ah / **plus the religious man**
111. R : okay / end of discussion

As in example 2, speaker F indicated that he agreed with speaker H's idea and this was further emphasized when he said "ah" to show agreement. The point that was agreed upon was the decision to accept the religious man as one of the candidates to be saved.

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 3)

3. D : I feel that religion doesn't / all of us that she is not needed as one person that's
basically what we need / where more than **one religion**
4. M: taking **one religion**
5. D : are we all / decided
6. M: yes

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 6)

38. X : yes // So he's a steel worker, he can get enough for his seven children
39. V : one is / his wife is **unemployed**
40. X : @ < nodding>
Unemployed // so it's very hard for (her)

Example 3 and 4 featured how the speakers not only echoed each other but also added other words to further elaborate the points discussed. In example 3, M added “taking one religion”, emphasizing the role of religion is fundamental and not to be taken lightly. Through the interview, M commented that life was modeled through the practice of principles and thus it was not just “one religion” but the reasons behind “taking” or choosing the right path to create the new generation (Appendix 13). As for example 4, speaker X echoed speaker V’s word “unemployed” after nodding and added “so it’s very hard for (her)” to encourage others to accept the argument at hand.

EXAMPLE 5 (Appendix 6)

69. X : What about **patient number 3** ?

70. W : **patient number 3**

71. X : hmm / should **we put**=

72. T : **=we put** the important first / should be

73. V : **one of the top threes**

74. T : **one of the top threes**

From the previous examples, the act of echoing took place among two speakers. Sometimes, the strategy was also adopted by the pairs of speakers (X and W, X and T and V and T) more than one speaker as shown in example 5. From lines 69 to 74 the echoing act was adopted three times. This strategy “may be seen as a way of indicating that the speaker acknowledges and confirms the information that he/she receives (Jamaliah, 2000 :124).

4.1.2 Appealing

From the data, two sub-strategies were identified under the heading of “appealing”. They were the uses of “you know” and the particle “lah”.

Strategies for appealing	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) you know	8	0	2	0	0	0	10
ii) "lah"	2	0	2	0	0	0	4

Table 4 Total number of strategies used for appealing

i) the use of “you know”

From the data gathered, the phrase “you know” was used 10 times. It was used as a phrase to suggest prior knowledge or a known fact of the issue discussed. In addition, the speaker who used the phrase, assumed that the other speakers knew about a particular aspect of the issue discussed. This will be illustrated in the examples below.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

7. Y: if we give him the heart / someday he might die / yeah / he’s too old.
8. A: in fact he can / **you know** / survive if he find a job on his own / hmm /
do you think if he should receive E ?
9. E : Eh / yeah / he should not receive the heart / but from this / aaa / *maklumat*
apa ? ah this information / he has 7 children.
- 10.Y : yeah

In the first example, the phrase “you know” was used by A to elaborate why she disagreed that the candidate in question should not be given the heart. The phrase “you know” according to A, was meant that the other members should have already known that

by giving the heart, the candidate should be able to find a job to support his family (Appendix 15). Speaker E later confirmed with “yeah” to show support to this line of argument.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 1)

37. Y : okay /

38. E : Yeah / effect of bacteria disease

39. A : but somehow / he can help those

40. E : he cannot...*bergantung apa* / ah / depend only / him //

41. A : Maybe his students can relate about this bacteriological disease / and **you know**
to some other diseases / so / I think

In example 2, from the transcription, it might be perceived at first that speaker A used “you know” because she did not know how to explain, “to eliminate the diseases”. Nevertheless, from the interview with A, she wanted to actually say the word “destroy” the diseases but felt “you know” was a better choice to get the other member involved in the discussion (Appendix 15).

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 3)

41. N : he comes along with a gun / it's not just him who had use a gun / the rest
must've used a gun before

42. D : exactly / but / he has a weapon / that fatally wound somebody / **you know** /
and it's not going to last us for long / if these people just take him for his gun

/ what do you think ? should take him / leave him

43. M: what if he does kill somebody ? they are together on an island / they have to
defend themselves and if they hate each other / what if he kills the others ?

In example 3, again speaker B assumed that the other group members would agree that a “weapon” could be regarded as a lethal object that could kill someone. Thus, by adopting this strategy, D said in the interview (Appendix 13) that he managed to convince his friends to accept his ideas, indicating how this strategy acted as a direct plea to the other interlocutors to accept the truth of the proposition (Jamaliah, 2000 : 132)

ii) the use of “*lah*”

The particle “*lah*” was used quite rampantly in the discourses observed in this study. The use of “*lah*” has been found to have different functions and effects on the interaction taking place. One of the uses of the “*lah*” particle was as an appealing strategy. From the data, it was found that the particle was used four times (refer to table 4).

Generally, “*lah*” was used to lessen the assertiveness when a speaker tried to convince the other members on the points raised. In addition, the speakers were found to be able to gain attention and the strategy was also used by the ones who dominated the discussion. Below are the examples to illustrate these points and the discussions will follow.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 3)

76. G : you're keeping the pregnant wife / *ah* ?
77. M : but obviously
78. D : I think for moral reasons I think we should keep the pregnant wife /
because she's going to have a baby / not one but two people / I think
for that reason / we should keep the wife*lah*

Speaker D was the dominant speaker, with the total of 750 words used out of the 1008 total words of the whole discourse (refer to table 2). In this example, D was trying to convince the group members to be more sensitive towards the pregnant woman. In the interview, speaker D said that he assumed other speakers would agree that in cases of life and death, a pregnant woman should be highly considered for survival because of the life she carries within her (Appendix 13). It was also observed that D used the pronoun “we” instead of the more personal “I” to suggest inclusion of other speakers in the notion that “we” were all sensitive people. D managed to convince them in the end.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 4)

28. Q : I think his colleagues⁷ he must be the most I mean the most brilliant man on the
bacteriological disease he's the leader in the world /
29. S : don't be so selfish*lah* / there are other people who are dying /
30. Q : we need him for the future
31. S : I'm dying also / okay ? Who want to take care of them? I'm dying also I have

three children / okay / no other responsibilities where like you^{lah} / you have to feed your three children / you got nobody

In example 2, the word “selfish” was used by speaker S to mean that Q was insensitive and tactless. According to S from the interview (Appendix 14), he thought by using “*lah*”, he made the remark sound less severe. It was also evident in the interview and observation that speaker Q was not offended by S’s remark. The use of the pronoun “you” in line 31 indicated S’s understanding of Q’s situation who had more responsibilities. This move encouraged other speakers to view the matter from his point of view (Appendix 13).

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 4)

17. Q : So who gets the heart ?

18. S : Pn Halimah Jamel / because

19. Q : I think I agree with S / pity her^{lah} because /

20. S : Thank you //

21. Q : First of all she’s a Malaysian perhaps and we’ve to think of her three children / and / if she survives / she may educate her three children and / *erm* / and / maybe someone / maybe *be* someone who is someone^{lah} / I mean maybe they can be a doctor and they / they may think see what happened to my mom before she survives because of the doctor I have to be something I want to be a doctor / She’s the one who can take the heart // Although / poor for Franklin / First of all / he’s not a Malaysian / he’s a foreigner / unmarried so / he got no one / I mean / if he dies / no one will / *er* / sad / Nothing if / he died /

On the same note, the example above also illustrates how the strategy was used to make a plea to other group members. Speaker Q used the strategy twice in this example, encouraging her friends to agree with the candidate she had selected, “Halimah Jamel”. As seen from the outcome of the discussion, Q managed to convince the rest of the group and “Halimah Jamel” got the heart.

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 1)

94. A : he should not?

95. Y : should not *lah*

96. E: just take turn *je lah*

97. A : okay so / he should not receive the heart

In this example, speaker Q made a plea to everyone in the group to agree on selecting “Halimah Jamel” as the candidate to receive the heart. The use of “*lah*” is somewhat similar to the particle “*kan*” in Bahasa Melayu that maybe likened to “please” in English or “*tolong*” in colloquial Malay (Morais, 1994).

EXAMPLE 5 (Appendix 1)

246. IN: do you think that nationality in terms of them being Malaysians or not
would be a consideration ? Would you consider that ?

247. Y : yeah

248. A : yeah / maybe

249. E :yes / *dah lah tu / tak larat* (that’s enough, I can’t go on)

250. A : it depends

Example 4 again, was a plea made by speaker E to the other speakers of the group. She was code-switching to Malay, pleading with her friends to stop the discussion on a much laboured point and to move on to the next one. Here, the strategy was used at a tensed period when the speakers felt that the discussion was inconclusive.

4.1.3 Disagreeing and Repair

i) the use of “lah”

When the students were showing disagreement in the discourses, they had used several strategies. Most of the time, they would use the word “no” or the duplicated “no, no” when they gave their feedback, which was observed as rather blunt and would be discussed under the heading of eliciting and providing feedback. Here, it was found that the particle “lah” was used also to show disagreement, but brought a more subtle and conflict-avoiding impact on the interaction. When “lah” was used in this case, the speaker was in a state of still trying to convince the other speakers by adding further information and examples. This was different from the use of “no” or “no, no” that appeared more intrusive and did not allow accord within the discussion.

Strategies for disagreeing	No of times used in the discourses						
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	TOTAL
i) lah	1	1	2	5	3	0	12

Table 5 Total number of strategies used for disagreeing

From the data gathered for this study, this strategy was used 12 times. Generally, the “lah” particle was used significantly at the point of disagreement and it helped soften or had a down-playing effect on what was said to avoid disharmony in the group. Also, it was discovered that the strategy was at times adopted when the situations got tensed. To illustrate these points, examples are shown below with the discussions.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 4)

82. S : But // orphanage / I don't trust the orphanage / I love my children / please
spare me

83. Q : Shut up^{lah} S !

@< laughs >

84. P : So okay / *ummm* / I still say that I should get the heart

The first example shows how “*lah*” was used to soften the assertiveness during a disagreement. Speaker S was defending his argument while Q was questioning S’s candidate’s capabilities as a mother. S, seemed annoyed when someone suggested sending the children to the orphanage. It was also evident from the transcription that the rest of the group members were already in agreement with S (Appendix 4). Q’s response with “shut up^{lah}” not only suggested divergence but could also indicate that she was fighting a losing battle. To save her own face when nobody else supported her, she remarked, “shut up^{lah}” and laughed. Thus, the particle “*lah*” softened the “order” to put a stop to the discussion. Furthermore, the act of laughing could be likened to saying “I don’t agree with you but that doesn’t mean we have to be enemies”. This was supported by speaker Q in the interview session when she said she did not want to argue with S even though she thought her idea was better (Appendix 14).

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 5)

31. Z : and the time / right ?

32. I : No *lah* / it’s the role of / right ? So he just / he has experience and he has *lalui*
macam-macam (gone through many things in life) so / give him time just him

a chance to other people / give the chance to a young boy like Johan Tajuddin
/ he's just 16 / still he's studying in Universiti Tenaga /

33. J : erm

As shown in example 2, sometimes “lah” was used with “no” to emphasise the disagreement of the speaker. Perhaps also, the use of this strategy helped to soften the impact of the speaker’s disagreement. Speaker I was not in agreement with the other speakers and tried to accentuate, how age is an unimportant factor in considering the issue at hand. Speaker I supported her argument by saying her candidate was young and should be given a chance to gain experience in life.

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 5)

6. J : Franklin Jones / the scientist / He is the one member who does research on the
bacteriological disease that can make the world happy the / one medicine to
decrease the / the / what disease / So if he die / maybe the medicine cannot
make~~lah~~

7. I : hey / you choose number 3~~lah~~

8. J : Number 3~~lah~~ !

In example 3, speaker J was explaining why her candidate, “Franklin Jones” should be given the heart – his contribution to the medical advancement would be fundamental and relevant. Speaker J was elaborating her point on “Franklin Jones” who was patient “number 3”. Speaker I had mistaken J’s candidate with another and corrected J, who had already chosen patient “number 3”. The use of “lah” in line 7, helped speaker J not to feel offended when she was corrected. As for J, who realised that it was actually speaker I who

was wrong, she used the same strategy and corrected I with the use of “lah”. Here, the use of “lah” was not only limited to showing disagreement (and to emphasise that candidate number 3 is her sure choice), but also to signify repair. Thus, it was also observed that when the strategy was used, harmony in the group was preserved.

Generally, maintaining harmony in a communication is an important consideration and by using a strategy like this, cordially was sustained. Thus, it is appropriate to say that the use of this strategy is essential for speakers who “try to avoid any confrontation or direct rebuttal as this is likely to result in the disruption of the flow of the discourse” (Jamaliah, 2000 : 141)

4.1.4 Emphasising

Strategies for emphasising	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) "lah"	0	0	1	2	4	2	9
ii) repeating information	1	0	3	1	3	0	8

Table 6 Total number of strategies used for emphasising

Under the heading of the emphasizing strategy, two sub-strategies were found – the use of the particle “lah” and the repeating of information.

i) the use of “lah”

The particle “lah” is used to bring different effects during an interaction. In the previous paragraphs we had looked at how “lah” was used to appeal and disagree. Although, the use of these strategies brought different effects depending on the contexts

they were used for, one similar characteristic of the strategies was that, they helped to give a positive and down-playing effect on the persistence or aggressiveness of the speakers. Similarly, "*lah*" was also used to bring this effect when used for emphasizing the points or argument brought up by the speakers. For this study, this strategy was used nine times (refer to table 6).

When the students were all warmed up for discussion, it was observed that the particle "*lah*" was used mostly in the middle of the discourses. The examples will be shown below and the discussion will follow.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 4)

78. P: But if you get the heart / would you send them to school / can you / can or afford to find all the things for the *nasi lemak* if you only depend on the welfare?

79. S: I will find a way to do *itlah* / remember three children /

In the example above, the "*lah*" particle occurred in line 79, almost halfway through the discussion. Speaker S was observed to be unhappy with P's remark that deemed his candidate as an irresponsible parent. Thus, S immediately responded and said "I will find a way to do *itlah*" which can be likened to "I am capable of doing it". Also, in the interview with S, he was under the impression that P was belittling his candidate and he wanted to stress that he was confident that his candidate, "Halimah Jamel", would find a solution to

the problem at hand – to make sure that her children will be well taken care of (Appendix 14).

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 5)

65. Z : But he's /

66. I : maybe that is the bad side of him if like / like that boy¹*lah* / he should have the heart / because the donor is also 16 / so / suit and the Malay also / Hah! Johan Tajuddin is also a Malay /

67. J : ooh /

In example 2, the use of “*lah*” was again found between lines 65 to 67, already halfway through the discussion. Speaker I emphasized the fact that age did not matter when a transplant was in question, as speaker I said in the interview, “as long as the heart does not deteriorate (due to delay in the surgery)” (Appendix 12). She managed to gain an ally from another member of the group in this argument.

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 5)

94. Z : anyway / Mr Amran

95. I : he should die²*lah* / I think he's the first one should die / the oldest among them all / you know / the oldest.

The example above, appeared in line 95, also in the middle of the discussion. As discussed in example 2, speaker I did not favour other candidates apart from the 16 year old “Johan Tajuddin”, the choice for the heart. Thus, when Z suggested another candidate, “Mr. Amran”, speaker I immediately remarked “he should die²*lah*”, making a clear stand that

“Mr Amran” should not even be considered for the heart. Later, she further emphasised that “Mr Amran” should be “the first one should die” and repeated the word “oldest” to mean he will not be able to contribute a lot to the community.

From both examples 2 and 3, speaker I managed to influence the other speakers as shown in the transcript (Appendix 5).

ii) repeating information

The other strategy of emphasizing is when the speaker repeated the information used. From the data, the strategy was used eight times (refer to table 6). In general, when a speaker repeated the information, he / she was making a stress or was highlighting a point that was important in convincing the group members into accepting his / her argument. Below are some of the examples to illustrate how the strategy was used.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

31. A : I think if we give him the heart / he can / you know / teach // um / um /
maybe he can / he's a scientist

32. E : yeah

33. A : tell that / if he had a student teach them about all these things and somehow /
they can help anot / anot / anot / another / next person / who get sick / okay
// they can help them / so how ? **he deserves the heart / he deserves the**
heart / I think he deserves the heart / even though /he's unmarried / but what
he knows from being a scientist is more / is more / erm / okay why do you
think he shouldn't receive the heart ? //

In the above example, speaker A repeated the phrase “He deserves the heart” three times to put emphasis on the point of why her candidate should be given the heart. Moreover, after realizing that speaker E in line 32 had backed her up with “yeah”, A took that as a cue to further elaborate how the candidate could contribute to the society because he had the experience and expertise as a medical scientist. From the interview, A admitted to using the strategy to convince her friends. Even though she was not able to “win” with her candidate, she managed to gain attention by repeating the information (Appendix 15).

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 1)

156. A : What a point !

157. E : Oh no ! who was to that *terdedah* // more open =

158. Y : = to the bacteria

159. A : but / still / patient no 4 / **no way** / sorry / **no way**

In this example, the repetition of information was the phrase “no way”, which was repeated twice. From the transcription, it was noticed that speaker A was alone in her “battle” against speakers E and Y. Here, in line 156, A remarked “What a point!”, indicating her judgment of Y’s argument as being irrelevant. Speaker Y latched E’s utterance in line 157 but speaker A remarked in line 159 with “no way”, to signify her total disagreement.

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 3)

21. D : okay / let's look at the women we have here / One is pregnant also and

one is a university professor / and we have an alcoholic agriculturist but we

--

don't know how OLD she is so / **one woman** / **one woman** is okay /

In example 3, speaker D was analysing the profile of all the female candidates. Going through their profile, he concluded by repeating “one woman” twice to stress that having just one woman for the journey was already enough. There was no need to bring more than one woman to start the new civilization.

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 5)

60. Z : What's the specialty about this guy ?

61. I : okay / he's studying in Universiti Tenaga and he's currently the best student in
his class

62. J : in his class only

63. Z : yeah /

@<laughs>

64. I : **he's studying in a university** / **he's studying in a UNIVERSITY**

In the last example, the repetition of information was done by repeating the phrase “he's studying in a university”. It was also interesting to note that by adopting this strategy, speaker I was able to convince the other speakers. From the interview, speaker I agreed that repeating the information helped him to gain attention and it happened naturally (Appendix 12).

It was also interesting to note that similarly, from the interviews, the speaker who adopted this strategy had done so without any planning and they had occurred without them realizing until mentioned by the speakers.

4.1.5 Eliciting and Providing Feedback

Of all the strategies identified in this study, these strategies of eliciting and providing feedback occurred the most in the discourses. There were 131 occurrences in the overall count of these major strategies.

Strategies to elicit/ provide feedback	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) ya / yeah	14	17	13	3	6	15	68
ii) no	8	0	8	1	5	0	22
iii) okay	15	10	4	1	2	3	35
iv) okay-okay	5	0	0	1	0	0	6

Table 7 Total number of strategies used to elicit /provide feedback

Under these major strategies, four sub-strategies had been found and they were “ya/ yeah”, “no”, “okay” and “okay-okay”. In the next paragraphs, examples will be given and the discussions for each will follow.

i) the use of “ya / yeah”

Firstly, is the use of “ya /yeah”, a strategy that was the most frequently used in the discourses to provide feedback. From the data, this strategy was used 68 times out of the overall 403 sub strategies (Appendix 10). In general, this use of “ya /yeah” indicated agreement between two or more speakers in the group. The positioning of “ya /yeah” was noticed to have occurred particularly in the beginning of an utterance - right after another

speaker had uttered a point or explanation that the strategy taker understood and accepted as relevant or appropriate. To illustrate this, the next example will attempt to explain the effect of this strategy.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

28. E : Because / he is unmarried.

29. A : Okay / **yeah** / he's a research scientist

30. E : **Yeah** / **yeah** //

31. A : I think if we give him the heart / he can / you know / teach // um / um /
maybe he can / he's a scientist

32. E : **yeah**

The use of “ya/ yeah” was observed to have a similar effect of using personal names during the discussion – to maintain rapport and create a bond between speakers. This enabled the strategy taker to have an ally or partner to support him / her during a decision making process in a discussion. As shown in example 1, speakers A and E had already established an alliance against the other speaker Y in this particular argument. In the beginning, speaker E mentioned that the candidate was “unmarried” and A agreed using “yeah” after the word “okay”. From the interview, speaker A assumed that this action signified E’s support and the “yeah” was duplicated in line 30. Hence, A saw E’s response and this encouraged her to further elaborate on the argument that the scientist candidate, “Franklin Jones”, was able to “teach” other researchers if he sacrificed himself to die. In line 32, again E confirmed A’s reasoning with “yeah” to show agreement (Appendix 15).

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

11. H : but / looking at the condition / they can survive by themselves / they can
change @ < leering >
12. L : but they still need somebody to get them there / right ?
13. H : **yeah**
14. L : because it's a long way
15. R : **yeah** / a new place / so we have this one to guide us

In the example above, “yeah” was again used to indicate agreement. Speaker L elaborated the importance to have a guide or advisor when they were going to a new place and ended the utterance with a question, “right?”. To confirm on the idea, speaker H said “yeah” to agree. Through this strategy, L saw an ally and added that an advisor was essential “because it’s a long way”. As a result of this, speaker R acknowledged his understanding by adding “yeah” and added “a new place” to reformulate what L had said.

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 2)

43. H : I might change my mind again //
- @ < all laughing >
44. R : He should
45. L : **yeah** / maybe he can convince
46. H : okay **yeah** / **yeah** / we'll take survivor number 5

In addition, the example above also showed agreement between speaker L and H. In fact, speaker L in line 45, did not even finish her sentence and H had already interrupted with his agreement. This strategy helped to create the rapport between these two speakers.

In relation to this, the next example also resulted in the same effect. The use of the similar strategy resulted in speakers W and V establishing an alliance:

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 6)

6. X : okay /
7. V : he's what he's I mean 80 / 80 over, right ? his mind is still working / better machine than the youngsters' right ?
8. W : maybe **yeah** /
9. V : Because he's a grandfather and he's / he's lived long enough
10. W : **Yeah** / actually his situation is the same as patient number 3 / Franklin Jones /
11. X : **Yeah**
12. W : what about this Mr Mustafa Kamil ?

The use of this strategy helped to smoothen the discussion and gave feedback to the speakers, indicating that the strategy takers have understood was being explained and accepted the argument brought up by any one of the speakers (Allwood, et.al., 1992:4). At the same time, it was observed that harmony was preserved and this resulted in a successful discussion.

ii) the use of “no”

The second sub-strategy for eliciting and providing feedback is “no”. Unlike “ye/yeah”, the speaker who used “no” becomes more hostile. The use of “no” reflected the attitude of the speakers and his/her reaction to the discussion. From the data gathered, “no” was used 22 times (refer to table 7). To illustrate the use of this strategy in detail, the examples are shown in the next paragraphs.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

23. A : Now patient no 3 / I think he should receive the heart

24. E : **No**

25. A : Why not ?

26. E : I don't think so

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 1)

53. A : I think he should receive the heart

54. Y : Should he ?

55. E : ah / **no** / **no** //

@ <avoiding eye contact >

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 1)

118. A : okay so / he should not receive the heart

119. E : **No, no, no** / now we look patient 6

120. A : **No** how about Y ?

121. Y : patient 7 / patient 6 / *kan* ?

122. A : patient 6

123. Y : **no**

124. E : **no**

As seen in examples 1, 2 and 3 , “no” was used to signify disagreement. It could also be added that it occurred when the discussion had already developed and the students were all warmed up. The students are all into the discussion and are engaged in the ideas they were trying to convey to the other speakers.

In the above examples, “no” reflected the attitudes of the speakers. In the first example, E was in disagreement with speaker A and used “no” in line 24. It was observed that later, E’s comment had become shorter, indicating detachment from the conflict at hand.

Again, in the second example, speaker E duplicated “no” and avoided eye contact with the other group members – a signal of total disagreement. She disagreed with A and did not want the candidate that A had chosen, to receive the heart.

In the third example, it was observed that all the speakers had used “no” and all decided not to give the heart to candidate 6.

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 1)

228. A : The last one

229. E : **no, no, no /**

230. A : you said yourself

231. E : **no, no, no / no /**

@ < shaking head > I said no okay ? because if patient 3 you know/ age 42/

the boy who wants/

232. A : Okay / look / look

233. E : the boy who give the heart is 16 years/ he is 42 years of age

In this example, the strategy was found towards the end of the discussion. Speaker E was not in agreement with A. In line 229, E had used “no” three times and even interrupted A while she was presenting her argument. In line 231, she repeated “no” three times and shook her head. This total disagreement was further enhanced when E remarked “I said no, okay? ”, a phrase that could be likened to “I’ve made up my mind” or “Don’t you understand me ?”, reflecting the annoyance she felt when A was patronizing her judgment of the issue.

In the previous examples, we had looked at how the use of “no” resulted in shorter sentences / utterances. However, there were instances where the use of “no” was followed by longer utterances. It was observed that this happened when the strategy was opted by the dominant speakers, as illustrated in the next examples.

EXAMPLE 5 (Appendix 3)

105. M: @ <giggles> shhh.. shhh.. SHUT UP !

106. D : One two three four we have space for two more people okay ? //

107. G : The scientist and the professor

108. D : **no** / we haven't checked the possible survivors / alcoholic agricultural
scientist / advises on cultivating the land / definitely yeah

109. G : we need her

110. D : definitely

The above example, indicated speaker D's use of "no", who later explained the reasons for his disagreement – saying that decisions could not be made at that point of the discussion because they had not considered all the survivors listed. Speaker D, dominated the discussion with 750 total words during the discussion (refer to table 2).

EXAMPLE 6 (Appendix 5)

70. I : **Nolah** / Just now I said / maybe after sometime he will change, he will change
to maybe not entirely the best student but usually we see right / all the students
that study all the time they don't think / They / never / I don't know / their
mind is jammed already / that's why / I think

The example above also illustrated a similar effect. It was observed that the word "no" was followed by the particle "*lah*" to show disagreement. Not only did speaker I indicated her disagreement, she added her reasons to support her stand. Again, speaker I dominated the discussion with a total of 944 words uttered out of 1423 of the total word utterance for this discussion (refer to table 2).

iii) the use of "okay"

This strategy was used 35 times (refer to table 7). The word "okay" used also to indicate the reaction of agreement, rather similar to "ya/yeah". In addition, the positioning

of “okay” was also in the beginning of an utterance or right after a point (that was agreed upon) had been raised. This can be seen in this instance below:

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

133. Y : contribute much to the country / because she is unemployed and on welfare

134. A : **okay** //

135. Y : So, I choose patient 7 to receive the heart

In the first example, speaker A agreed with speaker Y and said “okay” with the idea that the patient “Halimah Jamel” was not the right candidate for the heart and was not able to “contribute much to the country”. This was a signal for Y to further continue her argument and concluded that patient 7 should receive the heart. Also, according to A, the use of “okay”, confirmed that the other group members understood and received what had been discussed (Appendix 15).

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 3)

68. D : Are you able to have him...tribal chief ?

69. G : yes

70. D : **okay** / for me keeping him =

71. O : = (for) cultural reasons

72. D : yeah / exactly / that's one thing / cultural reasons / might be / we might keep him or we might not keep him / we might not have any Africans after him

As discussed in the previous paragraph, “okay” was used to indicate agreement between speakers. Pertaining to that, example 2 also introduced the same function of “okay”. Here, speaker D proposed a question to the group members on the status of the tribal chief, whether he should be left to live. G agreed and said “yes”. Taking that as a cue, D remarked “okay” as an indication of agreement towards G’s answer and speaker O later latched by finishing D’s sentence with “cultural reasons”. Through the observation, it can be concluded that the use of “okay” created a positive premise for discussion since it served to elicit some form of response. This may take the form of support, acceptance or even firm commitment (Jamaliah, 2000, p. 154)

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 5)

44. I : also I think he just 42 years old

45. Z : and ?

46. J : unmarried /

47. I : who ? ooh / *bujang*

48. J : let him get married*lah*

@<laughs>

49. I : **okay***lah*

Another example is seen as above. During the discussion, harmony in the group was maintained. Speaker I was not convinced at first with the choice of the “unmarried” candidate. After much hesitation, speaker I saw that Z and J had already agreed. She then concluded with “okay*lah*”. The particle “*lah*” further emphasised her decision which can be likened to “you win”, as mentioned by speaker I in the interview (Appendix 12).

iv) the use of “okay-okay”

The last sub-strategy under the heading of eliciting and providing feedback is the use of “okay-okay”. Basically, “okay-okay” was different from “okay” in the sense that the former was adopted by the students when they wanted to end a particular part of the interaction because the discussion had gone confusing or inconclusive. In most situations, it was observed that this strategy acted as a cue for the speakers to move on to the next point. From the data gathered, it was found that “okay-okay” was used six times (refer to table 7). The examples are given below and the discussions will follow.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

47. A : isn't that the / what *persamaan* / okay / he's unmarried / so what ? / guys can
stay unmarried if they want

48. E : I think cannot

49. A : **okay / okay**

50. E : how about / **okay / okay** / we stop here first /

51. A : okay //

In example 1, in the earlier part of the discussion, speakers A and E had already begun to argue about the suitable candidate to receive the heart. In lines 49 and 50, both speakers were observed to be exhausted and irritated with the outcome of the discussion. The use of “okay-okay” in both lines 49 and 50 indicated that E was tired and annoyed when the discussion was inconclusive, added by E’s phrase “we stop here first”. A also agreed with E’s suggestion and added her own agreement with “okay” in line 51. The discourse then moved on to discuss the next point.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 1)

64. A : He just wants to be a doctor

65. E : wait / if we look / our responsibility / if we look / our responsibility as a father
or mother must take care of what

66. A : but

67. E : teach / teach him to be a daughter because when younger / from / *tengok / bak kata pepatah / what / ah / melentur buluh biar sampai ke hujungnya*

68. A : **okay / okay**

Here in example 2, the use of “okay-okay” was used differently. After a long discussion between speakers A and E, A in the end agreed with E’s suggestion and comments. The use of “okay-okay” here can simply mean “I got your point” or even, “you win”. This adoption of the strategy suggested that the strategy taker would not wish to argue with the other speakers and “surrendered” as mentioned by speaker A in the interview (Appendix 15).

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 4)

91. C: You take care of my children / I'm willing but /
92. Q : Yes / that's right / that's a good idea
93. S: I agree with that / **okay** / **okay** I will take good care of your two children /
you are divorced / you can give your children to your ex-husband.
@<laughs>

Similarly, example 3 illustrated the strategy used to achieve the same effect as in example 2. Speakers C and Q decided that the heart would be given to "Halimah Jamel", S's candidate. This was under one condition, mentioned by C, which was S's candidate will take care of the children. After listening to the others' suggestions and comments, S finally agreed and used "okay-okay" that simply meant "we have come to an agreement" and there was no need to further the discussion. The discussion ended with everyone laughing, indicating this was a successful discussion.

From the examples gathered under the strategy for the use of "okay-okay", it can be concluded that the students adopted the strategy when there was a need to end certain parts of the discussion and to move on with the next point for discussion. A distinct effect that resulted from this strategy was that there was no further discussion on the same point beyond the utterance with "okay-okay". It was also observed that the strategy helped to minimise the level of conflict and harmony was maintained –which was essential for the discussion to continue.

4.1.6 Summarising / To Show Result

i) the use of “so”

Strategies for summarizing information/ to show result	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) so	11	12	5	7	11	6	52

Table 8 Total number of strategies used for summarizing information

Under the heading of summarizing, there was only one sub-strategy that was identified, which was the use of “so”. Basically, the use of “so” was adopted by the students to sum up particular information that had been discussed or explained. This was done for the benefit of the other group members in order for them to follow the flow of the discussion. It was also interesting to note that this strategy was adopted 52 times by the dominant speakers as illustrated in the examples that will follow.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

108. E : and if we look at him / he has 3 children / how sweet /

109. A : so ?

110. E : and the grandfather of 5

111. A : so ?

112. E : so / (he) his child can help /

In the first example, E summarized her point on why she had chosen the deputy prime minister who had 3 children and 5 grandchildren – his family was able to give him assistance if he had any difficulties. A in the beginning, was not convinced that the candidate, the deputy prime minister, will be able to function well and benefit the country.

Nevertheless, E tried to convince her and the other speakers on the possibility of the candidate contributing to the country because of his experience.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

40. F : does he possess any knowledge about the / you know the / they want to create
what we call it / a new civilization / so we need a new / a person / who
knows the / about this thing / about how / the government should be run
41. L : that's why we need the university professor / the scientist and the rest
42. F :so I think I choose survivor number 5 / can I know / who / who vote for survivor
number 5 ? H ?
43. H : I might change my mind again //
- @ < all laughing >

As mentioned in the earlier paragraph, the dominant speakers adopted the strategy most of time. This is relevant in the example above whereby the strategy taker was F, who contributed the largest amount of words in the discussion – a total of 570 out of the total 1211 words used in the discussion (refer to table 2). In the example above, we can see how speaker F in line 42 concluded that survivor 5 was everyone's favourite choice. This conclusion was made after he had heard the other group members' arguments and opinions. The other group members had agreed on the same decision except speaker H. Upon realizing this, the leader of the group, F, asked for H's stand. In line 43, it was observed that H agreed with the group's decision.

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 2)

78. L : so why should we have a protector / for what?
79. K : yeah for what ? from the sea

80. F : from the sea lion ?

81. H : if that is so / we live in a safe place / **so** / we can go without the *pahlawan* /
just survivor number 1 / that is the man of religion //

In the third example, H, concluded that since the rest of the group members agreed that there was no harm or danger expected in the new place they were about to go to, there was no need to bring along the “*pahlawan*” or the warrior. The act of summarizing this information based on the four speakers’ speech helped to focus the discussion and saved time for the next point to follow.

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 4)

22. S : Thank you

23. C : You're welcome.

24. S : / *apa* / Elena Wong / Carlos Wahnon / **So** you give the heart to me / I'm not
only saved but / you are saving three lives instead / including my three
children laughs / five children now / thank you

In example 5, speaker S began with “thank you”, acknowledging the group members’ approval to give the heart to his candidate , “Halimah Jamel”. The use of “so” here acted as a conclusion for the discussion and later, S mentioned how the group members were actually “saving three lives instead” – an outcome that was likely agreed by the group.

4.1.7 Reformulation

i) the use of “so”

Under the heading for reformulation, one sub-strategy was identified and it was used 18 times.

Strategies for reformulation	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) so	7	4	0	1	1	5	18

Table 9 Total number of strategies used for reformulation

Reformulation took place when the speaker tried to put together pieces of information and conveyed the message to the listeners so it was better understood by everyone. Below are examples to explain this.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

190. E : = his students can use that theory / to *kembangkan apa* / ah / develop / like a Islamic
191. A : he should receive the heart
192. Y : I think what E said is correct / like Arazi / another people use his theory to develop something new / so the students / his students can also use the same way / they also can use that theory to develop something new about *apa* / his research bacteriological disease

In the first example, speaker V explained why the candidate, “Johan Tajuddin” would make a good candidate to receive the heart. She described him as someone who could make changes. It was observed that the other group members were not satisfied until speaker T later in line 68 reformulated how the candidate was the best student thus “he has a clear picture of what he wants to be” – implying that a genius must have had some mental capabilities to excel and succeed.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 5)

81. Z : but

82. J : maybe he go / study in India / so that he what / ah / finish early

83. I : it is stated here that currently he is the best student in his class / **so** usually 16 is

only form 4 right ? He is studying in a University Tenaga / of course he is a

genius / Yeah / and also he is a Malay /

The example above followed the same discussion as the first example, whereby the discussion was to evaluate Johan Tajuddin as the potential candidate for the heart. Speaker I, reformulated with “so” - that Johan could be considered a genius because he was only 16 and had already been accepted into university. This was a scenario that was very rare among Malaysians because at 16, teenagers would still be studying at the secondary level in schools. Thus, the candidate was perceived as an asset to the country and should receive the heart so that he would be able to contribute towards the advancement of the country (Appendix 12).

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 5)

99. I : as I told you before / he's 65 / **so dia dah lama hidup tau tak, bagilah orang**

lain hidup pulak (so he has lived for so long, let other people have the chance to live)

100. J: *dah / dah* / (enough, enough) he has Grandson / children *lah* / 65 years living in this world

In the third example, speaker I could detect that J was not convinced with her argument as she mentioned in the interview (Appendix 12). J gave the feedback with “hmmm”,

which was unlikely to show total agreement, just a feedback that was vague. Thus, speaker I repeated the argument that the candidate in question was “65” years old. She later indicated what she meant by “65” – an age where one had experienced a lot of things in life. Thus, speaker I felt that it was necessary to let other people have the chance to live and experience what life had to offer. It was also interesting to note that the reformulation was done in Bahasa Melayu when speaker I wanted to emphasise the point (Appendix 12).

In general, this strategy provided flow into the discussion. The reformulation was done to help other speakers’ / listeners’ focus and follow the discussion. It was evident from the examples given that reformulation helped to “monitor the discussion with a view to ensure that speakers did not digress from the main issue (Jamaliah, 2000, p. 159).

It was also noticed from the example that there was a slight difference between the use of “so” to summarise and to reformulate. When summarising, “so” was used to end a particular part or point of the discussion after everyone had debated or argued their points. On the other hand, when students were reformulating, they were still in the middle of discussion and there was still an attempt to persuade the other speakers to accept their points of view.

4.1.8 Generating discussion.

From the data gathered for this study, it was found that two sub-strategies were found used by the students when they wanted to generate the discussion. The sub-strategies were “So” and “Okay”.

Strategies for generating discussion	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) so	2	7	3	0	1	1	14
ii) okay	15	10	4	1	2	17	49

Table 10 Total number of strategies used for generating discussion

One feature that was most clearly found in the examples was of the positioning of these two sub-strategies. The words “So” and “Okay” were found in the earlier part of the discussions and were positioned in front of the utterances. At times, they were used after very long pauses in the beginning (when the students were still warming up to the discussion and were adopted by the dominant speakers or the leaders of the group. The next paragraphs will attempt to explain the effect of these strategies through the examples from the discourses.

i) the use of “So”

Firstly, was the use of “So”, which was used 14 times (refer table 10). This strategy was used both as a question and as a statement to start off the discussion. We shall first look at the examples using the strategy in a form of a statement.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

1. A: I'm the doctor who's in charge of doing this transplant / and I'm the psychiatrist
/ my name is A.
2. Y: I'm Y.
3. E: I'm E / the person who in charge of the transplant / so / patient number 1
4. A: I don't think should receive the heart

In the first example, it can be seen that the use of “so” appeared in the earlier part of the discussion (in line 3). Speaker E initiated the discussion with “so” and was interrupted by A who finished the sentence for her in line 4, which indicated that E got the response / feedback from another speaker in the group.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

1. F : Okay / **so** / like what we do yesterday / we will do the ranking / which one
should be the first / up to 6
2. H : I think from this five survivors / perhaps / and you just pick 6 so //

Here in the second example, again, F adopted the strategy in the first line of the discussion, when the discussion had not even begun. According to F, he felt that the strategy helped to get the other member’s attention and focus for the discussion. He also mentioned that he felt the need for someone to start off the discussion and since no one else took the floor, he decided to take that role (Appendix 14).

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 2)

17. L : = four
18. F : three / four we just / four over six / so / ah / the one that have the most vote
is survivor number 1-4 and survivor number 5 / three of them / **so** / do you
think that the one with one vote / do you think we should discuss for them ?
19. L : We could change our mind

Sometimes, the speakers used the strategy in the form of a question, when they wanted to elicit feedback or to start the discussion. This use of “so” is different from the first two examples because they were used towards the end of the utterances, not the

beginning (although they still occurred in the earlier part of the discussion). The third example above demonstrated how the speaker used the strategy with a question at the end. Here, we could see how speaker F, the dominant speaker with 47% total words uttered (refer to table 2), used “so” in his question to gain further information from his other friends. It was observed that the question was not directed at anyone in particular but was responded by L.

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 2)

68. K : for entertaining

69. F : so okay / how about the singer / do you think she should join the crew ?

Similarly, the same speaker adopted the same strategy in the example 4, encouraging more discussion by the group members. In this example, F asked for the status of candidate “Elena Wong” who was not a favourite to receive the heart.

ii) the use of “Okay”

The second stub-strategy used to generate discussion was the use of “Okay”. Similar to “So”, the strategy was adopted at the beginning of the discussion and was mostly adopted by the dominant speakers. From the data gathered, this strategy was used 49 times (refer to table 10).

It was observed that the use of “Okay” to generate discussion was adopted as a sign of respect for his/ her friends when the speakers began to talk. In other words, this can be likened to the expression “excuse me” to indicate politeness and being tactful.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 2)

1. F : **Okay** / so / like what we do yesterday / we will do the ranking / which one
should be the first / up to 6
2. H : I think from this five survivors / perhaps / and you just pick 6 so //
3. L : **Okay**, the first 6 ? **Okay** / first the man of religion / doctor / the chief and his
wife / the scientist and the university professor /

In the first example, the strategy was adopted in line 1, when the discussion had not even begun. Speaker F suggested that the group should start the discussion by ranking the candidates in the order of importance. It was a move taken by F, the group leader, who mentioned “like what we do yesterday” to remind the group that the discussion was rather similar to the one they had done on the previous day. It is important to note here that the group had gone through one trial session to familiarise them with the format of the role-play a day before. Thus, this explained why speaker F was comfortable with the situation and initiated the first move with “Okay” as a signal to start the discussion.

As a result of this, he got the response from H and later L, who also adopted the same strategy twice. It can be observed that L actually interrupted H’s speech and added “okay” before moving on into her argument – similar to using “excuse me” before cutting into other people’s speech. L started off the discussion to select the best candidate to be transported to an island. It was also observed that H was not offended when L interrupted him and this made L’s adoption of the strategy as a successful one – cutting in without offending another speaker in the process.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

5. F : **okay** / my one is just like D's one //

@ < sighing >

6. R : **Okay** / now where do we want to start first ? do we want to start 4 / voted 4 or
just pick / out of ten pick just six

In the second example, F used “okay” before saying that he agreed with L in the previous line. There was a short silence during which F sighed and R later started off the discussion again with “okay”. There was no clarifications made or seeking of agreement in the previous lines and R just adopted the strategy to start the ball rolling again. It was also emphasised by R that, the use of “okay” was not rude to interrupt and begin a discussion (Appendix 11).

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 5)

60. Z : What's the specialty about this guy ?

61. I : **okay** / he's studying in Universiti Tenaga and he's currently the best student in
his class

62. J : in his class only

The use of “okay” in the following example above, provided speaker I with the premise to argue out her opinion as to why her candidate for the heart, “Johan Tajuddin” was the best candidate – his intelligence was his specialty and that would be considered as “priceless” (Appendix 12). It was also noted that speaker I dominated the discussion with 66% total words used (refer to table 2).

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 6)

4. X : Why do you say number 3 ?
5. V : **okay** / because he's the leading authority in the world in bacteriological diseases and maybe he has the cure for the world's worst dangerous disease /
6. W : But he's unmarried

In this last example, it can be seen again that speaker V (who used the strategy) was also the one who dominated the discussion with 577 of the overall words used (refer to table 2). Here, before providing the group with the reasons for choosing the candidate, "Franklin Jones", V started off the discussion with "okay". It was observed that all the group members paid her the attention she needed.

4.1.9 Seeking Agreement

There were times when the speakers, particularly the dominant ones, asked for the group members' agreement on a point raised or discussed. This was done so through two sub-strategies that were identified. They were the use of "right?" and "okay?".

From the examples, it was found that the positioning of "right?" and "okay?" was right at the end of an utterance. In other words, they were used right at the last sentence before another speaker responded. Since they were used in questions, they normally required a response from the other group members. In the next paragraphs, the discussion will look at a few examples collected from the data.

Strategies for seeking agreement	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) right ?	0	5	1	0	10	12	28
ii) okay ?	0	2	2	2	1	1	8

Table 11 Total number of strategies used for seeking agreement

i) the use of “right ?”

Firstly, is the use of “right?” which was used 28 times (table 11). Some speakers, were found to be fond of using this strategy as opposed to using expressions like “do you agree with me” or “what do you think” to elicit further discussion from the rest of the group members.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 2)

10. L : yeah / because I mean / we’re going to start a new civilization / **right ?** / okay /

I mean religion is important and I believe this man can help the others in this particular

11. H : but / looking at the condition / they can survive by themselves / they can change @ < leering >

12. L : but they still need somebody to get them there / **right ?**

In the first example, speaker L adopted the strategy twice. She was making a point that religion was important to start a new civilisation and that a learned person was needed to guide and advise them. She sought for agreement from the other group members for their response and feedback.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

51. F : I think number 4 / we don’t need two leaders / **right ?** / If there are two leaders / there will be a split inside the group / so / definitely if we choose the chief /

we don't need / we already have a judge / okay ? / so we should make him
the judge / okay ?

Similarly, the second example also showed the adoption of the strategy to seek agreement from the other group members. F argued that two leaders would only bring about problems in the group. There would be differences in principles, ideas or beliefs. It was observed that F was trying to convince his friends by looking at the issue from the group members' point of view.

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 2)

60. H : the gun is something to be scared of / the spear

61. L : he's like an agent /

right?

62. H : yeah

The above example demonstrated how speaker L achieved success in the adoption of the strategy. She used "right?" to see if the other group members agreed that the candidate in question functioned as "an agent". Speaker H agreed with L and used "yeah".

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 6)

27. V : he's what he's I mean 80 / 80 over, **right ?** his mind is still working / better
machine than the youngsters' **right ?**

28. W : maybe yeah /

In the last example here, speaker V used the strategy twice. In both cases, they were used to emphasise the point that what mattered for someone to be a good and effective leader were the capability and commitment, not the age (Appendix 16). This was followed by the response by W who said “yeah” to show agreement.

ii) the use of “okay?”

Secondly, was the use of “okay?”. In most cases, the strategy was adopted by the dominant speakers or the ones who contributed a lot of talk. From the data, this strategy was used eight times.

Although the use of “right?” also resulted in responses by the listeners in the group, the use of “okay?” was observed to carry further emphasis of dominance and power in the group. It was observed that the use of “okay?” was somewhat similar to the phrases “I have made up my mind” or “Don’t argue with me”. The following are some examples to illustrate these points.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 2)

51. F : I think number 4 / we don’t need two leaders / right ? / If there are two leaders / there will be a split inside the group / so / definitely if we choose the chief / we don’t need / we already have a judge / **okay ?** / so we should make him the judge / **okay ?**

In the first example, speaker F, the dominant one in the group with 47% of total words used (refer to table 2) the strategy after the discussion had been made. Even though speaker F appeared to be trying to convince the other members, he had already “assumed”

that they agreed with him when he said “we don’t need two leaders”. Moreover, he later commented that “*definitely* if we choose the chief ...we already have a judge, **okay** ? So we should make him the judge, **okay** ?” stressing that the decision had already been made with his use of “definitely”.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 3)

1. D : For us / taking one man of religion / the man of religion against survival / age
a bit elderly as he goes along I’m kicking this guy out **okay** ?
2. M: I agree

In example 2, it was clear that speaker D had already decided that the man of religion was not be considered at all, as mentioned by D that “ I’m kicking this guy out **okay** ?”. D used “okay” to mean “don’t argue with me” and this strategy was adopted even at the beginning of the discussion in the first line. M was observed to have approved of D’s decision. D was the dominant speaker for this discussion with the total of 74% total words used (refer to table 2).

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 4)

59. P : I will use to give something back
60. Q : what you know is game / crying
61. S : the real world is outside / you are living inside / **okay** ?
@<laughs>

In the last example under “okay?”, the decision to give the heart to “Halimah Jamel” had already been made by the group members, except for speaker Q, who initially disagreed. Speaker S, who was happy that his candidate had been given the heart, looked at

the situation as an opportunity to tease Q in line 61 - he implied that Q was not matured. It was also interesting to note that, even though S was “making fun” of Q (since he already had the other group members’ support), he later laughed to make sure that he did not hurt Q’s feelings. From the interview, Q mentioned that she was not (Appendix 14).

4.1.10 Indicating Dominance

Under the heading for indicating dominance, there were four sub-strategies identified and they were the uses of “so”, “so what?”, “what for?” and “what?”. The total number of words uttered by each student determined the adoption of these strategies.

It had been observed as well that not always did the dominant ones “win” the debate or argument. Nevertheless, they were the ones who had used the most strategies identified in the study. The next paragraphs will look at the four sub-strategies with the examples to illustrate the effect of adopting this strategy.

Strategies to indicate dominance	No of times used in the discourses						TOTAL
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	
i) so ?	6	1	0	0	0	0	7
ii) so what ?	3	0	1	0	1	0	5
iii) what for ?	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
iv) what ?	4	1	0	0	2	0	7

Table 12 Total number of strategies used to indicate dominance

i) the use of “so?”

The first sub-strategy was the use of “so?” which was used seven times (refer table 12). When this strategy was used, it was observed that the listener felt somewhat intimidated by the strategy taker. The use of “so?” that had a rising intonation seemed to put the listener in the position where she/he had to justify the argument and tried to win a losing battle.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

33. A : tell that / if he had a student teach them about all these things and somehow /
they can help anot / anot / anot / another / next person / who get sick / okay
// they can help them / **so** ? he deserves the heart / he deserves the heart /
I think he deserves the heart / even though / he's unmarried / but what he
knows from being a scientist is more / is more / erm / okay why do you think
he shouldn't receive the heart ? //

In the first example, "so?" was used by the dominant speaker A who dominated the discussion with 40% total of words used (refer to table 2). The effect of this strategy adoption was that the listener would be less active and anxious. This act of trying to control the discussion was further emphasised when A repeated the information "he deserves the heart" three times to stress her point.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 1)

108. E : and if we look at him / he has 3 children / how sweet /
109. A : **so** ?
110. E : and the grandfather of 5
111. A : **so** ?
112. E : so / he his child can help /
113. A : what makes you so sure about that / You all so / he has a chance to be more /

In the second example, speaker A was intimidating speaker E, adding pressure to E's initiative to support her own argument. At the same time, it was observed that A was sure that E's point was not relevant and convincing enough when she said "what makes you

so sure about that". The effect of this strategy on speaker E was that she was observed to have stammered and speaker A gained confidence instead.

ii) the use of "so what?"

The second strategy is the use of a more intimidating "so what?", which was used five times (refer table 12). Similarly, the strategy was used to intimidate the other group members whom a speaker saw as an "enemy" during the discussion.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

45. A : Why / WHY ?

46. Y : because he just doing a research in bacteriological disease

47. A : isn't that the / what *persamaan* / okay / he's unmarried / **so what ?** / guys can stay unmarried if they want

As mentioned earlier, speaker A dominated the discussion with 40% total of words used during the discussion (refer to table 2). Here, A repeated "why" twice in line 45 when she asked for clarification from Y regarding why her choice was not favoured by the other two members of the group. In line 47, she was quick to add on her point that people were free to stay unmarried and used "so what?" to simply mean, "There's no need for us to prolong this discussion".

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 5)

134. Z : / eh / how about Halimah ?

135. I : / unemployed / she can find other ways to / just give her children to welfare

136. Z : **So what ?**

137. I : He's Malaysian right?

Speaker Z may not be the dominant one in the group, but she did contribute a lot of talk during the debate at this point (Appendix 5). She was not convinced by the argument given by speaker I who mentioned the candidate's, unemployment (named Halimah in the stimulus) as the reason why she should be given priority for the surgery. Z remarked "so what?" in line 136 and said that she thought "I's idea was unacceptable" (Appendix 12).

iii) the use of "what for ?"

The third sub-strategy is the use of "what for ?" which could be likened to "you're losing the point". From the data, the strategy was used two times (refer table 12).

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

15. A : hmmm / once she come she could

16. E : she is just a singer / **what for ?**

17. A : still can find a newcomer / yeah / and for he children / maybe she can

In the first example, "what for" was used by speaker E, who claimed that candidate "Elena Wong", was just a singer. E was not convinced that a singer would be able to contribute much to the country if she was given the heart. Speaker E was the second dominant speaker in the group with 33% of the total words used (refer to table 2).

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

76. L : in a sense / uninhibited means no living things

77. K : yeah

78. L : so why should we have a protector / **what for ?**

79. K : yeah **what for ?** from the sea

80. F : from the sea lion ?

The second example demonstrated how the strategy used by L, the third dominant speaker in the group (17% of the total words used), gained support through another member in the group to help her win the argument. Speaker L used “what for?” in her argument when she questioned the need to have a “*pahlawan*” or warrior when they were going to a safe place.

iv) the use of “what ?”

This is the last sub-strategy identified in the study. The use of “what”, similar to the other three discussed, was also used to impose power by the dominant speakers in the group and was used seven times (refer to table 12).

The use of “what”, was also used with a rising intonation as so were the other three. It was interesting to note that the result of this strategy when the speakers adopted it, was that the listeners responded in a more angry manner. This indicates that not only were the speakers annoyed with how the discussion was going, but the listeners were too. The following examples will try to explain this.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

34. E : Firstly because he is unmarried / he is scientist of bacteriological disease / so /

he's

35. A : **WHAT ?**

36. E : er / more

37. Y : okay /

38. E : Yeah / effect of bacteria disease

The first example demonstrated how speaker A, the dominant speaker in the group (refer to table 2), used “what?” and note that the strategy was adopted when speaker E did not even finish her sentence. E stammered in line 36 but was supported by speaker Y, even though A was trying to overawe her.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 1)

83. E : no way / bye-bye / yeah / yeah

84. Y : because he just he has been in this world / has been living for 65 years / that's
enough / I think

85. A : He is

86. E : **WHAT** ? //

87. A : He is the Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia

88. E : OH MY GOD !

@ < leaning back >

This example is a follow-up to the argument by speaker A and E in the first example. The example again showed how “what?” was emphasized by speaker E. It was noticed that E later remarked “OH MY GOD !” simply to mean “I don’t believe this!” and leaned back to show a sign of detachment from the discussion. The next example also illustrated how the same speaker used the strategy and gained control of the discussion.

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 1)

223. E : cannot / unfair / what you got / Carlos the first one

224. A : okay / Carlos / the first one

225. E : second / patient number 7 /

226. A : Carlos / the first one ? Okay !

227. E : **What ? WHAT ?**

228. A : The last one

229. E : no, no, no /

Again, speaker E was in action, trying to gain control of the discussion. The disapproval of A's argument was also emphasized when she repeated "no, no, no".

From the examples, speaker E was the one who had used the strategy more than once. As a result of this, E did manage to "win" the argument and gained support from the other group members.

4.2 Code-Switching and Code-Mixing

As defined in Chapter 1, this study would view code-switching and code-mixing as two different entities. Thus, the analysis for both will be done separately.

4.2.1 Code-Switching

Code-switching was defined as the switching within languages and varieties (Chapter 1). The examples below illustrate the switching from English to Bahasa Melayu (inter-sentential) and the discussion will follow.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

64. A : He just wants to be a doctor

65. E : wait / if we look / our responsibility / if we look / our responsibility as a father
or mother must take care of what

66. A : but

67. E : teach / teach him to be a daughter because when younger / from / *tengok / bak*

68. A : okay / okay

From the recordings, an instance was found whereby a student code switched using a Malay saying. In example 3, the above saying basically meant that children should be educated while they were still young. It was also noted that in line 6 that speaker E was looking for the most effective way of convincing her friends (Appendix 15). She also stated that the effect of using the first language, instead of English, created a feeling of security, comfort and openness.

The feelings to maintain harmony is also evident in the next example.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 3)

13. D : no reason/ I think it's because he is a homosexual^{lah}

@ <laughs>

I agree that keeping him

@ <laughs>

14. O : *macam bagus je*

15. B : he needs to // CHANGE

In the above example, the participants were discussing the sexuality of one of the candidates in the game. When speaker D was commenting about keeping the candidate, everyone felt he (the speaker) was not serious. When D started to laugh, O commented “*macam bagus je*” which meant “as if you’re so good”. It was observed that D was not offended by this remark. It is perhaps, because these students had been close friends for almost two semesters and considered O’s comment was made only to tease D. Thus, it can

be observed in this example that code-switching reduces anxiety and creates a positive environment for discourses to take place.

However, there were also instances that show how code-switching, with the help of non-verbal communication, expresses a speaker's disagreements or signals a speaker's detached from the discourse. The next examples will illustrate this :

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 1)

144. Y : he should/ surely he would be a better person in the future maybe he/ someday / he will if he survives he would be the deputy prime minister to *ganti*/ to replace Amran Abd Jalil's place

145. A : *Cepat bangkang tu*

@ leaning backward

146. E : heah/ Ya Allah / patient no 4

147. A : patient no 3 *lah*

148. E : NO/ patient no 4

149. Y : he is currently the best student in his class =

150. A : = for now

In this example, speaker A was not in agreement with speaker Y. When Y debated in length, A commented "*cepat bangkang tu*" which meant "[Y] is quick to rebut". Further into the discussion (line 150) A latched to reaffirms her stand that patient no 4 should not receive the heart. From this example, it was observed by the researcher that when A code-switched, she was somewhat detached from the discussion as she leaned backwards and slumped her body on the chair and her remark "*cepat bangkang tu*" seemed to be rather cynical as if to say "try and argue with me".

EXAMPLE 4 (Appendix 3)

49. G : There will always be violence
50. N : no/not really
51. M : *tak semestinya*
52. D : okay/ so/ you guys want to keep him or kill him ?
53. G : kill him
54. D : you ?
55. O : keep him ? you ? keep him ?
56. M : @ <shakes head>

In the above example, speakers N and M were in agreement that keeping one of the candidates would be harmful. M code-switched and echoed N and said “*tak semestinya*” which meant “not really” or “not necessarily so”. Both speakers M and N refer to the same meaning but M used Bahasa to emphasise his point.

4.2.2 Code-mixing

Code-mixing was defined as the inclusion of linguistic elements from various languages (intra-sentential). These elements could be in the form of words or short phrases. Below are some examples and the discussion.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

246. IN: do you think that nationality in terms of them being Malaysians or not
would be a consideration ? Would you consider that ?
247. Y : yeah
248. A : yeah / maybe

249. E :yes / *dah lah tu / tak larat* (that's enough, I can't go on)

250. A : it depends

In example 1, speaker E code mixed when she wanted the discussion to end. According to her in the interview (Appendix 15), she thought the situation was tensed and she did not want to prolong the discussion. The adoption was observed to have helped ended the discussion on a positive note.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 5)

31. Z : and the time / right ?

32. I : No *lah* / it's the role of / right ? So he just / he has experience and he has *lalui macam-macam* (gone through many things in life) so / give him time just him a chance to other people / give the chance to a young boy like Johan Tajuddin / he's just 16 / still he's studying in Universiti Tenaga /

33. J : erm

In example 2, it was noted by the speaker I that she code mixed to emphasise a point made during the discussion. She also mentioned that by code mixing, she feels that her choice of words were more accurate and are understood by her friends. Similar to example 1, the use of Malay words and phrases seemed to flow nicely into the conversation.

4.3 Duetting and philharmony

There were some instances of duetting and philharmony in the discourses. It is important to note that these two features were not classified as strategies due to the fact that these features emerged in the conversation out of the group effort to achieve their objective of the discourse. This is as opposed to the strategies discussed, whereby they were found in each individual's speech.

In general, duetting was observed to have taken place among the students who had established an alliance. It was observed that a speaker ended or completed another speaker's speech as a sign of support and agreement.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 1)

157. E : Oh no ! who was to that *terdedah* // more open =

158. Y : = to the bacteria

159. A : but / still / patient no 4 / no way / sorry / no way

In this example, it was observed that speaker Y latched (completed) speaker E's speech and this showed an understanding between the two.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 2)

108. F : so / we have come to a conclusion whereby we choose doctor / university

professor / the alcoholic scientist / the chief and also the pregnant woman =

109. H : = plus the religious man

110. F : ah / plus the religious man

In the second example, H completed speaker F's speech with "plus the religious man". It was observed later that F acknowledged this agreement with "ah".

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 3)

36. D : that's security reasons / yes it's possible / but if he didn't come with the gun
maybe I might take him but because he comes with the gun / he might / he
might =

37. M: = uses it for (something else)

38. D : a source of power you know / he has a WEAPON / an object that could kill //

39. M: @ <giggles>

In the third example, again, a rapport was established between speakers D and M. Speaker M agreed with D on the effect of having a weapon. D, upon seeing an alliance with M, continued his argument with a reason that a weapon "could kill". M was observed to laugh – a sign of support for D.

Generally, the act of "latching" demonstrated how two speakers were able to understand the process of interacting and develop the ideas. What matters is that there was coherence in the meaning for the speakers and the harmony in the group was preserved.

As for philharmony, this can be viewed as an example of co-operation in interaction, whereby, when there were more than two speakers producing utterances that have the effect of a single speaker unity as far as the meaning and coherence are concerned, philharmony is the result (Jamaliah, 2000). In the interactions that took place during the study, there were some instances found.

EXAMPLE 1 (Appendix 2)

33. K : that means survivor number 5 is the leader
34. F : + who has to struggle to be the leader =
35. K : = maybe he knows about =
36. L : = the jungle
37. F : ahah / okay

Three speakers in this example produced utterances that made up a whole meaning of a point. If the words are all linked, the single speaker speech would sound like, *"That means survivor number 5 is the leader, who has to struggle to be a leader - maybe he knows about the jungle"*. The utterances were related in terms of meaning and were coherent as a whole.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 3)

41. N : he comes along with a gun / it's not just him who had use a gun / the rest
must've used a gun before
42. D : +exactly / but / he has a weapon / that fatally wound somebody / you know /
and it's not going to last us for long / if these people just take him for his gun
/ what do you think ? should take him
43. M : + what if he does kill somebody ? they are together on an island / they have to
defend themselves and if they hate each other / what if he kills the others ? I
mean we
44. D : + already have enough problems on the island

Again, when the utterances were linked, the result was a string of sentences that made up a whole meaning. It is significant to say that the importance of the conversation was to have a coherent meaning that was understood and agreed by everyone in the group.

4.4 Non-verbal communication

In general, the use of non-verbal communication and gestures has been discussed together with the communicative strategies. Nonetheless, a discussion on the distinct features can also be made. In the following paragraphs, the discussion focuses on the non-verbal communication and gestures mostly occurred during the discussion - hand gestures, upper body movements and facial expressions.

The hand gestures was observed to have an important role in complementing the message relayed. The most common gesture was when the hands are moved in a circular motion while a point is being made. It was also noted that a speaker's hands moved a lot, with the palm facing the other speakers particularly, when he or she did not agree with a point made in the discussion.

EXAMPLE (Appendix 1)

105. Y : I think maybe somebody who is more younger than him can be

@ < gesturing hands up and down >

106. E : yeah

107. Y : quite a good prime minister

@ < gesturing hands up and down >

108. E : and if we look at him / he has 3 children / how sweet /

50. E : how about / okay / okay / we stop here first /

51. A : okay //

52. E : How about we look at patient 4 ?

53. A : I think he should receive the heart

54. Y : Should he ?

55. E : ah / no / no //

@ <avoiding eye contact >

In the above example, speaker E was in no agreement with speakers Y and A. In the beginning, her sentences were longer. However, in the middle of the discussion, her lines became shorter (to indicate detachment). Later, in line 55, she said “no” twice and avoided eye contact. By not establishing eye contact, speaker A had detached herself from the discussion and the other speakers.

EXAMPLE 2 (Appendix 3)

7. D : okay / for me keeping him =

8. O : = (for) cultural reasons

9. D : yeah / exactly / that's one thing / cultural reasons / might be / we might keep
him or we might not keep him / we might not have any Africans after him

10. M : @<laughs> He must be // old

11. G : @<laughs> He's 29

12. D : I thought about keeping him because we don't have any Africans but his wife is
carrying a baby / so this cuts down / and another reason why don't want to keep
him is because it could be think

13. G : you're keeping the pregnant wife / ah ?

14. M: but obviously

15. D: I think for moral reasons I think we should keep the pregnant wife / because
she's going to have a baby / not one but two people / I think for that reason /
we should keep the wife^{lah}

16. M: why can't the wife / sit /

@<laughs>

17. D: Limited space I think she would understand (if we leave the husband)

EXAMPLE 3 (Appendix 3)

18. D: okay / so / you guys want to keep him or kill him ?

19. G: kill him

20. D: you ?

21. O: keep him ? You ? Keep him

22. M: @<shakes head>

23. N: @<shakes head>

24. D: no / fifty-fifty / so that's three / four against two

4.5 Conclusion

Based on the findings, few conclusions can be made. Firstly, it was found that communicative strategies used by the students helped in the students' effort to convey their ideas, arguments and opinions.

Secondly, the strategies used reflected, to a certain extent, the students' personality – for example, when they tried to dominate the discussion and win the argument. This was

noted from the interviews and total number of words used by each speaker in which the dominant speakers were also the ones who used the most strategies.

Finally, it can also be noted that in the discussions, the most important aspect observed by every student was to maintain harmony. This was reflected in the students' speech whereby uses of communicative strategies and features of duetting, philharmony and code-switching and mixing were evident. In sum, no matter how blunt and angered the students were in conveying their ideas, all the discussions ended on a positive note.