CHAPTER 4

Analysis And Discussion

4.1   Introduction

The purpose of this study is to document the use of Strategic Considerations (SC) and Communication Strategies (CS) during PSD in a rural setting. The data compiled will be analysed and discussed in the order of the research questions posed in Chapter 1 (page 16).

The analysis of RQ1 will take into account the SC used by all 4 teams; team 3A, 3B, 3Y and 3Z, throughout the three debates. However when looking at the implications of using SC, the frequency and function of CS used, as well as its relationship to the outcome of the debates, only CS used by team 3Y and 3Z will be analysed. Team 3Y and 3Z were involved in two debates and the semi structured questionnaire that was administered would serve as a cross reference to these two teams.

4.2   Research Question 1: Which classes of Strategic Considerations (SC) are used by the debate teams during the tournaments?

Analysis of all three debates revealed that every team (team 3A, 3B, 3Y and 3Z) utilised three of the four classes of SC listed by Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975). They are:-

i)   altering the perception of major aspects of analysis (SC1).

ii)   altering the perception of the advocates (SC2).

iii)   gaining emphasis through adaptation to formal procedure (SC3).

The only class of SC that was not utilised was gaining emphasis through adaptation to informal codes of conduct (SC4).

4.2.1   Altering the Perception of Major Aspects of Analysis (SC1).

The core of a debate is the analysis of the case. A team's ability to alter or fortify the perception of the listener with regard to the topic under scrutiny is essential in winning the debate.

All four teams involved in the debates proposed arguments and supporting evidence to counter the arguments put forth by the opposing side. Other than the main arguments, all four teams sought to alter perceptions by rebutting the points brought up by the opposing side while using the opposition's own evidence or logic against them. The use of POIs, or formal interjections, was practised by all four teams. POIs were used to try and convince the listener of an alternative view by posing well-timed 'interrupters' so that the listener would momentarily be distracted from the 'merits' of the arguments or points proposed.

It was noted that in all three debates, the teams that won its respective debates had concluded with a summary highlighting the merits of their case line while taking general swipes at the opposing side's case

line. Interestingly, in all three debates, the teams that won were teams playing the role of the 'Opposition'. Based on the turn-taking order in PSD, the 'Opposition' will always be the second last to speak. It is always the 'Government' bench that has the last say. Perhaps as Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975, p. 186) had stated, in outlining their case line at the end of the debate, the successful teams had altered the view of the listener by means of reordering their arguments so that it would leave a lasting impression in the mind of the listener.

4.2.2   Altering Perception of the Advocate (SC2)

This class of SC deals with the non verbal aspects, the psychological smokescreen to get the crowd on their side. Every debater involved in the three debates studied did utilise non verbal devices such as smiles, eye contact with the crowd and adjudicators, varying their tone of voice when presenting their arguments or offering POIs, and the show of confidence when standing to offer POIs or present arguments. However, the degree of success varied from one debater to the next. The second debater from team 3Z was the most outgoing followed by the first debater from team 3Y. Both these debaters, though partially dependent on their cue cards, made the effort to engage the crowd, to try and convince the listeners that their case was the better one.

Ultimately, team 3Z that projected the most confidence during and between debates, as well as practised the least dependence on cue cards, came out top among the four teams observed. The second debater from team 3Z was declared best speaker of each round of debates, even in the quarterfinal round when the team exited the tournament.

Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975, p. 188) summarised that the willingness of an audience to consider an analysis depends, in large part, upon its view of the stature of the advocate, in this case the debater who presents the analysis.

4.2.3   Emphasis Through Formal Procedure

This class of SC places emphasis on teams maximizing the components of PSD within the limited time given to present their arguments for greater impact. It also focuses on the ability of the team to strategise by playing their individual roles in the team so that arguments and rebuttal overlaps as well as time loss can be avoided. The use of well timed formal interjections, or POIs, is emphasised. The team's strategy marks are dependent on the effective utilisation of the above mentioned components.

When studying the four teams, the researcher noted the following:-

DEBATE	DEBATE 1		DEBATE 2		DEBATE 3	
TEAM	3B	3Y	3A	3Z	3Y	3Z
DEFINITION	√	√	√	√	√	√
STAND	X	X	X	√	X	√
TEAM STRATEGY OUTLINED	√	X	X	√	X	√
INDIVIDUAL ROLES PLAYED	X	√	X	√	√	√
POI (OFFERED AND TAKEN)	√	√	√	√	√	√
SUMMARY	X	√	X	√	X	√
DEBATE OUTCOME	LOST	WON	LOST	WON	LOST	WON

Table 4   Components of PSD and its Usage and Debate Outcome.

Only team 3Z fulfilled the general requirements of PSD. In both rounds, team 3Z provided definition for the debate topic, the team's stand on the issue under scrutiny, outlined the team's strategy; each individual debate team member played his or her role, POIs were offered and accepted, and finally during the reply session, provided a summary of their case.

Team 3Y managed to win its debate against team 3B because team 3Y debaters, in playing their individual roles, were able to highlight their

team strategy and alter the perception of the listeners by ordering and articulating their arguments and counter arguments or rebuttals more systematically than team 3B. However, when team 3Y went up against team 3Z, failure to highlight their stand on the issue, poor team strategy and failure to summarise their case line may have been the deciding factor in awarding the win to team 3Z.

When converting from the old, passive oriented style of debating to PSD, of the four areas that underwent change or that was introduced, three components, that is speech text, which relies heavily on individual roles being played effectively, rebuttals or counter arguments, and POIs ,or formal interjections, fall under this third class of SC – emphasis through formal procedure.

This research has proven that Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975, p. 192) were right in saying that the ability to use all the components of PSD effectively to argue a case is a crucial factor in winning a debate.

4.2.4   Emphasis Through Informal Codes

None of the teams involved in the debates departed from the formal codes of conduct associated with PSD. The debaters in each team focused on their roles, carrying them out to the best of their ability. None of the debaters went contra to order of presenting arguments or resorted to

tactics like singing or putting on costumes to sway the listeners' perception of the case at hand.

Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975, p. 192) had suggested that adopting an informal code to a formal proceeding could sway the audience in their favour. However, according to all four trainers interviewed during the debate, acting out of turn or pulling 'stunts', as one of the trainers put it, would guarantee the team a reprimand from both trainer and adjudicators, as well as penalty in both style and strategy marks.

Based on her observation, the researcher found that all teams involved were very mindful of what their trainers were imparting upon them. That would explain why none of the teams did anything extra ordinarily out of turn.

4.3   Research Question 2: What are the Implications of Using SC in a Debate?

When answering Research Question 1, it was evident that both team 3Y and 3Z used three out of the four classes of Strategic Considerations (SC) listed by Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975). The classes of SC utilised are:-

i)   Altering the Perception of the Analysis (SC1)

ii)   Altering Perception of the Advocate (SC2)

iii)   Emphasis through Formal Procedure (SC3)

In order to summarise the implications of using SC in a debate, an analysis of the SC and its correlation to the outcome of the debate was done. SC1 and SC3 could be observed and tabulated whereas SC2 could only be observed and analysed qualitatively.

The table below (Table 5) provides an overview of SC1 and SC3 used by all four teams throughout the three debates.

	COMPONENTS	DEBATE 1		DEBATE 2		DEBATE 3	
	TEAMS	3B	3Y	3A	3Z	3Y	3Z
SC1	OPPORTUNITIES TO PROMOTE POINTS, COUNTER PERCEPTIONS, AND PRESENT REBUTTALS	3	14	3	11	6	11
	POI (PRODUCTIVE)	-	10	-	5	7	5
	POI (COUNTER PRODUCTIVE)	9	-	8	1	1	7
	COMPONENTS	DEBATE 1		DEBATE 2		DEBATE 3	
SC3	TEAMS	3B	3Y	3A	3Z	3Y	3Z
	DEFINITION	1	1	1	1	1	1
	STAND	0	0	0	1	0	1
	TEAM STRATEGY	1	0	0	1	0	1
	INDIVIDUAL ROLES	2	3	2	3	3	3
	POIs OFFERED	12	14	19	6	15	13
	POIs TAKEN	9	10	8	6	8	12
	SUMMARY	0	1	0	1	0	1
	DEBATE OUTCOME	LOST	WON	LOST	WON	LOST	WON

Table 5   Overview of SC1 and SC3 used by all four debate team

Based on the analysis, the teams that won their respective debates had a higher frequency of SC1 and SC3 components.

4.3.1 Altering Perception of the Analysis (SC1)

Altering the perception of the analysis would entail using every possible opportunity; points, rebuttals and POIs, to get the listener to take their side.

Team 3B used only 3 opportunities whereas team 3Y used 14 opportunities to alter perception. Likewise team 3Z won by using up to 11 opportunities to alter perception in contrast to the 3 opportunities used by team 3A. The third debate revealed that team 3Z had used 11 opportunities to sway the adjudicators versus the 6 opportunities used by team 3Y.

When studying the use of POIs under SC1, if the POI managed to counter the argument put forth, then it is gauged as 'productive'. However, if the opposing side manages to counter argue or expose the POIs function as a 'distracter', then that POI is deemed counter productive.

For example, in Debate 1 (APPENDIX K)

11	G1	victory …(8) **((BELL RINGS))** As we have the qualification
12		in life … job opportunities is very widely open , wildly open we
13		can get a lot of job opportunities as you can see in the paper they
14		only need their PhD, or a degree, or a diploma, or something,
15		just for [qualification] **((HEAVILY READING FROM**
16		**TEXT))**
17	O1	[POI] please.
18	G1	Yes please.

19	O1	So why does…(2) aa(=) there's 16000 unemployed graduates in
20		our country …(2) if you say that academic qualification
21		guarantees us succ- .. aa(=), is prepare for you a good job?
22	G1	Yes it guarantee to find me a job, thank you.

The response given by G1, or the 'Government' bench, in line 22 does not contra the issue raised with regard to the 16,000 unemployed graduates. The POI is deemed productive to O1, or the 'Opposition' bench as it has raised doubts concerning the belief that academic qualification can prepare one for a job, therefore altering the perception set by the 'Government'.

Now, an example of a counter productive POI in Debate 1 (APPENDIX K) would be

297	G1	[POI please]
298	O2	Yes
299	G1	Can an uneducated person solve a ma-the-ma-tic problems?
300	O2	Thank you for your question. Umm actually I'm not meaning
301		like that. They also can they also can. Why not? They also have got
302		knowledge. Yes, I am agree that they are not uneducated,
303		they are uneducated but they know they know how to solve the problem.

This POI is considered counter productive to the 'Government' bench because it did not alter any perception. The 'Opposition' side managed to prove that even without academic qualification, an uneducated individual, using the knowledge around him, can still solve the problem.

The winning teams in Debate 1 and 2 had more productive POIs than counter productive ones. However, in the third debate, the winning team had more counter productive (7) POIs versus productive ones (5).

Closer scrutiny revealed that 5 of the 7 counter productive POIs were used to badger the opposing side into agreeing with them. The other two were counter productive as the opposing side managed to use the argument given against them.

In short, teams that managed to alter perception of the analysis (SC1) , as proposed by Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975), were the more successful ones in each round of debate.

4.3.2 Gaining Emphasis Through Adaptation to Formal Procedure (SC3)

Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975, p. 185), highlighted the importance for adaptation to the constraints and opportunities of a particular communication situation. This means that teams with a better ability to utilise the time allocated to highlight the crux of their case line stood a better chance of clinching the debate.

The analysis of the debates revealed that the teams that used all or most of the components in SC3 went on to win their respective debates. Team 3Z had the upper hand in both its debates because the team utilised all the components that give form to PSD. The team displayed consistency in how they outlined their case, defined it, informed the listener of their stand on the case, displayed team strategy where every member of the team played his or her role effectively, used POIs and concluded each of

their debates with a summary that hammered their case line into the mind of the listener.

Every debater is required to give at least two POIs and respond to two POIs offered by the opposing side. Though many POIs were offered throughout the debate, the most points for strategy were given to debaters for effectively using the POIs to their case's advantage. Accepting too many POIs may indicate to the listener that the debater has nothing much to say and is latching on to what the opposing side is saying to them via POIs to further develop their case. Alternatively, when a debater accepts too many POIs, it may eat into the limited time that the speaker has to deliver his or her own points. The only debater who went over the time limit was the third speaker of team 3Y, who spoke for 9 minutes and 10 seconds and took 9 POIs.

All 6 debaters from team 3Y and 3Z, with the exception of that one incident, hardly utilised the whole 8 minutes given to them to argue their case. When speaking to their trainers, it was revealed that the arguments were short as the debaters themselves lacked the content knowledge to elaborate further on the points put forth. Even when given the ideas by trainers, the debaters found it difficult to expand on the points due to language problems.

The following sections (4.3.2.1 and 4.3.2.2) seek to establish qualitatively the ability of Team 3Y and Team 3Z to utilise all the components that give form to PSD.

4.3.2.1   Team 3Y

The trainer of team 3Y lamented that helping not one but two of her debaters write their text and edit them line by line really took a toll on her. Apart from English, she had to use Bahasa Malaysia and even Tamil, at times, to help them structure their arguments. So when it came to getting them to use the various components of SC3, failure to use them was overlooked.

The feedback from the trainer of team 3Y echoed what her trainees had stated in their semi structured questionnaires.

The table below is the analysis of Part 4 of the semi structured questionnaire (APPENDIX N) given to team 3Y. The order of the debaters was the same as during the debates. This was done to facilitate analysis. The responses included are those of the respondents.

	QUESTIONS	DEBATER 1	DEBATER 2	DEBATER 3	RESERVE
1	How long have you been involved in PSD? (years)	2	1	1	1
2	Language(s) you use with your teacher/trainer when preparing for debates.	English Bahasa Malaysia Tamil	Bahasa Malaysia English Tamil	Bahasa Malaysia English Tamil	Bahasa Malaysia English Tamil
3	Language(s) you use with your team mates when preparing for debates	Bahasa Malaysia Tamil English	Bahasa Malaysia Tamil English	Bahasa Malaysia Tamil English	Bahasa Malaysia Tamil English

4	Do you prepare your own text? If no, who helps?	No. Teacher helps	No. My teacher and friends help	No. My teacher helps	No. My teacher helps
5	Do you memorise your text? Yes/No, why?	No. Can use cards.	No. Scared might forget	No. Cannot memorise. Not good.	No. Practise reading from paper.
6	Do you prepare your rebuttals and POIs? Yes/No, why?	Yes. We have to prepare for both sides so we can use points for rebuttal or POIs.	No. My friend will prepare. I will say if she ask me to.	Yes. We try and think of what is negative to our points.	No. My friends *lebih pandai.* (are smarter)
7	Who decides your role during the debate?	Teacher	Teacher	Teacher	Teacher
8	Do you practise your speech in front of your teacher? Yes/No, why?	Yes. To make sure she can understand my point and correct my language.	Yes. So my teacher can check my English	Yes. The teacher will make sure I say my points correctly.	No. I just practised with my friends. My teacher can *menumpukan perhatian* (focus) on my friends.
9	Do you like offering POIs? Yes/No, why?	Yes. I can attack their case.	No. I cannot talk fast because I think very slow.	No. I don't like	Never tried. But I like to see my friends giving POI.
10	Do you like receiving POIs? Yes/No, why?	Yes. I can prove that our case is better	No. I cannot understand because they talk very fast.	No. I am afraid I will not be able to answer correctly.	Yes. It challenge me to think fast

11	How would you describe yourself as a debater?	OK. I know I can debate because I have the confidence	I need more experience. I think I can be better if my English more better	Not good.	I think I can but I don't know yet. I answer next time.
12	If you could improve yourself as a debater, what would you like to improve?	My English	How I speak English	I want to be braver and speak better English	My English

Table 6   Semi Structured Questionnaire Responses of Team 3Y

All four debaters from team 3Y revealed a dependence on their trainer to help them with their debate preparations. Only the first debater revealed a little independence. This could be due to the fact that she has 2 years of experience debating compared to her team mates who have one year each. When it came to rebuttals and offering POIs, the first debater was the most active member of the team during both debates 1 and debates 3. She admitted that she liked giving and receiving POIs as it was a way to 'attack' their case and also a way to prove that their case was better.

According to their trainer, they really worked on the debate only 3 days before the tournament. That could be the reason why the second and third debaters of team 3Y were dependent on their cue cards; to the extent of reading heavily from them.

4.3.2.2   Team 3Z

The trainer of team 3Z stated that she did not face many problems as her trainees had 2 years worth of debating experience each. The two main problems that she felt they faced were content knowledge and the language barrier.

The table below is the analysis of Part 4 of the semi structured questionnaire (APPENDIX N) given to team 3Z. The order of the debaters was the same as during the debates. This was done to facilitate analysis. The responses included are those of the respondents.

	QUESTIONS	DEBATER 1	DEBATER 2	DEBATER 3	RESERVE
1	How long have you been involved in PSD? (years)	2	2	2	1
2	Language(s) you use with your teacher/trainer when preparing for debates.	Bahasa Malaysia English	Bahasa Malaysia English	Bahasa Malaysia English	Bahasa Malaysia English
3	Language(s) you use with your team mates when preparing for debates	Bahasa Malaysia English	Bahasa Malaysia English	Bahasa Malaysia English	Bahasa Malaysia English
4	Do you prepare your own text? If no, who helps?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Do you memorise your text? Yes/No, why?	No. I use cards or short notes.	No. I use cards. Dangerous to memorise	No. I write short notes on cards	No. We use cards and short notes

6	Do you prepare your rebuttals and POIs? Yes/No, why?	Yes. We discuss as a team what the opposition will say	Yes. We must or else we will lost	Yes. Since we have to prepare the Govt and Oppo points, we will prepare the rebuttal at the same time.	Yes. To make the case stronger. We *cuba jangka* (predict) the questions our enemy will ask.
7	Who decides your role during the debate?	Teacher	Teacher	Teacher	Teacher
8	Do you practise your speech in front of your teacher? Yes/No, why?	Yes. I want to make sure what I say is right.	Yes. My teacher will tell me if my idea is correct or not.	Yes. The teacher will help me with my grammar and pronunciation. She will also check if my facts are correct.	Yes. To make sure my English is OK.
9	Do you like offering POIs? Yes/No, why?	Yes. I can attack their case.	No. I cannot talk fast because I think very slow.	No. I don't like	Never tried. But I like to see my friends giving POI.
10	Do you like receiving POIs? Yes/No, why?	Yes. Because it shows that our case is better.	Yes. I want to show the judges that side is talking with no proof. Our case is better.	Yes. It will show the judges that our facts are better.	Yes. It will help make our case stronger.

11	How would you describe yourself as a debater?	OK. I am more brave this year	I think I am OK. I got Best Speaker 3 times ☺	I feel confident enough to speak in public. I think I am OK.	I know I will be OK because I am also the *wakil* (represent-tative) for the Public Speakig competition.
12	If you could improve yourself as a debater, what would you like to improve?	My English grammer and vocabulary	My English. My speaking is not high standard	My language	My English

Table 7   Semi Structured Questionnaire Responses of Team 3Z

Unlike team 3Y, the analysis revealed that the structuring of arguments, rebuttals and POIs was done in a collaborative manner between trainer and trainees of Team 3Z. All the debaters did admit seeking the trainer's help when it came to checking their language. However, the experience the debaters had with PSD, compounded with the collaborative working style, ensured the use of all components of SC1 and SC3.

When asked about the Team 3Z's exit in the semi final round, the trainer admitted that the opposing team, which was later declared tournament champion, had the upper hand when it came to content knowledge and delivery. Her challenge was getting her trainees to use as much English as possible in an environment where everyone speaks

Bahasa Malaysia and Javanese. However she is happy with their progress over the past two years and hopes that they will re-enrol in her school to do their Form 6 so that they can have another go at debating under her guidance.

4.3.3   Altering Perception of the Advocate (SC2)

When studying the feedback in the semi structured questionnaire (Part 4, 11 & 12), the researcher discovered that the debaters were who they said they were during the actual debates.

When asked how they would describe themselves as debaters, the first debater of team 3Y projected confidence in her response and that was the case during both debates. She engaged the crowd with eye contact and smiles. Her posture and manner of presentation showed that she had conviction in her speech. The second debater who was rather timid in comparison to her two other team mates admitted to needing more experience and felt that a better ability to use English would boost her confidence. The third speaker, who rarely made eye contact with the adjudicators, barely smiled because of her own perception that she was not a good debater. She felt that she needed to be braver and have a better command of English.

Team 3Z on the other hand had a positive perception of itself. While admitting that they needed to improve their command of the

English Language, they felt that they were 'OK' as debaters. The first speaker said that she was braver this year while the third debater stated that she felt that she did fine as she was confident enough to speak in public. The second speaker felt that being awarded best speaker three times had vindicated him as a debater.

Ziegelmueller & Dause (1975, p. 152), stated that it is crucial for the advocates, in this case the debater, to persuade the audience to look at the motion from their point of view. This would mean activating the audience to participate. The only way the crowd is going to be swayed is if the advocate, in this case, the debater, is deemed affable and sincere. Overall Team 3Z presented more confidence in their presentation, both verbal and non-verbal, than the debaters of Team 3Y and that proved to be an advantage.

4.3.4   Implications of Using SC in a Debate.

The analysis of the debates revealed that the effective use of SC brought about victory for the teams involved. Team 3Z utilised all the components of SC1 and SC3. The show of confidence played a major role in emphasising the SC3 of the team. The combination brought victory in both rounds of debates under study. Team 3Y, which utilised 24 opportunities of SC1 and at least 5 of the 7 components of SC3, was able to win the debate against team 3B that only utilised 3 opportunities of SC1

and 5 of the 7 components of SC3. SC1 proved to be the advantage for team 3Y because both teams were almost matched in terms of projecting confidence.

Since there are four classes of SC, there are four implications concerning the use of SC in PSD. The first implication from this analysis is the more opportunities utilised to alter perception (SC1), the higher the chances of winning. Teams, or debaters, cannot assume that once they have laid out their case line, they will win the debate solely on the one time fact presentation. They have to continuously harp on the merit of their case and thwart any attempts by the opposing side to weaken their case.

Debaters have to be well read individuals. When they understand what is happening in the world around them, they will be able to see alternative sides to various issues. This will help them to build better cases as well as construct strong rebuttals and quality POIs.

They will have to utilise rebuttals and POIs effectively to fend off any attempts to counter their arguments. They will also need to use the rebuttals and POIs to punch holes in the case of the opposing side so the listener will be able to see the strength in their case line.

The second implication is emphasis through formal procedure (SC3) is vital to winning in PSD. The ability of a team to utilise all the components of PSD effectively within the limited time given is pivotal in convincing the listener that the team is capable of addressing and

defending an issue within the confines of a stipulated protocol. Debaters should be aware of their roles as individuals and as a team so that none of the components of PSD are ignored during the heat of the debate.

The third implication is the ability to alter the perception of the advocate (SC2) may be a tie breaker in winning a debate. If there are two teams that are equal in terms of altering perceptions while adhering to all the criteria of PSD, the winning team would be the one that was able to reach out and engage the audience. Merely reciting facts or mechanically interjecting at all the right opportunities will not guarantee a win because debating is all about swaying the masses in their favour (Nisbett, 2003, p. 3). Debaters have to believe in their case line before they can try and convince an adjudicator of that fact. When they believe in their case, these debaters will be more confident when presenting it to the listener.

The fourth implication is emphasis through informal code (SC4) will not be tolerated in a formal debate setting in the Malaysian school system. The belief is if debaters adopt an informal attitude in their presentation, they may lose marks for strategy and style. Adopting an informal code of conduct, such as dressing in costume, would be viewed as trivialising the formality of the debate rather than providing an alternative perspective to the listener, as done by the defence team of the "Chicago Seven", in the Conspiracy Trail of the Chicago Seven in 1968, when trying to dramatise that the 'Chicago Seven" were being falsely

accused due to the difference between their lifestyle and that of the establishment (Ziegelmueller & Dause ,1975, p. 187).

Holistically, this researcher has summarised that in order to win a debate in this setting, debaters must confidently engage in a continuous effort to alter the perception of the listener using the protocols stipulated within the time frame given while maintaining the formal dignity of the proceedings.

4.4   Research Question 3: What is the Frequency and Function of Each Type of CS used during the debates?

Winning a debate depends largely on how well the argument is articulated. The language requirement for PSD in Malaysia is Standard English. Standard English in this context would mean the model of Malaysian English (ME) that is acceptable for formal model and official purposes. Baskaran (2005, p. 17-18) describes the formal as an acrolect variant that tends to be more of the Standard British English although some local influences, especially at the lexical and phonological level, are tolerated. This is the variant aimed at the pedagogical domain as the prescriptive norm in language instruction (Baskaran, 2005, p. 19).

When the language of the debaters was analysed to study communication strategies used during the debates, the researcher was tolerant of words spoken with different degrees of ethnic accent,

intonation and stress patterns (Pillai and Kamruddin, 2005, p. 40) as well as the inclusion of deeply ingrained lexical items like 'mamak' and 'cendol' that makes ME so recognisably Malaysian (Baskaran, 2005, p. 18).

4.4.1   Language of Choice

Based on the feedback obtained from Part 1 and Part 2 of the questionnaire, overall the respondents listed English as the third language they were proficient in.

When it came to communicating with members of their family, all 5 Malay respondents, who are of Javanese descent, listed Javanese as their primary language. English, if ever used in the family circle, would be the third choice amongst siblings or cousins, indicating the younger set. Among the 3 Indian respondents, Tamil was the primary language within the family with English taking third place.

75% of the respondents listed Bahasa Malaysia as the primary language of choice among peers whereas 25%, or the other two, listed Tamil as their choice. English, ranked third among all the respondents from both team 3Y and 3Z.

When communicating with teachers, all 8 respondents listed Bahasa Malaysia as the primary language, followed by English. Team 3Y, which is made up of 3 Indian debaters, listed Tamil as its third choice.

When it came to communicating with members of the community, the choice of Bahasa Malaysia as the primary language was reflected in all the 8 questionnaires. Among the Indian respondents, English was listed as their third choice after Tamil, whereas all the Malay respondents listed English as their second language option.

The tables below are the analysis of language choice amongst respondents of team 3Y and 3Z.

	PART 1	DEBATER 1	DEBATER 2	DEBATER 3	DEBATER 4
	Gender	F	F	F	F
	Ethnicity	I	I	I	M
	Age/Form	17/5	17/5	17/5	17/5
	PMR Grade	A	A	A	A
	Part 2				
1	Language(s) Proficient In	BM Tamil English	BM Tamil Telegu English	BM Tamil English	Java BM English
2	Language(s) used at home				
a)	Parents	Tamil BM English	Tamil Telugu BM English	Tamil BM English	Java BM
b)	Siblings/Cousins	Tamil BM English	Tamil Telugu BM English	Tamil BM English	Java BM
c)	Aunt/Uncles	Tamil BM English	Telegu Tamil BM English	Tamil BM English	Java BM

d)	Grandparents	Tamil	Telegu Tamil BM	Tamil	Java
3	Language(s) used in school /community				
a)	Schoolmates	BM Tamil English	Tamil BM English	Tamil BM English	BM Java English
b)	Teachers	BM English Tamil	BM English Tamil	BM English Tamil	BM English
c)	General Community	BM Tamil English	BM Tamil English	BM Tamil English	BM English

* BM – Bahasa Malaysia

Table 8   The Language Choice of Debaters from Team 3Y

	PART 1	DEBATER 1	DEBATER 2	DEBATER 3	DEBATER 4
	Gender	F	M	F	M
	Ethnicity	M	M	M	M
	Age/Form	17/5	17/5	17/5	17/5
	PMR Grade	A	A	A	A
	Part 2				
1	Language(s) Proficient In	Java BM English	Java BM English	Java BM English	Java BM English
2	Language(s) used at home				
a)	Parents	Java BM	Java BM	Java BM	Java BM
b)	Siblings/Cousins	Java BM English	Java BM English	Java BM English	Java BM English
c)	Aunt/Uncles	Java BM	Java BM	Java BM	Java BM

d)	Grandparents	Java	Java	Java	Java
3	Language(s) used in school /community				
a)	Schoolmates	BM Java English	BM Java English	BM Java English	BM Java English
b)	Teachers	BM English	BM English	BM English	BM English
c)	General Community	BM English	BM English	BM English	BM English

* BM – Bahasa Malaysia

Table 9   The Language Choice of Debaters from Team 3Z

Based on all the feedback with regards to language choice, it can be summarised that in this particular rural setting, the English Language is the third language for the respondents from team 3Y and 3Z.

Interesting to note that despite listing English as their third language of choice or use, all 8 respondents obtained Grade 'A' for their *Penilaian Menengah Rendah*, a major public examination. This result can be used as a yardstick to state that all respondents are of the same level of proficiency with regard to the English Language.

4.4.2   Communication Strategy (CS) Awareness (CS$_A$)

Part 3 of the questionnaire was used by the researcher to identify the level of CS awareness (CS$_A$) and use among debaters.

The researcher adapted and adopted features of Rebecca Oxford's *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (SILL), formulated in 1990 (Brown, 1994, p. 203-205). The researcher adopted the scale to measure the truthfulness of the respondents' statements.

All 16 declarative statements made are in tandem with the 16 subgroups listed in the Taxonomy for Communication Strategies (APPENDIX H) compiled for this research.

1a	If I cannot continue a sentence because I do not know the word in English, I start another sentence using different English words.	Word Avoidance
1b	I do not talk if I don't understand what the other person is talking about in English.	Topic/Message Avoidance
2	I use words from my own language if I cannot remember the English words.	Code Switching
3	If I can't think of the English word, I describe the word.	Circumlocution
4	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word that means the same thing.	Approximation
5.	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	Word coinage
6.	I translate word-for-word from my own language to English	Literal Translation
7	I say parts of a word until I can say the whole word	Retrieval
8	I start conversations in English.	Initiate Topic
9	I repeat what I said earlier to help me build my sentences.	Repetition of Self
10	I repeat what others say to help me build my sentences.	Repetition of Others
11	I stop to think of a word or how to say something in the middle of a conversation.	Use of fillers/pauses
12	If I say something wrongly, I correct it immediately	Self Initiated Repair/ Reconstruct/ Restructure
13	I ask English speakers if they understood what I had just said	Comprehension Check
14	I ask for help from English speakers	Direct Appeal For Help
15	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	Mime/Gesture (Non- linguistic Appeal For Assistance)

Table 10   Taxonomy for Communication Strategies

The following statements found in the table were taken directly from Oxford's SILL (1990):-

a)   No. 6 $\longrightarrow$ Part C No. 27

b)   No. 9 $\longrightarrow$ Part B No. 14

c)   No. 15 $\longrightarrow$ Part F No. 48

d)   No. 16 $\longrightarrow$ Part C No. 27

The remaining 12 statements were structured based on the patterns found in Oxford's SILL (1990).

Each respondent was instructed to select the statement that best describes them in each instance. The rationale behind this inclusion is for the researcher to triangulate what CS they admit to utilising and the actual utilisation of CS during the debates.

The following tables are the analysis of CS used among the active debaters of Team 3Y and 3Z using the scale from Oxford's SILL (1990).

1.   Never or almost never true of me
2.   Usually not true of me
3.   Somewhat true of me
4.   Usually true of me
5.   Always or almost always true of me

	STRATEGY / DEBATERS	3Y 1	3Y 2	3Y 3		3Z 1	3Z 2	3Z 3
1a	If I cannot continue a sentence because I do not know the word in English, I start another sentence using different English words.	5	2	2		4	5	5
1b	I do not talk if I don't understand what the other person is talking about in English.	2	5	5		3	2	3
2	I use words from my own language if I cannot remember the English words.	5	5	5		5	5	5

3	If I can't think of the English word, I describe the word.	5	5	5		5	5	4
4	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word that means the same thing.	5	5	5		5	5	5
5.	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	1	1	1		1	1	1
6.	I translate word-for-word from my own language to English	2	4	3		3	4	3
7	I say parts of a word until I can say the whole word	4	4	4		4	5	4
8	I start conversations in English.	2	2	2		2	3	2
9	I repeat what I said earlier to help me build my sentences.	3	5	4		4	4	4
10	I repeat what others say to help me build my sentences.	4	5	5		5	4	4
11	I stop to think of a word or how to say something in the middle of a conversation.	5	5	5		5	5	5
12	If I say something wrongly, I correct it immediately	3	3	3		2	2	3
13	I ask English speakers if they understood what I had just said	2	3	3		4	3	3
14	I ask for help from English speakers	4	5	5		5	5	5
15	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	5	5	5		5	5	5

Table 11   Analysis of CS Awareness (CS_A) Amongst Team 3Y and

3Z

The information compiled in the table will be used to discuss the

use of CS in the actual debates.

4.4.3   Frequency of CS Used (CS_U)

The analysis of CS used (CS_U) during the debate was only done on

teams 3Y and 3Z. Both teams went through two rounds of debates each.

So the researcher would be able to study if the CS usage among the debaters was according to a pattern or a one off occurrence.

The data is classified according to the sixteen subgroups listed in the Taxonomy of CS (Appendix H). A frequency count of each subgroup used by debaters from team 3Y (Debate 3B vs 3Y) and 3Z (Debate 3A vs 3Z) during the first round of debates was done and tabulated in the following table:-

STRATEGY SUB GROUP	3Y1	3Y2	3Y3	TOTAL	3Z1	3Z2	3Z3	TOTAL
1a	1	2	-	3	1	-	-	1
1b	1	-	-	1	1	3	3	7
2	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
3	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	2
4	9	2	3	14	8	9	3	20
5	-	1	-	1	0	-	-	0
6	5	3	5	13	1	5	-	6
7	1	-	1	2	2	2	-	4
8	1	3	1	5	-	7	-	7
9	7	13	3	23	6	4	11	21
10	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
11	17	37	11	55	16	9	15	40
12	13	6	5	24	6	7	8	21
13	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	1
14	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
15	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	4
TOTAL	57	69	32	158	43	48	43	134

Table 12   Frequency of CS used (CS_U) by Team 3Y and 3Z during the first round of debates.

STRATEGY SUB GROUP	3Y1	3Y2	3Y3	TOTAL	3Z1	3Z2	3Z3	TOTAL
1a	1	-	3	4	2	-	-	2
1b	1	-	1	2	1	1	3	5
2	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0

3	2	-	2	**4**	2	3	-	**5**
4	16	4	10	**30**	6	13	3	**22**
5	-	-	-	**0**	-	-	-	**0**
6	6	1	4	**11**	-	9	5	**14**
7	9	-	2	**11**	4	-	-	**4**
8	5	11	3	**19**	1	9	1	**11**
9	5	4	9	**18**	10	11	4	**25**
10	-	-	-	**0**	-	-	1	**1**
11	22	31	22	**75**	27	11	16	**54**
12	18	5	10	**33**	11	5	6	**22**
13	1	3	2	**6**	1	6	1	**8**
14	1	-	-	**1**	1	-	1	**2**
15	1	7	6	**14**	5	6	1	**12**
TOTAL	88	66	74	**228**	71	74	42	**187**

Table 13   Frequency of CS used (CS$_U$) by Team 3Y and 3Z during the second round of debates.

4.4.3.1   Correlation between CS Awareness (CS$_A$) and Actual Use (CS$_U$)

Before going on to study the function of each CS in this debate, this section of the analysis will study the correlation between the stated awareness (CS$_A$) and the actual use of CS (CS$_U$) during the debates.

4.4.3.1.1   Team 3Y

The analysis of the CS used by Team 3Y and 3Z as a whole during the two debates has been ranked according to its frequency in the following table:-

ROUND 1	FREQ	ROUND 2	FREQ
Use of Fillers/Pauses	55	Use of Fillers/Pauses	75
Self Initiated Repair/ Reconstruct/ Restructure	24	Self Initiated Repair/ Reconstruct/ Restructure	33
Repetition of Self	23	Approximation	30
Approximation	14	Initiate Topic	19

Literal Translation	13	Repetition of Self	18
Initiate Topic	5	Mime/Gesture (Non- linguistic Appeal For Assistance)	14
Mime/Gesture (Non- linguistic Appeal For Assistance)	4	Literal Translation	11
Word Avoidance	3	Retrieval	11
Retrieval	2	Comprehension Check	6
Comprehension Check	2	Word Avoidance	4
Topic/Message Avoidance	1	Topic/Message Avoidance	4
Circumlocution	1	Word coinage	2
Word coinage	1	Direct Appeal For Help	1
Direct Appeal For Help	0	Circumlocution	0
Code Switching	0	Code Switching	0
Repetition of Others	0	Repetition of Others	0
TOTAL	**158**	**TOTAL**	**228**

Table 14   Ranking of CS Frequency by Team 3Y

The results from the table indicate that the team utilised fillers or pauses, which falls under Stalling and Time Gaining Strategies, the most, followed by Self Monitoring Strategies. Code switching, which comes under Achievement or Compensatory Strategies, as well as Repetition of Others, which falls under Stalling and Time Gaining Strategies were not used at all.

Repetition of self, approximation or generalisation, literal translation and the use of mime ranked amongst the more used strategies in both rounds. The use of a time gaining strategy, to initiate topic, via POIs or formal interjections, tripled from Round 1 to Round 2.

Word and topic avoidance, circumlocution, word coinage and direct appeal for help were strategies least used.

When CS awareness (CS_A) versus CS use (CS_U) was analysed according to debater, the following results were tabulated.

DEBATE STRATEGY	3Y1			3Y2			3Y3		
	CS_A	CS_U R1	CS_U R2	CS_A	CS_U R1	CS_U R2	CS_A	CS_U R1	CS_U R2
Word Avoidance	5	1	1	2	2	0	2	0	3
Topic/Message Avoidance	2	1	1	5	0	0	5	0	1
Code Switching	5	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0
Circumlocution	5	0	2	5	1	0	5	0	2
Approximation	5	9	16	5	2	4	5	3	10
Word coinage	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Literal Translation	2	5	6	4	3	1	3	5	4
Retrieval	4	1	9	4	0	0	4	1	2
Initiate Topic	2	1	5	2	3	11	2	1	3
Repetition of Self	3	7	5	5	13	4	4	3	9
Repetition of Others	4	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0
Use of Fillers/ pauses	5	17	22	5	37	31	5	11	22
Self Initiated Repair/ Reconstruct/ Restructure	3	13	18	3	6	5	3	5	10
Comprehension Check	2	0	1	3	0	3	3	2	2
Direct Appeal For Help	4	0	1	5	0	0	5	0	0
Mime/Gesture (Non- linguistic Appeal For Assistance)	5	2	1	5	1	7	5	1	6

Table 15   CS Awareness (CS_A) versus CS Use (CS_U) by Team 3Y

Despite stating that they would most likely code switch and repeat after others, all three debaters did not do so. As for stopping to think in the middle of a conversation, all three debaters did as they said they would. In spite of being on the fence with regard to correcting themselves while speaking, all three debaters posted relatively high use of this strategy that it was ranked third on the whole. Word coinage, which was the only

strategy all three debaters said that they would not use, was used once by debater 3Y2 in Round 1.

4.4.3.1.2 Team 3Z

The analysis of the CS used (CS$_U$) by team 3Z as a whole during the two debates has been ranked according to its frequency in the following table:-

ROUND 1	FREQ	ROUND 2	FREQ
Use of Fillers/Pauses	40	Use of Fillers/Pauses	54
Self Initiated Repair/ Reconstruct/ Restructure	21	Repetition of Self	25
Repetition of Self	21	Self Initiated Repair/ Reconstruct/ Restructure	22
Approximation	20	Approximation	22
Topic/Message Avoidance	7	Literal Translation	14
Initiate Topic	7	Mime/Gesture (Non- linguistic Appeal For Assistance)	12
Literal Translation	6	Initiate Topic	11
Retrieval	4	Comprehension Check	8
Mime/Gesture (Non- linguistic Appeal For Assistance)	4	Topic/Message Avoidance	5
Circumlocution	2	Circumlocution	5
Word Avoidance	1	Retrieval	4
Comprehension Check	1	Word Avoidance	2
Word coinage	0	Direct Appeal For Help	2
Code Switching	0	Repetition of Others	1
Repetition of Others	0	Word coinage	0
Direct Appeal For Help	0	Code Switching	0
TOTAL	**134**	**TOTAL**	**187**

Table 16   Ranking of CS Frequency by Team 3Z

Team 3Z also utilised pauses and fillers the most under the Stalling and Time Gaining Strategies. This was followed by Self Monitoring

Strategies and repetition of self, which also falls under Stalling and Time Gaining Strategies. Approximation or generalisation, which falls under the Achievement or Compensatory Strategies Group, came in fourth in both rounds.

In round one, team 3Z did not utilise code switching, word coinage, repetition of others or direct appeal for assistance. However, in round two, only code switching and word coinage were not utilised at all.

Strategies like topic avoidance, initiating topic and literal translation were utilised more compared to strategies like comprehension checks, word avoidance, word coinage, circumlocution, retrieval and miming in Round 1. However in Round 2, strategies like literal translation, miming, topic avoidance and circumlocution were used more compared to retrieval, word avoidance, direct appeal for assistance and repetition of others.

When the CS awareness (CS_A) versus CS use (CS_U) was analysed according to debater, the following results were tabulated.

DEBATER / STRATEGY	3Z1			3Z2			3Z3		
	CS_A	CS_U R1	CS_U R2	CS_A	CS_U R1	CS_U R2	CS_A	CS_U R1	CS_U R2
Word Avoidance	**4**	1	2	**5**	0	0	**5**	0	0
Topic/Message Avoidance	**3**	1	1	**2**	3	1	**3**	3	3
Code Switching	**5**	0	0	**5**	0	0	**5**	0	0
Circumlocution	**5**	1	2	**5**	0	3	**4**	1	0
Approximation	**5**	8	6	**5**	9	13	**5**	3	3
Word coinage	**1**	0	0	**1**	0	0	**1**	0	0
Literal Translation	**3**	1	0	**4**	5	9	**3**	0	5
Retrieval	**4**	2	4	**5**	2	0	**4**	0	0

Initiate Topic	**2**	0	1	**3**	7	9	**2**	0	1
Repetition of Self	**4**	6	10	**4**	4	11	**4**	11	4
Repetition of Others	**5**	0	0	**4**	0	0	**4**	0	1
Use of Fillers/ pauses	**5**	16	27	**5**	9	11	**5**	15	16
Self Initiated Repair/ Reconstruct/ Restructure	**2**	6	11	**2**	7	5	**3**	8	6
Comprehension Check	**4**	0	1	**3**	1	6	**3**	0	1
Direct Appeal For Help	**5**	0	1	**5**	0	0	**5**	0	1
Mime/Gesture (Non- linguistic Appeal For Assistance)	**5**	1	5	**5**	1	6	**5**	2	1

Table 17   CS Awareness (CS$_A$) versus CS Use (CS$_U$) by Team 3Z

Debaters from Team 3Z did not code switch at all even though they stated that they were most likely to. Despite indicating that they would most probably appeal for help, repeat what others say and avoid words they do not know, all three debaters, barely did any of the above.

Every debater from team 3Z stated that they would stop to think of a word or phrase in the middle of their statement. During the debates, all three debaters made a total of 94 pauses which may have helped them to structure better arguments. Moreover, all three debaters stopped to correct themselves or restructure their arguments during the debates even though they stated that they would most likely not do so.

4.4.4   Function of Each Type of CS

According to Varadi (1980) when encountering difficulties expressing himself or herself in the target language, the user will resort to certain devices as he or she tries to communicate in the target language (Færch and Kasper ,1983, p. 82).

Both team 3Y and 3Z, which listed English as their third language, used communication strategies a total number of 709 times throughout the debates. Other than bridge the lexical gap, some of the CS were used as time gainers, topic initiators, comprehension checkers and even as teasers.

The functions of each type of CS are accompanied by examples from the debates involving team 3Y and 3Z. Bearing in mind that all the CS were used with the aim to win the debate, the analysis of every CS will be from a debater's perspective.

4.4.4.1   Avoidance Strategies

a)   Word Avoidance (1a)

The following strategy was utilised when the debater could not think of a word on the spot. So instead of wasting time, the debater would restructure the statement with another word or phrase and carry on (Færch and Kasper, 1983).

278 O2	connection. What good all those paper qualifications if you don't	
279	know how to <u>murr–</u> how to connect yourself and stand able? In	1a

b) **Topic Avoidance (1b)**

When a debater does not know what to say on the topic, he or she

will start a new topic (Færch and Kasper, 1983).

Example 1 Debate 3Y vs 3Z

454 G3	Are you saying that the Ministry of Health is coming	
455	everyday to the stalls for to check the food qualities? Does	
456	<u>not--</u> …(5) **((READING HEAVILY FROM TEXT))** The	1b,11
457	person who must be <u>conso—what I want to tell is</u> the person	1a,12
458	who must be concerned of our life is us not the the stall	

Because the debater could not elaborate on the issue of inspection,

she reverted to her text and started on a new issue.

A debater may also practise topic avoidance because engaging the

POI may jeopardise the team's case line or use up time allocated to the

team. He or she may do so by blatantly not picking up on the thread of a

statement via rejecting a POI, or informing the opposing side that there

will be no more discussion on the matter.

Example 2 Debate 3Y vs 3Z

424 O2	I'm not satisfied with your opinions that it is more clean in	
425	your house. Can't we see today that the Ministry of Health is	
426	always some inspection from day to day, to make sure the	
427	restaurant is always clean. Give your opinion about this.	
428 G3	**((HOSTILE TONE))** <u>I think you have come up with this</u>	15
429	<u> same question, so please.</u> **((STARTS READING**	1b
430	**HEAVILY FROM TEXT))**	

4.4.4.2   Achievement or Compensatory Strategies

a)   **Code Switching (2)**

Code switching takes place when the speaker uses a L1 word and its pronunciation in the target language conversation (Tarone,1981). Both team 3Y and 3Z used terms like *'mamak', 'cendol'* and *'kas kas',* that are currently accepted as part of ME. The only instance when code switching took place was when the third debater of team 3B uttered the following statement.

     Example   Debate 3B vs 3Y

494 G3	you can answer me? Do you or will you go for a better job or	
495	will you just **<L2jualL2> <L2** cendol**L2>** and be happy with	2
496	your 500 with your, like one of your speakers said just now? I	

The word *'jual"* is Bahasa Malaysia for sell.

b)   **Circumlocution (3)**

A debater would utilise circumlocution to bridge a lexical gap (Tarone et al, 1976) in a statement or argument.

     Example   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

514 03	family. Secondly she said she, the second speaker said, if we	
515	home, the home cooking will be good but if you eat at home	
516	every day <u>mmm</u> every single day, of course you'd be bored	11
517	every single day you eat at home mmm <u>the thing your</u>	11
518	<u>mother cook</u>. Don't you feel you'll be bored. You eat <u>aa(=)</u>	3,11

After pausing momentarily, perhaps hoping for the term 'home cooked food' to pop into her mind, this debater just filled in the gap by

saying 'the thing your mother cook' which also implies a home cooked meal.

c)   Approximation (4)

Approximation, or generalisation, happens when an alternative term is used to describe an item which shares characteristics with the target item (Tarone et al ,1976).

Example   Debate 3Bvs 3Y

88 O1 89	life your…(2) your life is success. Success in <u>academy</u> cannot be equal to success in life. Life is more than <u>academy</u>. The The	11, 4 4, 9

In this scenario, the debater is using the term '*academy*' to convey the meaning of 'academics'. Throughout her monologue, she interchanges 'academics' with 'academy', 'academic' and 'academically'. Since all term have a relationship to education, the debater assumes the listener will be able to deduce the implied meaning.

d)   Word Coinage (5)

One instance of word coinage (Tarone et al, 1976) took place.

Example   Debate 3B vs 3Y

260 O2 261 262 263 264	minister from the opposition to raise my first point. My first point is a academic success is only a <u>ca-to-pa-ni-tist</u>. Today if you read a biography a lot of successful <u>person people</u> you will realize that a lot of successful people were not successful academically. Lim Goh Tong is Genting Highland boss. He's not	 5 9

The researcher is still perplexed by the intended meaning of the term 'ca-to-pa-ni-tist.' The debater makes no mention of the term after that. The elaboration of the point is on individuals who succeeded in life without a degree. So the researcher is left guessing what the actual word may have been.

e)   **Literal Translation (6)**

The examples of literal translation (Tarone, 1981) that were found during analysis came in the form of phrases, Wh-Imperatives/Can or Not?, Tags, Yes – No Interrogatives and reduplication.

Example 1   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

| 412 G3 | I'm not saying like that. I'm saying that err the tools in our | 6, 11 |

"I'm not saying like that" is direct translation of *"Saya bukan (tak) kata (cakap) macam itu."*

Example 2   Debate 3A vs 3Z

| 322 O2 | personality is is also a key to get a successful future. That's mean | 11 |
| 323 | you support us. Is it right not? | 6 |

Instead of saying 'Is it true?', 'right not' is directly translated from *'betul tak?'* According to Baskaran (2005, p. 149), these ME tags are of the basilect variantion, the least formal of the ME variants.

Example 3 Debate 3Y vs 3Z

304 O2	choose **<L2**mamak**L2>** restaurant to fill their leisure time.	
305	Do you think that when they go to the restaurant, they just	
306	talking talking no point? But in my view, when they go to	6

Example 3 is reduplication. '*talking talking*'is direct translation of '*cakap-cakap*' or '*sembang-sembang*' meaning to have a conversation or chit chat. This form of reduplication is found in Bahasa Malaysia where a single root word is repeated to form a new word (Baskaran, 2005(b), p. 70)

f)   Retrieval (7)

Another strategy to overcome a lexical gap involves debaters saying parts of the word until they are able to form the whole word.

Example 1   Debate 3A vs 3Z

223 O2	scholarship to ter- ter-ti(=)err-ry(=) institutions and the	7

Example 2   Debate 3B vs 3Y

469 O3	information, academic is only four, four, forty percents of our	7

4.4.4.3   Stalling or Time Gaining Strategies

a)   Initiate Topic (8)

This strategy has been the second most used strategy in the 2 rounds of debates. Debaters used this time gaining strategy (Dörnyei, 1995) to steal precious moments away from the opposing side. When a debater offers a POI, or formal interjection, and it is accepted, the giver of

the POI will have to initiate the topic for contemplation and response. It is also a strategy to divert the attention of the listener from the original thread of thought.

Example 1   Debate 3A vs 3Z

24		those who want to further their education? Take the 9th	
25		Malaysia Plan for instance. The government has allocated	
26		millions of ringgit to spend on our country's education. This	
27		proves that education is important as it wants to enhance our	
28		country's development as a global hub.	
29	O2	Point Of Information, please.	8
30	G1	**((NODS))**	
31	O2	Let me reinforce that education is supporting for those who	
32		enter the higher level institutions but in my opinion <u>aa(=)</u> we	11
33		can sees that there are <u>peoples</u> who get straight As in SPM	4
34		examination but they still cannot enter the university. Can	
35		you give us your opinion on this?	
36	G1	I think you're very mislead. Please revise your text back	
37		because that's not my point. **((CHECKS TEXT))** To be	

By using the POI, the opposing debater has not only forced the proposing debater to lose precious time responding, but also to digress from the main line of argumentation.

b)   **Repetition of Self (9)**

According to Tannen (1989), word repetition is the 'central meaning-making strategy, a limitless resource for individual creativity'. Celce M et al (1995) states that repetition is used to sustain continuity of a conversation in the face of communication difficulty by playing for time to think while searching for the intended meaning (Sawir, 2004, p. 2)

During the debates, most debaters repeated what they said for the following reasons:-

i)   To emphasise a point

Example   Debate 3A vs 3Z

421 O3	again, the second speaker made a major mistake. She said	
422	that academic guarantees <u>aa(=)</u> academic guarantees, I repeat	
423	guarantees you, a successful future. But we also said that	
424	there is still unemployed graduates out there. That shows that	

ii)   To gain time to think of what to say next or to stall.

Example   Debate 3A vs 3 Z

350 O3	qualifications, they will look at your skills, at your personality,	
351	<u>how did you --how did you</u> introduce yourself?	9

According to Perrin et al (2003), this type of repetition is called 'taking into account', which serves two functions; as a back channel and as a preparation for an answer (Sawir, 2004, p. 9).

iii)   To comeback to the argument when interrupted with formal interjections.

Example   Debate 3A vs 3Z

389 O3	Denied. Although there's a thousand academic institution, to	
390	get in there, you still need determination. You cannot just	
391	have academic qualification.	
392 G1	POI please	
393 O3	Denied maam. Skills and the right personality to support	
394	**((WAVES AT G2 TO SIT DOWN – REJECTING A**	15
395	**POI))** to support you. You need the will, you need	
396	personality you [need]	
397 G2	[POI] please	
398 O3	Denied maam. You need determination, the right skills, the	
399	right personality to support <u>you [to]</u>	1b

The speaker was interrupted three times so she kept repeating the points till she felt she had said what she wanted to say before moving on to the next part of her argument.

iv)   To help restructure a statement.

A debater may sound out a word or phrase before restructuring the phrase or statement.

Example   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

463 G3	that so they will not—they will avoid aa(=) to use Ajinomoto	9,11

In this example, repetition and resrtructuring takes place simultaneously. According to Sawir (2004, p. 11), repetition is also used as a remedying utterance to ensure correctness.

c)   Repetition of Others (10)

During this debate, there were no instances where one debater had instantaneously repeated what another debater had said. In retrospect, what the opposing side had said was used for emphasis, especially in a rebuttal.

Example   Debate 3A vs 3Z

421 O3	again, the second speaker made a major mistake. She said	
422	that academic guarantees aa(=) academic guarantees, I repeat	11,9
423	guarantees you, a successful future. But we also said that	
424	there is still unemployed graduates out there. That shows that	
425	academic qualification is not a guarantee factor that	
426	contributes to a successful future.	

d)   Use of fillers or pauses (11)

The use of fillers like 'aa', 'ummm', 'OK' 'err' and filled pauses (Dornyei, 1995), proved to be the most popular of CS. The fillers and pauses, some very short whereas others long enough to be timed (e.g. …(X), X= the number of seconds), were used by debaters as stalling

mechanisms to either think of the appropriate thing to say or to skim and

scan the text that they were using before continuing.

Example 1   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

45 G1	large amount of profit . Other than that, they, the restaurant,	
46	er the owner of the restaurant, also use…(2) the er vegetables	11^3
47	or meat that is kept in the er refrigerator for a long period but	11
48	we do not do this because we know -- we do not do this by	12
49	using a lot of – using a lot of meat or veg that is keeped for a	9,4
50	long period in the refrigerator to avoid bacteria infected, to	4
51	effect aa(=) aa(=) that bacteria.	11,11

The debater is using the pauses to think of what to say and how to

say it.

Example 2   Debate 3B vs 3Y

243	government. The government's Prime Minister said that a lot of	
244	job opportunities but why still 60,000 odd err err graduates still	11,11
245	being unemployed [and why--]	
246 G2	[It is because] a lot of[graduates--]	
247 AD	[Shhh] You have to POI first.	
248 G2	Oh sorry sorry.	
249 O2	**((NODS)) ((READING HEAVILY FROM TEXT))…(4)** and	15,11
250	he also said education aa(=) that aa(=) and aa(=)the educated	11^3
251	person err still being err err that they having err a err good err a	11^6
252	good err successful life but I'm just angry with that statement	
253	because …(2) there are 60,000 all an employed err errr graduates	11^3
254	being unemployed. The second, the first Minister for the	

The debater O2, was in the midst of a prepared rebuttal when

interrupted by the opposing side, G2. To find the cue, she utilised the

pause to scan the text before proceeding.

According to Perrin et al (2003), the repeated use of fillers also

serves two functions: as a backchannel and as a preparation for an answer

(as cited in Sawer, 2004, p. 11).

4.4.4.4   Self Monitoring Strategies

a)   Restructure/Reconstruct (12)

Despite being on the fence about using this particular strategy, all debaters involved repeatedly used this strategy to do what they believed, improved, fortified and rectified phrases or statements used for better effect (Celce-Murcia et al, 1995). Self monitoring more often occurred right after a pause or in the process of repetition.

Example 1   Debate 3B vs 3Y

412 O3 413 414 415	weaknesses of the points raised by the Government. Just now the main point mentioned by the Prime Minister is a lot of money came from <u>well education qualification</u>. <u>Well educated qualification.</u> I'm not agree with this statement because the most	 12

The above is an example of monitoring after a turn.

Example 2   Debate 3A vs 3Z

193 O2 194 195	You not given me any evidence such as in Germany a lot don't have job. But can you show me <u>where did you get</u> <u>where you can get</u> the evidence ?	 12

The above is an example of monitoring while speaking.

4.4.4.5   Interactional Strategies

a)   Comprehension checks (13)

Some of the debaters used terms like 'OK' or non verbal devices like nods to do a comprehension check (Celce-Murcia et al, 1995).

Example 1   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

219 G2 220 221 222	your health. And when it <u>why is good and build</u> a, <u>err</u> which can make the knowledge more. Which food, which vegetable. <u>OK</u>? **((LOOKS IN DIRECTION OF O2 FOR CONFIRMATION))**	12,11 13

The above is an example of using 'OK' as a confirmation check.

Example 2   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

181 G2 182 183 184 185 186	Well thank you, <u>OK</u> lets see <u>OK</u> <u>aa(=)</u> when we cook at home our parents <u>aa(=)</u> like <u>aa(=)</u> mostly most of <u>aa(=)</u> are in <u>aa(=)</u> our <u>aa(=)</u> country, that <u>err</u> our mother will cook at home is it? **((LOOKING AT O3 AND O3 NODS))** So the mother would know what is good and bad for <u>for</u> their child their child.	8,8,11 11^3 11^3 15,15 9

The above is an example of non verbal cues being used a

comprehension check. They were used by the debaters to clarify that the

listener understood exactly what was conveyed.

b)   **Appeal for Assistance (14)**

Due to the nature of debates, the only people a debater can appeal

for assistance from would be his or her own team mates.

Example   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

604 O3 605 606 607 608 609 610	go and see it? That is why I'm telling you, the government team, again and again, that there's a variety of choices to choose from. Its all in your hands. **((GOING THROUGH NOTES. CONVERSING WITH TEAMMATES))** <u>OK</u>. Before I sat down back in my place, I would like to reaffirm our motion for today, that is it is also more healthier to eat out than to prepare your own	 14,8

The act of conferring with one's team mate is a no-no in PSD.

Therefore, the fact that the debater conferred to perhaps confirm that

everything that needs to be said has been said is in itself an appeal for help.

c)   Mime or Gestures (15)

When a debater is totally stumped, he or she will use non verbal cues to try and continue 'speaking' (Tarone et al, 1976; Tarone 1981; Færch and Kasper, 1981; Dörnyei, 1995; Celce-Murcia et al, 1995). During the reply round, both speakers in that round ran into problems. Both used non verbal gestures to appeal for help. However, the speaker from team 3Y managed to solve the problem herself, whereas the team mates of the speaker from team 3Z came to her rescue by passing her a note.

Example 1   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

687 G1	I suppose they didn't know <u>err</u> other than McDonalds	
688	restaurant you're talking about, having <u>aa(=)</u> …(8)	11,11
689	**((GESTURING WITH HER HAND, LOOKING FOR A**	
690	**PARTICULAR WORD))** <u>hygiener</u> and cleaner food.	15,4

Example 2   Debate 3Y vs 3Z

637 O1	Having the <u>cont-</u> having the …(2) <u>having the …(2)</u> having	11,9,11
638	the …(6) **((GESTURING, SMILING, TRYING TO**	11
639	**FIGURE OUT WHAT TO SAY))** having the	15
640	<u>…(8).</u>**((TEAMMATES HAND HER A PAPER))** <u>If you</u>	11 1b 8
641	are eating outside, you have the opportunity to mingle	
642	with others.	

4.5   Research Question 4: What is the Relationship between the Frequency of CS Employed and the Outcome of the Debate?

Based on the frequency of CS used during the debates, the team with lesser CS won the debate. In the debate between team 3Y and 3Z, team 3Y utilised a total of 228 CS in comparison with 187 CS used by team 3Z.

The outcome indicates that the use of CS is detrimental to the team's chance of winning. This researcher wondered why it was the case since CS had enabled teams that consider English as their L3 to get ideas across as well as respond to statements made by the opposing side.

The trainers of both teams had some valuable insight on this outcome. According to the trainer of team 3Y, the use of CS should be encouraged during training sessions, not during the actual competition. She stated that the use of CS, for example pauses, repetition and restructuring, may have helped them to overcome communication problems but they simultaneously disrupted the flow of the arguments.

The trainer of team 3Z, who is also an experienced adjudicator, agreed that too many CS during competition is bad. The use of CS, according to her, 'eroded' the quality of presentation as well as content. It highlighted to the adjudicators that the debaters did not have control of the language.

When debaters rely on CS to fill in the lexical gaps, the act of circumlocution, word coinage, code switching and approximation or generalization, in particular, may cause the debater to get overtly creative and come up with 'nonsensical' terms, insert L1 words in a L2 context and ignore or disregard grammatical rules.

According to them, despite using the Communicative Approach in the classroom, most adjudicators are 'unforgiving grammarians' who would see strategy use as encouraging 'broken' English.

Both debate trainers concurred that various CS should be introduced in the classroom. However, since PSD is a formal event, the language that is used has to be of the acrolect variation of ME (Baskaran, 2005(a), p. 17-18) and debaters hoping to win the competition have to display credible control of the language.

However, both trainers also added in a caveat that language is only part of the collective whole that will determine the outcome of the debate. They both stated that in addition to having good command of the language, individual debaters would have to play his or her role effectively to clinch the tournament. Teams that are able to convince the crowd through formal procedure can win the debate despite utilising more CS than the opposing side. It is when teams are equally matched in terms of substance, strategy and style, language fluency and commendable use becomes the deciding factor.

Based on the results and feedback from the trainers, this researcher has come to the following conclusions:-

1)   The use of CS should be encouraged as a means to bolster the debaters' confidence by giving them devices to help them express themselves when faced with communication difficulties.

2)   The use of CS should be weaned in stages so by the time debaters go into competition, the answers or alternatives that they discovered while using CS, can replace the gaps to produce fluid arguments.

The use of CS in a debate tournament should be equated to the analogy of playing with fire. When the usage of CS is minimal, it can be helpful in clinching victory. If used too frequently in one instance, it could end up destroying any chance the team may have of winning.