Using Persuasive Discourse Strategies to Strengthen Arguments in School Parliamentary - Style Debates

Ganeish Balakrishnan
Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

Shamala Paramasivam
Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

Abstract
Purpose - *This research investigates the use of persuasive discourse strategies to strengthen arguments in parliamentary-style school debates. The research focuses specifically on the use of the three persuasive discourse strategies (quasilogical, presentational and analogical) proposed by Barbara Johnstone (2012).*
Methodology - *The research design employed is action research that is qualitative in nature utilizing discourse analysis as the method for data analysis.*
Findings - *The victory of the winning team can be attributed to the effective use of these three strategies during the debates. The persuasive strategies consisted of repetition, questions, appeals, using logical reasoning, giving examples and storytelling method. The study shows that persuasive discourse strategies, if effectively used to develop the argument structure, will prove to be an effective method to win debates.*
Significance - *The findings of the study are useful for school debaters and teachers, trainers or coaches of school debating teams.*
Keywords: Persuasion, Persuasive Discourse Strategies, Persuasive Discourse, Argument, Argument Structure, Parliamentary-Style Debates, School Debates

Introduction

I (first author) have been training debaters for almost 10 years but not until 2012 I discovered a strategy to turn debaters to become winners. My initial strategy was to use what most trainers use, the basic form of argument called syllogism. Syllogism is Aristotle's Argument structure, a structure that most trainers use at school level. This structure did not get the debaters far. So after doing some research on the art of persuasion, I tried using Johnstone's (2012) persuasive discourse strategies to train my students to debate against each other. The debate became more intense and I realized they spoke without inhibition and were able to express themselves more freely. I selected a group of 6 students and tested their ability to debate in a more formal setting. It worked and I started using this strategy for students at different levels.

The persuasive discourse strategies used throughout the debate is often a neglected factor because the focus is often on the argument itself. Discourse strategies play a major role in persuading audience and adjudicators because without proper use of persuasive discourse strategies to support the arguments, they will appear weak and unable to support the stance.

According to Johnstone (2012), one way to improve argumentation is through the use of persuasive discourse strategies. She explains that when people know in advance that they will have to persuade others to new beliefs or courses of action, discourse may be quite consciously designed for strategic purposes. The role of debaters is to persuade the audience to believe and accept their arguments and the debaters are well aware of this fact. Therefore, it is only logical that debaters employ both the argument and discourse strategies in unison to support the case line. Both these mentioned elements are crucial in every debate and they must work together to ensure high quality debate. Metsamaki (2012) too notes that in persuasion, apart from the role of the speaker, the nature and structure of the message are significant. Persuasion is successful, if it leads to attitude change (Jones & Simons, 2017). Change in attitude can be interpreted as people are convinced and believe in what has been said, which is the primary aim of every debate.

In the Malaysian context, there is limited information available on secondary school parliamentary debates because very limited previous research has been done on this topic. There is only one book on local school debates in Malaysia titled Fundamentals of Parliamentary Debate, written by Paramasivam et al. (2007). As a debate adjudicator and trainer, I find there are some salient features involving argumentation and persuasion in the Malaysian School Debates that need to be highlighted for the benefit of both student debaters and trainers of school debates, and with my co-author, I undertake to research them in this action research.

Research Objectives and Questions

The aim of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of Johnstone's persuasive discourse strategies to strengthen and make the arguments persuasive. The objectives are:
- To examine the type of argument used in school debates
- To examine the effectiveness of persuasive discourse strategies to affect persuasion in school debates

The research questions of the study are:
- What argument structure do school debaters use?
- How do persuasive discourse strategies affect persuasion?

Debate

Debate is defined as "assertive interaction between two parties, consisting of the affirmative and the negative, with both parties having different views on given topics" (Ylikoski, 1987 cited in Metsamaki, 2012, p. 207). Debating requires skills of argumentation, reasoning, persuading and appealing (Metsamaki, 2012). According to Freely and Steinberg (2009), debate is the way of reaching at a reasoned judgment on a proposition through the process of inquiry and advocacy. Debate can be a technique used by an individual to reach to a decision in one's own mind or can even be used by groups to make others think according to the groups' way of thinking. Hill and Leeman (1997) believe although debates vary from setting to setting, "they are argumentative interactions designed to allow competing advocates to present and test arguments." (p.7). Philips and Hooke (1994) claim "debate is an organized argument that involves an analysis of issues and ideas." (p.6).

Types of Debate

Basically debates fall into two broad categories; they are academic debate and applied debate. Both applied and academic debates involve practical arguing, involving two or more individuals or parties. According to Freely and Steinberg (2009), applied debates are real life debates based on certain propositions, statements or questions and is usually presented by advocates in front of judges or other people who have the power to make binding decisions on the debated questions or topics. Freely and Steinberg (2009) have divided applied debate into 4 distinct categories. They are special debate, judicial debate, parliamentary debate and non-formal debate. Special debates are carried out with specific rules designed specifically for the event to ensure its relevance. The American presidential debate, a televised debate, is an example of a special debate. The second type of applied debate is judicial debate. Judicial debates commence in the court of law and it adheres strictly to the law of the institution, state or country (Freely & Steinberg, 2009).

Parliamentary debates are the third type of debates with its purpose being to make amendments to laws or to defeat proposed resolutions and motions by elected representatives in a parliamentary assembly. Parliamentary style debate is a popular type of debate judging from its practice at state legislatures, town councils and other city governing bodies and at business meetings (Freely & Steinberg, 2009). According to Philips & Hooke (1994), where parliamentary style of debate is concerned, two of the most common and popular types are the American Parliamentary Debate and the British Parliamentary Debate. It is a common belief that the focal point of parliamentary debates is the value of logical argumentation. Persuasiveness that comes with sincerity and humour is seen as the fundamental factor of speaking style in parliamentary debates (Philips & Hooke, 1994).

The last type of debate is the non-formal debate. The word non-formal tells us that unlike special debate, judicial debate and parliamentary debates that are rule governed, non-formal debates has no bearing on the formality or informality of the events and does not comply to formal rules (Freely & Steinberg, 2009). An example of non-formal debate takes place when two radio commentators make differing comments on "road rage". This discussion will then be extended to the listeners and it becomes a non-formal debate, involving listeners throughout the nation and the radio commentators. Non-formal debates also take place at home, at workplace, chatrooms and other types of social network.

If applied debates are meant for the real world, academic debates are meant for the academic world that eventually prepares learners for applied debates in the real world (Inoue, 1994). Conducted by educational institutions, academic debates primarily provide educational opportunities to students. Contrary to actual parliamentary debate where the government legislators propose motions while the opposition oppose them, in academic debates the debaters practice both to propose and to oppose because their roles as government debaters or opposition debaters change from debate to debate (Inoue, 1994). Academic debates are not very different from special debates like presidential debates, judicial debates and parliamentary debates because it is rule-governed. Furthermore, academic debate is usually facilitated by a speaker or a chairperson and judged by independent judge or judges and audiences are an inescapable part of the process. Time too, is of essence in academic debates. Debaters, both from the government and the opposition teams speak alternately and are given equal amount of time to speak (Rieke et. al, 2005). According to Hill and Leeman (1997), educators and scholars refer to academic debate as a laboratory to test, develop and refine methods to argumentation.

The British Parliamentary Academic Debate

Since the Malaysian school debate follows the format of British Parliamentary Academic Debate, it is essential to have an understanding of it. The British Parliamentary Academic Debate

consists of four teams of two speakers each, known as factions. Each side will have two factions, meaning the government will have two factions and the opposition will have two factions. The British Parliamentary Debate format begins with the Prime Minister's speech followed by the Opposition leader, then it progresses to the Deputy Prime Minister and on to the Deputy Opposition Leader. Then it continues with the member of the government and on to the member of the opposition. Finally the Government Whip and the Opposition Whip will speak before the debate ends. Parliamentary debate is "extemporaneous and cannot use pre-researched evidences" (Philips & Hooke, 1994, p.127). It does not require evidence or published material to substantiate a claim. Instead it requires good general knowledge, acceptable logic, appropriate reasoning and skillful presentation.

The topic for the debate is received 15 minutes before the actual debate begins and preparation has to be done during that 15 minutes. Each debater is permitted to speak for 7 minutes and the other speakers are allowed to offer points of information when a speech is presented. During the 7 minutes speech the bell will be rung 3 times. The first bell will be rung immediately after one minute, the second bell at the end of 6 minutes and the last bell at 7 minutes. The first bell is a signal to inform the debater who is speaking to be ready for points of information and the other debaters to be ready to request for points of information. The bell at 6 minutes is to signal the debaters to end the points of information and the bell at 7 minutes is to signal the end of time for the debater. A debater who is delivering the speech may accept or may reject the point of information because it is his prerogative to do so because technically the debater who requests for point of information is requesting time that belongs to the debater who is presenting the speech at that moment.

The first government speaker or the Prime Minister will begin the debate by stating the motion and defining the motion. The definition of the keywords, phrases and the summary of the definition are somewhat important because the link between them will ensure the motion is strongly arguable. The rest of the debate is all about how persuasively the arguments are presented to ensure victory. The points of information can be a statement, a rhetorical question, a remark or simply a fact. Points of information are what make parliamentary debates interactive, interesting and spontaneous both in terms of questions posed and answers received (Freely & Steinberg, 2009).

Argument

An argument involves the process of establishing a claim and then proving it with the use of logical reasoning, examples, and research. An argument must encompass:
• Logic + Emotions + Trustwortiness (speaker) = Argument

In debate, the focus is so much on logic that we forget the audience as human beings with emotions who need to have the trust of the speakers in order to be persuaded.

Are the Arguments that we use Good Enough to Persuade People?

The answer to the above question is a 'NO'.According to Hill and Leeman (1997), syllogism, the type of argument that most teachers and debaters use, have missing elements, which are critical for understanding arguments. The syllogism in its basic form has three parts;
• Major premise (A) - establishes a generalization (all As are Bs)
• Minor premise - establishes a specific situation related to the generalization (C is an A)
• Conclusion - based on the major premise and minor premise a logically inescapable conclusion is formed (therefore C is a B)

An example of syllogistic reasoning:
• Major premise - All legally insane people are in incompetent to make binding agreement

- Minor premise - John Doe is legally insane.
- Conclusion - Therefore, John Doe is incompetent to make a binding agreement. (Freely & Steinberg, 2009)

In the syllogism, the argument begins with a sweeping generalization and ends with a specific claim. This is a dialectic method or a formal inquiry method that leaves the argument open to vigorous questioning to ascertain the truth. Teachers often use syllogistic arguments with or without realizing they are doing so. I find this argument structure inadequate in achieving persuasion. An argument has to begin with a claim and we have to prove the claim in more than one way leaving no room for doubt and counter arguments. Syllogistic type of arguments, that we most frequently teach students to use in debates are neither concrete enough to make them win nor become good debaters.

Persuasive Discourse Strategies make Arguments more Concrete than Syllogistic Type of Arguments

According to Barbara Johnstone (1989, p. 143) persuasive strategies "are the range of options from which a speaker selects in deciding on an appropriate tactic or combination of tactics for persuasion in a given situation." These communicative strategies encompass both verbal and nonverbal communication, which we choose according to the necessity and requirement of the context and situation. In persuading others some people use logic while some tell stories. Some people use threats, bribes and display strong emotions, while others simply repeat what they say until the listeners give up, give in or accept. According to Johnstone (1989) these tactics are the broad range of possible choices of persuasion that is part of speaker's communicative competence.

A persuasive strategy in one debate may fail in another depending on the topic of the debate itself, the rebuttals and the strategy employed by the other team. In academic debates, logic is often thought to be superior to other ways of persuading, similar to the western tradition. However, one cannot dismiss the effectiveness of other forms of persuasive discourse strategies such as the use of emotion, repetitive structures and presentational strategy to convince listeners (Johnstone,1989). Johnstone (1989) proposes three persuasive strategies along with their linguistic correlates, which are commonly employed by persuasive speakers. The quasilogic, presentation and analogy persuasive strategies (see Table 1) are the three different models proposed by Johnstone (1989).

Table 1 Persuasive Discourse Strategies

	Quasilogic	Presentation	Analogy
Distinguishing model	Model from formal logic, convincing	Model from poetry; moving	Model from narrative; teaching
Linguistic correlates	Use of "logical connectives": thus, hence, therefore ------------------------- ------------------------- subordination; integration	"rhetoricaldeixis": here, now, this ------------------------- visual metaphors: behold, look, see ------------------------- coordination/ parataxis/ parallelism;	Formulaic language: "You know what they say"; "it reminds me" ------------------------- "the words of the ancestors"; proverbs ------------------------- chronology; timeless past ("once upon a time"), involvement

Johnstone (1989, p.145)

Quasilogical Persuasion

Quasilogical argumentation is informal, non-demonstrative similar to formal demonstrative logic. Quasilogical argumentation makes use of the structure and the vocabulary of formal logic, creating the rhetorical impression that the arguments are logically incontrovertible (Johnstone, 1989). The goal of quasilogical persuasion is to convince the audience using the power of rationality to accept the conclusion (Johnstone, 2012).

Presentational Persuasion

The aim of presentational persuasion is to make the claim and argue maximally appealing to the listener's conscience, by repeating certain selected structures, paraphrasing it, emphasizing its importance, calling for aesthetic attention to it (Johnstone,1989). Presentational discourse as a persuasive strategy can also make use of visual metaphors that can make a claim seem to be present. Audience can be asked to "look", "see", "imagine" or "visualize" as though the claim were actually in the audience's line of vision. Presentational discourse is characterized by features of discourse that create interpersonal involvement.

The presentational persuasive discourse strategy does not involve rational convincing like the quasilogical persuasion; instead, it is swept along by rhythmic flow of words and sounds, the way we are sometimes mesmerized by poetry (Johnstone, 2012). The goal of presentational persuasion is to present the argumentation to a point where it reaches the conscience of the audience. This is achieved through repetition of structures and through paraphrasing calling aesthetic attention to it (Johnstone, 2012). Presentational discourse can go beyond repetition to the extent of getting audiences' line of vision and using the realms of space and time in reference to ideas. Johnstone (1989) explains that the use of terms like here, now and *this*, referred to as rhetorical deixis, is a powerful strategy for persuasion because it creates involvement similar to the effect that good poetry creates.

Analogic Persuasion

The third persuasive strategy is the analogic persuasion. Analogic persuasion persuades by teaching and reminding the audience of time-tested values through indirect mode of storytelling (Johnstone, 1989). Analogical persuasion strategy takes the audience on a journey to the past and connects them to the present. In analogical persuasion traditional wisdom is embedded in fable-like stories or parables. According to Johnstone (1989) the language of analogical persuasion is the language of folktales marking formulaic openings and closings with timeless and placeless quality such as "once upon a time, in a land far away, when I was your age." Persuasive speakers who use stories as analogies ensure these stories have chronology and linguistic markings of chronology and in doing so, they create involvement between the speech and audience.

Methodology

The research design employed is action research that is qualitative in nature. The research was done with 6 debaters, all of whom were secondary school students, aged between 16 -18 years of age, who represented the school as debaters. Three students each formed the Government and Opposition teams. The debate title was given to both teams. They prepared for the debate knowing their roles as debaters (Government and Opposition speakers) and with the basic understanding of what a syllogistic argument is. They were not exposed to any other specific debate techniques. The debate took place in class and their speeches were recorded (voice recording). The voice recording was transcribed orthographically using Transcription Conventions from DuBois, 1991 (Schiffrin, 2008, p. 422). Data analysis involved discourse analysis of the debate speeches. The

quasilogical, presentational and analogical discourse strategies were identified and analysed using the framework for Persuasive Discourse Strategies (refer to Table 1).

Table 2 shows the number of times persuasive discourse strategies wereused by both the Government and Opposition debaters before they were exposed to the strategies. The opposition team won the debate.

Table 2 Frequency of use of Persuasive Discourse Strategies by Debating Teams before being Taught Persuasive Discourse Strategies

Teams	Number of times used		
	Quasilogical	Presentational	Analogical
Government Debaters	2	4	2
Opposition Debaters	3	4	2

Then, another debate motion was given to both the teams. The Government debaters were taught to use Johnstone's Persuasive Discourse Strategies when constructing their arguments. The Opposition debaters, on the other hand, used their existing knowledge to frame their arguments. The debate took place and their speeches were recorded (voice recording).The voice recording was also transcribed orthographically using Transcription Conventions from DuBois, 1991 (Schiffrin, 2008, p. 422). The government debaters won the debate. Results can be seen in Table 3.

Findings and Discussion

Table 3 shows the number of times Johnstone's Persuasive Discourse Strategies were used by both the Government team and the Opposition team after the Government Debaters were taught to use Johnstone's Persuasive Discourse Strategies. Table 4 supports Table 3 by showing the distribution of the strategies in percentage form. Table 5 shows the frequency of use of strategies by speakers in both teams. Table 6 displays the use of pronouns by both teams.

Table 3 Frequency of use of Persuasive Discourse Strategies by Debating Teams after Govt Team was taught Persuasive Discourse Strategies

Teams	Number of times used		
	Quasilogical	Presentational	Analogical
Government Debaters	2	4	2
Opposition Debaters	3	4	2

Table 4 Distribution of Persuasive Discourse Strategies in the Debate

Persuasive Strategies	Quasilogical		Presentational		Analogical	
Debate Teams	Frequency of use	Percentage (%)	Frequency of use	Percentage (%)	Frequency of use	Percentage (%)
Government Debaters	4	66.7	17	77.3	6	75
Opposition Debaters	2	33.3	5	22.7	2	25

Table 5 The Use of Persuasive Discourse Strategies by Respective Debaters

Debaters	Quasilogical	Presentational	Analogical
Persuasive Strategies			
Government Debater 1	0	6	2
Opposition Debater 1	2	2	1
Government Debater 2	2	4	2
Opposition Debater 2	0	0	2
Government Debater 3	2	6	2
Opposition Debater 3	0	2	0
Opposition Reply Speech	0	1	0
Government Reply Speech	0	1	0

Table 6 Number of Pronouns used to Give the Effect of Presentational Discourse

Key Pronouns Used	Number of times used	
	Government	Opposition
You (your, yours)	1	1
We (us, our, ours)	78	3
They (their, theirs)	35	6
He (his, him)	5	2
She (her)	3	0
It	7	0

Quasilogical Arguments

The Quasilogical strategy was used by both the debate teams. The Government team used the strategy in 4 instances, while the opposition team used it twice. The analysis of the debate transcripts showed that the method in which the Government debaters and the opposition debaters presented their quasilogical argument differed noticeably. Firstly, two government debaters presented two quasilogical arguments each; their arguments did not differ in content as they threaded along the same line. Therefore, the government debaters used the same argument in the 4 instances to push their idea of the motion. Furthermore, they repeated the same words and phrases to ensure the main idea of their argument was accurately linked to the motion in order to persuade the listeners to believe in what they were saying. In doing so, they created an impression that their arguments were logically unquestionable. As for the opposition team, only the 3rd debater presented 2 quasilogical arguments and both the arguments were neither connected to each other in relation to words or phrases (to show connection) nor to the motion directly, resulting in creating little impact on persuasion.

Secondly, the government team's quasilogical arguments contained logical connectives like *therefore, if* and so, both implicitly and explicitly. The arguments also had subordination integration, where clauses were explicitly related to each other as superordinate claims and subordinate sources of support for these claims.

A quasilogical argument is presented in Excerpt 1 taken from the Transcript of the 2nd Debater of the Government.

Excerpt 1

…we…the present generation belong to an overlapping generation which means there is a blood relationship between us and the past generations…we call this intergenerational historical relationship…so members of the house…let me ask you this/…how can we claim that we do not have any relationship with the past injustices…when the past generations were actually our forefathers?... we inherit the wealth of our past generations gladly/…do we ever reject them?...we inherit properties and lands of our forefathers and today many people are rich... some are ultra-rich because of inherited property/…has this been th◇ debated by anyone?.. Has this ever been questioned?... No/…because it benefits us…why then don't we inherit and compensate the injustices committed by the previous generations…members of the house?... it's as simple as that…they want to inherit all the benefits but they want to wash their hands of the sins of their forefathers…what kind of [intergenerational…]

The central argument in Excerpt 1 is a logical syllogism with the major premise - due to blood relationship the present generation inherits everything belonging to the past generation. The minor premise is that the present generation is responsible in inheriting the wrongdoings and sins of the past generation. The conclusion is that the present generation must pay compensation to the victims or the descendants for past injustices. This argument solely emphasizes on the terms of relationship, inheritance and compensation. Words and phrases such as "present generation", "overlapping generation", "blood relationship", "past generation", "intergenerational historical relationship", "past injustices", "forefather", "inherit the wealth, properties, lands, and compensated" are repeated in almost every sentence throughout the paragraph to create a connection. The debater begins the argument with a short description of blood relationship and intergenerational relationship and then poses 5 logical questions on the relationship of the present generation with the past generation pertaining to inheritance. This is similar to an excerpt in Martin Luther King, Jr, "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" (Johnstone, 2012, p.245). The logical connection between the 3 introductory statements on intergenerational relationship and the questions posed pertaining to inheritance establish logical relationship hence forming a quasilogical argument. This argument when scrutinized gains momentum as it develops. The first 2 sentences in the excerpt encompass the definition of intergenerational relationship and the following questions form a sturdy buildup of relationship with inheritance and responsibility that ends with a strong statement of what kind of an intergenerational…(responsibility is this?)

This argument is a quasilogical argument because it has been constructed by the debater based on the logical principle of "transitivity": if A implies B, then B implies C (Johnstone, 2012). However, relationship between generations and inheritance, especially pertaining to sins does not have transitive relationship. Though related through blood, everyone is born as an individual and the past generation's wrongdoings need not necessarily be inherited by the present generation unless they want to do so. However, in Excerpt 1, the language of logic is used quasilogically by the debater as if there is a logical relationship between the past generation and present generation in relation to inheritance of all sorts.

The discussed argument is utterly important in this debate because it holds the motion of this debate, "The present generation must compensate for the injustices of the past generation". Therefore, the government debaters kept on pushing this idea as a persuasive strategy to execute their plan in making the opponents, adjudicators as well as the audience not only to believe but also to prescribe to this quasilogical idea.

Presentational Arguments

Presentational discourse was a salient feature in the debate. Debaters of both teams employed it 22 times, with the government team leading, using it 17 times (77.3%). Government Debater 1 and Government Debater 3 used it the most number of times, at 6 times each with the 2nd Government Debater using it 4 times. The 1st opposition debater and the 3rd opposition debater used it 2 times each.

In the Presentational arguments, the transcripts showed that the Government debaters used repetition combined with the stylistic device of parallelism, demonstrating emphasis on the main content of the argument for the listeners to notice. According to Simpson and Mayr (2010), parallelism is a device which expresses several ideas in a series of similar structures. It can serve to emphasise that the ideas are in equal importance and can add a sense of symmetry and rhythm, which make the speech more memorable. Politicians use parallel patterns in their speeches to draw attention to a particular part of their message and make it stand out from the rest of the speech. Parallel elements not only start with the same part of the speech but also employ the repetition of a specific phrase or the same pattern of construction (Simpson & Mayr, 2010). According to Simpson and Mayr (2010), repetition of structure and idea is a feature in persuasion. The one-word repetition of "this" and "these" alternately in parallel structures was a salient feature in the debate especially by the Government speakers. The Government debaters evidently employedrepetitive words and phrases, rhetorical deixis and visual metaphors in order to create involvement.

Apart from the discussed words and phrases, the Government debaters further employed and repeated powerful and effective words and phrases that drew the imagery of serious torture and suffering to make their claim maximally present in the listeners' consciousness. The aim of presentational persuasion is to reach the audience's consciousness through a variety of linguistic means, the right language and imagination (creating visual metaphors).In doing so persuasion reaches listeners through vivid pictures created through the choice of words. The government team did this effectively.

A presentational argument is presented in Excerpt 2 taken from the Transcript of the 2nd Debater of the Government.

Excerpt 2

"Now onto my team's second point…intergenerational (2) historical and moral obligation… we(1)…the present generation (2) belong to an overlapping generation which means there is a blood relationship(2) between us(1) and the past generations (2)…we (1) call this intergenerational historical relationship (2)…so members of the house…let me ask you this/… how can we(1) claim that we(1) do not have any relationship (2) with the past injustices (2)… when the past generations(2) were actually our(1) forefathers?...we (1) inherit (2) the wealth of our (1) past generations (2) gladly/..do we(1) ever reject them?...we (1) inherit properties (2) and lands (2) of our (1) forefathers (2)…and today many people are rich (2)..some are ultra-rich (2) because of inherited property/ (2)..has this been th◇…debated by anyone?...Has this ever been questioned?...No/.. because it benefits us (1)…why then don't we(1) inherit(2) and compensate the injustices committed (2) by the previous generations…(2) members of the house?

The words labeled (1) refer to the plural form of first person personal pronoun 'we' and its anamorphous 'us' and 'our' (Ye, 2010). While the words and phrases labeled (2) are words and phrases that are related to one another and repeated throughout the extract.

According to Ye (2010) personal pronouns have the interpersonal function in discourse because they establish a particular relationship between the speaker and the listeners. Deictic (deixis) originates from the Greek language and it is used for pointing to a subject. The analysis of Excerpt

2 shows the debater used personal deixis extensively in her argument. The plural form of the first person pronoun "we" appeared 8 times and its anamorphous "us" and "our" twice each, totaling to 12 times, within one argument.

According to Ye (2010), in Functional Grammar, 'we', 'us' and 'our' can be both, 'inclusive' or 'exclusive'. Inclusive means 'I' and 'You' (the speaker and listener), holding emotional effectiveness, minimizing the detachment between the two parties and making them sense that they share a common objective. Exclusive 'we' stands for 'I' and 'others' not 'I' and 'you', implying a sense of authority, making the listeners experience a feeling that the speaker and his team are strong enough to knockdown everything (Ye, 2010). Analysis of the extract shows that, all the 'we' that appeared in the excerpt are inclusive ones because they refered to the present generation as suggested after the appearance of the first 'we', "…we…the present generation…". It is evident the debater suggested each and everyone who belongs to the present generation, inclusive of the audience, the adjudicators and the opponents need to have a sense of responsibility in paying compensation. By including the listeners, the debater shared the responsibility and burden of paying compensation with all his listeners. The debater included the listeners unconsciously and involuntarily through the emotions attached with the inclusive 'we' and persuaded them to join her team in paying compensation.

The words and phrases labeled (2) in Excerpt 2, ("intergenerational", "overlapping generation", "present generation", "blood relationship", "past generations", "intergenerational historical relationship") are words and phrases that fall into the same category in terms of relationship and they are repeated throughout the excerpt. These words and phrases are used and reused to emphasize the main content of the argument, which the debater wants his listeners to notice. It is evident that in Excerpt 2, the debater used the word 'generation' creatively, in different forms to ensure the concept of term 'intergenerational' registers in the audience mind. The phrases linked to 'intergenerational' are, "present generation", "overlapping generation", "blood relationship", "past generation" and "intergenerational historical relationship". These phrases are related to one another not only in terms of meaning (generation, relationship) but also create a rhythm through the emphasis on repetition and paraphrasing. This is a distinct feature of presentational persuasion. Terms like, "intergenerational relationship" and "blood relationship", establish a sense of responsibility and belonging between the present and the past generation, creating an appeal to pathos by evoking the emotional attachment in the minds of the listeners. This debater used a single word ("generation") significantly and repeated them in different forms to grab the listeners' attention to the fundamental issue in discussion.

Analogical Arguments

Analogical discourse strategy was employed 8 times in the total course of the debate. It seemed to be a more popular strategy among the government debaters who used it 6 times, compared to the opposition debaters who used it 2 times.

Analogical persuasive strategy reminds the audience of time-tested values by taking them through a journey, making lateral leaps between past events and the lessons learned from them relating them with current issues (Johnstone, 2012). According to Johnstone (2012) the language of analogical persuasion is the language of folktales with formulaic openings and closings, and the timeless and the placeless quality, indicated by phrases like, 'once upon a time, in a far away land.' According to Labov (1972), stories used as analogies involve chronology and the linguistic makings of chronology that underscore the pointfulness of stories.

A notable difference in the analysis of the analogical persuasive discourse strategy of both the debating teams is the type of persuasion involved. In persuading the listeners, the government

debaters, consciously or unconsciously,have employed facts and figures and linked them to stories in their analogical persuasive strategy as opposed to the opposition debaters who appear to have used only facts and figures to make their persuasion work.

Analogical argument is presented in Excerpts 3 and 4 taken from the Transcript of the 1st Debater of the Government.

Excerpt 3

…an example of genocide in the past generation…is of culturing the reign of Hitler…Hitler wiped out 6 million Jewish people…he ordered the massacre of these people..who in his eyes were going to pollute his reign supremacy…tagged each of…we can't just let this holocaust pass by…we need to compensate…

Excerpt 4

Saddam Hussein members of the house…killed more than 80000 people in Iraq under the pretext of (XX) their best enemies to Iran…people have been fighting for justice to ask for compensation for the crimes that were committed against these people…members of the house…these people were thrown into jails and even died too…we need to pay compensation…

Both the excerpts above refer to history, specifically to injustices committed by past leaders. The debater presents history like a story and links it to the present time, in which the debater clarifies that the mistakes of the past must not be forgotten and the present time is the best time to make amends for past mistakes. The debater justifies her claim by providing historical evidences of injustices. The excerpts clearly demonstrate the injustices done by the past leaders, the sufferings that the people endured and on how we the present generation can make changes through compensation. The debater persuades by having the audiences "make abductive leaps between past events and current issues" (Johnstone, 1989, p. 149). Both the excerpts narrate the events that rationalize injustice that led to sufferings. The excerpts discussed above are distinctly analogical persuasion. History is involved in this instance, so persuasion takes place through logical reasoning (logos). However, when history is linked to the present generation and appeal is made to people to pay compensation, sympathy and empathy comes into play. As a result, pathos or emotional sensibilities of the audience comes into play. Therefore, persuasion in this instance is achieved both through logos and pathos.

Concluding Remarks and Future Research

The findings of the study show that the Government debaters' strategy in using persuasive discourse strategies after being trained on its use, illustrate that their arguments are far more persuasive than arguments of the opposition debaters. This gave the Government debaters a clear victory over their opponents. The use of persuasive discourse strategies to complement the syllogistic argument structure is certainly a giant leap towards forming concrete and effective arguments in debate. However, more research as sequels to this action research has to be done to investigate if Johnstone's persuasive discourse strategies could be effectively used in instructional modules for debating.

This research did not benefit from any research grant.

References

1. Freely, A. J., & Steinberg, D. L. *Argumentation and Debate*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, 2009.
2. Hill, B., & Leeman, R. W. *The Art and Practice of Argumentation and Debate*. California: Mayfield Publishing, 1997.

3. Inoue, N. *Ways of debating in Japan: Academic debate in English speaking societies*. 1994.
4. Johnstone, B. Linguistic Strategies and Cultural Styles for Persuasive Discourse. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, 1989.
5. Johnstone, B. *Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, 2012.
6. Jones, J. G., & Simons, H. W. *Persuasion in Society*. Routledge, 2017.
7. Labov, W. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.
8. Metsamaki, M. Persuasive Discourse in EFL Debate. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(2), 2012, 205-213.
9. Paramasivam, S., Misyana, S. H., Supramaniam, K., & Mello, G. D. *Fundamentals of Parliamentary Debate*. University Publication Centre, 2007.
10. Perelman, L., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, C. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise in Argumentation*. University of Notre Dame Press, 1971.
11. Philips, J., & Hooke, J. *The Debating Book*. Southwood Press, 1994.
12. Rieke, R., Sillars, M., & Peterson, T. R. *Argumentation and Critical decision making*. Pearson Education, 2005.
13. Schiffrin, D. *Approaches to Discourse*. Blackwell, 2008.
14. Simpson, P., & Mayr, A. *Language and Power*. Routledge, 2010.
15. Ye, R. The Interpersonal Metafunction Analysis of Barack Obama's Victory Speech. *English Language Teaching,* 3(2), 2010, 146-151.