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# Appendix 1. Link You Tube English debate

1. English Debate Competition SETARA 2021: <https://youtu.be/U_2h12I0pRU>
2. English Debate Competition Gonzaga Festival 2021: <https://youtu.be/Ic56j_1uZIA>

# Appendix 2. Name Competitor

1. SETARA Competition Kejar Deatline:
   * Jhose / speaker 1
   * Kalista / speaker 2 & conclusion
   * Michelle / speaker 3

ILYSM:

* + Nadine / speaker 1
  + Dazzle / speaker 2 & conclusion
  + Tati / speaker 3

1. Gonzaga Competition SMA 68 Jakarta:
   * Maura / speaker 1
   * Jessica / speaker 2 & conclusion
   * Elsabel / speaker 3

SMAN 2 Jakarta:

* + Ghaitsa / speaker 1
  + Aya / speaker 2 & conclusion
  + Elena / speaker 3

# Appendix 3. Transcription Maura speech

Maura / SMA 68 Jakarta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech**  **Error** |
| 1 | Ladies and gantelment, today we will be distiguissing under the motion. This house believe that social movements should // **(SP)** embrace cancel culture as a tool to promote social change. Now, royalty concept contextualize what the motion means. // **(SP)** Cancel culture // **(SP)** cancel culture // **(SP)** is a critism or a backlash that is give to a specific person with a large platform // **(SP)** platfrom, *er,***(FP)** because of a certain behavior cancel culture will cause a sharp decline in that person’s relevance or popularity // **(SP)** it is efficient in making sure that do things that they do condemn // **(SP)** you do are condemned publicly and being socially punished and send a message that we need to change now what do we mean by social change. What we mean by social change is to change the persons’s views towards the person that they are being backlashed with aiming to change the persons’s perceptions in order to / **(RP)** in order to help them realize that they are wrong, and they  need to have accountability. | SP : 7  FP : 1  RP : 1 |
| 2 | Now // **(SP)** what we see here is that people misconcept what cancel culture really means, and by this we would like to also give some skill cancel culture has its own toxicity. We know that of course but // **(SP)** we know that of course for example the toxicities is that people who is a hater use it to their own entertaiment to hate on the specific celebrity or a persons with a huge platfrom plus the haters could bring up a persons’s past mistake which has already been addressed maybe and // **(SP)** people // **(SP)** and we do believe that people do deserve that factors, because they received for doing something  wrong. | SP : 4 |
| 3 | Now here is our stance, first // **(SP)** first is that // **(SP)**  people // **(SP)** understand here is that people we’re targeting \ **(RF)** we have \ **(RF)** we are target \ **(RF)** we | SP : 10  FP : 2  RF : 5 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | are targeting people who have a big platform and who | UF : 2 |
| have a big influence |signal| for socienty and the second | RP : 3 |
| we are both |signal| culture we have a big social \\ **(UF)** | ST : 2 |
| socialist that has a lot and also those people have a lot of |  |
| influence and / **(RP)** and // **(SP)** parties that got effective |  |
| for example cancel culture \ **(RF)** for example racism, |  |
| bullying, feminism. Number thrid and it’s our starting |  |
| time is that we don’t advocate // **(SP)** cancel culture for / |  |
| **(RP)** for a low level, uh, **(FP)** threats // **(SP)** for those |  |
| we dosen’t really have aa-a **(ST)** bigger-bigger-aaa-huge |  |
| **(ST)** // **(SP)** platfrome, because they don’t really have, |  |
| err, **(FP)** huge influence towards the bigger amount of // |  |
| **(SP)** of the socienty. And now we will bring tree main |  |
| arguments today with the first argument for amino |  |
| arguments \ **(RF)** today with the first argument is why is |  |
| it justifiable and what it woud like to be implemented? |  |
| And the second one is why is it effective? And the thrid |  |
| one is what kind of social movement needs cancel |  |
| culture? Number four \\ **(UF)** fifth why is it more morally |  |
| just. And now moving on to our first and main // **(SP)** |  |
| main argument which is why is it justifiable and what it |  |
| will be like when it is implemented. First we would like |  |
| to say // **(SP)** first we would have to say is that we have |  |
| an objective and we have a clear motive which is to |  |
| change, social, culture. With this / **(RP)** with this enough |  |
| we believe that. |  |
| 4 | Cancel culture is justifiable to create a social change // | SP : 13 |
|  | **(SP)** and // **(SP)** our goal is to make the person realize | RP : 11 |
|  | that their mistakes // **(SP)** their / **(RP)** their preceptions | FP : 2 |
|  | are something is |signal| is wrong and we must take them | RF : 3 |
|  | account help them |signal| and // **(SP)** and because we | ST : 2 |
|  | have a clear objective and a clear // **(SP)** clear motive // |  |
|  | **(SP)** not // **(SP)** now we also talk about whether or not |  |
|  | the person who is counsel, like, **(FP)** it or not. They have |  |
|  | a huge influence that will it \ **(RF)** that will influence |  |
|  | largely of the society, because they have fans, they have |  |
|  | people to look up to they have a huge problem to change |  |
|  | people’s perspective. This is dangerous if the person / |  |
|  | **(RP)** if the person / **(RP)** the person they got / **(RP)** they |  |
|  | got cancel culture, because of their behavior spread |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | wromg immoral \ **(RF)** wrong immorals or unjustifiable  // **(SP)** viewers because then their friends or those who look up to the |signal| people in |signal| this safety in general can / **(RP)** can // **(SP)** that is // **(SP)** that is / **(RP)** that is wrong and more and is erecting you and this a about this will create \ **(RF)** this would create an impact to social change for example when one is saying what is a dangerous // **(SP)** the dangerous of disappointment or / **(RP)** or unjustifiable abuse things, like, **(FP)** partying during the coffe or antibiotis |signal| for example we could also give the recent news about Cardi B being / **(RP)** being patients and for example of James Charles and Sean Chandes sin were getting cancelled // **(SP)** and by those impact we realized that by giving a cancel culture helps-helps-helps **(ST)** the cellebrities or those who have a heart large platfrom to realize that their perception is wrong and it is unjustifiable and we must give them accountability and that is why ladies and gantelment it is justifiable will if feel to be implemented we are going to cancel them until they realize that they are always |signal| in the |signal| maybe a holiday |signal| for example |signal| and also changes by making them realizing that they’re wrong and then by making them accountable / **(RP)** accountable our // **(SP)** our / **(RP)** our goal is / **(RP)** is rich. The matter is-the maa..-the matter **(ST)** is important to be discussed and even until the  person, doesn’t realize that wrong. |  |
| 5 | The most important thing is it is the discussion which I | SP : 5 |
|  | will explain more in our second argument. Which our second argument is why \ **(RF)** is it effective solution, why? Because it is a direct solution / **(RP)** it is direct | RF : 1  RP : 6  SOT : 1 |
|  | solution to the sourch that is is the thing that is // **(SP)** |  |
|  | that is / **(RP)** that is being cancelled even if there are // |  |
|  | **(SP)** even if those who are directly cancelled does it |  |
|  | make a change at least it is bought up the discussion is |  |
|  | brought online into / **(RP)** into the social online world, |  |
|  | which is they have a very huge impact when things are |  |
|  | being discussed online // **(SP)** online people // **(SP)** |  |
|  | online, because they are from everyone from // **(SP)** from |  |
|  | certain backgrounds and answering groups will have a |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | thought and a discussion about things online whather there is a all this / **(RP)** all this perception is wrong and but this is just a powerfull, but this is not just a rapport the important thing is that things is being issues, is being discussed online and it is spread everywhere and **people can look at people – a lot of people can see new views (SOT)** regarding / **(RP)** regarding issues and this goes back to the point that this |signal| person might not be wrong |signal| but the questions are wrong but at least the things is / **(RP)** is that the issue is being discussed online and that is by additional but we probably propose the  motion that is given today. Thank you very much. |  |

# Appendix 4. Transcription Ghaitsa speech

Ghaitsa / SMAN 2 Jakarta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech Error** |
| 1 | In current status quo where cancel culture already exists at the very first place many influencers get cancelled during this era. Tony Lopez is one of the inluencers that  / **(RP)** that cancel culture isn’t enough to do social change knowing that he is still famous be still get exposed no social change happened in their side of a house we don’t want this to happen in our cyber house panels, so we thing / **(RP)** we thing that it \ **(RF)** we thing that there’s no will not ever to heather this kind of problem we are so proud to oppose. So our stance is we will / **(RP)** we will not, er, **(FP)** embrance a cancel culture, uh, **(FP)** as a tool to promote social change with a mechanism in our side. First we think that of punishment, like, **(FP)** jail law / **(RP)** law parts authority is more and is more that enough to promote social change and second is but even if it doesn’t and now we think that it is better to educate them not through cancel culture it’s better to just block these people not to inviting society to hate these people, right? You need to understand that cancel culture country is  not a trend, not a promotion plat from panels you \\ **(SP)** | SP : 1  FP : 4  RF : 1  CR : 1  RP : 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | your purpose is not for just a followers but for the social change itself we think that their cyber house even they want to get, uh, **(FP)** even they get –ah **(IT)** followers from the society that are most likely easy to be provoked it means that the quality of their followers is bad and at  the end of the day. |  |
| 2 | When you’ve got a bad followers you will lose | SP : 3 |
|  | followers, right? So society will, uh, **(FP)** see you as a member is so **propo propogative (SOT)** and having over promotion so at the end of the day it will not be good anyway like this social change, will not be good  anyway in their side of the house, right? So our goal is | FP : 17  RF : 1  RP : 2  ST : 1  SOT : 1 |
|  | both side we want to have, uh, **(FP)** wehave a goal to |  |
|  | promote social change but we think that you should, uh, |  |
|  | **(FP)** use the healthier way with \ **(RF)** way to do this |  |
|  | panels we didn’t actually bring it into a trend movement |  |
|  | where you need to understand that these society focus |  |
|  | on the artist that being cancelled not focused on the |  |
|  | social movement itself. So, before I jump into my |  |
|  | argument I will bring several rebutals about what the, |  |
|  | err, **(FP)** proposition side already being they said that |  |
|  | they have a clear object / **(RP)** that they have a clear |  |
|  | object, they have a celar motive but maybe yes they |  |
|  | have a clear motive at the very first place but they will |  |
|  | most likely be unstable panels because the character of |  |
|  | the society they will actualy a..- more - a..- more **(ST)** |  |
|  | likely to mock them without actually educating them, |  |
|  | without actually promoting the socal change itself |  |
|  | battels so we think that at the end of the day maybe |  |
|  | they have a clear objective at the very first place but at |  |
|  | the end of the day they will not able to capture this |  |
|  | problem which is // **(SP)**, uh, **(FP)** those uh, **(FP)** which |  |
|  | is the associate, uh, **(FP)** which is to, uhh, **(FP)** to get |  |
|  | the social change itself and also their arguments but this |  |
|  | is very irrelevant, and second of all they say about, |  |
|  | umm, **(FP)** James Charles being, like, **(FP)** uh **(FP)**, // |  |
|  | **(SP)**, uhh, **(FP)** change or they, uh, **(FP)** people, uh, |  |
|  | **(FP)** not support them or whatever but here’s the thing, |  |
|  | James Charles it still famous now // **(SP)** and also |  |
|  | people stil, uh, **(FP)** prom, uh, **(FP)** people stil support |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | the, uh, **(FP)** James Charles and also James Charles are you problematic, no. The game channels are still / **(RP)** still being problematic in the status quo banners notice on James Arnold’s after his apologize video he’s still  being grooming the minor spellings. |  |
| 3 | So the social,uh, th-the-the **(ST)** cancel culture itself | FP : 13 |
|  | isn’t enough so this is that / **(RP)** that apology video, uh, **(FP)** is enough because, mm, **(FP)** it / **(RP)** it makes them realize that, uh, **(FP)** notice that it / **(RP)** it is not enough what already stated before that Jim Sterling still  do thet \\ **(UF)** that kind of thing and Tony Lopez still | RF : 3  UF : 2  RP : 4  ST : 1  SOT : 1 |
|  | the do, uh, **(FP)** grooming the \\ **(UF)** tho grooming the |  |
|  | miners and stuff like that so it is not enough. So they say |  |
|  | that it is a direct solution we think that this is not a |  |
|  | direct solution am I explaining later wht it’s not a direct |  |
|  | solution and my, uhh, **(FP)** and my argument. So they |  |
|  | will say that, uh, **(FP)** it, mm, **(FP)** will be a discussion |  |
|  | but we think this is not exclusive and the end of the day |  |
|  | because in our cyber house we will also get the, uh, |  |
|  | **(FP)** discuss online because the platfrom social change |  |
|  | is still, uh, **(FP)** there right? So the discuss of online will |  |
|  | still exist in our sidebar, so there, umm, **(FP)** so the |  |
|  | argument isn’t true and also the argument is the next |  |
|  | very very verse but so the argumentsalready fall at |  |
|  | **revervel (reversal) (SOT)** so moving on to my |  |
|  | argument, let’s see about the status quo \ **(RF)** let’s see |  |
|  | in the status quo many problematic persons are famous |  |
|  | on the internet they’re being artist panels such as Saipul |  |
|  | Jamil getting exposed even they, uh, **(FP)** even that he |  |
|  | being into prison enter and / **(RP)** and enter and yeah \ |  |
|  | **(RF)** and he even already get the cancel culture but the |  |
|  | society still \ **(RF)** but he still has the opportunity to |  |
|  | work panels maybe the government will say that, uh, |  |
|  | **(FP)** mm, **(FP)** Saipul Jamil get rejected by 18 |  |
|  | corporation but panels you need realize that Sipul Jamil |  |
|  | get accepted at kementrian. |  |
| 4 | It’s even bigger thing you know and he’s now in | SP : 1 |
|  | government a predator being in the government after getting cancelled, so we think that their side of the house the cancel culture is not enough panels so this is | FP : 6  RF : 1  RP : 1  ST : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | why they’re in the status quo, er, **(FP)** Cancel culture it’s not enough so let’s see the characteristic of the society are easy to **propo – provo – provoke (SOT)** at the reverse list when their announcement that this person is being cancelled without actually knowing the contex I know the backstory we think that this is so bad e-e-t-th-da **(ST)** that these people being proud of okey we don’t actually knowing what happened, right? So the cancel culture the very first place, mm, **(FP)** make // **(SP)** at the very first place to, uh, **(FP)** is the, uh, **(FP)** the interest is to make people aware but so they will not do that / **(RP)** that action or their action, right? I like the figure that being canceled but it s getting changed on the their **council (cancel) (SOT)** culture actually giving them the platform for YouTube blame them right panels, so why blaming them will be harm I will explain it later in my sex, uh, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** my second layer so, moving on to my second layer why cancel culture it’s being problematic because the sanse of contour is the movement that over glorifiying the pride of the finals the wrong person, uhh, **(FP)** the wrong person battels  let’s see how canceled culture works. | SOT : 2 |
| 5 | Cancel culture is the moment that socienty is spreading | FP : 3 |
|  | bad news about this person so that the person will able to know that this influencer is problematic and they will, mm, **(FP)** they, uh, **(FP)** so that I hope that they will not | RF : 1  UF : 1  CR : 1 |
|  | support the influencer, right? But why this is |  |
|  | problematic at the very first place because the society |  |
|  | they already has the tendency to mock that influencer |  |
|  | with out actually trying to educate them battels why do |  |
|  | you say \ **(RF)** why I’m able to say this because let’s say |  |
|  | in this sentence. There’s several friends that are being |  |
|  | problematic, like, **(FP)** for example making birthday |  |
|  | party doing people then to mock them –ah **(IT)** mock at |  |
|  | tik – tok \\ **(UF)** titoker in the coment section and why |  |
|  | this is problematic, because it is not only mocking them |  |
|  | because of the problem they mock them with other |  |
|  | aspect panels. |  |
| 6 | Then the likelihood of socienty that among the | SP : 1 |
|  | influencer because they are already seen, ehh, **(FP)** uh, | FP : 10 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(FP)** because they are already seen that influencer as a | RF : 2 |
| bad person, so they will walk the entire aspect of that | RP : 6 |
| influencer without, er, **(FP)** that / **(RP)** that shouldn’t be | ST : 1 |
| that \ **(RF)** shouldn’t be mocked and they aren’t trying | SOT :1 |
| to educate themselves and discuss **bu-willing (*bullying*)** |  |
| **(SOT)** to the influencer and why bullyingg at the first |  |
| place is problematic even that person is already |  |
| problematic, for / **(RP)** for their fist place because it is, |  |
| uh, **(FP)** / **(RP)** because it is, uh, **(FP)** they will only |  |
| focus to mock them to actually educate themselve that |  |
| their action is bad why their tendency not to educate it is |  |
| because se-se-the **(ST)** society will think that they are |  |
| better than this problematic person so they will only |  |
| mocking them and / **(RP)** and they all will already feel |  |
| that they are better with actually trying to analysis, like, |  |
| **(FP)** why this / **(RP)** why this habit able to happen and |  |
| why they will shop themselves for not this a kind of, uh, |  |
| **(FP)** kind of problematic thing insight // **(SP)** so what |  |
| and this is happening in the stepthoscope because at the |  |
| end of the day messages should be given to the society |  |
| will not achieve to educate this themselve okay even if |  |
| the society able to educate themselves our sense is still |  |
| better because there’s not a hug they will not \ **(RF)** they |  |
| will educate them but with / **(RP)** but with mocking the |  |
| influencer at vapor space because against the cancel |  |
| culture will be able to do, uh, **(FP)** what will be able to |  |
| cancel the uh influencer if the, uh, **(FP)** if the news are |  |
| viral right so and, like, **(FP)** what I already said in the |  |
| status quo. |  |
| 7 | The moment when you, uh, **(FP)** when problematic | FP : 7 |
|  | person are viral they will be mocking them and the and /  **(RP)** and they \ **(RF)** and maybe they are able to gain | RF : 2  RP : 1 |
|  | followers but therefore aren’t people that are educated |  |
|  | themselves and this is bad for the moment it’s a |  |
|  | because, uh, **(FP)** because other people being |  |
|  | problematic they will a quick jump into decision with |  |
|  | mocking them without actually trying to educate |  |
|  | themselves and what they and because they think that |  |
|  | they are better than the influences, uh, **(FP)** itself so at |  |
|  | the ned it will not achieve so let’s comparison on our |  |
|  | side the house the trend will be, uh, **(FP)** blaming this |  |
|  | person will not happen, uh, **(FP)** will not happen panels, |  |
|  | so we think that we are \ **(RF)** we should, uh, **(FP)** we |  |
|  | think that our, uh, **(FP)** benefits is exclusive and we are |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | so proud of this thing. |  |

# Appendix 5. Transcription Jessica speech

Jessica / SMAN 68 Jakarta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total**  **Speech Error** |
| 1 | Judges let’s see how opposite side of the house here clearly isn’t understanding what the first speakers from our side of the house has already clearly bought. First, they talk about how, // **(SP)** mm, **(FP)** they all they over and over talked about how it is not enough, not enough and not enough when obviously the motion here is not a solution we’re not saying that we’re using this as a solution of social change we’re using it is a tool because in the and of the day we want to make effect, we want to make efficiency, we want to find an effective solution and this is just one of the tools that we would do in order to promote social change, one thing is that. Next I will be giving four rebuttals towards the opposite side of the house. First talking the they look the example of James Charles and Tony Lopez, now here we / **(RP)** we are not / **(RP)** we are not talking about the cancel culture that’salready currently existing like what the first speaker from arsenal has already mentioned cancel culture is obviously toxic we all know that we are all aware of that however our side of the house advocates and believes that // **(SP)** with the social the cancel culture that we advocate for is those that we an objective and don’t have unnecessary hate to it with this kind of, um, **(FP)** cancel culture that has been done to **Jam James (SOT)** Charles and Tony Lopez they’re obviously doing it just for their own entertaiment just to make fun of them, they’re doing it because they want to \ **(RF)** they’re doing it because their haters are sudenly there using it as a platfrom to talk about all the bad stuff that they done when this is exactly not what we  are advocating for. | SP : 2  FP : 2  RF : 1  RP : 2  SOT : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | Next talking anout how James Charles currently is still famous now. The problem is that another point that we do not want to take away their livelihood, as the end of the day these public figures have their platfrom as there livelihood and that is not what they want, what we want // **(SP)** we’re not \ **(RF)** we don’t want to take away the fact that they are famous we just want them to take accountability for their actions and for people to understand for them to understand that what they are doing is wrong and that is should be discussed. Next talking about how they it is not enough when exactly // **(SP)** cancel culture, er, **(FP)** and how it is not enough and that instead of that they wnat to educate the people. Now here we see that the opposition of the house it’s clearly being unrealistic, because // **(SP)** if we think about it logically if you were to either give people backlash to educate them educating is such a passive process that obviously people would not follow is let’s be realistic here educating them would do nothing they would do way / **(RP)** way less than actually giving them the backlash and giving them the shock that what they’re doing is wrong being directed and telling them what they are doing is wrong and that they have to defend for their actions which is why we’re saying that even cancel culture here brings the issue to the table and in the end of the day eductaes them and educate towards the problem that we are facing. So, actually their solutionof educating is already brought in the, err,  **(FP)** in the movement of cancel culture itself. | SP : 3  FP : 2  RF : 1  RP : 1 |
| 3 | In the end of the day it is not effective and it can be, mm, **(FP)** implemented through this cancel culture itself //**(SP)** next, //**(SP)** um, **(FP)** // **(SP)** next I will be moving on to my motions, so // **(SP)** the we are \ **(RF)** we will be bringing four motions here. First is why is justifiable, second effectiviness thrid, mm, **(FP)**  // **(SP)** why // **(SP)** the morality of this \ **(RF)** why is it morally just what / **(RP)** what kind of social movements are we talking about and I’ll be bringing a  stakeholder analysis of this why it is best for all sides | SP : 6  FP : 3  RF : 2  RP : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | in socienty here right now. The first speakers of our house is already bought about why is more effectife because one more direct solution second the issue is actually being to the table, but let’s talk about why it would not be effective on their side of the house, why do we not what would happen if we were not to implement this motion. One, the issue is just being swept under the rug, because as we can see here socienty would not want they wouldn’t be as interested if it was just an educating process, what ever it is they never even talk about how they want to educate these people they never gave a clear picture of what it wouldn be likeeducating trought what through the government I don’t know to the people I don’t know. They never / **(RP)** they never expalined at all about this, which is why we demand an explaination from the opposite side of the house. That’s first the problems are swept under the rug, because if we were to implement this motion at least the issue is being discussed and people are able to find out what is right,  what is wrong. |  |
| 4 | The news outlets will be talking about this, because it’s something viral and right now viral things are. What’s really effective when we want to promote social change. Things that are hugely discussed things that are controversial when we talk about these issues then we are able to find out what we’re supposed to do, what we’re not supposed to do, what is right what is wrong and then we can find a solution and as well educate the people and educated the influencers. Second, justice is not brought up in thiss issue if this issue is just brought under put under the swept, under the rug like we said before // **(SP)** we’re not abel to find out what is right, what is wrong. Thrid, these important topics // **(SP)** these important topics would not be brought up all right, now let’s talk about why even in our worst case scenario it would be better than their best case scenario. Our worst case scenario is even if these people do not change even if these people  do not say sorry or they do say sorry and they go back | SP : 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | to being famous again and people still and they still have some fans at least we can see right now that James Charles // **(SP)** there are he has so many haters, because people are aware of the fact that he does a lot of bad things and that they should not follow people like him and that he is not a right public figure, they know the things that he has done wrong but if we were  not to implement this motion no one would know that. |  |
| 5 | People would not be aware that what this person is | SP : 3 |
|  | doing is bad // **(SP)** and that these issues should be | FP : 1 |
|  | talked about an example we can take is saying the n- | RF : 5 |
|  | word a few years back let’s just go back to about 10 | RP : 1 |
|  | years people didn’t talk \ **(RF)** the people didn’t |  |
|  | understand the significance of the n-word as much as it |  |
|  | is talked about what now. Why? Because cancel |  |
|  | culture exists and a lot of public, uh, **(FP)** influencers |  |
|  | they were canceled for saying the n-word which is |  |
|  | why the topic was then discussed talking about why it |  |
|  | has \ **(RF)** what sinificance it has what meaning it has |  |
|  | behind it and now people are why more careful and |  |
|  | they understand they are educated about the fact that |  |
|  | thesen is a negative connotation behind that word and |  |
|  | that we should not just carelessly say it which just |  |
|  | shows that cancel culture can really educate not only |  |
|  | the / **(RP)** the influencers, on only tell them, that they |  |
|  | are wrong but also society because when society sees |  |
|  | when these people \ **(RF)** these followers see that their |  |
|  | public figure are doing that kind of thing it will be |  |
|  | normalized and they will not know that it is a mistake |  |
|  | // **(SP)** and then what is their best case scenario that’s |  |
|  | their best case scenario like what we said before is to |  |
|  | only educate these influencers, once again they never |  |
|  | really explain what educating means and once again |  |
|  | let’s be realistic educating them would not bring a lot |  |
|  | of significance, would not bring a lot of efficiency and |  |
|  | in the end of day it would be very – very hard to |  |
|  | actually educate a huge amount of people for us to |  |
|  | actually do social change, because educating // **(SP)** |  |
|  | even if it’s as \ **(RF)** it’s more at \ **(RF)** it’s most |  |
|  | effective it will only educate the influencers it self at |  |
|  | most. |  |
| 6 | Now let’s talk about what kind of \ **(RF)** why is it | SP : 1 |
|  | morally just / **(RP)** it is morally just because in the end | FP : 1 |
|  | of the day these and social media influencers have a | RF : 2 |
|  | big platfrom and it’s their responsibility, they should | RP : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | be aware that whether or not. They like it, they are \ **(RF)** they have a certain amount of influence towards people and that they should be responsible towards the things that they did and that // **(SP)** they should take accountability if they were to do something wrong and they should educate their followers as well and fans as well. That what they did was wrong also a bit, uh, **(FP)** information on what kind of social movement that we’re talking about / **(RP)** we’re talking about social movements that have a lot of controversy and power over society for example bullying, racism, black face, n-words, feminism, sexual harassment and other things as such. Quick stakeholder analysis for people they are able to be aware of what is right, what is wrong. They are able to (07.20/slesai) find out about what should not be done or not and for influencers they are able to take accountability, able to learn from their mistakes and so in the end of the day from our arguments it’s way more structured and showing that our side of the housse deserves to win and I hope  proud to propose thingking. (1:10:37) |  |

# Appendix 6. Transcription Aya speech

Aya / SMAN 2 Jakarta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraf** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech Error** |
| 1 | Panels, notice thatwe already bring mechanisms that will not only educate them panels, we will block them so they wouldn’t get any spotlight like they shouldand we also give them punishment like tail lost **cut cutters (SOT)** stuff that / **(RP)** that are all of and all of it already mentions on our first speakers. They said really bad and they never listened to our mechanisms finals. So now, on to my rebuttals. First, uh, **(FP)** starting from the first speakers how their arguments consist of why is it justified and how their set will create discussions, uh, **(FP)** on why is it justified they said that it’s make the person realize what their mistake. First responses is we believe that it will  create a backlash, because cancel culture only aims on | FP : 3  RP : 1  SOT : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | to call out people and not educate them. There is no likelihood of them or that people that they all out to educate their self by the end of the day. We believe that they only, um, **(FP)** spread haters towards these people which will be backlash by the end of the day and I will explain that elaborate on my arguments later. Secondly, they will mention about howw their  child will create discussion. |  |
| 2 | First responses we believe that it is untrue be believe | SP : 3 |
|  | that the spotlight that cancel culture give have nothing to do with discussions. They need to realize that the likelihood of queso culture only brings it by the other  day. Even if it’s through panels it is unexclusive, | FP : 6  RF : 1  CR : 1  RP : 4 |
|  | because our proposals bring discussion and / **(RP)** and |  |
|  | discussion and educations too. We with our side of the |  |
|  | house is better because we are / **(RP)** we are aligned |  |
|  | with our interests, which is to advocate and spread |  |
|  | awarness instead of hate, right? They need to show |  |
|  | you on how their side of the house have likelihood of |  |
|  | this thing to be achievable or else, their side cannot |  |
|  | win because it’s not correlated with our interests at the |  |
|  | very first place // **(SP)** and they also, uh, **(FP)** starting |  |
|  | and then on the second speakers they motioned about |  |
|  | how we, umm, **(FP)** neglect their speakers by saying |  |
|  | that –oh **(IT)** our side only use this as tool, which is, |  |
|  | mm, **(FP)** not / **(RP)** not // **(SP)** it often at all, |  |
|  | because it’s exactly what we’re saying is that / **(RP)** is |  |
|  | that exactly what we mean as the tools which means |  |
|  | you’re using cancel culture to actually call people that |  |
|  | are wrong, but we believe that is \ **(RF)** that it is under |  |
|  | justify and create backlash with already explained by |  |
|  | Mr speaker they also mentioned about how there’s not |  |
|  | only one to those people that, mm, **(FP)** // **(SP)** mm, |  |
|  | **(FP)** being called out to take, uh, **(FP)** to just take a |  |
|  | big accountability. |  |
| 3 | First response to this we believe that it’s untrue. The | SP : 1  FP : 8  RF : 1  UF : 1  RP : 2 |
|  | real world wouldn’t look like that, they neglect the |
|  | facts and examples with my \ **(RF)** by my first biggest |
|  | but \\ **(UF)** that shows an actually real life of cancel |
|  | culture is, like, **(FP)** in online societies, right? They |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | are the ones that lives in imaginary world exactly the moment their side of the house, mm, **(FP)** // **(SP)** their side of the house neglect the facts and examples given by, mm, **(FP)** my first speakers and also even / **(RP)** even though, uh, **(FP)** even though taking accountability met the achievable understand the house we believe that it’s not exclusive as well, because, mm, **(FP)** there’s not clear because we believe that they’re out of the house but they only create, mm, **(FP)** only promote mocking and / **(RP)** mocking and society will not listen to them, even though they try to educate, because they already the label this movement or communities as like about communities that, uh, **(FP)** spread hate side, mm, **(FP)**  and they also make a contradiction panels. |  |
| 4 | They said / **(RP)** they said the second speakers said | SP : 4 |
|  | that education is not **impot – im – import (SOT)** // **(SP)** would that the education on our side of the house will do nothing and how it is unrealistic. But notice on how their first speakers, uh, **(FP)** mentions that their /  **(RP)** their impact is to create discussion, so that they | FP : 5  RF : 2  UF : 1  RP : 2  SOT : 2 |
|  | could educate people right, which is why if they said |  |
|  | that educate people is unimportant on \\ **(UF)** or will |  |
|  | do something they will would they even put it on their |  |
|  | mechanisms righ? That the mechanisms is a really bad |  |
|  | things, and then lastly about how their stats mention |  |
|  | their worst case scenario is still better than our best |  |
|  | quest scenarios by telling that even if those people |  |
|  | don’t say sorry at least people wouldn’t hate them |  |
|  | notice that it’s not even their worst case scenario |  |
|  | because **the – tip – that (SOT)** people do not sorry is |  |
|  | actually what will happen it is not worst case scenario |  |
|  | it is what will like \ **(RF)** will actually happen it is the |  |
|  | most, like, **(FP)** it’s the scenario that have the biggest |  |
|  | likelihood to happen, but this worst case scenario is |  |
|  | that \ **(RF)** if this, um, **(FP)** if our of movement is will |  |
|  | be seen bad and how our side will only spread hate, |  |
|  | which is not corellated to our interested right. And |  |
|  | responses to this we also believe // **(SP)** that, mm, |  |
|  | **(FP)** their side only // **(SP)** their side is wrong // **(SP)** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | for glorifying this, uh, **(FP)** glorifying that people who  paid them as punishment is a benefits, right? |  |
| 5 | We believe that hates \ **(RF)** that attract those people | SP : 5 |
|  | backflashed with our movement because it can create our movement a bad names and // **(SP)** and they also said that it is better than an side without even, uh, **(FP)** engaging on how our side without even engaging on  how our selves will apply and only bring, uh, **(FP)** the | FP : 7  RF : 2  RP : 2  ST : 1  SOT : 3 |
|  | worst case on our side and telling them that it is our |  |
|  | best case which is completely wrong, now and \ **(RF)** |  |
|  | now open tommorow guest, uh, **(FP)** arguments here I |  |
|  | will brings about two argument which is how our set |  |
|  | can shift the focus to actual, to spotlight what actually |  |
|  | matters and how our site, uh, **(FP)** on how their site |  |
|  | will backlash and how their set will bring bad things |  |
|  | by the end of the day so // **(SP)** on the first // **(SP)** |  |
|  | first argument we believe that there is out of the house |  |
|  | only gloryfies but the persons which didn’t align with |  |
|  | our interests the soptligth should go to our activists |  |
|  | and movement instead of the person slightly wrong |  |
|  | right. Cancel culture only worse that scenario, |  |
|  | because, uh, **(FP)** er, **(FP)** because social movement |  |
|  | are the social activists would barely achieve // **(SP)** |  |
|  | what, uh, **(FP)** our goals and our aims is two skin |  |
|  | knowledge that might happen on their side of the |  |
|  | house, firstly cancel // **(SP)** this the dimensions of that |  |
|  | cancel **counter (culture) (SOT)** is will be a vital thing |  |
|  | like and how it is a trend. We believe that many |  |
|  | influencers outside of the **ac – acts (SOT)** of activism |  |
|  | itself will join this camcel culture because it was a |  |
|  | trend right. They want to be see nice and supportive or |  |
|  | some-some-some **(ST)** kind of / **(RP)** some kind of |  |
|  | activism, ( “no” ) thank you. And they also want to gai |  |
|  | attention right? because they’re influencers they’re / |  |
|  | **(RP)** they’re get attention and they didn’t even |  |
|  | educate themselve about the matters, right. We believe |  |
|  | this is harmful, because itshifts the focus to the trend, |  |
|  | so the actual people from the **comm community** |  |
|  | **(SOT)** itself that wants to educate wouldn’t get the |  |
|  | spotlight, right? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | Realize now implants have areally big impact on online communities the moment they joined the trends without even knowing the reason of cancellations that happens they would just take the spotlight from what actually matters. This likely will be so big anf it wan’t happen. ( “no” ) no, thank you. It’s happening in the status quo right now for example a lot of people call out about art is doing all their appropriations right, and a lot of people also join to call up this artist right. But what does impact, they cover people from the / **(RP)** from the actual character to / **(RP)** to, uh, **(FP)** speak up about this even right. Even if the influecer attention is nice or they actually want to educate their follower most of the time, they only cover the people that actually should get the actual spotlight, right. And that people that actually want to educate about the matters which is why we believe that impact is bad better today on our side of the house and are compare to our side on our mechanisms shown how our site we are actually aligend with our interest, because we aim to educate panels. Yes, we can see it we might not get that much attention **wit – with (SOT)** out trends but we believe our site is still better because we fully  achieve our aim to educate. | FP : 1  RP : 2  SOT : 1 |
| 7 | We believe that long time is fine, because if we want it fast, we will end up getting backlash where people that join us only do it for trends which is really bad things as I explained this is a bad this is bad because when your followers itself are uneducate or the people that joins our movements are indicated and don’t want to educate themselves if they and, uh, **(FP)** // **(SP)** educate them selves which is really a bad thing even if they want the educate themselves after they’re doing any movement we’re starting and it’s not exclusive because on our side / **(RP)** on our side of the house we can also attract people that actually support and lose or goal to hard our movement. So, even if it’s slow it’s shares and a consistent which is \\ **(UF)** why it’s benefited on our second house. Second, kind of even if those influencers didn’t joint the trends or the cancel culture itself which is only fully from the peoples of the movement // **(SP)** and of the communities itself we  believe it is still bad, because it can bring us bad | SP : 3  FP : 3  RF : 1  UF : 2  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | names which is, uh, **(FP)** opens to my second argument. Firstly, before I start that, uh, **(FP)** a little bit of characteristic cancel culture, uh, **(SP)** agains cancel culture really share anything about education and awarness on what the social movement itself support. But instead focus on the cancelling of the person that makes mistake right. This nano \ **(RF)** this mostly points out about one person mistakes and rarely spread out about what person would \\ **(UF)**  shoul have done, right. |  |
| 8 | We believe that this will bring our // **(SP)** our | SP : 1 |
|  | communities bad name because the highlight of the cancel cultur will only focus on telling people that someone did wrong instead of educating / **(RP)**  educating them to not be, like, (**FP)** to not \ **(RF)** to be | FP : 3  RF : 2  RP : 2  SOT :1 |
|  | like those person like. Notice that my speakers also |  |
|  | mentioned that people onlin are easy to be **provocate** |  |
|  | **– pro – vocate (SOT)** the narrative will only bring |  |
|  | hates towards a person why those days are bad day by |  |
|  | the end of the day. We believe that it is bad, because it |  |
|  | show on how our movement are our community is |  |
|  | harsh an just full of weight (1:18:33/slesai) which is |  |
|  | total opposite from our aims and goals right. We want |  |
|  | to avoid that, because on our side of the house we will |  |
|  | educate people as how it is aligned with our |  |
|  | differences intead. We want to avoid backlash where |  |
|  | people will know will / **(RP)** will think that we are bad |  |
|  | at, uh, **(FP)** by themselves these scenarios in our |  |
|  | sights. It when education are said how they’re able to |  |
|  | keep or grow slowly. First response it is we believe |  |
|  | that it is likely to happen because on social media we |  |
|  | believe that we can educate on social media where |  |
|  | things canbe spread easily. So, I think \ **(RF)** so we |  |
|  | think that our aim to reach more audience is always |  |
|  | possible if it does online, right? But even if it doesn’t |  |
|  | happen we believe slow progress is fine because our |  |
|  | slow progress makes a good progress instead of just |  |
|  | getting backlash on their side of the house and how |  |
|  | they’re set up without inconsistent eith and not |  |
|  | aligning eith interest which is why shows on our side |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | is so pro, uh, **(FP)** outside is better I’m surprised.  Thank you (1:19:10) |  |

# Appendix 7. Transcription Elsabel speech

Elsabel / SMA 68 Jakarta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total**  **Speech Error** |
| 1 | Ladies and gantelman, that’s see that we both / **(RP)** both of the house, uh, **(FP)** once, uh, **(FP)** want, uh, **(FP)** change in the socienty, but in this under this motion our side of the house brings, uh, propose a better solution by  / **(RP)** by canceling those public figure and-and-and **(ST)** our / **(RP)** our second speaker and first speaker has stated that how are we gonna / **(RP)** how are we gonna implement those-those-those cancel culture. The first one is we do not advocate for the low / **(RP)** low level key because they don’t have, uh, **(FP)** a bigger platfrom they don’t have, uh, **(FP)** a wide enough platfrom to influence other people and second that we / **(RP)** we won’t at advocate for unnecessarily prolonged cancel culture, and because of that we do not advocate for bring up their post mistakes in the process, because what? Because we believe if they have // **(SP)** if they have passed their / **(RP)** their mistakes if they / **(RP)** if they have realized their mistakes and moving on with their life, uh, **(FP)** living their life, uh, **(FP)** freely without doing anymore mistake then // **(SP)** it’s not nesessarily we have to bring up bout their past their past mistakes. And now, uh, **(FP)** first of all why is it / **(RP)** why is it our house is better that we \ **(RF)** that you voices in all positions having a house, because we want this public figure to be accountable, to be responsible what of \ **(RF)** what they’re doing and what will what \ **(RF)** and what // **(SP)** are their next step, what-what-will-what-what **(ST)** future might hold \\ **(UF)** holds them and from the solution or / **(RP)** or // **(SP)** from the solution that was proposed by the oppositions of the house, they did not  mention or elaborate, uh, **(FP)** how do they want to make | SP : 4  FP : 9  RF : 3  UF : 1  RP : 10  ST : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | those public figures responsible, and about education. Because they do not elaborate anything about their  solution. |  |
| 2 | They only talk about education by nor explaining what | SP : 2 |
|  | kind of education, how are you going to educate who –ah **(IT)** to whom are you going to educate // **(SP)** and it doesn’t mean that we-we-we **(ST)** say that education is not / **(RP)** is not important or in ours \ **(RF)** in our  scenario. There is no education, we rather believe that by | FP : 6  RF : 2  CR : 1  RP : 8  ST : 2 |
|  | / **(RP)** by making up public discussions, uh, **(FP)** uh, |  |
|  | **(FP)** in terms of concelling those / **(RP)** those public |  |
|  | figures is / **(RP)** is also about education, why? Because |  |
|  | we \ **(RF)** because there will be some smart people who |  |
|  | can take the lead of the discussion, who can actually // |  |
|  | **(SP)** tell other people about what is right and what is |  |
|  | wrong and it’s an education for the society. It’s / **(RP)** |  |
|  | it’s also an education for the public figures themselves, |  |
|  | because they will listen to what people are taking about. |  |
|  | And now, moving on into three points of, uh, **(FP)** three |  |
|  | points that are clashing in this / **(RP)** in this debate. The |  |
|  | first one is about education. The ladies and gantelman, |  |
|  | uh, **(FP)** the government have the house we have |  |
|  | objectives and boundaries is what our / **(RP)** our first |  |
|  | speaker has stated our objectives is what we-we-will |  |
|  | **(ST)** make the public figure realize, change and make a |  |
|  | social change by / **(RP)** by showing that they are |  |
|  | responsible by showing that they know what they did |  |
|  | was wrong and they change, and because of that they |  |
|  | wiil use their platfrom to show their growth, because it’s |  |
|  | all about growth too and people can change, people can |  |
|  | grow. But we also, uh, **(FP)** but we also in this, uh, **(FP)** |  |
|  | we also have boundaries. |  |
| 3 | That our boundaries is that we will not hate them and we | SP : 4  FP : 8  RF : 3  UF : 2  RP : 16  ST : 2 |
|  | will giving them second change by / **(RP)** by giving / |
|  | **(RP)** by giving them the change by, uh, **(FP)** making |
|  | them // **(SP)** still, uh, **(FP)** still can utilize the \\ **(UF)** |
|  | their platfrom to show that they / **(RP)** they can change |
|  | this is unlikely \\ **(UF)** unlike the opposition of the house |
|  | proposed that / **(RP)** that they will / **(RP)** they will block |
|  | them and actually block is-is-is **(ST)** also a cancel culture |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | too, because you / **(RP)** you cancel them, so you block them / **(RP)** so you block them to / **(RP)** to don’t have any platfrom and it’s a form of the / **(RP)** the platformized and if you block the / **(RP)** the public figures which it \ **(RP)** which is unjustified, because they are still human and they might only, uh, **(FP)** say somenthing wrong / **(RP)** they might only say something wrong but they do not harm you in a direct and personal way. And it’s not \ **(RF)** it’s just not just because- because-because **(ST)** they can change and you just block them you / **(RP)** you block them from from getting the second change and / **(RP)** and, uh, **(FP)** making, umm, **(FP)** making money for, uh, **(FP)** // **(SP)** for a living making money for a living, and // **(SP)** and second, uh, **(FP)** why is this justified, because if people take about some certain issue then there will be media coverage, media will talk for intance, uh, **(FP)** people are talking about the n-word, because some celebrities say are // **(SP)** were say \ **(RF)** we’re saying that, and because of that we cancel those celebrities and after that the media convers about how bad is it, if you say the n- word and it will create, uh, **(FP)** some \ **(RF)** it will create some reading so / **(RP)** so people in the future can learn about the past events, can learn about the past mistakes, that the past public figures made and so that’s why many people will educated by our tool, by this tool,  by our way. |  |
| 4 | And second point is that the impact to social change, we believe it’s a direct solution to the society because compared to do nothing, uh, **(FP)** / **(RP)** because compare to do nothing, uh, **(FP)** because compared to do nothing or / **(RP)** or not taking any serious action by relying on the authority to make \ **(RF)** to take them to jail for instance and our cose scenario is again better than your best case scenario, because we \ **(RF)** because at least people in the future know what is right, what is wrong and they won’t follow the public figure if tnd if the / **(RP)** if the public figure does not change, uh, **(FP)** for instance is the worst scenario, then at least you are  educated people are aware, and / **(RP)** and yes, uh, **(FP)** | SP : 2  FP : 8  RF : 5  CR : 1  RP : 11  ST : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | we / **(RP)** we can still, um, **(FP)** give them second change if they / **(RP)** if they eventually / **(RP)** if they eventually apologize // **(SP)** and we’re not trying to send hate or make them not popular anymore. Not unlike the opposition have the house which, uh, **(FP)** who blocks them, and who blocks them from havingthe second change and make moneyfor a living. And their solution by puting them to jail such as / **(RP)** as the first people proposed doesn’t educate the people it’s better to educate a much of people than just educate the person privately, because you don’t \ **(RF)** you didn’t elaborate it and-and- and **(ST)** for example Saipul Jamil, he got jailed for six years and after they got \ **(RF)** after he got, uh, **(FP)** he got out he didn’t get, because he didn’t get any education he // **(SP)** and we canceled them because / **(RP)** because our people who were not educated by canceling them in the past didn’t know that what they \ **(RF)** what he did was wrong and educating but block them for instance maybe you-you-you-you **(ST)** will educated them privatly, but you block them, then how are they gonna make the change to spread it to use the platfrom to spread what is it the right thing actually, and the last one point that is clashing is about why is it morally jarred. – Well **(CR)** are you just we believe that after all they did something wrong and we have to do something to make them realize. The idea of if / **(RP)** of if you dare to do something you have to be ready for the consequences or you have to be responsible and because / **(RP)** and because you are blocking them or de–platformizing them it is just unlike, we propose the best scenario and still, uh, **(FP)** still morally, just that is why we are proud to  propose. Please suport foe propose. |  |

# Appendix 8. Transcription Elena speech

Elena / SMAN 2 Jakarta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech**  **Error** |
| 1 | And also I think there’s a of the house already felt on | SP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | this bit, because I’ve probably said. Firstly, let me clearing the mechanisms, because it’s still not clear until the end of the debate right. What is the different without side of the house we educate these peoples through our mechanisms we taught society that you should not following these artists that being canceled do without provocate them and inviting them to hate these peoples, right. We will educate these people when media already announced and clarify that an influencer is guilty, so under our side we will not directly take conclusions that these people’s is guilty. Punishment is not our burden by us you need to realize that your burden is to change these peole’s mindset, right. If you talk about punishment then it already exists at the very first place social punishment trough gossip through, uh, **(FP)** // **(SP)** , uh, **(FP)** through jail it exists on the status quo, right. On the corporasion on your side of the house you need to realize when they counseling it means they told society that these people are guilty you need to conceling them you, um, **(FP)** and this, uh, **(FP)** social movement invitng people to actually, um, **(FP)** hating them, right. So it’s totally different with our side of the house, because under our side you need to understand that we will not inviting people to actually start, um, **(FP)** provocate each other and start hating this, um, **(FP)** influencer, right. Basically you need to understand that the interest of social movemnts is to  being consistent to social change itself on their side. | FP : 7 |
| 2 | This will not achieve, because your propose at the | SP : 3 |
|  | first place is to change these people’s mindset, right. But, it become an interest to inviting people canceling them, hurting them that’s why understood of the  house in the rules of social movement will not | FP : 6  RF : 2  UF : 3  RP : 3 |
|  | achieve in the end of the day, because the purpose |  |
|  | itself change into / **(RP)** into inviting people’s to |  |
|  | cancelling // **(SP)** the counseling these people to, uh, |  |
|  | **(FP)** // **(SP)** to / **(RP)** to actually hating them, right. |  |
|  | But, thridly they told you that this influencer does not |  |
|  | have platfrom to get spotlight. But you need to realize |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | panels that you are the one who give them spotlight through cancel culture itself. The social movement announced to society that you shoul call, that you should hate, um, **(FP)** an a artist for example it means you give spotlight for them, right. I don’t understand / understand, uh, **(FP)** what they say talking, like, **(FP)** but thridly, uh, **(FP)** \\ **(UF)** fourthly they told you that they will this happen, right. They told you about like, um, **(FP)** about their argument but there is no likelihood, because you know we already bring the characteristics of society, where is it being provocated without actually knowing the back story of the contac itself, right. Yes, they will make harm direct. They \\ **(UF)** the for \ **(RF)** the influencer itself, but they are not directly giving education, giving information to society about how this influencer is doing that action. All of the talk to society is that \\ **(UF)** this // **(SP)**artist is guilty and you / **(RP)** and you ned to hate them, right. Lastly, the bundaries is too late, but even if it’s not late it’s not likely they stole our arguments were we told you that peop \ **(RF)** that these peoples start hating these influencers, because you thought about cancel culture, right. I don’t understand why on their side of the house they can give up boundaries for people, so not hating this artist, right. Moving to my class, I found two questions on this debate. First question justification level. They told you about misconceptions, but they say that these people deserve this hate, transporses. Firstly this is not important the fact is that your propose is to do social  change, not only fighting people’s hating them. |  |
| 3 | The fact when you state about misconceptions it | FP : 4 |
|  | means this society does not know what kind of wrong action that this artist that being consulet or no, right. Secondly, you need to understand that these days | RF : 1  RP : 1  SOT :1 |
|  | cancel culture is become entrenched on social medias |  |
|  | like tik – tok, small mistake can make you being **cons** |  |
|  | **canceled (SOT)** and we don’t think it’s justified, |  |
|  | right. Second chance still exists for people’s just, uh, |  |
|  | **(FP)** do small mistake panels you need to understand |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | when you let this \ **(RF)** when you let these people’s counseling, uh, **(FP)** uh, **(FP)** these influencers just because small mistake it means you give a message to socienty that if / **(RP)** if someone do mistake for them, I need to cancel them you should hate them, it would be hard for socienty to forgive people in the end of the day. There’s no never response to that, right. Thrid, uh, **(FP)** lastly even if it’s justified it’s not significant you need to realize that this socienty having misconception, right. But this socienty having misconception, right. It must be questioning to them. How they can make people’s being smart and educate and know what constitution when a lot of people  being provocated with us. |  |
| 4 | The benefits will not achieve, because they told you  from first until thrid speaker that they can make | FP : 2  RP : 2 |
|  | society know what, uh, **(FP)** what actually is wrong |  |
|  | or not, right. The fact is that it will not achieve, |  |
|  | because the likelihood of society / **(RP)** society |  |
|  | doesn’t know about the back story or of, uh, **(FP)** or |  |
|  | what wrong actions did that the influencers do, right. |  |
|  | But, on the second point make these influencers |  |
|  | realize two responses, but these this is not true the |  |
|  | fact is that okay, they get bad comments, but it does |  |
|  | not mean they will suddenly realize. Knowing that |  |
|  | they realize when influencer get spotlight even though |  |
|  | the spotlight is in hate comments from they’re still |  |
|  | happy. Because why some parties can give them job |  |
|  | to inviting them at variety show to do clarification |  |
|  | video to entertaining society, right. This is |  |
|  | characteristic of society that you need to change when |  |
|  | people doing bad actions, society give them spotlight |  |
|  | panels. Even if in / **(RP)** in the hate comment from |  |
|  | they still happy because they get spotlight, right. The |  |
|  | fact is that spotlight is not benefiting you a social |  |
|  | movement, but give this influencer spotlight. |  |
| 5 | Secondly, even if it’s true it’s not exclusive, right. | FP : 2 |
|  | When influencers do bad things, they still get punishment like jail punishment, love punishment or even if they don’t get that there are social punishment, | RF : 1  UF : 1  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | right. We think on a status quo is more than enough to give this influencer realization, right. What makes the cancel culture exclusive, but lastly discussion will exists through this process. Firstly, this is not \ **(RF)** this is not signifiant, uh, **(FP)** this is not significant benefits that the discussion that happens is / **(RP)** is in a gossip froms, only gossiping about the bad actions just for material to entertaining society to have something to talk and we don’t think that this is benefiting, right. This kind of discussion is not benefiting because it’s only like a toxic, uh, **(FP)** discussion where you only in the from of material for you to having something to discuss but secondly not exclusive discussion will happen on the rest of the house anyways when art is being problematic there will be news reporting this, right. What makes the discussion exclusive lastly even if it’s exclusive we think a discussion wil not useful, because you need to realize people use this for just gossip for one day. When the next day there is another artist they will start changing the go \\ **(UF)** the topic they will start changing the.. gossip, right. In the end of the day on the side of the house social change will not happen because society only use that for entertaiment just  having a materials to talk, right. |  |
| 6 | Comparatively under our side of the house you need | SP : 1 |
|  | to realize when we didn’t make this as a friend after society will not being provocated, right. // **(SP)** The | FP : 1  RP : 3 |
|  | society is not using this a gossip but when, uh, **(FP)** |  |
|  | but on our mechanisms on their side you need to |  |
|  | realize there will be lots of perfection, because all of |  |
|  | you do is just blaming, right. Evenif on their side, |  |
|  | they can’t / **(RP)** they can’t get followers all of they |  |
|  | got is bad followers where it contains people who are |  |
|  | easily blaming these people society will see you as in |  |
|  | that movement, because you generalizing that |  |
|  | blaming people is okay. In the end of the day you get |  |
|  | bad names as my second speaker told you, right. |  |
|  | Under our worst case scenario even if the progress to |  |
|  | educate these people is step by step and kind of slow |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | it’s okay. So, if they / **(RP)** if they talk about followers you need to weigh which one will chose, right. Quantity versus quality you should choose quality because in the end of the day if you get a lot of quantity on their side of the house you will lose your followers again because all of your followers is just blaming people hating people you are not being consistent you give society a message that if / **(RP)** if people doing mistake what you need to do is blaming and hacking them that’s why we are so proud to  propose, thank you. (07:20/1:35:14 selesai) |  |

# Appendix 9. Transcription Aya conclusion speech

Aya (conclusion) / SMAN 2 Jakarta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total**  **Speech Error** |
| 1 | Panels, notice that their site clearly promoting mocking they never bring like why mocking will actually make people change unknocking will be the exact potential why to make our goal cheap, so which is why we believe there’s had achievements in the day. Let me sum up the debate starting from the justification class their first speaker’s arguments only, but // **(SP)**only talks about how it is justified because it can make the person realize that their-their-their **(ST)** mistakes. They never bring an elective code on how those people would listen to them or how their purposes will work panels our site responds to them this by telling you that this is not what will happen, but instead it will be backers for the communities. My first speakers countributes on giving mechanisms  |signal| my first speakers also told you the characteristics of socienties and how they are easy to be provoked which shows that these mentions will not go well and cannot be justified by debate at the end of the day, because what their glorifies will not work. We shows bigger likelihood that these proposals will  only send haters towards the people which are not | SP : 1  ST : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | tolerated to what our goals and stances as a social  movement, right. |  |
| 2 | They never responses this well and never / **(RP)** and never neglect the realife example of cancel culture itdelf that their site should engage but don’t \ **(RF)** but they only mention about how it is wrong, but they didn’t tel us what / **(RP)** what will accept exactly // **(SP)** happen on their side of the house and like the foots we believe that their argument is not enough. What are such contributes to you we give likelihood of the real world and how the shows on and it shows on how society is too easy to be provoked at the moment it will only pass hate because of this. There is not only say that is untrue but don’t elevate anything, which is why we believe the response is enough \ **(RF)** is not enough finals. There are burdens to answer about why it is \ **(RF)** it’s just \ **(RF)** it is judtified cannot stand at the moment there is no likelihood which is why we believe our side when the justification costs, on the pratice quest. The recitability shows any, uh, **(FP)** but there’s not barely brings any arguments,er, **(FP)** about impact and only bring extensions from the first speakers but let’s talk about it shall we they bring arguments about how in the long term they will create discussion our responses is personally untrue we believe the spotlight that can \ **(RF)** that cancel culture gives have nothing to do with discussionn they need to realize that the likelihood of cancel cultures only bring needs even if it’s true it is unexclusive, because our propose  is being discussion two and educations as well. | SP : 1  FP : 2  RF : 5  RP : 2 |
| 3 | They need to show / **(RP)**to show you on how they’re set up likelihood of this thing to be achievable or else their site cannot win because it’s not corroded with our interests at the very first place. They also mentioned about how they just want those people to take accountabilities of their mistakes neglecting the fact that haters are the ones that will be spotlight, right. We believe that this argument is untrue, the real  world wouldn’t look like that. They / **(RP)** they chose | SP : 1  RP : 4  SOT : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | no likelihood so that arguments cannot be **create credited**, **(SOT)** right. Even if it happened it is not exclusive against. On their side canceled cultures becoming trend, where people blaming this artis being canceled and you need to know that it / **(RP)** that it gives them spotlight whis is not our interest panels if  // **(SP)** you’re interested a social movement is to change these people’s mindsets, right. But the education have to come from you as the social movement itself not from the people that you cancel, right. Understand that when these people or artists that being canceled get spotlight, there will be no / **(RP)** there will be no any kind of education, because all this water is not for you buut for the people that  are but you cancel, right. |  |
| 4 | Even if it’s under our side you gain followers slowly | SP : 7 |
|  | but at least you;ve got followers who are have good enough qualities it is \ **(RF)** because it is important to  have good // **(SP)** good qualities followers because | FP : 5  RF : 2  RP : 1 |
|  | our purpose is to change, umm, **(FP)** // **(SP)** to make |  |
|  | social change, right. So, lastly what our site brings |  |
|  | which shows on how their sites will only bring bad |  |
|  | names and will only shift focus on the actual things |  |
|  | that should be highlited which is a really bad thing, |  |
|  | because it’s not related to our aims and our goals, we |  |
|  | elaborate on how uncharacteristic and characteristic |  |
|  | of societies and likelihood of things that our side on |  |
|  | our arguments brings // **(SP)** uh, **(FP)** to happen, |  |
|  | right. Their site didn’t engage in this and even their |  |
|  | responses is limited to that how argument is untrue. |  |
|  | But failed to our buddhist lord explains the likelihood |  |
|  | of their side will be through on or will be achievable, |  |
|  | right. We believe this clash should be win by our side |  |
|  | as well that’s how we // **(SP)** we chose impacts and |  |
|  | likelihood by the day // **(SP)** uh, **(FP)** at the end we |  |
|  | believe that we are able to fulfill the moment to make |  |
|  | people change, and we also, umm, **(FP)** // **(SP)** |  |
|  | correlated with our goals we also fulfill the \ **(RF)** we |  |
|  | also fulfill our burden of proof where we also shows |  |
|  | about, uh, **(FP)** likelihood and / **(RP)** likelihood and |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | how // **(SP)** likely what characteristic and clear mechanisms we’re so proud to oppose. Thank you.  (03.27 / 1:39:48 selesai) |  |

# Appendix 10. Transcription Jessica conclusion speech

Jessica (conslusion) / SMA 68 Jakarta

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total**  **Speech Error** |
| 1 | Judges, let’s be clear here the argument side of the house has were very exhausted listening to the arguments that has been brought by opposition house, why? Because one they clearly don’t understand the things that we have been saying over and over again and they clearly are bringing a case that is very vague and never in the first place give a clear farmwork of what it is. Let’s talk about two huge issue that the opposition side of the house has towards our side of the house. First they clearly said, err, **(FP)** as / **(RP)** as a response towards how they would educate they clearly said that they would not only educate but also quote, unquote, block the influencers and what does block mean, it means to bring them down from their platfrom which exactly is our motion which is to cancelculture, so in the end of the day really which stands are you in opposition house, are you on our side or are you in your own side, please be clear on your stance. And also they talked about how in the end of the day would still be social punishment they talked about social punishment and they talk about meaning that psychologically you do agree that cancel culture is needed, because cancel culture equals social punishment they’re talking. They’re talking that social punishment is needed for people to understand  that they need to take accountability. | FP : 1  RP : 1 |
| 2 | Second is, they do not understand what we’re talking about they clearly don’t understand what the motion is talking about. The motion clearly says that // **(SP)**  we’re using cancel culture as a tool, but they over and | SP : 4  FP : 5  UF : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | over and over again talk about how we’re saying that it’s a trend when obviously we’re saying that we’re using it as a tool not as a trend to ask people to join and hate on this guy, uh, **(FP)** on this certain, um, **(FP)** // **(SP)** influencer. And we also talked about how we would not focus on low level things saying that we only talk about the huge objectives. We talk about controversies that have a lot of power over socienty for example bullying, racism, blackface and other stuff like that and we also do not advocate for unnecessary hate, which we have been talking about over and over again but for some reason obviously inside the house keep bring it, er, **(FP)** er, **(FP)** // **(SP)** err, **(FP)** a thousand times already and so moving on to the overview of today’s debate govern thi \\ **(UF)** the // **(SP)** points brought by government and the points brought by opposition and why in the end of the day our side of the house brings a structured and clearer debate than the officers the opposite side of  the house. |  |
| 3 | Let’s talk about the burden of proof thet we have. | SP : 1 |
|  | First is, why is canceled calls to justifiy our side of the house talked about why it’s justifiable? Because we have as sert, we have a clear objective which is to  create social change and how do you create social | RF : 2  UF : 1  RP : 3  SOT :1 |
|  | change means that we need to have a huge effect, we |  |
|  | need to have a much influence as possible and why \\ |  |
|  | **(RF)** who do \ **(UF)** we do that, which is // **(SP)** we |  |
|  | do that by getting a lot of media coverage by getting |  |
|  | virality through this issue which how do we do that \ |  |
|  | **(RF)** we do that through cancel culture by |  |
|  | implementing **cancer (cancel) (SOT)** culture people |  |
|  | are able to be more aware of this issue people are able |  |
|  | to be educated by it, educated from it and in the end |  |
|  | of the day the / **(RP)** the influences themselves have a |  |
|  | big platfrom meaning that they have the responsibility |  |
|  | to take accountability for the actions and once again it |  |
|  | is also normally just because of this fact itself, |  |
|  | because they have to understand that there they have a |  |
|  | certain amount of influence over the people to other |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | side of the house didn’t really talk about why it was actually justifiable and their / **(RP)** their solutions here is only to educate and let’s be realistic here if even giving backlash woudn’t not make them change how would / **(RP)** how would educating them would  actually help. |  |
| 4 | Educating would not give as much info it would not | SP : 6 |
|  | give as much effect as we were to // **(SP)** implement cancel culture and also once again // **(SP)** if we were to only educate the people that means we’re only | FP : 2  UF : 1  SOT : 2 |
|  | focusing on the, uh, **(FP)** // **(SP)** mem \\ **(UF)** on the |  |
|  | person who is caught // **(SP)** on the public figure itself |  |
|  | meaning that we’re not able to educate the people as |  |
|  | well which in the case of ourselves of the house |  |
|  | would be able to do that. Second is, let’s talk about |  |
|  | what kind of social movement needs cancel culture |  |
|  | the second burden of the truth the social movement |  |
|  | that we’re talking about is like I said before the big |  |
|  | so the controversial ones that would actually attract a |  |
|  | lot of attention from the people meaning that it would |  |
|  | be able to reach more people and that it would be |  |
|  | much more effective at the end of the day, why is ours |  |
|  | more effective than them because one it is a direct |  |
|  | solution and the issue is brought to the able meaning |  |
|  | that it will be duscussed and it will in the end of the |  |
|  | day educate the people even if it is at the wort case |  |
|  | scenario // **(SP)** but **wh why (SOT)** is our worst case |  |
|  | scenario better than their best case scenario. Their |  |
|  | **biscuit (best it) (SOT)** scenario at the end of the day |  |
|  | does not bring as much effeciency as us and // **(SP)** |  |
|  | (04.20 / 1:44:43 waktu selesai) they never even clear |  |
|  | clearified what, uh, **(FP)** educating means and so in |  |
|  | the end of the day our side of the house brings way |  |
|  | more points and a more structured debate and that is |  |
|  | why our side of the house deserves to win both for us. |  |
|  | (1:44:53 selesai) |  |

# Appendix 11. Total speech errors in Gonzaga competition

**TOTAL SPEECH ERROR IN GONZAGA COMPETITION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **SP** | **FP** | **RF** | **UF** | **IT** | **CR** | **RP** | **ST** | **SOT** |
| Maura | 39 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 1 |
| Ghaitsa | 6 | 60 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 4 | 5 |
| Jessica | 18 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 |
| Aya | 17 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 8 |
| Elsabel | 12 | 31 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 45 | 8 | 0 |
| Elena | 5 | 22 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| Aya (conclusion) | 10 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| Jessica (conclusion) | 11 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| **SUM** | 118 | 178 | 66 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 123 | 24 | 20 |
| **TOTAL** | **553** | | | | | | | | |

The total number of speech errors in Gonzaga Competition are 553 data. 118 data of silent pause, 178 data of filled pause, 66 data of retraced false start, 19 data of unretratced false statr, 4 data of interjections, 1 data of correction, 123 data of repeats, 24 data of stutter, and 20 data of slip of the tongue.

# Appendix 12. Transcription Jhose speech

Jhose / Kejar Deatline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech**  **Error** |
| 1 | Three points of setup in this debate. One, we are talking about environmentally sensitive areas which mean that the area is very important for long-term interest for example it did not revert which **poses (proses) (SOT)** a significant importance in ecosystems for creating fertile lands around the river it directly links to the livelihood of people because it acts as a water resource for milions and has provided a source of irrigation to transport the dry area around it. It will last argicultural, right. Secondly, legal personel means that we will give the sensitive areas the right as a person that is to say we will givr righteousness not being heard and like etc, I think mostly the concern and contentious part is on issue of pollutants for environmental / **(RP)** environmental education. Thridly, for companies \ **(RF)** for individuals that distruct or provide the ones they receive legal punishment, *that is*, **(CR)** various based on the degree of severity just like the current court so there’s going to be a coordinated decision on what punishment is justified, so if opposition states we’ll punish them for minor crimes and that’s bad thing’s not true because the punishment will be propotionate to the front that being said two arguments one why we change corporations incentive and which are the major processes at school certainly why do we take society moving on to the first argument why can we change corporations which are the most protein addresses at school to have more  regressions and act better. | RF : 1  CR : 1  RP : 1  SOT : 1 |
| 2 | The promise of this argument is that companies are also some of the largest producess as well and we acknowledge that we need to pressure them to act more etically and engage in environmental friendly efforts. Firstly, why do companies act better on corporations  who I want to know unlike what opposition might say | - |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | that these problems for individuals at first claimed that corporations like MNCS are the major causes and destruction of the environment therefore the main answer of the run considering punishment we give is proportinate to the degree of deception they do this is because of true reasons one corporations are they incented to poorly and distrupt sensitive areas because usually those kinds of errors have more prosperty to build up new businesses for instance those areas provide lands which can be used to build up new factories which is harmful because those visits are going to be major contributing factors to water crossing across the globe or like those kinds of air forces because they usually do  illegal dumping or contaminate water gases etc. |  |
| 3 | Secondly, most likely sensitive environments are full of natural resouces and rich in terms of crops they are dealing by the corporations therefore there is an example for corporations to come to the scientific area and gain profit by taking away their natural resources for example like proposing to destory the emergent force to take oil and gas and make them as the raw materials all of that caused by the destruction of this conservative environment this kind of perverse examptive increased versus incentive are going to be worse than your possession in a positive world companies kept destroying this area because they accused that are profitable and there’s no consequence or punishment for doing it, because the environment is the environment there’s no legal punishment they cannot be sued etc. They don’t want to change all of their business pratices they have been going on because for decades and other methods of encouraging to be climate friendlier also do not work as they can easily just to peer from this stuff without actually thingking what goes into their products and I beat campaigns about how much you’re donating to the rainforest but continuing to use the refuse we think that it’s just a rhetoric that companies are used like / **(RP)** like \ **(RF)** most likely to use comparative on our side as much  more likely that companies not the intended innovate to | RF : 1  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | find climate friendly options i.e. |  |
| 4 | Finding areas that are less sensitive or finding more sustainable options like airbus innovating with liquid **nitr – nitrogen (SOT)** and oxygen for their flights, why? Because there’s a cost opportunity that means on our mechanisms addresses companies to their core instead core interests which is their provite incentive one // **(SP)** one legal policeman means fines, which means companies and have more incentive to of for other options that are more green because they don’t want to lose their money and profit. Secondly, I think companies can not get away with this reasone is: a) law is binding, b) legal partisan says procendence that sets the standard, *that is*, **(CR)** actually common as a corporation is wrong therefore they can no loger use password to disguise their heroes acrions and to prevent the laws of reputation I’d say companies are going to choose “b” to be recent first and offer separate actions instead but on to my second argument on how do we  change socienty but before that i’ll take that P1. | SP : 1  CR : 1  SOT : 1 |
| 5 | When entering into like lawsuits or contracts who will represent these esa’s. I believe thats it’s so easy for those kinds of environment to actually gain those kind of independent thrid party and like in general like it’s already / **(RP)** already happening inside those kinds of, like, **(FP)** um, **(FP)** those kinds of, like, **(FP)** people in general and there’s already experts in environment that’s already like carinng for the legal person for the environment in and of itself akay jumping into my second argument on how do we change socienty I want to know the opposition cannot **realy (rely) (SOT)** on independence progress or neighbors attempt to campaign instead we need punitive access and that’s for six reasone. One we think most harm of climate change on the environment are not obvious and physical in many cases it is unclear what the impacts are unless you have been plagued by the environmental damage which  was already too late. | FP : 3  RP : 1  SOT : 1 |
| 6 | Secondly it is easy for governments to distorts  narratives some individuals don’t think that the flood is | FP : 1  UF : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | caused by pollution when you can frame it and ship it as natural disaster being in a millennial which is what the chinese government literally did in the worst fight in human history in a big long time. Thridly, because there’s a cause of acting problem when often individuals think their accents have minimal consequences so why they’re going to be the ones responsible to make a personal sacrifice when other people are not going to do some thing they have less incentives to do it because they don’t see people at around them trying to act and do better for the environment itself so they have less incentive to do because they don’t want to have discount that’s their own sacrifice and they didn’t say. Fully when there’s a prioritization problem you mean \\ **(UF)** you may care to some extent about the environment it isn’t \\ **(UF)** it’s likely going to be affording the tournament. Compare to the economic policies they’re immadiate and have direct consequences to as to where you live and how you’re going to be living in the next five years what you’re able to buy and what schools you can go to also affects on to economic policies which is people are less more likely to sleep forth from people who have economic crisis that environtment that is, like,  **(FP)** very long termbut has a very permanent impact. |  |
| 7 | Thridly beacause there’s a lack of visibility as to how much the network is quoting the are it’s unclear to the extent of which harm acting creates and etc. Because when you look at companies whit in area and holding air those kinds of smoke and those kinds of gases just disappears but you don’t know where it went to you don’t know how much area an environment is going to create how many, like, **(FP)** um*,* **(FP)** like, **(FP)** nitrogen and, like, **(FP)** chemicals that have been throw into the water because you cannot feasibly see it but once you can it’s already too late for you and anyways sixty there’s a lack of incentife for companies to tell consumens as well because companies prefer customers to buy more than less versus on their side if companies want to be honest and brutal they are scaring away  customers and feeding them to be morally evil there is | FP : 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | not optimal on their side in either side of the house placing the environmentally friendly bad luck it’s not enough to deter influence from the worst action so how  does this hit on our side. |  |
| 8 | What are the mechanisms we say it’s quite simple and if it doesn’t have a direct state the punishment directly reshapes your choice to not exceed it we change the incentive majority this is because you now you humanize the environment as a person we set a motor called the environment as a person and there’s a punishment if you call it this changes them in two ways one people pollute less in the area because people care more about those kinds of, like, **(FP)** environment that they’re already perceiving and secondly people condemn companies that do more violence for the environment itself when there’s a lot of proteins when they can see the gases that are coming out from factors and it’s way better advocacy for ,mm, **(FP)** for the people it self and there’s going to be more social movement for this kind of environmentalist and activism in general for under our side because now we kind of support them and say to them that “yes”, nature is important environment is important for us to like perceive and perserve the conclusion of this argument is that besides creating a better environment for all socienty that wins it’s way we have a side that aligns on individuals interests with the greater interest of socienty we don’t need them to be environmental advocates we care more about the fact that they are now taking account of their self-interest to solve climate change I don’t think the concern is who is educating there’s a thrid party judge it’s for this environment I think in general being actually quantified as well under out site for all those reasones we believe that the questions under their side is like how they can actually help those countries in weapor without those kinds of legal personel under their south house we’re all those things  that we’re very proud to propouse. | FP : 2 |

# Appendix 13. Transcription Nadine speech

Nadine / ILYSM

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech**  **Error** |
| 1 | It is clear that the world is in an environmental crisis but providing ESA’s legal personhood would not only contribute to the crisis but start another one ladies and gentelment the question of how plants and areas are able to nature for themselves without the aid of humans our model then stands that we will be coming with today is number one ESA’s will not have legal personhood most ESA’s are going to be under the control of the government and this is likely because governmets case about preserving environmental entities for example the amazon rainforest and some of them are likely to be under the control indigenous grups and in situation where environmental degradation is bad, umm, **(FP)** // **(SP)** this is even more important andd thus the burden on government is to prove why legal personel is exclusively benefical, umm, **(FP)** this kills you case because punishing people is absolutely not exclusive this debate is not about. Whether companies can be sued  because they already are. | SP : 1  FP : 2 |
| 2 | However it’s about whether the ESA should be the one to sue them so this \ **(RF)** so firstly, mm, **(FP)** we would like to begin with our rebutals. You’d say that we are changing corporations, but if corporations can –oh **(IT)** corporations business model is based // **(SP)** –oh **(IT)** from environmental exploitation they will likely continue that on either side in fact they will find loopholes which I will talk about in my second argument additionally general representation does not compare to the million dollar lawyers hireed by MNCS and big misses acountable and secondly you state that it manipulates people by blaming the environmental issues on natural, uh, **(FP)** \\ **(SP)** unnatural disasters but there will really be a natural issues if we ignore, umm, **(FP)**  everything that govern, eer, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** if we ignore | SP : 3  FP : 6  RF : 2  CR : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | and we neglect issues going on in the environment you can use China as example fine but we // **(SP)** we use the entire world as an example. We, state that climate change affects every single plant and every single leaf on this planet. So by not being able to make change there maybe there’s no pollution in this world, fine. But there will be a plethora of other issues that will occur, umm, **(FP)** you also say that it change the incentives of people on the ground. However there are environmental campaigns that do not need a legal basis. If your argument is about awarness that same thrid party gives information into socienty can still exist. Punishment is not exclusive because people will not interact with  ESA’s and rural, uhh, **(FP)** in rural areas, right. |  |
| 3 | Most people will not be in the / **(RP)** in the natural reserve so this is nature, umm, **(FP)** now we will be moving on to the first argument which is why unprintable ESA’s cannot have legal personhood. One, why legal personhood makes no sense –well **(CR)** ladies and gantelman we would like to compare this one. First, with, uh, **(FP)** minors who have cognition and are unde age well let me ask a question to you minors can have cognition but they do not prioritize the ability to be treated, uh, **(FP)** if they do not have the ability to be treated as a person that can have their property then why should we allow environmentally sensitive areas to have, so there is no real benefit i.e. The value of an ESA only stems from the benefits it provides to humans we must realize that sowing large corporations can already be done by inhabitions on that land or by that particular government itself it requires a representative not real and there is not real personhood tho have,err, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** it’s not real personhood if you have one’s right, and one’s options rpresented by  another party. | FP : 4  RF : 1  CR : 1  RP : 1 |
| 4 | The second thing that we’d like to stage is that legal personhood is naturally restictive legal person that covers all aspects of an area’s right, the eight that yes, they will own the property rights of all the flora and  fauna that reside within it and without legal an owner | FP : 3  RF : 1  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | can change it’s reatures for example to conserve a certain species with this if there is a species that is endangered within the area no person will be able to do anything about that. Because why? Because in the status quo, people could change the area to converse it after entering a written argument with it’s owner. But, since the area has gained legal personhood it should be able to consent to things. Yes, well in this case the environtment cannot speak for itself and what is the impact of this seeing these area’s are unable to make these decisions, no decisions will be made ladies and gentelment. There will not be change seeing as these area’s are owned by those other area’s of wich we as real humans have no control over. It’s true that humans have caused harm and biodiversity in their environment but it’s also true that humans protect the environment as well for example balinese people, uh, **(FP)** treat these area’s such as gods perserving the environment and often investing in top of the line technology in order to benefit those places that they live in, mmm, **(FP)** The thrid point we’d like to bring is that legal personhood restricts the effective, uhh, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** the effectivity of government policy e.g, maybe the / **(RP)** the  government needs to open certain plantation elsewhere. |  |
| 5 | This is naturally bad for the livelihoods of the people for example in Indonesia when people rely on the palm oild industry, umm, **(FP)** fourthly legal personhood prevents natives from claiming and taking care of their land. Governmnets from a certain country, for example the US are notorius for taking away land from native inhabitants are we really going to take away the natives. Now we have just give back the neighbors know how to take care of the land the best way they see fit and even view the environment with reference which ensure that hey won’t destory the environment. // **(SP)** Our second argument will discuss why this legal loophole opens more possibilities for exploitation the premise is that this allows for corporation and people to be in the general opposition / **(RP)** opposition to the  environment. And why is this bad government because | SP : 1  FP : 1  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | corporations that wants to build projects near ESA’s are likely to make the ESA enter into course of deals for example contracts and note that they have a myriad of lawyears that are likely to find legal loopholes in it’s implementation these contracts are legally binding which means that you can effectively give a company 10 years of contracts and corporations can sue into the  land. |  |
| 6 | Corporations are big businesses with an out almost | FP : 10 |
|  | bottomless amount of money to search for the world’s | RF : 1 |
|  | best lawyers, if any swing occurs there is a counter suit | UF : 1 |
|  | to wards the land itself and when the suit occours it is | CR : 1 |
|  | likely that the damages paid are in the form of | RP : 1 |
|  | environmental assets for example the land itself or the |  |
|  | porperty on that land. So, umm, **(FP)** no, thank you, |  |
|  | umm, **(FP)** thus \\ **(UF)** this is bad, because you give |  |
|  | corporations more control over this plan. ESA’s will |  |
|  | have no defense at all ladies and gantelman that is |  |
|  | effectively illegal for if representative to come and |  |
|  | defend a client without even knowing what their wishes |  |
|  | are ladies and gantelman, umm, **(FP)** thus, / **(RP)** umm, |  |
|  | **(FP)** thus we would like to state that it is likely that |  |
|  | corporate lawyears are going to strike out witnesses or |  |
|  | strike out lawyears on that basis even rendering essays |  |
|  | and their rights completely defenseless. So, why is our |  |
|  | alternative, uhh, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** what is our alternative on |  |
|  | the opposition? –Well, **(CR)** firstly there is no legal |  |
|  | loophole, umm, **(FP)** governments are free to enter the |  |
|  | environment and, umm, **(FP)** most of these governments |  |
|  | do care about environmental protection because it is one |  |
|  | a voting issue in many elections and two directly deals |  |
|  | with the people, umm, **(FP)** with the wealfare of the |  |
|  | people on the ground and governments if, uhh, **(FP)** and |  |
|  | for corporations if they sue the government |signal| loses |  |
|  | some money but it pays that out of its own pockets in |  |
|  | response to actually giving up some of the ESA’s |  |
|  | aspects for example certain aspects of the land, umm, |  |
|  | **(FP)** and it’s for all the reasons that the opposition has |  |
|  | stated before that we believe that ESA’s shoould not and |  |
|  | will not ever have legal personhood. Thank you. |  |

# Appendix 14. Transcription Kalista speech

Kalista / Kejar Deatline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech**  **Error** |
| 1 | I’d say it’s about time we start giving strict regulations on the distructions of vital environments. I wonder what the opposition team wants us to debate today, because by their concessions they also want to have punishments and for people to not enter these regions, right. So if they say that they’re not going to want people to destory the environment and they realize the importance of these regions then persumably they also support our case when they support that these peop \ **(RF)** these regions actually get to have protection they only talk about the likelihood of how this is going to work for example how these companies are going to have expensive professional lawyers. Okey, let’s buy the bullet right, but let’s characterize why these companies want to get into the land if they’re going to want to use the land at a very worst case they need to lose a lot of money like they said how they are going to hire these professional lawyears for millions of dollars in order to get into this place, right. So, we think that in order to actually use this place they need to trade off a huge amount of their profit which cannot even be gotten by using the land, so we think that the moment we create this huge and tall entery barrier for them before being able to use the land in contrast to just having the government being lobby it’s much easier for these regions to be protected under the house so even if it’s not going to be perfect as in no one is going to be able to enter and they are going to sue each other in court at least we have people for example donating around the world to help the legal personhood of this region because they also want their, umm, **(FP)**  // **(SP)** safety net and for example to still have oxygen in amazon to actually still live a healthy life so we  think that is why people also have the incentive to help | SP : 1  FP : 4  RF : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | and that is why governments who have, uhh, **(FP)** mmm, **(FP)** corporations will have less incentive to come in because they need to spend a huge amount of money to actually be able to use the line. The case of opposition talks about two things, right. One the right of, umm, **(FP)** their case conceives on regulation so the debate cannot toss and justification that’s how to  not get back and change the sign, right. |  |
| 2 | Having said that the corparison on government is | FP : 1 |
|  | better or this mechanisms. So, if we can prove the | RP : 2 |
|  | government is not realible we directly win the debate |  |
|  | they prefer the government to control five responses |  |
|  | first of all we say that the government is unrealiable |  |
|  | this can be seen where the government has less interest |  |
|  | to focus on environmental issues because this is not a |  |
|  | strategic voting campaign because the result of |  |
|  | environment being better is not feasible and long-term. |  |
|  | The politicians only serve in office for, like, **(FP)** a |  |
|  | term or two tears they don’t / **(RP)** they don’t really |  |
|  | have interest to do so, because this spotlight will be |  |
|  | given to the next politician who’s getting elected |  |
|  | instead not them. So what politicians do is usually |  |
|  | economy policies, human rights policies, because those |  |
|  | are the ones that give immediate results and give the |  |
|  | most emotion to the people. Number two we prove to |  |
|  | you that it’s not good to have voting issues because it’s |  |
|  | not feasible and etc. This / **(RP)** this is not feasible all |  |
|  | of the state structural reason that jones gave to you |  |
|  | where awarness is not going to exist because there’s no |  |
|  | popular support to have environmental friendly as |  |
|  | presumably that this comes on a trade-off as well with |  |
|  | economic interest of society. |  |
| 3 | That is why the government don’t have the the interest | SP : 1 |
|  | to actually protect these places in the first place but | FP : 6 |
|  | number three indigenous communities are still | RF : 1 |
|  | alienated and left behind by the majority of |  |
|  | government. This means that government does not care |  |
|  | because they’re not the voter bases so they will care |  |
|  | more for the majorities that actually, umm, **(FP)** // |  |
|  | **(SP)** will harm the environment much more sure, they |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | say the government cares about the walfare of people but it’s minor in terms of numbers. Numbers four, corporations will be easy to lobby governments. Most governments are lobbying, because there’s a corporate capture where companies once funded political, umm, **(FP)** politic campaigns like hilliary clinton in the twenty, uhh, **(FP)** like, **(FP)** Trump in the 2020, uh, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** 2016 election that is why government will be likely to be lobbied and biased towards these corporations as well and it flips the entire opposition case on lawyers, because government also lobbies lawyears and government also have the capability to actually, uhh, **(FP)** change the law, right. So a number six, if government and the people have protected the environment like Bali for example. The deate has no delta because then they’re also not punished so they have no impact at all. The case of opposition mainly talks about two things, right. One on the right of humans to use land and number two on who actually  creates that good. |  |
| 4 | We say that this has been fulfilled in a status quo we have many places whit urban developments people already have land. They own 90% of the land in the world. We think that there’s enough land for people in Indonesia to actually use as a business mechanisms. So, it doesn’t matter whether or not the land in amazone is used we already have enough land number two the problem then becomes when people over pollute they destory everything they come across simply because it’s profitable even if it’s not corporations who are using the piece of land, having humans live there also brings damage for example laces in the mountain of himalaya are badly famaged because they have a high number of tourist which destorys the place because of pollution more and more buildings are built and it lost it’s life because they are buried under five meters of concrete and those remaining 10% are destroyed because they don’t give people that drinks for destroying the region. We think  // **(SP)** that on the other side this is objectively good, | SP : 3  FP : 1  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | yes it creates night goog. Notice that the characterization of these places are places that are sensitive for example a place that actually contributes in // **(SP)** giving oxygen of human beings and that is why the moment that you let people have the probability to actually destroy this places. They’re not only destroying the region but they’re also destroying the lives of / **(RP)** of around it. So, what’s the comparative? I think policy passing is a fire and plus the one that will regulate this is going to be a new party that will be // **(SP)** have the, uhh, **(FP)** expertise  in the environment. |  |
| 5 | They say that our side is bad, because MNCS can find lawyers. First of all this is also non-comparative. The comparative is that you realy on the government on their side. There is no legal punishment at all corporations can also get lobby and companies gain full control, but number two even if there’s lawyers it’s hard to find legal loopholes, because the fact that you destory environment is actually something that’s factual and it’s hard to contest, because it’s a fact the small and gases come from your factory the waste dumping on reverse is your preparations no matter what lawyers you hire if it’s already factual they’ll still be punished. Even in the worst case that the lawyer worse note that they will not only file it at once they will continue to do pollution, so they will continuously getting trials as a result they’ll need to give more fundings because they we tell you that we care for profit if they lose profit they’re strategized for other ways to make their products. So judges I want you to see the harm of destruction of the place not as a mere region as a place, but instead as the lives of millions of people, because when the place dies us humans die with them. Presumably the moment that corporations best interest is to actually get the most profit that is feasible under theirs of the house we take away this profit we make sure that they get punished they need to go to trials spend millions of dollars just to enter the  amazon force it’s much better and we give a much | - |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | hingher barrier for them to enter. Proud to oppose. |  |

# Appendix 15. Transcription Dazzel speech

Dazzel / ILYSM

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total**  **Speech Error** |
| 1 | So obviously team government just // **(SP)** didn’t listen to that all speach right, because the mechanisms that we give to you on punishment on regulation are things to suggest that there is absolutely no exclusivity in their case at all. Our claim was that there will be punishment. That \ **(RF)** but that punishment is based on the government and the preferences of the people that you can actually access under our side // **(SP)** of the house. Given that there is no such thing as pure legal personhood what we claim is \\ **(UF)** that is likely to be exploited by companies it wasn’t simply that have ,like, **(FP)**lawyers and you cannot avoid environmental responsibility. It was the case that this particular legal loophole allowed companies to have far more room that when we just said the government represents the environment as opposed to environment representing themselves. Two questions, firstly why legal personhood is principally restrictive? Secondly, we talk about why this opens room for worse outcomes from the environment flipping the entirety of their case? Firstly, why does legal personhood // **(SP)** ,like, **(FP)** naturally restrictive. I want to deal first with the responses that they gave to wards our case i.e. they gave to you two  things. One that the government is unreliable. | SP : 3  FP : 2  RF : 1  UF : 1 |
| 2 | The first response I have to this is to say that the same mechanisms of thrid party advisors or thrid independent boards or whatever can still exist under our side we explain that the environment is necessarily a voting issue because by their characterization that these ESA’s deal with the livelihood of the people to a large extent. That means people are likely to care about ESA’s. More  just like some random rainforest. Which is the // **(SP)** | SP : 4  FP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | reason why this debate is specifically about yes is that aligh impact to wards it’s people and therefore are likely to be big voting issues in that country, so for example the amazone rainforest in Brazil. Number two is that even in their best case scenario where you have some form of, like, **(SP)** unreliable government that might be lobbied but can still be checked by the vote. Anyway, I think it’s much worse to have an independent thrid party that just has // **(SP)** vote power over everything that can, like, sue on behalf of that environment I’ll talk about why that’s not true, but I’ll // **(SP)** actually flip this and say that it’s much worse for two reasons. Number one is that there’s often disproportionate power given towards,  like, **(FP)** this particulary party, right. |  |
| 3 | The second thing to point out is that this is not true, like, **(FP)** this is not the preference of the people the // **(SP)** priority in this debate is not necessarilly to have environmental protection it is to have the livelihoods of the people given that we place a premium on things such as democracy for example, and for that reason given that they never prover why the environment has the same stakes as actual humans live. You must prioritize the lives of people or you must prioritize the preferences of the people that may access towards a government as opposed to towards like a legal personhood that’s, like, **(FP)** very vague. The second response I want to make is towards this idea that // **(SP)** govermnets are likely to be lobbied. // **(SP)** There’s the same issue here because they don’t // **(SP)** actually deal with the mechanisms. I still don’t understand why this is exclusive, because inhabitants of that land can equally sue the government for any form of negligance. Expecially if by their own characterization it’s hard to avoid fault when that environmental damage already occurs. For that reaso it’s much easier to sue the government, umm, **(FP)** in that particular regard and, like, **(FP)** overturn the lobbiying of corporations in comparison to the corporation actually counter-suing you which I’ll talk about in my, like, **(FP)** second clash  there were three things that we give to you as a form of | SP : 4  FP : 5 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | independent arguments. That were not rebbuted at all, I  hope they do this in their thrid. |  |
| 4 | The first thing we said is that on pronciple there is no | SP : 3 |
|  | such thing as real legal personhood and, like, **(FP)** as a | FP : 10 |
|  | principle it stands by itself, because it can’t, like, **(FP)** | ST : 1 |
|  | the environment cannot express preferences as a legal |  |
|  | person and therefore cannot be represented that leads to |  |
|  | massive outcomes in which you are unreable to actually, |  |
|  | like, **(FP)** defend the-the-the **(ST)** particular ESA in |  |
|  | court which I’ll talk about later. Two that legal |  |
|  | personhood is naturally restricted to government policy |  |
|  | we give you both best case and worst case example i.e. |  |
|  | in the best case example, like, **(FP)** is looks, like, **(FP)** |  |
|  | endangered species which presumably becomes a |  |
|  | property os ESA are no longer able to be touched by the |  |
|  | government are no longer able to like be nurtured by the |  |
|  | governments, if they care about their biodiversity this is |  |
|  | naturally a restrictive policy that cannot exist in their |  |
|  | world the worst case scenario is, like, **(FP)** // **(SP)** |  |
|  | people like destroying the environment for palm oil |  |
|  | industries which at that point prevents the government |  |
|  | from boosting an economy in an important sector I think |  |
|  | the vast majority of government face internasional |  |
|  | backlash as well, when they, like, **(FP)** // **(SP)** harm |  |
|  | environments or harms ESA to a much larger extent so |  |
|  | think about like Singapore backlashing againts |  |
|  | Indonesia. When they, like, **(FP)** // **(SP)** made palm oil |  |
|  | plantations. Which suggest to us that even if you destroy |  |
|  | one ESA like the government are likely to replant and |  |
|  | you likely to, like, **(FP)** recover their traps as a result |  |
|  | meaning that we at least give them some form of |  |
|  | flexibility to, like, **(FP)** make policies where their |  |
|  | policies are due. |  |
| 5 | The thrid thing that we give to you as an arguments is, | SP : 1 |
|  | that this takes way ownership from people expecially | FP : 2 |
|  | indigenous people. This works because in some | RF : 1 |
|  | instances, // **(SP)** like, **(FP)** giving back ownership |  |
|  | towards the people acts as a reparation towards them |  |
|  | and therefore the channel is not the governmnet, so their |  |
|  | rebuttal about, like, **(FP)** indigenous people are not |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | represented does not make any sense. I think for a lot of people it’s very important for to modify environments to have their own cultural pratices and so far as you have a thrid party that is not indigenous or is unable to connect with those experiences. I think you take away some autonomy from those people. How do you weigh this argument. Number one is that there are many that can or cannot happen to the environmnet this debate. Exploitation might happen or it might not the need to preserve certain species. Regardles of this therefore you must prioritize being able to be flexible for the government to protect the \ **(RF)** to the protect the environment on their behalf and not be constrained by legal metricts. Two environmental protection is not the absolute goal this debate, they never wait this it’s too late to do it the absolute goals is dependent on the state  and the preferences of the people. |  |
| 6 | Second idea, what is this open room for legal exploitation? I want to first kick out their idea that this changes the actions of the people. One none of their six mechanisms if you listen to it carefully are based on a legal basis and base on the idea you need to have legal personhood i.e. all the campaigning still works if people care about the environment that much, because it affects them and you humanize it that can just merely be a rhetoric shif in the way environmental movements message not a legal thing that has to exist in policy that people are unlucky to look at in court right. The second thing is that // **(SP)** I think that under our side we don’t force some form of organic change. I think it starts from sociental level acceptance and compresses to their world where the vast majority of people might be sued for example by doing actions out of ignorance or inhabitiants may be suited for pratices that they have done for, like, **(FP)** myriads like \ **(RF)** or like years in the past or decades in the past. This is not just a backlash argument but it manifests in the way that they are able to counter vetro committes our counter the thrid party that is seen as not representative of their own  views they cannot check against the government. | SP : 1  FP : 1  RF : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | Last thing I want to talk about is an the incentives for corporations. One lawyers are expensive but in comparison to changing their entire business model lawyers are cheap especially with all the tree mechanisms they give you, which means that // **(SP)** companies will rather the / **(RP)** in the state or sue the governor or sue the entire land itself in comparison to changing the business model or changing t become environmentally friendly, because it’s much cheaper to do so for three reasons. number one is that you can force the environment to enter course of contracts. Two that there’s a possibility of counter suing which is bad, because any form of loss that you face from suing will directly disadvantage the environment and give power to the company i.e. 20M of land. For that company, right. But thridly the environment is always defenselvess that is \\ **(UF)** there is the legal loophole in court that to be represented you need to be able to express your prederences towards your representative. Given that the environment cannot do that I think corporate lawyers make it super easy to kick out or strike out lawyers. Even if there’s some defense from, like, **(FP)** lawyers of the state the argument is questionable, because they can never fulfill the burden of proof in court it makes \ **(RF)** it far easier for corporations to win court cases under our side I think governments can actually point to that factual basis as opposed to just legal, like, **(FP)** loopholes that just  draws out the court cases. For those reasons vote for all. | SP : 1  FP : 2  RF : 1  UF : 1  RP : 1 |

# Appendix 16. Transcription Michelle speech

Michelle / Kejar Deatline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total**  **Speech Error** |
| 1 | The startegy of Dazzle is lazy, because instead of responding. He tried to call all benefits by saying that  we want to punish MNCS too but under government | SP : 1  FP : 2  RF : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | but it is unclear how all their concerns differ, because presumably MNCS also can hire lawyears against government. Their concern on environment, umm, **(FP)** their will // **(SP)** the unconstrained environment not being able to voice out prevalence also becomes symmatris. Futher, they have no fear that there will be regulations by government has no incentive to do so all their mechanism doesn’t work they cannot call our benefits. I have two question in this page. First, can opposition co – op or benefit is there likely to be regulations by government or not. Second, which side brings better accountability. First question, then can opposition co – op orbenefits and is there likely to be a regulation by government or not. Two observation, observations number one they told you that they want government to be the ome who care for the environment. Two responses, first is the government does not care, uh, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** if the government does care why does bolsonaro not profect amazone there is no fear that all governments will be very caring to words the environment, not all governments will be democrats there are many governments who are  economic incentive based as well. |  |
| 2 | This also looks, like, **(FP)** umm, **(FP)** the middle east country. Who keep on using their oil resources for example. So, that their economy can improve. They cannot just say that they are going to replen in the environment, because nature cannot be flexible you cannot destroy a regoion and replenish because the way environment works is once you destroy it / **(RP)** it can take decades for example before they can return to the way they used to be. So, before you can change things you will also have to face the damages of environmental damages. So and it also take a lot of money to replenish, right. So you lose money, lose time and lose the environmental on their side. Second, they also tell you that this does not compare to MNCS lawyers. Well, we do think that this is going to be symmetrical on both sides on yourself the  house the companies will be able to break the | SP : 2  FP : 2  UF : 1  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | government itself as well and because they’re \\ **(UF)** they need funding from corporations for their campaign for example. They can be lobbied as well. On our side there are skilled chances that the legal // **(SP)** personhood can give better // **(SP)** protection for  the sensitive area. |  |
| 3 | This is true, because there will be environmentalist for example who will hire good lawyears for the sensitive areas as well, and also obversation number two they say that this is a big voting issues, umm, **(FP)** two responses. First, no that doesn’t happen under your side of the house, because there’s no ESA under their site which means that when people don’t see that our environmental is important and are actually sensitive. People have no incentive to vote for environmental, rights. This looks like Indonesia for example. We are full of nature, that is important but no one actually cares rights, corporations still pollute. When ever they’d like to. So, umm, **(FP)** when you don’t have ESA you don’t have any political capital for the government they cannot call of benefit and also there’s less sense of urgency, because people don’t see anything that is actually, umm, concrete such as, umm, **(FP)** this kind of legal personhood right, and so saturn why would that  happen under our side of the house when ESA exists. | FP : 3 |
| 4 | Notice that the government does not care about the environment which pulls you why for two reasons. First, it’s long – term issue and it will be discredited to other politician as well, because they also don’t want to, umm, **(FP)** have that kind of legancy for the next politician for example meaning that they will be very very soft-terminus under their side of the house if they want to use government mechanisms as well right and also second but most importantly we proud six reasons why socienty is not worked on this issue that went unresponded by Dazzle, and also, umm, **(FP)** remember that hard for example one harms of climate change on the environment are not obvious  and visceral too it’s easier for government to distort | SP : 1  FP : 7  RF : 4  UF : 1  RP : 1  SOT : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | narratives some individuals don’t think that a fault is caused by pollution when government can frame it and shape it as natural disaster being once in a **millen millennium (SOT)** for example which is, uh, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** which is why the government literally did in the worst sort \\ **(UF)** slot in human history in the / **(RP)** the and also because there’s no \ **(RF)** there’s a collective action problem and also for not popular issues, umm, **(FP)** compared to the economic policies they are immediate and have direct consequences to where you live where you are able to buy and whats schools you can go to, and also six because there’s a lack of visibility // **(SP)** as to how much an individual is polluting in that certain area right so it is unclear to the extent which the harm and actions will create for example if Chinese have many, uh, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** if China has many, mm, **(FP)** factory for example it is unclear as to which extent it is polluting right. So, this is / **(RF)** this is wrong winning because if we show society does not care and isn’t really **aew aware (SOT)** gov also does not care because government makes campaign based on what society wants this is crucial right and you should, umm, **(FP)**  weight this out as well. |  |
| 5 | They told you that ESA cannot voice out prevalence. They cannot just defend this because it cannot voice out preference right because people who die, also cannot voice out their performance we don’t need them // **(SP)** we don’t need them to have // **(SP)** to express their prevalence. We standardize this kind of punishment by actions that’s why we don’t need environment to testify in court that, umm, **(FP)** incarnate Dazzle and there’s \\ **(RF)** there are standards that help // **(SP)** cutting trees are bad and objectively bad actions and // **(SP)** it is already factual it’s already very clear and it’s already, umm, **(FP)** learned in kindergarten for example they also / **(RP)** they also say that campaigning will work if it work then amazon will already be protected by now,  But look at the status quo. Name one environment | SP : 4  FP : 6  RF : 1  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | areas that is protected you cannot*.* Because people can, uhh, **(FP)** people’s cube will care more about the BLM campaign or the family’s campaign instead of environment campaign that’s way their alternative to attract people cannot work, at the end of the day as well and also note that they don’t engage to all defense corporations can do, like PR and donating while, umm, **(FP)** still having that kind of, mm, **(FP)** while still distracting the environment at the end of the day. So, the way here it that, mm, **(FP)** they say that the legal person is bad because we cannot check and balance it. But I think the characterization of legal personhood shows why it’s really easy to check and balance because you can clearly see the damage. We told you we have people who do care about the environment, right. And also second question which  side brings better accountability to observations. |  |
| 6 | Observation number one, they told you that there will be legal loopholes. We said that this is untrue because, we told you that under our south house we will be able to hire lawyears as well because there will be many people for example the environments will gather the donation for example to hire a lawyer but they feel, like, **(FP)** they need to sue these people have already damaged amazon so badly for example. Meaning that under our side of the house, even if there will be legal locals lop-lo-loopholes **(ST)** we say that it is still // **(SP)**, umm, **(FP)** challenge able because people will be able to get that kind of chance, in order for them to sue that people. Obversation number two the bus, mm, **(FP)** this is the vast majority of people might be sued for doing things years ago, mm, **(FP)** two responses this is a contradiction because you also want punishment and regulation as well, on your side of the house so that, umm, **(FP)** so that kind of thing will not, umm, **(FP)** \ **(RF)** so that kind of thing symmetric under both sides of the house and also they say that lawyers are that cheap. First it is clearly wrong their crime, um, **(FP)**  their crime are factual and visible so we say that, | SP : 3  FP : 11  RF : 1  RP : 1  ST : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | umm, **(FP)** it is, umm, **(FP)** // **(SP)** actually, umm, **(FP)** // **(SP)** achievable and also second, no even if they are cheap once consumers know you are violating the, ee, **(FP)** ESA’s arise then they will boycot you so maybe you are free from the law but not your consumers. Which means that they will lose a significant amount of profil as well. This is crucial, because they never proved why there will be regulations at all corporations. Which means they can still pollute the environment under their side of the house and there’s no point because there’s no ESA under their site so it is not a trending topic and no one knows about it this is a harm that they never prove at  / **(RP)** at all. Proud to pre-pro-propose. |  |

# Appendix 17. Transcription Tati speech

Tati / ILYSM

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total**  **Speech Error** |
| 1 | Thank you, government for presenting such a succinct argumen however we have a few issues with said argument. Before we get into that, I would like to // **(SP)** pose a few **clarifi clarifications. (SOT)** They said that we contradicted, uhh, **(FP)** when we // **(SP)** and we said that we still want punishment, no. That can still exist on either side if the government wants it // **(SP)** and // **(SP)** before I go further into my speech I will be addressing my two clashes. First one being on prince // **(SP)** the first one being why on principle ESA can’t have legal personhood, and the second one being on why this legal  // **(SP)** this legal personhood opens more loopholes and more possibilities for ex, uh, **(FP)** for –ah **(IT)** explanation // **(SP)** First, the government said that the protection of a region is inherently null in our case. This is not true, because the protection of a region, is not exclusive to the governments case. Legal mechanisms are currently in place to stop people from destroying //  **(SP)** and from destroying the environment // **(SP)** the | SP : 11  FP : 2  IT : 1  SOT : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | notion that // **(SP)** legal personhood is needed to defend the **en – environment (SOT)** is redundant // **(SP)** again there’s a little thing called environmental law in place. To stop people fom destroying the environment. Even if this is true the ESA’s receiving legal atatus as a person  is counterproductive. |  |
| 2 | Something I will touch on later in my speech. Two, the | SP : 5 |
|  | government said that the government is inherently | IT : 1 |
|  | unreliable. This is not true as a government –ah **(IT)** are |  |
|  | incentivized by internasional agrements and |  |
|  | internasional pressure. They are being held accountable |  |
|  | by internasional agreements such as the Paris climate |  |
|  | agreement // **(SP)** and this should be incentive enough to |  |
|  | protect the environment, right. If this is true, how much |  |
|  | more reliable can // **(SP)** the areas be themselves. Have |  |
|  | to let you that legal personhood is inherently redundant |  |
|  | and does not make sense. Unlike fiction, no lorax is |  |
|  | there to be // **(SP)** able to speak for the trees. Why are |  |
|  | miners who have cognition, are treated as not // **(SP)** |  |
|  | their own legal entity. Why should a piece of land have |  |
|  | more rights than a child. A child can’t get legal |  |
|  | representation whereas a piece of land can // **(SP)** |  |
|  | something seems unjust here legal mechanisms are |  |
|  | already in place to protect ESA’s. People are already |  |
|  | being punished for destroying the environment that’s |  |
|  | why the entire segment of environment law exists. |  |
| 3 | Legal personhood can be naturally **res restrictive**. | SP : 6 |
|  | **(SOT)** // **(SP) The es the ESA (SOT)** will own property | FP : 2 |
|  | righs. Of all flora and fauna that reside in it without | RF : 1 |
|  | legal personhood an owner can change features to // | SOT : 2 |
|  | **(SP)** for example to conserve a certain species with this |  |
|  | is a certain species is being endangered in the are no |  |
|  | person will be able to change it and a species will be |  |
|  | lost to time forever // **(SP)** in the status quo people |  |
|  | would be able to change the area to conserve it after |  |
|  | enteringg a written agreement with the owner since, the, |  |
|  | area has gained // **(SP)** legal personhood it should be |  |
|  | able to consent to things sorect. Well not really it’s |  |
|  | trees, trees can’t speak legal personhood can \ **(RF)** |  |
|  | legal personhood restricts // **(SP)** got the government |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | from being able tp take care of it’s people, like, **(FP)** the  // **(SP)**, like, **(FP)** our leader of the opposition said they  can, build, palm oil plantations to bost the economy but with this, they can’t do that. |  |
| 4 | Legal personhood again prevents natives from taking | SP : 4 |
|  | care and claming their ancestral land again, this is \ | FP : 1 |
|  | **(RF)** this has been a con \ **(RF)** an issue of contention | RF : 4 |
|  | for the past few years and the oppo \ **(RF)** and the | RP : 2 |
|  | government has failed to address our point in this now | SOT : 2 |
|  | the government side fails to consider // **(SP)** the |  |
|  | preferences of the people. So if the preference is no |  |
|  | environmental protection, that should be fine. The |  |
|  | government keeps on pulling Brazil as an example, and |  |
|  | I find this extremely lazy. **Bolso bolsonaro (SOT)** is |  |
|  | such as extreme example / **(RP)** example an that man is |  |
|  | inherently shady. They did not pull positive example |  |
|  | like Canada who aggressively, defendes and protects |  |
|  | their environment and natural resources. Now I will be |  |
|  | moving on to our second clash on why this legal |  |
|  | loophole opens more **poss-possibilities for explo** |  |
|  | **exploitation (SOT)** // **(SP)** the government said that |  |
|  | companies will not be able to sue land because, umm, |  |
|  | **(FP)** sorry,\ **(RF)** the government said that companies |  |
|  | will not be able to steal land because they gain more |  |
|  | from buying the land in the first place. Well, this is not |  |
|  | true because land is just not land. Land is a new |  |
|  | operative place for people to conduct businesse you may |  |
|  | be looking aat the price of a meter square of rest but |  |
|  | companies who are fucused on their / **(RP)** on their |  |
|  | economies // **(SP)** are looking out areas with |  |
|  | opportunities. Even if this is true, land is very valuable, |  |
|  | land is one of the // **(SP)** only assets whose values grows |  |
|  | exponentially because of the fact that population would |  |
|  | increase thus, there’s more demand for land. |  |
| 5 | Companies are aware of just how land // **(SP)** of how | SP : 9 |
|  | much valueland has // **(SP) watev-whatever (SOT)** that | FP : 5 |
|  | be // **(SP)** in the current time or in the near future. If the | RF : 2 |
|  | government can and we will now be moving on to –ah | IT : 2 |
|  | **(IT)** rebutting the.. government’s second point if what // | CR : 1 |
|  | **(SP)** on why if \ **(RF)** why the government cares so | RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | much why hasn’t-haven’t-hasn’t **(ST)** anything been done about the amazon. This is not true because // **(SP)** you even know about the amazon // **(SP)** is a product*, that is,* **(CR)** being publicized. How can we get cosent // **(SP)** for it to be publicized when it can’t even voice out, umm, **(FP)** and it doesn’t even have a voice to do so awarness itself is something we have done in order to improve amazon. Including other ways they have improved, umm, **(FP)** an example as laws on the environment and harvesting resources from there. Even if this is true the government of other nations have always helped in may ways. And we cannot exclusively look as \ **(RF)** look at the environment in the amazon. Additionally how can we even discuss new solutions on the amazon. If the amazon can’t even consent to anything // **(SP)** they said –ah **(IT)** the corporations will can still be punished // **(SP)** not true, mm, **(FP)** the government frames people as mindless puppets of the // **(SP)** of the government, uh, **(FP)** with no ability to think for themselve, and again in our / **(RP)** in our, uhh,  **(FP)** world. | SOT : 1 |
| 6 | Corporations can still be punished // **(SP)** because of pre–existing environmental laws and again the government I would like to point out that the government has consistently, mm, **(FP)** ignored this idea of a pre–existing **enver environment (SOT)** law // **(SP)** and, again // **(SP)** to touch back on my original point // **(SP)** to that we say, mm, **(FP)** // **(SP)** to the point the government said that, uh, **(FP)** the government can still twist the mindset of the people we say that this is not true, because people are not true, because people are not mindless puppets of the state and they can think for themselves there is internet // **(SP)** to research and understand and // **(SP)** and again we would like to touch another, uh, **(FP)** thing the government has said which is dead people cannot testify, uh, **(FP)**cannot testify well not phsically but there are wills in place. Dictating the views of the dead // **(SP)** trees do not have such privilage now I will be addresing // **(SP)** why our side  wins. There is a huge legal lopphole where ESA’s will | SP : 12  FP : 7  RF : 1  RP : 1  SOT : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | never have legal devense. Which means that you effectively cannot sue corporations because, at least under our side there is a possibility of change, hiring lawyears does not work // **(SP)** because exactly this lophole allowy you to strike out // **(SP)** lawyers and their arguments in court. Two, coercive contracts entering coercive are in her \ **(RF)** are in herently, uh, **(FP)** bias to wards the side of the corporations as again, like, **(FP)** we have stated numerous times trees cannot speak for / **(RP)** for themselves // **(SP)** and so we are  proud to oppose, thank you. |  |

# Appendix 17. Transcription Dazzle conclusion speech

Dazzle (conclusion) / ILYSM

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech**  **Error** |
| 1 | I’ll be completely honest government was lazy because they did not take the time to understand the legal basis argument that we give to you. Notice this is exclusively a law based debate which means that there’s not a generic like environmental debate where you can claim benefits of environmental awarness if you do not tie that back to the court process and exactly what happens inside the courtroom. Our from of argument is that any form of protection can exist on either side of the house it is exclusively base on who gets to sue the companies who gets to like own the land and who gets to make decisions on that basis. We say that when governments do it is much preferable under out side of the house two issues firstly on environmental outcomes something I’m going to talk about principle as why this restrictive. Firstly on environmental outcomes taking their only case out of this debate firstly on this idea on, like, **(FP)**  // **(SP)** awarness of the people their six mechanisms as I explained were not exclusive they do not bring it up back in thrid though there are awarness campaigns no body pays attentions to exclusively court cases or  humanization of the / **(RP)** of the environment itself | SP : 1  FP : 1  RP : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | meaning that there’s just a rhetoric shift in comparison  to actually having a legal basis. |  |
| 2 | Number two is that there’s no argument to this idea of | FP : 1 |
|  | like-like-like **(ST)** push back to wards environmental | RP : 1 |
|  | policy i.e. if in their best case scenario they have a thrid | ST : 2 |
|  | party this is unseen as this is seen as not representative |  |
|  | at least under our side of the house you get an organic |  |
|  | change to campaigns which are likely to be much more |  |
|  | longer maybe in time period but as last far more |  |
|  | sustainable when they actually like care towards the |  |
|  | needs of the people as opposed to just one thrid party |  |
|  | trying to sue every other person. On this idea on |  |
|  | corporations and even if you don’t but the idea on |  |
|  | people I think corporations are where this impacts like a |  |
|  | lot more people and, like, **(FP)** are the basis of this |  |
|  | debate, right. Know that corporations are equally |  |
|  | powerful o either side i.e. they will sue on either side |  |
|  | maybe because they have lawyers because they won’t |  |
|  | change the business model or whatever, right. But what |  |
|  | we explain necessarily is that the delta is not just that |  |
|  | corporations have lawyers that’s unnuanced our nuance |  |
|  | is that there is a legal loophole when you give legal |  |
|  | personhood i.e. you are not allowed as the government |  |
|  | to send a state lawyer to defend the got to the defend the |  |
|  | ESA simply because that / **(RP)** that person is unable to |  |
|  | represent the interest of the-of the-of **(ST)** the |  |
|  | environment itself which is a legal loophole that exists |  |
|  | where you have to know that the rapper like you have to |  |
|  | know the preferences of your defendant to actually be |  |
|  | able to represent them in court which is the reason why |  |
|  | hiring more lawyers to get rid of this legal hoophole |  |
|  | does not work because they are the ones that are going |  |
|  | to be striked out in court. |  |
| 3 | Their testimonies are the ones that need to be striked out | SP : 5 |
|  | before the trial actually, begins. Which is the reason | FP : 4 |
|  | why corporations are infinitely more likely to win their | RP : 3 |
|  | world because of this legal loophole. When corporations |  |
|  | do win at least // **(SP)**under our side it does not give |  |
|  | them more power i.e when you / **(RP)** you sue the / |  |
|  | **(RP)** the environment that from of competition towards |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | a corporation is the environment itself i.e. they have more power over, like, **(FP)** the land of that / **(RP)** that particular environment or the resources that they have. In comparison on our side when a corporation suits the government as the entity they can, like, **(FP)** // **(SP)** pay some money to the corporation but that doesn’t give them access to the ESA itself // **(SP)** waiting. One this flips the entirety of their claim companies are stronger on their side, but it makes them infinitely much more easier to sue the ESA to comparatively if it is much more // **(SP)** easy to sue based on factual basis it’s another reason why the government has to be the ones who sue the corporations I’m not the ESA suing the corporation itself. Second idea on restrictions and why this is principally unjust. The claim I want to kick out is this idea that government cannot be trusted. We give you hosts of incntives, like, **(FP)** they are equally plausible than the incentives they give to you right, like, **(FP)** the votes of the people international condemnation swinging backs by the inhabitants of that land. But we took the worst case here even if governments are not reliable and this is a thrid party they don’t prove why that thrid party is better because at least in their world there is no intrinsic of protecting environment which means that you cannot bypass the preferencess of the people who might need that for economic benefits // **(SP)** under our side of the house. Which is why our  argument was two fold. |  |
| 4 | One that this is government policy i.e. there can be good government policies such as protecting endangered plans that cannot exist in their world when you cannot have access to ward ESA as the government. Two they just take away ownership from the people, like, **(FP)** indigenous groups which means that is infinitely worse for those particular beliefs as well what is the weighing of this argument. One, there are flexible priorities in this debate, every country has different priorities which is the reason why you need to have the utmost flexibility and not prioritize this one form of idea. Two this is  particularly important because there are always many | FP : 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | incentives that can lead to a good outcome we access all of those incentives because we can protect endangered groups palm oil plantations whatever as long as the government has that form of control in comparison to the thrid party that is, like, **(FP)** to be sued by that  company itself and sue the ESA for those reasons. |  |

# Appendix 19. Transcription Kalista conclusion speech

Kalista (conclusion) / Kejar Deatline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph** | **Dialog** | **Total Speech**  **Error** |
| 1 | Two is just in the speech and why we want both one is the environment a big voting issue and number two on accountabilitiy. On the first issue, is the environment a big voting issue. This is the most important clash because if we can show you that it us not a big voting issue that is the most important clash because if we can show you that it is not a big voting issue. This means that all of oppositions attempt to co–opt out benefits by regulations under governmnet cannot work. We told you that it is not very mny reasons. One, instead of politicians // **(SP)** politicians don’t really care because the environment is a long–term issue. Mitigating environmental destruction and climate change take time, it can take, like, **(FP)** 10 years before a tree can reach you high, and the problem with that taking a long time,  is that government is short term is. | SP : 1  FP : 1 |
| 2 | There are politicians who care about eligibility and the problem with that, is they can only serve in office in maximum 10 years. That means that long–term benefits mostly it’s not a startegy politicians call up in campaigns. Because of the risk of it being credited to future next politicians and instead of them. Further, I think we know once that since jones that environtment campaign mostly comes in expense of economic campaign. And economy campaign is mostly more portable because it’s immediate and physical. Number  two on society we give you six structural reasons why | FP : 1  UF : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | society isn’t currently aware they didn’t respond Dazzel just say campaign works. Why? Environmental campaigns have existed back in early 2000’s but society is still unaware. I think additionally there are other counter – economic campaigns that is more palpable. Futhure, I think mostly companies can hide the fact right by PR campaign and the nation to disguise these bad things that they did. This is important because it will show that society does not care tha \\ **(UF)** the government then does not care as well then their desperate mechanisms is internasional conversation, like, **(FP)** paris agreement, love US pulled out from  paris agreement there’s a defense of sovereignty. |  |
| 3 | They never show why internasional agreement offects all countries involved and why that’s legally binding. The way here is that we went clearly on this and that means women debate because if they cannot have punishment and regulations to environment. They need to defend sacrificing the environment for interest of corporations which they did them. Number two, which side creates account better \ **(RF)** accountability, no. The thing opposition need to know is that not all government will here the incentive to really protect the environment many governments are driven by economic incentives if you don’t buy bolsonaro for example middle east countries are also exploiting all resources. This showed to you that oppositions very best case by assuming that government is all reliable there might be legal loopholes but that happens on both side of the  house. | RF : 1 |
| 4 | There’s presumably even if the legal loophole is that bad, you controversial government will be far worse because they will make them not being able to have chance. To fight and government will wasily run away. In comparison to our side it’s better because at least they can challange the loophole as well. At least, in comparison in opposition they’ll not be able to get \ **(RF)** to deter anyone. On your side you can just make closed door agreements because they land is yours. At  least on ours, when you want to use the land you’ll be | FP : 1  RF : 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | sued and go to court and therefore get condemnation from the people, because those people who protect the environment are people who are passionate people, like,  **(FP)** environmentalists and director numbers. |  |
| 5 | That is why we make it harder for other to control and manipulate their region. They keep talking about lawyers and say that this is a lot debate, right? Dazzle, even if it is you don’t show why your legal impact is exclusive. One, under your side the admins will also be able to lobby the government meaning that it is much worse because there will be no transparency as well on their side. Number two even if they win because of the liars, consumers are still going to boycott the corporations unless they change. Which makes them lose profit, they’ll change their their market strategy when their spatula price that they actually harm these ESA’s. Number three, if this is true they also can’t protect the environment from the pollution of the corporations. So, they actually have no benefit at all. Even if the best case they mitigate the harm at least our benefits still stands. Indigenous comunities are harmed the most under their side. We don’t understand the one– liner analysis that government will care for them. Brazil don’t care, US didn’t care and make Hawai a tourism spots. Indonesia didn’t care for Papua either. So, with out ESA’s there’s also no incentive for the government to care for the environment under their site. That’s all I  love you so much, but we are winning this debate. | - |

# Appendix 20. Total speech errors in SETARA competition

**TOTAL SPEECH ERROR IN SETARA COMPETITION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **SP** | **FP** | **RF** | **UF** | **IT** | **CR** | **RP** | **ST** | **SOT** |
| Jhose | 1 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nadine | 15 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Kalista | 5 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Dazzle | 17 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Michelle | 11 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Tati | 41 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 |
| Dazzle  (conclusion) | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Kalista  (conclusion) | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUM** | 97 | 120 | 30 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 24 | 4 | 13 |
| **TOTAL** | **307** | | | | | | | | |

# Tabel 1 Total Speech Error in SETARA Competition

The total number of speech errors in SETARA Competition are 307 data. 97 data of silent pause, 120 data of filled pause, 30 data of retraced false start, 8 data of unretratced false statr, 6 data of interjections, 5 data of correction, 24 data of repeats, 4 data of stutter, and 13 data of slip of the tongue.