



**HIGH SCHOOL SUCCESSFUL DEBATERS'
SELF REGULATED LEARNING STRATEGIES
AT SMAN 3 MALANG**

Fachrial Saputra
lusciferre.lf@gmail.com
University of Brawijaya

Ive Emaliana
ive@ub.ac.id
University of Brawijaya

Received September 12th 2016
Revised October 27th 2016

Accepted October 3rd 2016
Published online December 13th 2016

Abstract. Debate is one of teaching strategies that is used in learning speaking. Debate includes the discipline of learners to manage their own learning. When learning English through debate, learners are using Self Regulated Learning (SRL) strategies. SRL strategies in debate are helping so many debaters to maintain their speaking using English as well as to think analytically while speaking using English. Therefore, this research was conducted to see the way that senior high school debaters used SRL strategies. This study used case study that is very popular form of qualitative analysis and involves a careful and complete observation of a social unit, be that unit a person, a family, an institution, a cultural group or even the entire community. Case study in this study was applied to analyze the kinds of SRL strategies that were used by senior high school successful debaters in SMA Negeri 3 Malang. This study revealed the presence and the way SRL strategies were used by the participants that were included into several attributes, including metacognitive, strategy, adapting, engaging, and self-initiating. Each of attribute was having their actions, including goal setting and planning, organizing and transforming, keeping records and monitoring, seeking social assistance, reviewing records, environmental structuring, self-evaluation, rehearsing and memorizing, self-consequence, and seeking information. Moreover, not all of the strategies always appeared on every participant and also the way that the participants used the strategies was different one to another.

Keywords: *Self Regulated Learning (SRL), Self Regulated Learning (SRL) strategies, debate*

Introduction

In teaching English as a foreign language, debate is used as one of learning activities. Brynteson, *et al* (2009, p. 5) explain that debate is a competitive speaking activity which involves two sides arguing the merits of a resolution in an attempt to convince the other people that their arguments are the best. Other explanation about debate also comes from Trapp (2007, p. 10) who defines that debate is a communication that use argumentation as the tool for claiming to one another. Besides, the way of speaking is determined by the argumentations that are delivered by the debaters. In making the argumentations for debate, debaters assert the claim and reason to make their argumentations become plausible. As an extracurricular in Indonesian schools, debate exists to improve students' skill in speaking English. Most of debate competitions in Indonesia use Australian Parliamentary System and British Parliamentary System, like National Schools Debating Championship (NSDC), East Java Varsities English Debate (EJVED), and The ASEAN Law Student Association (ALSA) Debate. In those debate competitions, communication in English spoken language is used. Therefore debate is a medium for students to strengthen their speaking skill in using English as well as their analytical thinking.

Many high school students are exposed to many debate competitions to cope up not just their English speaking only, but also their analytical thinking in order to compete better than others. Debate uses speaking as the main tool, while speaking helps debaters to support their social skill.

As stated by Brynteson, *et al* (2009, p.6):

Most people naturally avoid public speaking--debate provides a nonthreatening environment to practice these skills so that down the road when you're called on to speak in college or on the job, you'll have the skills necessary to do a great job. This increases your chances of doing well in important interviews for jobs or scholarships.

It means that debate helps the students to be better speakers in any situation. Debate also helps the students to develop analytical thinking skill. Analytical thinking in debate will help the students to use reliable source of information, develop good arguments and find the flaws in bad arguments, teach them to solve the problem, teach them how to ask and answer questions (Rybold, 2006, p. 3). Both of the skills can be acquired and enhanced better as long as the students keep practicing debate regularly.

In acquiring both of skills, debaters need practice. The debaters use practice time to prepare for competition (Brynteson, *et al*, 2009, p. 5). However, because debate is an applicable skill in daily activity, the practice of debate is easily can be integrated into daily activity. The time when the students go to school, they can do several practices which are included into kinds of debate training, for example read assignment before learning or practicing, take note in learning or practicing, stay organized in note-taking, review the information, and ask questions (Rybold 2006, p. 6). Those practices not only help students to become good debaters, but also give so many other advantages.

The students who join debate competition are called debaters, and being debater has many advantages. The competitions help students to learn how to make a strategy, for example, before delivering arguments in debate, there are several strategies are included to make the delivery of idea becomes clear (Brynteson, *et al*, 2009, p. 34). By applying the strategies of arguments making in debate, the arguments, which are delivered by debaters, will become clear and well organized. Beside of that, self-motivation is also increasing in debaters as the one of advantages. This can be seen from the classroom action research that was done by Rubiati (2010, p. 38) in the second cycle, the activeness and enthusiasm of students to be engaged in debate is increasing. It is also supported by Zimmerman & Schunk (2012, p. 2), without self-motivation, learning is hard to be acquired. Therefore, while practicing debate, not only strategies are sharpen, but also self-motivation is increasing as the impact of positive effect in practicing and joining debate.

Debaters' successes mostly come from their own autonomous learning. When debaters practice themselves (including organizing, plan setting, self-motivating), in other words that they are doing autonomous learning (Holec, 1981, cited in Murray, 2011, p. 8). In learning autonomously, debaters use debate environment to help them acquiring English by themselves. As stated by Shen (1993, p.144):

The learner is a system that can perform a set of actions to the environment and perceive a set of percepts from the environment. It has a set of goals, expressed in terms of percepts that are either self-generated or given by external commands. Its objective is to construct a model of the environment so that it can drive the environment into states that match its goals.

Even the environment has impact to the autonomous learners' learning, but the source and center of an autonomous learning is on the learners' self (Murray, 2011, p. 5-16). From the description, both of the debate environment and debaters are supporting each other to build up autonomous learning in learning speaking using English. In debate environment, most of the participants, adjudicators, spectators, and tutors are using English as the tool for communicating. Seeing this environment, giving a chance for debaters to sharpen their English speaking, proof that environment and debaters are supporting each other. The autonomous learners do in practicing their speaking are mostly similar to self-regulated learning proposed by Zimmerman (1990, p. 3-17).

When strategies, motivation and behavior are affecting the learning of debaters, all of those things come up to be the keys of success of debaters especially in organizing and delivering ideas through speaking which are related to self-regulated learning (SRL). SRL is learning done by learners that affect them cognitively, behaviorally, and motivationally (Zimmerman, 1990, p.4). SRL strategies in debate are helping debaters to learn speaking better. The self-regulation of cognition, motivation and behavior are important aspects of learning and the extent to which the students become self-regulated learners

which appears to influence their academic success, especially speaking as stated by Beishuizen & Steffens (2011, cited in Effeney 2013, p.58). Besides those three attributes proposed by Zimmerman (1990, p.4), there are other attributes those are involved in improving debaters' SRL strategies, including metacognitive, strategy, adapting, engaging, and self-initiative (Bernacki, *et al*, 2011, p. 4). Even there are differences on the SRL strategies explanation, the research will use both of theories to see how every attribute is affecting every strategy in each debater's analytical speaking skill.

The way debaters speak by using English is different from other students' English speaking. The speaking, which is done by debaters, is a formal speaking which deliver about a particular issue with particular claim, reason and situation. This is different from other speaking activities, namely speaking of informal talks for daily activity (Tillit & Bruder, 1985, p. vii). When debaters deliver their cases they need to deliver concise and clear speech that requires appropriates sentences, structure through proper sentence constructions. Besides, they need to acquire the ability to respond the opponents' cases fast and properly. In order to have a good ability in delivering arguments in good way communication and being competent in applying analytical thinking skill, SRL attributes help the debaters.

SRL is defined as the indications of how and why students choose particular strategies or responses (Zimmerman, 1990, p. 6). Moreover, Bernacki (2011), SRL strategies are divided based on several attributes including metacognitive, strategy, adapting, engaging, and self-initiating. Metacognitive is the sense that student engages in effective forms of planning, organizing, task-analysis, goal-setting and monitoring the progress. Strategy is including the effectiveness of students using domain-general (e.g., help-seeking and note-taking), and do-main-specific strategies (e.g., reading strategies) to help them overcome processing limitations, emotional distress, and promote better comprehension. Adaptive is about how a student adjusts appropriately to change in circumstances and demonstrates emotional and motivational profile, which are related to the achievement (e.g., a calibrated sense of ability, self-efficacy, being concerned about the right kind of things). Engaging is the way student remains focused on learning the material and be able to avoid being distracted. The last, Self-initiating is the feeling that they do not need others to urge them to begin tasks, remain focused, organize themselves, use strategies and so on, because they want to be successful and understand how these behaviors help them be more successful. In other words, those strategies in every attribute help them a lot.

SRL attributes have helped many of debaters to improve success in speaking using English and gain their analytical thinking. In line with that, the reason of this research to exist is to see how SRL strategies affect the successful debaters in speaking using English and what strategies are appeared in their speaking. Therefore, this study chooses SMAN 3 Malang as the institution that will be studied because the school has so many successful debaters. Moreover, the school has good reputation in joining and winning many debate competitions, including ICOSH UB Debating Championship,

Brawijaya English Tournament (BET), National English Festival, and many more. In addition, this research is studying about the SRL strategies' appearance based on its' attributes (metacognitive, strategic, adaptive, engaged, and self-initiating) which divided again into several branch and see how each participant from SMAN 3 Malang is using every strategy inside of each attribute.

SRL attributes and strategies have helped many students to master their skill, especially in speaking skill. It is supported by several studies related to self-related learning and debate. Those studies are about (1) the use of debate in the classroom of English Language Teaching Department Tarbiyah Faculty at IAIN Walisongo Semarang to improve the students' speaking skill studied by Rubiati (2010) and (2) the presence of SRL strategies in adolescent males in general acquisition along with the source (Effeney, et al., 2013).

Although two previous studies have shown that SRL attributes bring positive impacts toward the teaching of English, particularly speaking. However, several factors like different data analysis, which more specific explanation on this SRL strategy forms is needed because it can give a portrayal on how debaters use it.

This study is different from the first previous study in terms of participants (senior high school debaters), different research problems (asking how debate SRL strategies affect the way debaters' learn English speaking), and different objectives (seeing how SRL strategies exist and the form of existence in each of participant). On other sides, the difference between the second previous study and this study is this study uses different participant and different data analysis (which more specific explanation on this study for every SRL strategies). Moreover, this study is combining the Zimmerman's SRL theory (1990) with Bernacki, *et al* (2011). Therefore, this present study is worth studying.

The results of this research are expected to give useful information about the way of SRL strategies affect the learning style of SMAN 3 Malang debaters in acquiring their speaking. Besides, the results will be useful for people who study about debate strategies and learning style such as debaters itself, debate tutors and further researchers.

For debaters, this study can be an important knowledge to know what strategies commonly used as SRL strategies users. As the tutor of debate, this study will helps tutor to provide as many as possible strategy explanations for their students who are also debaters so the debaters will be better than before in delivering ideas by using common used SRL strategies. And for the further researchers, it can be used as reference for who are interested in conducting similar researches in the future.

Method

This study was using case study. According to Kothari (2004, p.113), case study is a method which involves a careful and complete observation of a social unit, be that unit a person, a family, an institution, a cultural group or even the entire community. The reason why this study was using case study

was because the participants who were taken by the writer were in one school (SMA Negeri 3 Malang). Because it was a study in one institution (one school only), therefore the qualifications of case study have been met. Moreover, by using case study, this study was aimed at observing about (1) the appearance of SRL strategies in participants' speaking by using English and (2) the way participants used SRL strategies to avoid or solve the errors in speaking.

In avoiding bias, the writer took position as an outsider (not a member of participants' community). Also, the environment was not manipulated by writer in order to the data as natural as possible.

The participants of this study were debaters of Malang High Schools. Those debaters were the debaters who ever won the debate competition (at least) at province level. It was because the debate level at province level is the minimum level as same as the minimum level of selection in National School Debating Competition (NSDC). When a debater had ever won the province level of competition, they would had a higher percentage in passing the selection of NSDC at province level because he/she had a better experiences and skill in debate.

The writer took four debaters from SMA Negeri 3 Malang. Debaters from SMA Negeri 3 Malang passed the selection of NSDC in 2014 and represented Indonesia in World School Debating Competition. Moreover, Debaters from SMA Negeri 3 won the others competitions including UNIKAMA English Debate Competition in 2014, UGM IREC in 2016, and so on. Debaters who were being the participants from SMA Negeri 3 Malang were the students from second grade class (including XI IPA 7 and XI IPA 4). All participants who had met the given criteria are female.

The writer used purposive sampling technique in choosing the participants. It made the writer had the consideration in choosing participants those match to the criteria given by the writer. In this case, the chosen participants had fulfilled criteria given by writer.

The research's instrument used in this study was interview guide. The interview guide was adapted from Self-Regulated Learning Interview Schedule (SRLIS) from Zimmerman & Pons (1986, p.614-628) combined with Bernacki's theory of SRL attributes (2011, p. 4). The interview guide contained questions about 14 SRL classified strategies to (1) indicate the appearance of SRL strategies in participants' speaking using English and (2) the way participants use SRL strategies to avoid or solve the errors in speaking. Moreover, the content of interview schedule has been validated by an expert.

The expert validated the interview guide. She is an expert of Debate Teaching Strategies. The validation was done with her on 18th February 2016. The validation was about correcting the dictions which are used in the interview guide. In order to make it more natural, for example the diction that was given by her was changing the word "*Ilustrasikan*" To the word "*Seandainya*". More revisions can be seen on.

The data which had been carried and analyzed by the writer was the data of spoken interview that sourced by participants' answers about SRL strategies those they used. The data included about (1) the appearance of SRL

strategies in participants' speaking using English and (2) the way participants use SRL strategies to avoid or solve the errors in speaking.

The technique of data collection was using interview. The interview consisted of twelve questions to indicate (1) the appearance of SRL strategies in participants' speaking using English and (2) the way participants use SRL strategies to avoid or solve the errors in speaking. Every participant was interviewed around 30-40 minutes for one session of interview. The interview was scheduled on 14th March 2016. Moreover to make the answers from participants become natural, the interview was conducted only between participants and writer as interviewer without the intervention of outsider (teachers or friends).

The data from interview was analyzed by the table along with the description to indicate each of participants' answer in using SRL strategies. There were four tables which was explained this study objectives from the start. The tables were including (1) SRL appearance and (2) the way SRL strategies used. Moreover, every data in tables were verified and validated to make it trustful.

In order to make it valid, the writer used *triangulation of sources*. Triangulation of sources was analyzing the consistency of different data sources by the same method (Patton, 1999, p. 1192). The sources in here were the participants who are debaters from SMAN 3 Malang. Therefore, the writer took more than one participants from SMAN 3 Malang to make the data valid under the same method of interview.

The participants were interviewed on the 14th March 2016, at the break time of the school. The first interview was with Participant 1, second with Participant 2, third with Participant 3, and the fourth with Participant 4. The interviewer interviewed on the participants' actions in using SRL strategies. Moreover, the findings of the interview can be seen on the next chapter and Appendix 3.

Findings

Data of SRL Strategies Appearance in Participants' Speaking Using English

As the explanation of SRL strategies in the previous chapter, the writer had taken the data through interview and presented the data of SRL strategies' presences. In the findings, the writers found that every participant had their own goal-setting along with the planning that they did to achieve the goal. In 'organizing and transforming', 'keeping records', 'monitoring', 'self-evaluation', 'rehearsing', 'memorizing', 'self-consequences', and 'seeking information' strategies, their presences also existed in Participant 1, 2,3, and 4. Although it seemed like almost all of strategies appeared in participants, but still there were some absences of several strategies.

The absences of strategies appeared on 'seeking social assistance', 'reviewing records', and 'environmental structuring'. In 'seeking social assistance', from what had been they stated in the interview, all participants were not seeking assistance from the adults (other adults beside of teacher, for

example their parents). Moreover, they preferred to seek the assistance from their friends and teachers.

In 'reviewing records', the strategies' presences were various. Participant 1 preferred to use internet resources in helping her to speak using English in debate. Participant 2 preferred to reread notes and reviewed from internet resources. While Participant 3 and 4 preferred to reread note only. In addition, the 'environmental structuring' strategy appeared in all participants except Participant 3. Therefore, it can be concluded that not all of the SRL strategies appeared in every participant.

The Way Participants Use SRL Strategies to Avoid or Solve the Errors in Speaking

After knowing the presence of SRL strategies, now the writer will explain the way participants use these strategies as follow:

Goal-setting and Planning

In 'goal setting and planning', every participant had their own goals and planning. Participant 1, 2, and 4 had the goals to win every debate competition and become the top 10 best speakers. While the third participant had the goal to win every competition only. In order to achieve their goals, Participant 1 preferred to focus on training with or without mentors two weeks before competition. Participant 2 and 3 preferred to learn tenses and practiced debate with or without mentors twice in a week. The last, Participant 4 preferred to train intensively one month before competition.

Organizing and Transforming

In 'organizing and transforming', the ways participants organize and transform their idea to help them speak were vary. Participant 1 preferred to make argument one by one and decided the stance to make her easier in speaking. Participant 2 and 3 preferred to see the motion first, decided the involved actors, observed recent condition, and made arguments which are appropriate for every speaker. In addition, Participant 4 preferred to make arguments, focused on future implications and side actors.

Environmental Structuring

Different from other strategies, there was a total absence of 'environmental structuring' strategy in a participant. While participant 1, 2, and 4 preferred to set the place for training debate, Participant 3 did not do any environmental structuring for training debate.

Self-evaluation

In 'self-evaluation', there was a little difference in using this strategy on every participant. Participant 1 and 4 used note to write down the mistakes they do, but in addition, Participant 4 set her mindset of 'not being bullied by teammates' to avoid her from doing the same mistake. In order to have the

‘self-evaluation’, Participant 2 and 3 applied the mindset of ‘not being bullied by teammates’ only without wrote it down into their notes.

Rehearsing and Memorizing

For ‘rehearsing and memorizing’, all participants had the same action. All participants used the previous materials from previous debates for brainstorming. Furthermore, the previous materials were not merely used but it was developed more, so it was matching to the recent topic of debate.

Self-consequence

For ‘self-consequence’, every participant had their own consequence if they did not join and win debate competitions. Participant 1 believed that if she did not join debate, she would not be open-minded and the reputations of the debate club where she joined will be broken if she did not win in debate competitions. In Participant 2, if she did not win in debate competitions, she would not have any certificate and embarrassed the reputation of her debate club in the school. In line with Participant 3, she believed that if she did not join and win debate competitions, she would not have any certificate to pass the university selection. Different with Participant 3, Participant 4 believed that the only consequence if she did not join and win debate competitions was that she would fail the reputation of the school.

Seeking Information

In the last strategy, every participant also had their own preference in using ‘seeking information’ strategy in case if they train debate alone and find the problems in words translation. Participant 1 preferred to use electronic dictionary, Participant 2 preferred to browse internet for searching the dictations, Participant 3 preferred to see the notes and searched the synonym, and Participant 4 preferred to use the word references given by mentors or open the dictionary.

Discussion

SRL Strategies Appearance in Participants’ Speaking Using English

From the findings we can see the strategies that appear in every participant are vary. More than that, it can be seen that there is a total absence of the ‘environmental structuring’ strategies in participant 3.

In ‘environmental structuring’ strategy, the Participant does not feel any difference between setting the place or not. It is counted as a total absence of the ‘environmental structuring’ strategy (different to the absence of ‘seeking social assistance’ and ‘reviewing records’ branch strategies, if participants have any of the branch strategies, for example ‘reread notes’, it still can be counted as ‘exist’) because once the participant does not do any place setting for her learning, it means that she cannot be counted to have any ‘environmental strategy’. It is also contrary to what Smith (2001, p. 671) states that learners will control the learning environment by reducing distractions, but for Participant 3, she believes that the matters in debate training are about the

speech and keeping the dynamic of debate. Even when the writer asks one more about the difference between setting the place or not, Participant 3 seems not to find the advantages of setting the environment. Therefore, in learning English speaking, the presence of environmental structuring sometimes can be put aside in this case. But even though like that, still the appearance of every strategy is helping them in debate.

Every SRL strategy appears in debaters' speaking to help them in practicing and competing, for example, participant 1 feels helped by organizing idea through her action. When being interviewed, she tells that by organizing and transforming the idea, she can think faster in the limited time of debate case building. Moreover, her speaking is also being well organized because of this well-organized brainstorming so she is always organizing and transforming. It is in line with what has been studied by Zimmerman & Pons (1990, p. 57) that gifted students displayed greater use of organizing and transforming, self-consequence, seeking peer assistance, and reviewing because they feel helped by these strategies. In the end, it can be concluded that every action of SRL strategy is helping them in learning to speak using English.

Discussions on the Way Participants Use SRL Strategies to Avoid or Solve the Errors in Speaking

There are various actions, which are performed by participants in learning speaking using debate. For the first, in the 'goal-setting and planning', whereas this strategy is about students' setting of educational goals or sub goals and planning for sequencing, timing, and completing activities connected to their goals (Zimmerman & Pons, 1986, p. 618), 3 of 4 participants have the same goal of being the winner and passing through the 10 ten best speakers (except Participant 3 with shorter goal). Furthermore, in planning to achieve the goal, they do the same thing in common (practice routinely). Those practices are influenced by their motivation to achieve their goals (Smith, 2001, p. 677). Moreover, they have other same things in the common in the case of strategy applications beside 'goal-setting and planning'.

In 'keeping record and monitoring', every participant has the same strategy by writing down to their note. The things those make different are the things those they wrote in their note. For example, participant 1 and 4 write down not only the verbal adjudication that they get from the adjudicators, but also their mistakes in speaking. It means that to keep their mistake in speaking from happened again, they also write down the mistake that they do to help them remember and avoid it (Smith, 2001, p. 678). In additional, every participant writes down the verbal adjudication in order to use the note if they find the same topic of motion, so they will be helped in their debate speaking if they find the similar motions.

Verbal adjudication that has been written down by the participant can help them to reviewing record, rehearsing and memorizing. As stated by every participant, they prefer to reread their note if they find the similar motions. To add, the brainstorming from previous motions was not merely used, but along with further development of debaters' idea. This is also in line with what has

been studied, that cognitive strategies (including rehearsing, elaborating, modeling, and organizing techniques, etc.) enhance the learning (Smith, 2001, p. 679). Therefore, it helps them in speaking better when they deliver their argument. The fact, taking note is helping them to learn speaking using English so much.

Other strategy is 'self-evaluation'. In the same understanding of self-evaluation strategy, by self-evaluating, they can evaluate their mistakes and do some progressions which are relative to their goals by making adjustments to current cognitive and regulatory strategies in order to align performance with the learning goal. (Smith, 2001, p. 671). More than that, the self-evaluation strategy that they use is differ one to another. For example, participant 1 and 3 prefer to use note-taking action to write down their mistakes and avoid it by having the mind setting of 'to no be bullied' by their teammates. This action can be some kind of internal motivation from them to avoid the same mistakes and do some progressions because they don't want to be bullied by their teammates that is very shameful for them. Moreover, the progression is happening in the force of internal motivation.

Other strategies also have their roles to help these participants to speak better in debate. For example, the presence of mentors as 'social assistance' in participants' speaking. Most of participants agree that teachers as the main source of their social assistance strategy in learning to speak English, whether for helping them to learn the dictions in English debate or getting the debate materials. It is the same result that happened in the study which was done by Effeney et al. (2013, p. 64-66) where the teachers are the dominant source for SRL learners. While as the secondary source, friends who are also their senior in debate help them to find the dictions which are usually used in debate. If they do not have anyone to assist them in training, the participants are not losing the idea. They use other assistances for example, internet, dictionary, or notes to help them as the form of 'seeking information' strategy. Learners with higher SRL will tend to have 'seeking information' strategy. It is also supported by the results of study by Effeney et al. (2013, p. 63) where students with high SRL have their own 'seeking information' strategy. Furthermore, those strategies are affecting so much in helping them to speak better using English.

Finally, still there is a strategy that does not affect the participants too much in speaking using English, for example in the case of 'environmental structuring'. Even when Smith (2001, p. 671) supports that learners goal can be achieved if they reduce the distraction by setting the environment, but participant 3 insists that she does not feel any advantage in setting the place for training debate. She believes that what matters in debate are about speech and the dynamic of debate. Therefore, she feels that her speaking in debate is not being differ whether the place is set of not.

Above of all, the presence of strategies in every participant are helping them to improve their learning in English speaking in debate and classroom. Supposed that they are the high user of SRL strategies and almost all of the strategies appear in their learning, it is can be concluded that they also use that

in learning English academically in the school. It is also supported by Effeney et al. (2013, p. 68-69) that the wider range user of SRL strategies tend to be academically capable in the classroom. Moreover, the use of SRL strategies is needed not only in learning English through debate, but also in the classroom. In conclusion, no matter SRL strategies they use, it looks like agreed by them that it is useful for learning and maintaining their English speaking.

Conclusion & Suggestion

SRL strategies' appearance in every participant is various. Especially the appearance of 'reviewing records' and 'environmental structuring.' The variations depend on the participants' preference that they believe to really helping them or not. Furthermore, it depends on the use degree of SRL strategies in every participant. We can't force them to do the same strategy if it is not based on their preference. Moreover, those SRL strategies that are used by them are success in helping them to speak effectively in debate and achieve the champion in debate competitions.

First, about the way SRL strategies used by senior high school debaters successful debaters. By seeing the appearance, we can also see the way that they use every action related to the strategies. Even it is the same action of taking note, but the use is different from participant to another. For example in the case of participant 1 and 4, they use to reread note not only for reviewing and rehearsing, but also for self-evaluating, while participant 2 and 3 use that only for reviewing records and rehearsing. Therefore, it is back again to the way that they rely on the strategies by different actions which help them to speak better.

Based on the conclusion above, the writer gives some suggestions as follows. First, the debate mentor does not have to force debaters to have some learning styles those are not their preference. What is being mentor's duty is about facilitating and guiding them about what debater should have in their learning styles. Therefore, by knowing debater's SRL strategies, mentor will know that learning style is better if it is involving SRL strategies so much.

Second, about the way SRL strategies used by senior high school debaters successful debaters. By knowing the actions those related to debater's SRL Strategies, mentors can give advice to debaters about the kinds of action those can be used for some strategies in debate speaking. Moreover, mentor can teach them that one action can be used for some strategies those help them to speak better in debate.

References

- Bernacki, M. L., Aguilar, A. C., Byrnes, J. P. (2011). Self-Regulated Learning and Technology-Enhanced Learning Environments: An Opportunity-Propensity Analysis. *Fostering Self-Regulated Learning through ICT*, 1-26.
- Brynteson, D. J., Baron, R., Madson, R. (2009). *A student and coach's guide to Public Forum Debate*. Retrieved October 8, 2015, from <http://www.mdt.org>

- Effeney, G., Carrol, A., Bahr, N. (2013). Self-regulated learning: key strategies and their sources in a sample of adolescent males. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 2013, 13, 58-74.
- Kothari, C. R. (2014). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques (2nd Edition)*. New Delhi: New Age International Publisher.
- Murray, G. (2011). *Metacognition and imagination in self-access language learning*. In D. Gardner (Ed). *Fostering autonomy in language learning*. Gaziantep: Zirve University. Retrieved from <http://ilac2010.zirve.edu.tr>
- Patton, M. C. (1999). Enhancing the Quality and Credibility of Qualitative Analysis. *HSR: Health Services Research*, 1999, 34(5), 1083-1263.
- Rubiati, R. (2010). Improving students' speaking skill through debate technique (a classroom action research with first semester students of English Language Teaching Department Tarbiyah Faculty at IAIN Walisongo Semarang in the academic year of 2010/2011). *Thesis of Bachelor Degree*, non-published. Semarang. IAIN Walisongo.
- Rybold, Gary. (2006). *Speaking, Listening, and Understanding: Debate for Non-Native-English Speakers*. New York: IDEBATE Press Books
- Shen, Wei-Min. (1993). Discovery as autonomous learning from the environment. *Machine learning*, 1993, 12, 143-165.
- Smith, P. A. (2001). Understanding self-regulated learning and its implications for accounting educators and researchers. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 16(4), 663-700. Retrieved May 5, 2016, from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/210878158?accountid=46437>
- Tillitt, B., Bruder, M. N. (1985). *Speaking Naturally: Communication Skills in American English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Trapp, Robert. (2007). *The Debatabase Book: A Must-Have Guide for Successful Debate (3rd Edition)*. United State of America: IDEA Press Books.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: an overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 1990, 25(1), 3-17.
- Zimmerman, B. J., Pons, M. M. (1986). Development of a Structured Interview for Assessing Students Use of Self-Regulated Learning Strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1986, 23(4), 614-628.
- Zimmerman, B. J., Pons, M. M. (1990). Student Differences in Self-Regulated Learning: Relating Grade, Sex, and Giftedness to Self-Efficacy and Strategy Use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1990, 82(1), 51-59.
- Zimmerman, B. J., Schunk D. H. (2012). *Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning: Theory, Research, and Applications*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.