ISSN P : 2722-6999
E: 2722-7006

English Debate Mastery and Students' Speaking Performance

Ahmad Gunadi Salam [a]

[a] English Students, Universitas Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram

Nurul Azizah[b]

[b] English Lecturer, Universitas Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram, nurulazizahfilla@gmail.com

Moh. Gufron[c]

[c] English Lecturer, Universitas Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram, rajabulgufron.id@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of the research was to determine the relationship between debate mastery and speaking performance; whether debate helps students improve their speaking performance; and how strong the correlation is between the two. It is classified as "correlation research" because it aims to measure the relationship between two variables without the researcher's control. The data was analyzed using the SPPS application, and it was determined that the range of critical thinking was as follows: excellent (19–24), good (13–18), average (7–12), and poor (7). Meanwhile, the range of speaking skills was as follows: excellent (21–25), good (16–20), average (11–15), poor (6–10), and very poor (less than 6). The result was 0.8508. Thus, both debate mastery and speaking performance have been included as very strong correlations.

Keywords: *Debate, Speaking performance, Correlation.*

INTRODUCTION

Debate is mostly known for competition but is not a method to improve the capacity of a language, specifically speaking performance. English debate offers several methods that can improve speaking performance and facilitates English students by using the debate method for it because debate activity unconsciously imitates students. Kreige (2005) believes that debate is an excellent activity for language learning because it engages students in a variety of cognitive and linguistic ways. Debate provides students with meaningful listening, speaking, and writing practice. Debate is also highly effective as a way to develop speaking skills in debate. Students show obvious progress in their ability when practicing debate by analyzing every word of the motion and speaking each argument when practicing.

According to Freeley and Steinberg (2009), a debate is the process of inquiry and advocacy, a way of arriving at a reasoned judgment on a proposition to decide in their minds. Additionally, debating is mostly an activity of speaking that exclusively covers all

the processes, including advocacy, reading, and critical thinking. However, before we debate, we must master what we need to convey when delivering an argument. Very little can be conveyed without grammar; nothing can be conveyed without vocabulary. Thus, debate covers all of the components, including speaking, vocabulary, reading, and writing.

According to Scoot (2005:79), "Speech is considered the most productive and oral skill." Speaking is a cognitive skill. "It is the idea that knowledge increases automatically through successive practice." Speaking through debate is an effective way to get practice because the debate is mostly about speaking, such as delivering arguments and interacting when case building, it is proven that practicing debate will successfully increase speaking performance, which is why this research needs to be improved by conducting debate methods.

The method of increasing speaking skills at the university level by conducting debates is used by many of the debating club organizations on campus, such as the Academy Speaking Club at Nahdlatul Wathan University. As an example, for one of the organizations that focuses on English debating, all of its members have different departments such as English, Biology, and so on. Their ability, specifically speaking, is above average compared to other students, but this research will underline the need to focus on measuring the correlation between debates and speaking performance among students who have taken part in English debating.

Based on the background above, there is a significant ability toward students after they join the English debating organization at the University of Nahdlatul Wathan. The goal of this research is to identify whether English debate can improve speaking performance or not, and to find out the correlation between speaking performance and English debate.

LITERATURE REVIEWS

Debate

Krieger (2005) says that debate is an excellent activity for language learning because it engages students in a variety of cognitive and linguistic ways. Halvorsen (2005) says that debate forces students to think about the multiple sides of an issue, and it also forces them to interact not just with the details of a given topic, but also with one another.

Debates also demand the development of oral communication skills, which are vital for success in most careers (Combs &

Bourne, 1994). "Debate involves not only determining what to say but how to say it" (Roy &Macchiette, 2005, p. 265). Williams, McGee, and Worth (2001) surveyed 286 participants of competitive debate teams at 70 different universities. These students rated improved communication skills as the most substantial benefit of debate participation. The marketing students surveyed by Combs and Bourne (1994) reported a statistically significant improvement in their and their peers' oral communication skills as a result of in-class debate participation.

From the explanation mentioned above, it can be inferred that debate is considered statistically significant in accordance with improving students' critical thinking and speaking skills. This can also stimulate the students to think critically in relation to the multiple viewpoints in the debate process and activity and requires them to deliver their argument and viewpoints structurally.

John Dewey (1993) further suggested a five-phase critical thinking model which included (1) suggestions, (2) problem definition, (3) hypothesis generation, (4) reasoning, and (5) hypothesis testing. John Dewey (1993) further suggested a 5-phase critical thinking model that included (1) suggestions, (2) problem definition, (3) hypothesis generation, (4) reasoning, and (5) hypothesis testing.

Speaking

Speaking is one example of an activity that is used by someone and another to communicate something. There are some definitions of speaking. They are as follows: To most people, mastering the art of speaking is the single most important aspect of learning a second language, and success is measured in terms of the ability to carry out a conversation in the language (Nunan, 1991: 39). Speaking is active or productive. It means that speaking is commonly performed in face-to-face interaction and occurs as part of a dialogue or other form of verbal exchange. Speaking as an instance of use is thus part of a reciprocal exchange in which both reception and production play distinct roles. In this sense, the skill of speaking involves both receptive and productive participation, (Widdowson, 1996).

Based on the definition above, we conclude speaking is part of human life, such as communicating with each other and informing each other in human daily life to fulfill their demands. And one of the applicable methods to improve the students' English-speaking skills is debate. This

statement is supported by Dobson (1987), who asserts that debate helps students speak more fluently, and during a debate, they can represent their feelings and thoughts on an issue. Students can be more involved in this strategy by using the debate method since it is a good way to practice speaking.

The researcher used a literature review that was relevant to the topic at hand. This was Jaya Nur Iman's (2017) study from the University of Indo Global Mandiri, which he wrote about in an article called "Debate Instruction in EFL Classroom: Impacts on the Critical Thinking and Speaking Skills." The objective of this study is to find out whether or not using debate gives a significant improvement in the student's critical thinking and speaking skills.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is categorized as correlation research. A correlational research design measures relationships between two variables without the researcher controlling, understanding, and assessing statistical relationships between them with no influence from any extraneous variable. It aims to find out whether there is either a strong relationship or a coefficient that suggests no relationship, and negative correlation coefficients suggest an inverse relationship.

The research was conducted at the Academy Speaking Club of Nahdlatul Wathan University, a UKM of English debate. The research population consisted of all members of the UKM Academy speaking club, and thirty students who had previously participated in English debating were chosen as the research sample.

In collecting data, this research measures the student's critical thinking as an instrument of debate mastery and speaking performance. The experiment was conducted by observation and recording. The students were asked to choose one of the topics that commonly appear in debate. The researcher used a critical thinking rubric to assess critical thinking achievement, which includes aspects of critical thinking such as identifying and explaining issues; recognizing stakeholders and contexts; evaluating assumptions; evaluating evidence; and evaluating implications, conclusions, and consequences. The researcher used SOLOM (Student Oral Language Observation Matrix) to measure the students' speaking skills. SOLOM is made up of things like comprehension, vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and fluency.

ISSN P : 2722-6999
E: 2722-7006

The data was extracted from the recording and analyzed with SPSS. To interpret the students' scores individually, the range of critical thinking was as follows: excellent (19–24), good (13–18), average (7–12), and poor (7) Meanwhile, the range of speaking skills was as follows: excellent (21–25), good (16–20), average (11–15), poor (6–10), and very poor (6).

Based on the above, the researcher can formulate the hypothesis of the study. The hypothesis is as follows: H0 : There is no correlation. H1 : There is a correlation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The finding of this research deals with students' scores in analyzing the argumentation of students, which is conducted by recording, testing the normality of data, testing the linearity of data, and hypothesis testing. These findings are described as follows:

Table of Classification Scores

NO	NAMA	CRITICAL THINKING	SPEAKING PERFORMANCE
1	Abdul azizurrahman	20	22
2	Imam burhanuddin	19	21
3	Ilman	18	20
4	Hafizaturrohani	20	21
5	Mustakim hadi	18	19
6	Satria wira utama	20	20
7	Elvi sistrianan putri	23	23
8	Abdul halim perdana kusuma	24	23
9	Haerani fathul jannah	18	21
10	Erni yuliastri alpani	19	22
11	Ira julfiana	17	20
12	Pendi juhrianto	16	18
13	Alaudin soheh	23	24
14	Muhammad khalqi	18	20
15	Dewi ratna syafitri	16	18
16	Fathul mubin	14	15
17	Halimatuzzahro	13	16
18	Arlinda aulia	21	21
19	Lina maharani	20	21
20	Desika rahmawati	19	18
21	Zohratul ainy	21	20
22	Sulhiyah	22	22
23	Laeli	19	19
24	Nita sari	21	21
25	Santy ramdayani	20	20
26	Muhammad solehudin akbar	18	19
27	Siti qomariah	15	16
28	Ahmad zarkoni	22	20
29	Nurul hidayati yuliana	23	21
30	Maula hidayatul atqia	20	21

Normality Test

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Critical thinking	,124	30	,200*	,969	30	,502
Speaking performance	,187	30	,009	,944	30	,113

The result above was obtained with significant Shapiro-Wilk as a variable of critical thinking as big as 0,502 and a variable of speaking performance as big as 0,113. Both critical thinking and speaking performance are higher than the standard of 5% (0,005) or sig. > 0,05. As a result, both the data and the distribution were normal.

ISSN P : 2722-6999
E: 2722-7006

Linearity Test

			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Speaking performance * Critical thinking	Between Groups	(Combined)	102,900	11	9,355	7,332	,000
		Linearity	92,113	1	92,113	72,193	,000
		Deviation from Linearity	10,787	10	1,079	,845	,595
	Within Groups		22,967	18	1,276		
	Total		125,867	29			

The data above was obtained with a significance of 0.595, higher than the standard of 0.05 (5%). Thus, it was linear data.

Correlation Test for Hyphotesis

		critical thiking	speaking performance
critical thiking	Pearson Correlation	1	,855**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	30	30
speaking performance	Pearson Correlation	,855**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	30	30

There are two types for testing the corelation:

1. The first method is based on the results above. The sig. 0.000 0,005 (the standardization of 5%) definitely indicates that there is a correlation between critical thinking and speaking performance. This is a step that is looked at by analyzing its significance.
2. The second method can compare between the *r table* and the person correlation if the *person correlation* is higher than the *r* table, where the *person correlation is* 0,855 > *r table* 0,361. Thus, it addresses the correlation.

Based on the results above, the strength of the correlation between debate mastery and a student's speaking performance is very strong. Please refer to the table interpretation below:

Correlation Coeffient (Value)	Interpretation
0	Zero Correlation
0,01 - 0,20	Very Weak Correlation
0,21 - 0,40	Weak Correlation
0,41 - 0,60	Sizeable Correlation
0,61 - 0,80	Strong Correlation
0,81 - 0,99	Very Strong Correlaion
1	Perfect Correlation (rarely happen)

r Product Moment Value Table

N	Taraf Signif		N	Taraf Signif		N	Taraf Signif	
	5%	10%		5%	10 %		5%	10%
3	0,997	0,999	27	0,381	0,487	55	0,266	0,345
4	0,950	0,990	28	0,374	0,478	60	0,254	0,330
5	0,878	0,959	29	0,367	0,470	65	0,244	0,317
6	0,811	0,917	30	0,361	0,463	70	0,235	0,306
7	0,754	0,874	31	**0,355**	0,456	75	0,227	0,296
8	0,707	0,834	32	0,349	0,449	80	0,220	0,286
9	0,666	0,798	33	0,344	0,442	85	0,213	0,278
10	0,632	0,765	34	0,339	0,436	90	0,207	0,270
11	0,602	0,735	35	0,334	0,430	95	0,202	0,263
12	0,576	0,708	36	0,329	0,424	100	0,195	0,256
13	0,553	0,684	37	0,325	0,418	125	0,176	0,230
1	0,53	0,66	3	0,32	0,41	150	0,1	0,21

4	2	1	8	0	3		59	0
15	0,514	0,641	39	0,316	0,408	175	0,148	0,194
16	0,497	0,623	40	0,312	0,403	200	0,138	0,181
17	0,482	0,606	41	0,308	0,398	300	0,113	0,148
18	0,468	0,590	42	0,304	0,393	400	0,098	0,128
19	0,456	0,575	43	0,301	0,389	500	0,088	0,115
20	0,444	0,561	44	0,297	0,384	600	0,080	0,105
21	0,433	0,549	45	0,294	0,380	700	0,074	0,097
22	0,423	0,537	46	0,291	0,376	800	0,070	0,091
23	0,413	0,526	47	0,288	0,372	900	0,065	0,086
24	0,404	0,515	48	0,284	0,368	1000	0,062	0,081
25	0,396	0,505	49	0,281	0,364			
26	0,388	0,496	50	0,279	0,361			

Discussion

Regarding the result of the findings, there were some aspects of correlation in the debate regarding a student's speaking performance. Both critical thinking as an indicator of debate mastery and a student's speaking performance have a very strong correlation. This might be caused by the fact that in the debate process, critical thinking and speaking performance are coherent, and in the debate session, which requires the students as members of the debate to think critically and speak fluently when delivering arguments. Rybold (2006), on the other hand, says that perspectives help debaters come up with the best arguments for a position without bringing in their own personal beliefs.

On the other hand, in the aspects of speaking skills, all the aspects of speaking skills achievement were influenced by debate, such as fluency, grammar, pronunciation, comprehension, and vocabulary. And the aspect that was affected by the debate was fluency. This might be caused when the students were delivering arguments and defending their arguments as well as opposing the opposing team's arguments. They also probably tend to be emotional in debate to deliver and argue. They might neglect other components of speaking skills like grammar, pronunciation, comprehension, and vocabulary. This is relevant to what Dobson (1987) reveals: that debate helps students speak more fluently, and during a debate, they can represent their feelings and thoughts on an issue.

Obviously, students who were accustomed to using the debate process to increase the language elements (grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary) significantly improved their performance. So, it seems clear that there was a strong link between

being good at debate and being good at speaking.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Based on the result and the discussion above, the following three conclusions could be drawn: First, it could be concluded that critical thinking is at the core of debate because, through debate, students often think as reasonably as possible during debate competition. Second, there was significantly improved students' speaking performance through debate because students fully speak as fluently as possible. Third, it was clear that critical thinking and how well you speak go together in a very strong way.

REFERENCES

Agustiawati, H., Petrus, I., & Sitinjak, M. D. (2015). Using Debate to Improve Students' Vocabulary and Speaking Achievements. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language*, *2*(2), 26-37.

Cahya, E. S. The Study of Vocabulary Size of Senior High School Students Who Participated in English Debate Competition. *Journal of Teaching of English*, *4*(1), 89-97.

Husnawadi, H., & Syamsudarni, S. (2016). The role of English debating tournament in the Face of ASEAN Economic Community (AEC). *Dinamika Ilmu: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *16*(1), 119-133.

Iman, J. N. (2017). Debate Instruction in EFL Classroom: Impacts on the Critical Thinking and Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, Vol. *10* (4), 87-108.

Puspitasari, P., Setyadi, B., & Yufrizal, H. *Modifying Debate as a Technique to Improve the Students' Speaking Skill* (Doctoral dissertation, Lampung University).

Oweis, T. I., & Karain, K. A. (2021). Improving EFL Students' Speaking Skills through Debating Techniques. *Psychology and Education Journal*, *58*(2), 3331-3342.

Saputra, E. (2020). Improving Reading Comprehension and Speaking Performance of the Eight Graders Using ICM. *Linguists: Journal Of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 89-100.

Zahra, I. A. (2019). The Effect of Debate Activity in English Four Skills: The

Students' Perspective. In *UICELL Conference Proceeding* (pp. 57-67).

Zare, P., & Othman, M. (2013). Classroom Debate as a Systematic Teaching and Learning Approach. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, *28*(11), 1506-1513.