ГУЛИСТОН ДАВЛАТ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ

филология факультети 4 босқич талабаси Кубаева Гулчехра Фарход қизи томонидан 5120100 Филология ва тилларни ўқитиш (Инглиз тили) таълим йўналиши бўйича бакалавр даражасини олиш учун

"Using the Technique of "Debates" as a Way of Developing Speaking in English Lessons"
мавзусида бажарилган битирув малакавий иши

CONTENT

Introduction

As a foreign language in Uzbekistan, English is learned seriously by many people to have a good prospect in the community of international world. Recently, English becomes important. Since it's important, English is taught widely at formal school starting from elementary school up to universities; even at informal school i.e. courses. There are four English skills to learn, namely speaking, reading, writing, and listening skill. Speaking seems intuitively the most important skill to master. The success is measured in terms of the ability to carry out conversation in language speaking in an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing information.

Speaking is very important because by mastering speaking skill, people can carry out conversations with others, give the ideas and exchange the information with others. Hence, in speaking classroom the learners should work as much as possible on their own, talk to one another directly and not through the medium of teacher. Speaking is the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non verbal symbol in a variety of context. Speaking is making use of words in an ordinary voice; uttering words; knowing and being able to use a language; expressing oneself in words; making a speech. In short, speaking skill is the ability to perform the linguistic knowledge in the actual communication. By speaking with others, we are able to know what kinds of situation are in the world.

There are several techniques which are used by the teacher for teaching speaking. The technique should be interesting to interest students in teaching learning process. One of the teaching techniques in teaching speaking is debate technique. It is seen as an active learning process because students will learn more through a process constructing and creating, working in a group and also sharing knowledge.

Debate is a teaching strategy to improve verbal communication and critical-thinking skills. Debate is presented as a valuable learning activity for teaching critical thinking and improving communication skills. Debating is an effective pedagogical strategy because of the level of responsibility for learning and active involvement required by all student debaters. This strategy can involve all students to be active, not only debate performer.

Topicality of the research. The main reason for choosing this topic for my bachelor thesis was realizing how important speaking is in every day situations. Usually teachers say when they organise discussions at lessons they usually grow into quarrels. That's why we need to learn some debate formats and rules to use time efficiently. No matter where we are, either in Uzbekistan or in a foreign country, English conversation plays a crucial role in understanding each other and dealing with different kinds of uncovered problems. It means that not only pupils that I teach, need English for communication abroad but also Uzbek teachers need English to communicate with their colleagues – native speakers.

The aim of the research: How is the implementation of debate technique to improve the students' speaking skill; how far the use of debate technique improve the students' speaking skill.

The following **tasks of the research** were set before the research: to describe the implementation of debate technique in speaking class and to measure the improvement of students' speaking skill after implementation debate technique.

Scientific scrutiny of the research. During the preparation of the research paper we studied lots of book by different researches such as: Broughton Geoffrey's "Teaching English as a Foreign Language", J. Huryn's "Debating as a teaching technique", H. Kayi's "Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language".

Novelty of the research is different new methods which has been studied during the research.

Methods of Investigation. During writing our work we used methods of literature analysis, descriptive, comparative methods and the translational method in working with the literature.

Object of the research is the pupils' speaking skills.

Subject of the research is methods of affective teaching speaking.

Scientific value of the research The finding of this research can enrich the theory of students' speaking mastery. The result of the research paper can be a useful input in teaching speaking using debate technique.

Structure of the qualification work. The paper consists of introduction, the main body with its two chapters where various teaching methods has been studied, conclusion and the list of used literature. At the end there is an appendix with a set of pre-taught communicative activities described minutely and their evaluation for other teachers who would like to apply them in their speaking lessons.

Chapter I. Teaching speaking in EFL classes
1.1. Speaking as one of the most important skill

For most people, the ability to speak a foreign language is synonymous with knowing that language because speech is for them the basic means of human communication. English learners no longer expect the traditional approach of their teachers based on developing mainly the grammatical competence and using methodology popular in the past. Today, teachers are expected to provide their students with useful active knowledge of the foreign language, not just theory about the language.

Communicative approach focuses on a balance between fluency and accuracy and is the most suitable for those students whose aim is to gain confidence in speaking and conversational abilities. Nevertheless, speaking in a foreign language has often been viewed as the most demanding of the four skills. "While listening and reading involve the ability to correctly receive messages and are therefore referred to as receptive skills, speaking and writing, on the other hand, involve language production and are referred to as productive skills."[1]

Producing spoken language has often meant a difficulty and an obstacle for English learners. There might arise a question why. The answer is obvious. In the natural spoken language students are required to be aware of characteristics of fluent speech, such as reduced forms, use of slang or idioms, fixed phrases, collocations and most importantly the pace of speech. All of these have to be taken into consideration while practising conversation in class. Without these, our spoken language would sound bookish and unnatural. To avoid this, it is essential to introduce and practise "real" communication with our students within the learning process. If it is neglected, it may be a reason why students are often shocked and disappointed when using a foreign language for the first time whilst

---

[1] Harmer Jeremy. The Practice of Teaching English. – Longman. 2000. – p.386.

interacting in foreign environment. They have not been prepared for spontaneous communication and could not cope with all of its simultaneous demands.

The embarrassment is usually caused by students' inability to adjust to native speakers' speech. This is natural and adjures patience while learning to speak or communicate in a foreign language. As I already mentioned, native speakers are a great support and the opportunity to communicate with them means even greater encouragement for our students. Although it is quite demanding for students to keep up in conversation with them, they take it as an advantage in their studies. Most English learners are actually familiar with the fact that the best way to advance their speaking skills is adjusting to it in an English speaking environment.

Although the terms "speaking" and "conversation" may seem clear, they often get misunderstood. Speaking as a skill taught at schools presents the student's ability to express his or her opinions, thoughts and ideas to a particular matter. Speaking practice, which is usually based on story telling, giving speech or presentation, is the necessity for later successful conversation. Nevertheless, the focus on speaking activities has diminished in recent years. This has been caused by many factors, especially by realizing the need of everyday communication.

As I mentioned above, giving speeches or presentations is not what we concentrate on in our lessons. Even though these are crucial prerequisites for later conversational practice, the teachers tend to focus on communicative activities as the main goal of speaking lessons. I have no objection to this, but it is essential to mention the importance of presentations for military English learners working for the Ministry of Defence and the consequences of the lack of speaking skill while giving military presentations abroad. For this reason, it is very important for teachers to think through the purpose of speaking and communicative activities being prepared for lessons and also the target group of learners.

Kayi mentions that being able to speak reasonably correct and even fluent English is one thing, but being able to engage in on-going, interactive, mentally

satisfying conversation is another. Conversation is such a natural part of our lives that many people are not conscious of what happens within it.[1] However, conversation follows certain rules which should be obeyed in order for participants to feel relaxed and be satisfied with it.

The main purpose of conversation is the exchange of information among people. While communicating, our students may find themselves in different social situations playing various social roles and the main task for language teachers is to prepare them for these real situations they might participate in. This also includes leading students to develop the ability to initiate and sustain conversation whenever it occurs.

1.2. Students' motivation to participate in a speaking lesson

When students learn a foreign language, they very often accumulate a lot of knowledge (grammatical rules, lists of vocabulary items), but then they find out that they can not actually use this language to communicate when they want to. Tannen claims that there seems to be some difficulty in moving language from passive knowledge into active usage.[2] Without experience in using the language, learners may tend to be nervous about trying to say things. Partly they may fear seeming foolish in front of others, they may worry about getting things wrong they may want to avoid teacher's comments or correction and so on. It takes quite a long time for some students to express themselves, which leads to long embarrassing pauses while learners are trying to find out how to say what they really want to say.

One of the best ways of helping learners to activate their knowledge is to put them in "safe" situations in class where they are inspired and encouraged to try to speak a foreign language. Teachers should try to create such activities in which learners feel less worried about speaking and less under pressure.

---

[1] Kayi H. Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language. – Retrieved June 30, 2011 from http://iteslj.org/Articiles/Kayi-Teaching.
[2] Tannen D. Argument culture: Moving from debate to dialogue. – New York, Random House. 1998. – pp. 57-59.

Nevertheless, the teacher is not the only one whom the students' success in speaking is based on. There are also motivational factors, differing from student to student, which influence his progress in the spoken language. Harmer distinguishes extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. He claims that students´ attitude to speaking the language may be affected by different factors from the outside, such as people in close surroundings, previous speaking experience in a foreign language or the job opportunities offered after mastering foreign language communication.[1] All of these represent extrinsic motivation. Although extrinsic motivation is nowadays a driving force for most students, without intrinsic motivation no goal in improving the speaking skill could be achieved. Success is also based on students´ willingness to learn to speak a foreign language, which may be influenced by the teacher´s methods used in teaching communication and, above all, his or her personality. Considering these, teachers should realize how important role they play in encouraging the students to learn to speak a foreign language.

Students' personalities also play an important role in determining how quickly and correctly they will manage a speaking task. Those students who are risk-takers, unafraid of making mistakes, are generally more talkative but usually make many errors. Those who are shy may take a long time to speak confidently, but when they finally manage it, their English contains fewer errors. The aim of both types of students is the same, indeed – to use the language correctly and fluently. To achieve this goal the teachers should try as much as they can to break the silence in the classroom and get the students speak no matter how many mistakes they make or how long it takes them to produce sentences. In order to decrease shyness while speaking in front of the whole class, students may be offered the opportunity to work in groups or pairs, which is a suitable approach for enhancing the active language use.

Different motivational factors depending on the age and level of the students are pointed out. Children's and adolescents' motivation to speak a foreign

---

[1] Harmer Jeremy. The Practice of Teaching English. – Longman. 2000. – p.386.

language is irrelevant for the purpose of my thesis because, as mentioned above, I deal with adult English learners and their motivational needs for a foreign language communication are substantially different from the others. I concentrate on intermediate students who represent the majority in my classes. Their English is good at this stage but they are motivated by a primary goal of achieving a more advanced level of the language. They already know a lot and are able to have a conversation about every day matters but sometimes there might occur some problems. One of them is often the feeling that they are flooded with the new complexity of the language and cannot cope with it. Teachers, when having found this out, should focus on building up the knowledge students already have and assure them they can speak the language well enough to understand and be understood.

Ur declares that "motivation is very strongly related to achievement in language learning." This statement results from teaching practice showing that eager learners willing to invest effort in speaking activities are likely to make greater progress. On the contrary, those sitting silently at the desk without desire to be involved in any kind of speaking activity, may find themselves stuck to be able to improve their speaking skill. Having noticed this, teachers should encourage low-motivated students to develop the interest in communicative activities.

Ur describes some strategies to enhance students' motivation to speak in a lesson. The principal one is selecting the topic carefully to make it as interesting for students as possible. If the teacher's choice fails in the class, there should be no panic or embarrassment. The possible solution to this situation may be asking the students to vote for a topic they would be interested in talking about.[1]

Varied tasks are also suggested for a successful and efficient speaking lesson as well as using visuals to enhance students' motivation to speak. Average pictures copied from different sorts of textbooks and workbooks do not encourage adult

---

[1] Ur P. A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory, – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1996. – pp. 274-281.

learners to speak anymore. Based on my teaching experience, adult learners prefer to be set into real situations, dealing with real and current news items concerning today's world and society.

To satisfy students' expectations, teachers should be supplied with sufficient amount of authentic materials, such as newspapers and magazines. The speaking tasks could be based on describing the photos to each other and guessing the place in the world where the action has happened. Connection between the picture and reality makes it even more tempting for students to express their points of view to a particular event and, at the same time, the teacher's goal is achieved as well – getting students to speak and communicate with each other.

Accuracy and fluency are terms characteristic for a successful and fecund conversation. Accuracy is the ability to speak correctly without making serious mistakes and therefore a greater use of instant teacher's correction within a speaking activity is appropriate. On the contrary, fluency is the ability to speak confidently without irrelevant pauses or hesitation, however, often with making major mistakes. In this case, instant correction may be inappropriate and could interfere with the aims of the speaking activity.

Teachers should be aware of whether their main goal in a speaking activity is accuracy or fluency and adapt their role in class eligibly. If the main aim is to get students to speak, then one way to achieve that would be reducing teacher´s contribution. It is supposed that the less he or she speaks, the more time and space it will allow the students to. If the main aim is accuracy, the teacher should concentrate on students´ mistakes and devote time to their correction.

However important speaking without mistakes is, a promoted trend at present seems to be to lead students to a fluent conversation in every day situations. Taking this into consideration, this approach best fits the needs of today´s society which is based on fast exchanges of information. Nevertheless, it would be injudicious to qualify accuracy as less important in communication and

underestimate its importance. It is also essential for the ability to speak a foreign language well.

In a fluency activity the teacher is expected to monitor the class and encourage the students to speak with minimum interfering and correction. This technique is called scaffolding. Oros states that "it is a way a competent language speaker helps a less competent one to communicate by encouraging and providing possible elements of conversation."[1] In practice it means to encourage the weaker one by nodding, eye contact, repeating the last word in order to encourage the speaker to continue, asking tag questions, etc. The aim of this encouragement is to make a student speak as much as he or she is able to.

Considering a fluent activity, correcting the mistakes should be done after finishing this activity. Suggested techniques are the following:

a) writing the sentences used during the activity on the board and discussing them with the whole class;

b) writing incorrect sentences used during the activity on the board and encouraging the students to make correction;

c) inventing and writing down the story that includes some errors the teacher overheard during the activity and students try to find them and correct them;

d) writing out two lists A and B – each list contains ten sentences from the activity but some of them are correct, some of them incorrect. Students work in two groups and their task is to decide if the sentences are either correct or incorrect and why;

In an accuracy based activity the teacher is required to correct students´ mistakes whenever possible. While practising accuracy, students become aware of their own mistakes in speaking straight away because the teacher does not wait until finishing the task. This approach is suitable while focusing on grammar

---

[1] Oros Andrew L. Let's Debate: Active Learning Encourages Student Participation and Critical Thinking. – Journal of Political Science Education, 3:3. 2007. – p. 293.

mainly and enables the students to realize and correct their mistakes and also prevent their recurrence.

1.3. Communicative activities in EFL classes

Every speaking lesson should be based on communicative activities which fulfil two important language learning needs. They encourage the learners to acquire language knowledge and prepare them for real-life language use. Achieving the outcome requires the participants to interact, which means not only speak with a person but also listen to what he or she is saying and react to it.

Communicative activities are dealt with in a large number of methodology books and their classification is distinguished according to each author´s point of view. However, all of them mention the same or similar communicative tasks but in different extent. Supported by a sufficient amount of literature, I created the following categorization of prevailing communicative activities:

The most common information gap activity is spotting the differences in the pictures, exchanging personal information, guessing games and also creating the story based on flashcards shown to the students in random order, for a few seconds and one flashcard per group only. This makes the students cooperate and communicate with each other to find the lacking information.

Discussions. Discussions are a commonly used activity in a speaking lesson. A topic is introduced to the students via a reading or a listening passage and then they are asked to discuss a related topic in order to come up with a solution or a response. Oros mentions that students need to be reminded that each person within a group should have a specific responsibility in the discussion – either keeping time, taking notes or reporting the results made by the group members.[1]

Role plays. A widely spread and one of the best communicative activities is a role play which trains the students in the classroom to deal with unpredictable

---

[1] Oros Andrew L. Let's Debate: Active Learning Encourages Student Participation and Critical Thinking. – Journal of Political Science Education, 3:3. 2007. – p. 295.

real-life conversation in an English speaking environment. Broughton points out the special reasons for using the role play in the lessons.[1] It puts students in situations in which they are required to use and develop language necessary in social relationships and helps them to build up their social skills. Using role play is useful especially while teaching shy students who have difficulty participating in conversation about themselves. Through this activity they are put into various roles and no longer feel that their own personality is implicated. Role play is an essential communicative technique which develops fluency, promotes interaction in the classroom and increases motivation.

Simulations. Simulation is a kind of role play but the emphasis is put on creating the atmosphere of a real world. Students pretend they are a part of a simulated environment and take part either as themselves or are given a role and pretend being someone else. To achieve a suitable simulated environment, the classroom is usually rearranged and, where possible, converted in a required place according to the situation.

Guessing games. Guessing games can be used as free activities for revision of vocabulary or as an interesting way to give quite controlled practice. Although they are called "games", they provide intensive language practice, especially in asking questions, so they should not be regarded as an extra activity. Students are fond of these guessing tasks mainly because they enjoy themselves without realizing they also practice and improve their speaking skills.

Pair work and group work present ways of organizing the class while teaching speaking. The teacher´s responsibility is to choose a suitable communicative activity depending on what is going to be practiced – either fluency or accuracy – and organize the students into pairs or groups. In some activities such as role plays and guessing games, pair work is essential. On the other hand, discussions and debates require group work and enable the students to express their opinions on a given topic within the group. After that, the spokesman of each

---

[1] Broughton Geoffrey. Teaching English as a Foreign Language. – Routledge. 2003. – p. 257.

group notifies the rest of the class about the conclusion they have reached. This may lead to a following discussion among groups and if the topic is amusing, the speaking lesson seems to be enjoyable for both students and the teacher, too.

Advantages of pair and group work. There are many reasons for pair and group work to be used in the lessons. First of all, they provide the students with a lot more practice than working as a whole class. Students also feel more comfortable to speak to one or two people rather than the whole class and the teacher. Moreover, speaking to just a few people is closer to real-life situations.

Pair and group work allows each student to work at the pace of his or her small group or pair. The teacher is no more considered the only source of information but the students learn from each other. This creates opportunities for learners´ knowledge to be shared. In order to be successful, learners need to become accustomed to using English without the teacher´s permanent support. Therefore, working in pairs or groups helps them to build up their independence and confidence for further conversations.

The advantages of pair and group work can be noticeable not only from the learner´s but also the teacher's point of view. It provides the teacher with more time to work with weaker students and encourage them, by participating in a role play or discussion, to communicate. Teachers can also benefit from a great availableness of different communicative activities being offered in bookshops and on the internet nowadays. The variety of materials for pair or group work speaking practice is praised by most of them and their use has proved to be very efficient for speaking skill improvement.

Slight disadvantages of pair and group work. However efficient and useful pair and group work is, it may sometimes cause little problems while practicing speaking. According to Brown the noise belongs to these obstacles the teachers have to overcome during lessons. Usually the students themselves are not disturbed

by the noise, it is more noticeable to the teacher observing pairs or groups.[1] However, the noise created by pair and group work demonstrates learners´ engagement in a speaking task and gives the teacher visual evidence of students´ involvement. Considering this, the success in working in pairs or groups depends mainly on the students´ and the teacher's approach.

Another fact Brown mentions is the difficulty to control the whole class during a communicative activity. To stop activity getting out of control, it is important to give the students clear instructions, define the speaking task clearly and set up a routine, so that students accept the idea of working in pairs or groups and know exactly what to do.

The role of a teacher in communicative activities. The teacher is a facilitator of students´ learning and as such he has many roles to fulfill. Fowler describes him as *a manager* of classroom activities. In this role, one of his major responsibilities is to set up activities that promote communication. During the communicative activities he acts as *a consultant* answering students´ questions, offers advice and provides necessary language items. One of the most important roles is to make sure that students know what they are supposed to practice and check if they do it effectively. These roles are called *a conductor* and *a monitor*. Although there is a great number of various activities which may be used in speaking lessons, their use would be confusing and pointless if they would not be logically organized. Being a good *organizer* should be an ability possessed by every skillful teacher.[2]

Considering the facts mentioned above we can conclude that the teacher´s personality in a learning process is very important not only while participating in the activity but also while monitoring the students. The teacher´s less dominant role in communicative activities offers the students the opportunity to be involved

---

[1] Brown H.D. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. – New Jersey, Prentice Hall Regents. 1994. – pp. 72-75.

[2] Fowler F.G., Fowler H.W., Thompson D.F. Speaking. The Oxford Pocket Dictionary of Current English. – Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2000. – p. 127.

in conversation and improve their speaking skills to be able to cope with the real-life situations.

1.4. Debate formats

There are many kinds of debate which used in the world. All forms of debate, whether consciously or not, make certain assumptions about argumentation theory. The core concept of argumentation theory is the notion of advocacy. In most cases, at least one side in a debate needs to maintain the truth of some proposition or advocate some sort of personal or political change or action. A debate could also potentially be between two or more competing propositions or actions. Or debate also could be a purely performative exercise of charisma and emotion with no assumption of fixed advocacy, but it would possibly lose much of its coherence.

The kind of debate which familiar in the world can be explained bellow:

Parliamentary (Parli Debate). Parliamentary Debate (sometimes referred to as "parli" in the United States) is conducted under rules derived from British parliamentary procedure. It features the competition of individuals in a multi-person setting. It borrows terms such as "government" and "opposition" from the British parliament (although the term "proposition" is sometimes used rather than "government" when debating in theUnited Kingdom).[1]

Throughout the world, parliamentary debate is what most countries know as "debating", and is the primary style practiced in the United Kingdom, Australia, India, Greece and most other nations. The premier event in the world of parliamentary debate, the World Universities Debating Championship, is conducted in the British Parliamentary style.

Even within the United Kingdom, however, 'British Parliamentary' style is not used exclusively; the English-Speaking Union runs the national championships for schools in a unique format, known as the 'Mace' format after the name of the

---

[1] http://www.ncfca.org/Pages/Debate/LDDebate.html

competition, while simultaneously using British Parliamentary format for the national universities championships.

In the United States the American Parliamentary Debate Association is the oldest national parliamentary debating organization, based on the east coast and including all of the Ivy League, although the more recently founded National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) is now the largest collegiate sponsor. The National Parliamentary Debate League (NPDL) is the umbrella organization for all parliamentary debating at the secondary school level in the United States. And in Canada, the Canadian Universities Society for Intercollegiate Debating (CUSID) is the umbrella organization for all university-level debating; at the secondary school level, the Canadian Student Debating Federation (CSDF) has the same function.

Topics in parliamentary debate can either be set by the tournament or determined by the debaters as the "Government" side begins. For example, if the topic was "This House Would Bomb Cultural Sites", the Government could define it in any way which it feels suitable, for example, only during wartime, and excluding religious cultural sites. The Government must be sure the definition does not give them an unfair advantage, and the Opposition may dispute the definition if it feels it violates fair play. In many forms of the activity rhetoric and style, as well as the more traditional knowledge and research, can play a significant role in determining the victor with marks shared equally between matter and manner. It has been widely labeled as the most democratic form of debate.

Mace Debate. This style of debate is prominent in Britain at schools level. Two teams of two debate an affirmative motion (e.g. "This house would give prisoners the right to vote,") which one team will propose and the other will oppose. Each speaker will make a seven minute speech in the order; 1st Proposition, 1st Opposition, 2nd Proposition, 2nd Opposition. After the first minute of each speech, members of the opposing team may request a 'point of information' (POI). If the speaker accepts they are permitted to ask a question.

POI's are used to pull the speaker up on a weak point, or to argue against something the speaker has said. However after 6 minutes, no more POI's are permitted. After all four have spoken the debate will be opened to the floor, in which members of the audience will put questions to the teams. After the floor debate, one speaker from each team (traditionally the first speaker), will speak for 4 minutes. In these summary speeches it is typical for the speaker to answer the questions posed by the floor, answer any questions the opposition may have put forward, before summarizing his or her own key points. In the Mace format, emphasis is typically on analytical skills, entertainment, style and strength of argument. The winning team will typically have excelled in all of these areas.

Public Debate. The International Public Debate Association (IPDA), inaugurated on February 15, 1997 at St. Mary's University (Texas) in San Antonio, Texas, is a national debate league currently active in the states of Arkansas, Louisiana, Kansas, Alabama, Texas, Mississippi, Tennessee, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Florida, and Oklahoma. Among universities, IPDA is the fastest growing debate association within the United States. Although evidence is used, the central focus of IPDA is to promote a debate format that emphasizes public speaking and real-world persuasion skills over the predominate use of evidence and speed. To further this goal, IPDA predominantly uses lay judges in order to encourage an audience-centered debate style. Furthermore, although the main goal of the debater is to persuade the judge, IPDA also awards the best speakers within each tournament.[1]

IPDA offers both team debates where two teams of two debate and individual debate. In both team and individual debate a list of topics are given to the two sides thirty minutes before the start of the round. A striking negotiation ensues to pick a topic. The sides, one affirming the resolution and one negating the resolution, then prepare an opening speech, a cross-examination of the other side, and closing remarks for the round.

---

[1] http://debate.uvm.edu/NFL/rostrumlib/ted%20intro%20roberts%2011-02.pdf

While most member programs the International Public Debate Association are associated with colleges or universities, participation in IPDA tournaments is open to anyone whose education level is equivalent to seventh-grade or higher.

Australasia Debate. Australasia style debates consist of two teams who debate over an issue, more commonly called a topic or proposition. The issue, by convention, is presented in the form of an affirmative statement beginning with "That", for example, "That cats are better than dogs," or "This House", for example, "This House would establish a world government." The subject of topics varies from region to region. Most topics however, are usually region specific to facilitate interest by both the participants and their audiences.

Each team has three members, each of whom is named according to their team and speaking position within his/her team. For instance the second speaker of the affirmative team to speak is called the "Second Affirmative Speaker" or "Second Proposition Speaker", depending on the terminology used. Each of the speakers' positions is based around a specific role; the third speaker for example has the opportunity to make a rebuttal towards the opposing teams argument introducing new evidence to add to their position. The last speaker is called the "Team Advisor/Captain". Using this style, the debate is finished with a closing argument by each of the first speakers from each team and new evidence may not be introduced. Each of the six speakers (three affirmative and three negative) speak in succession to each other beginning with the Affirmative Team. The speaking order is as follows: First Affirmative, First Negative, Second Affirmative, Second Negative, Third Affirmative, and finally Third Negative.

The context in which the Australasia style of debate is used varies, but in Australia and New Zealand is mostly used at the Primary and Secondary school level, ranging from small informal one-off intra-school debates to larger more formal inter-school competitions with several rounds and finals series which occur over a year.

Presidential Debate. Since the 1976 general election, debates between presidential candidates have been a part of U.S. presidential campaigns. Unlike debates sponsored at the high school or collegiate level, the participants, format, and rules are not independently defined. Nevertheless, in a campaign season heavily dominated by television advertisements, talk radio, sound bites, and spin, they still offer a rare opportunity for citizens to see and hear the major candidates side-by-side. The format of the presidential debates, though defined differently in every election, is typically more restrictive than many traditional formats, forbidding participants to ask each other questions and restricting discussion of particular topics to short time frames.

The presidential debates were initially moderated in 1976, 1980, 1984 by the League of Women Voters, but The Commission on Presidential Debates (CPD) was established in 1987 by the Republicans and Democrats to "ensure that debates, as a permanent part of every general election, provide the best possible information to viewers and listeners." Its primary purpose is to sponsor and produce debates for the United States presidential and vice presidential candidates and to undertake research and educational activities relating to the debates. The organization, which is a nonprofit, nonpartisan corporation, sponsored all the presidential debates in 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004. However, in announcing its withdrawal from sponsoring the debates, the League of Women Voters stated that it was withdrawing "because the demands of the two campaign organizations would perpetrate a fraud on the American voter." In 2004, the Citizens' Debate Commission was formed in the hope of establishing an independent sponsor for presidential debates, with a more voter-centric role in the definition of the participants, format, and rules.

Online Debate. With the increasing popularity and availability of the Internet, differing opinions arise frequently. Though they are often expressed via flaming and other forms of argumentation, which consist primarily of assertions, there do exist formalized debating websites, typically in the form of online forums or

bulletin boards. The debate style is interesting, as research and well thought out points and counterpoints are possible because of the obvious lack of time restraints (although practical time restraints usually are in effect, e.g., no more than 5 days between posts, etc.).Forums are Moderated and welcome online debaters in a friendly format so all may speak their pros and cons. Many people use this to strengthen their points, or drop their weaker opinions on things, many times for debate in formal debates (such as the ones listed above) or for fun arguments with friends. The ease-of-use and friendly environments make new debaters welcome to share their opinions in many communities.

Also, while forums are interesting, live video conference debating has taken a recent jump in popularity. The leading website hosts live debates in a video conference room with up to 6 live feeds.[1] Most competitive college programs participate on the website, and it will soon be one of the standard forums that college debate teams use to compete in parliamentary debate, NFA-LD, CEDA, and individual events.

Comedy Debate. With the growing popularity of debate among the general public, comedy debates have developed as a form of entertainment with an often educational twist. While comedy debates are not generally mainstream events, they have gained significant popular support at occasions such as the Melbourne International Comedy Festival, and are often popular fixtures among experienced debaters.

The debaters use the valid data from certain problems, then they give the response about the problem. But, not only serious debate which they made, but, they perceive the problems by using words, sentences, or something that make the audiences laugh. In addition, their perceives are not far from the "red line of the problem" which has been given. Although the debate form is aimed for the entertainment, but, the educational aspect also included in the form. This debate

---

[1] http://worldforensicsnetwork.com

usually reflects the problem which faced in daily life. The "language" which used can be defined as a "satire" to the government or concerned person/institution.

Debate and Education. In the previous chapter, has been explained that debate also can be implemented in educational sector. As an alternative to teach speaking, but in the reality it also can be implemented in to teach other skills of English.

Classroom debates enable students to work cooperatively, brainstorm ideas, develop vocabulary and read to support an opinion. Through researching students are taking notes to summarize, to question, and to clarify information. Students are identifying the main idea, deleting less important information, collapsing, categorizing, and labeling information. Questioning allows students to explain and to explore additional facts for clarification purposes. These comprehension skills are essential for students to become competent readers and writers linking debates directly to the entire curriculum.

Debates allow students to become more proficient in speaking, researching, reading, and writing skills, and they promote reasoning as well as communication skills. Fact-filled and passionate debates provide the incentive for students of all academic and socioeconomic levels to become engaged and to participate in the debate process. In addition, debates, both formal and informal, are a vehicle for students to express their opinions assertively in a respectful manner on a relevant issue or topic.

The Process of Debate. Sometimes in speaking class, we find that the rule of the teacher is dominant and makes the students passive in the classroom. This can limit the communicative function that the students need to use and the interactional skills they need to practice.

The teacher's role should be limited in the class activities in order to give the students more chances to express their mind, opinion, or their argument. The teacher should not interfere too much the activities, but let the students practice using the target language.

The role of the teacher in conducting this technique is very important. The teacher must be careful in preparing the material because of the succeed of the technique depends on the preparations made by the teacher. The importance of teacher's role can be found when the teacher acts as the facilitator. The teacher has to give explanation to the students, and make them understand about debate, and also the way to do debate well. The teacher explains how will be done, gives the topics which will be used in debate, the teacher also gives the general view or explanation about the topics to make them easier to be understood.

Besides as the facilitator, the teacher also acts as motivator. The teacher supports the students and makes the students believe that their activities will be useful in daily life.

The third role of the teacher is as the observer. When debate is begun, the teacher observes the activities of the students in debate. The teacher acts as the "Passive Person" while the debate was going on. In this role, the teacher make notes about the students activities which will be used to give comments when the debating process ended.

Chapter II. Using technique of Debate in English Lessons
2.1. Teaching by debate

Since my introduction of the debate model, I have seen increased pupils preparation for class and an improvement in my pupils' ability to persuasively and succinctly articulate their position. Still, as the semester drags on, I notice pupils' enthusiasm dwindling. As a response, I have replaced debates with other teaching methods with meager results. Upon conducting a survey of my sections, I found that the majority of the class wanted to continue debating, though there existed in most sections a minority of students that wanted nothing more to do with debates.

Beyond summarizing some of the literature on teaching by debate, my purpose in this paper is to provide several debating methods that can be used over the course of a semester, giving the reader options to choose from in formulating a plan to introduce debate and keep the class interested over the long haul. Before doing this, however, I will briefly discuss some of criticism of using debate in the classroom followed by a rebuttal. After understanding both the criticisms and advantages of debate, the reader can then choose among the various methods, many of which allow the professor to account for the potential drawbacks of this teaching method without totally scrapping the idea and losing the unique educational opportunities it affords.

Debate is not without its critics. In the article "The Debate Debate"[1], Professor Tumposky sets forth numerous critiques to the use of debate in the classroom. First, she emphasizes that debates tend toward dualism. Dualism is "the division of something conceptually into two opposed or contrasted aspects, or the state of being so divided." In the classroom, this means that debate –instead of causing students to consider a multiplicity of perspectives– might persuade students to view an issue as having only two positions (yes or no). Thus, Professor Tumposky explains that "debate can oversimplify and misrepresent the nature of knowledge." Second, debates tend to focus students toward the question of

---

[1] Tumposky N. The debate debate. – Clearing House. London, 2004. – p. 52.

winning or losing. Instead of seeking the best solution to the proposed problem or issue, students focus selectively on aspects that strengthen their own argument, often refuse to make concessions, and permit arguments to be reduced to sound bites (e.g., think of televised presidential debates). Third, inherent in the debate format is the need for two sides to validate a point of view; however, most reasonable people will agree that some issues do not have an "other side of the story." For instance, Professor Tumposky cites an issue such as Holocaust denial as a prime example of an unreasonable position not suitable for debate. Fourth, debate fosters a confrontational classroom environment that is not suitable for many students. Professor Tumposky cites several studies that suggest the adversarial nature of debate tends to be less suited to the way females and members of certain minority groups communicate. As such, Professor Tumposky raises good questions about whether debate is a prudent pedagogy to foster genuine peer interaction and learning in universities today.

After considering the criticism, it seems reasonable to question the utility of debate in the classroom. Yet, for all of the criticism, proponents continue to laude the advantages of debate in the classroom for disciplines that range across a spectrum of educational disciplines, including sociology, history, psychology, biotechnology, math, health, dentistry, nursing, marketing and social work. In fact, debate in a written format has even been utilized effectively in online courses. Initially, it is key to understand that debate is not a methodological strait-jacket. In her influential article on the utility of debate, Professor Kennedy defines debate broadly: "Debate refers to the process of considering multiple viewpoints and arriving at a judgment, and its application ranges from an individual using debate to make a decision in his or her own mind to an individual or group using debate to convince others to agree with them."[1]

---

[1] Kennedy Ruth. Tin-class debates: Fertile ground for active learning and the cultivation of critical thinking and oral communication skills. – International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Cambridge, 2003. 19(2), – p.184.

Research has shown that students learn more effectively when they play an active role in the learning process as opposed to passively absorbing information. Active learning has several definitions but generally means providing students "opportunities to talk and listen, read, write, and reflect as they approach the course content." No one method of instruction is perfect, as students learn in different ways and benefit from a variety of instructional methods being used in any given class, but study has demonstrated a positive link between student engagement and critical thinking and grade point average, particularly in cases involving students with low Scholastic Aptitude Test scores. This research supports the use of debate in the classroom since it requires active engagement by students, investing them with the responsibility to investigate, articulate and defend a particular issue.

Research has also shown that debate encourages class participation among those students that typically do not talk in class. For professors struggling with ill-prepared students, debate also offers an opportunity to put the onus back on the student but with the benefit of sharing in the reward of presentation (or at least the fear of looking ill-prepared in front of one's peers). Study has proven debate to be an effective means of requiring students to master content more thoroughly by preparing for the debate. Despite complaints about the workload involved in preparing for debates, student surveys have yielded overall favorable results toward debate.

Most importantly, debate offers an opportunity for students to move beyond the acquisition of basic knowledge in a subject matter and progress into the types of higher order critical thinking skills that good debate requires. Debaters must analyze, synthesize and evaluate the knowledge they have acquired in order to propose, oppose and make competing choices. Debaters apply course material through the use of well-reasoned arguments that are capable of being understood by not only their professor but also their peers. This process develops and

improves oral communication skills, and at the same time, hones students' listening skills as a necessity to make effective rebuttals.

Though some may question the competitive nature of debate in the classroom, it can actually create unique opportunities for students to develop empathy. Through exposure to contrasting viewpoints or by the defense of a position to which a student is opposed, students learn to listen to both sides of an argument and to see things from the other point of view. Debate also provides an opportunity to reduce instructor bias toward subject matter and encourages the introduction of logic and reason into a class that might otherwise be overcome by personal opinions. Though not an all-inclusive list, these are among some of the many reasons why debate has been recognized as one of best methods of learning for two thousand years.

Debating in the classroom can take many forms. Though not an all-inclusive list, the following debate methods offer a range of opportunities to increase student understanding and involvement with course material. This section will discuss the following types of debate: four corner, role-play, fishbowl, think-pair-share, and meeting house.

The four corner debate starts with a question or statement, such as: "The health care law is a constitutional exercise of the commerce clause." Students are then afforded time to personally consider the statement and their view based on the law. The four corners of the classroom are labeled "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." After personal consideration, the students move to the corner that most represents their position on the issue. The groups in each corner of the classroom then work together to come up with the best arguments for their position. After a specified time for group discussion, each group presents their strongest arguments to the other groups. This can be made in presentation form or through a more directed debate where the professor or assigned students can moderate and direct time for each group to present and rebut. After the debate, students are permitted to switch sides if their personal views

changed. This form of debate directly counters the argument of dualism, showing there are more than two-sides to an issue, and often, variations of the sides.

Role-play debates also help to avoid dualistic debate models by assigning students to argue on behalf of different characters in a situation. For instance, in the issue of national health care, students could be assigned to various roles, such as doctor, patient, a wealthy person, a poor person, a lawyer, a judge, an insurance company, the president, and so on. Through the debate of the issue from various points of view, the students can broaden their understanding of the issue and its complexity.[1]

Fishbowl debates can take several different forms, but usually involve grouping chairs in a circle pattern. Several chairs are then placed inside the circle for teams representing the different positions of the debate. Chairs can also be added for several students representing the audience. To bolster attention among those outside the fishbowl, an empty chair can be added, which is free game, allowing someone from the outside to enter the fishbowl to ask a question or make an argument.

Think-pair-share debates require students to think and make notes alone about the issue. After personal reflection is completed, pairs are formed. The pairs then work together, comparing their notes and creating lists to support both sides of the issue. Once complete, the pairs of two are combined with another pair. The newly formed groups of four discuss the issue, choose a position, and edit their list down to their best arguments. Finally, the groups of four present their position and reasons to the class.

Meeting-house debates and problem-solving debates are variations of the Lincoln Douglas debate model. In a meeting house debate, each team makes an opening argument. The class is then given the opportunity to question each side. The professor serves as moderator, ensuring each side gets an equal amount of time to argue. In order to encourage more class participation and limit certain

---

[1] Tannen D. Argument culture: Moving from debate to dialogue. – New York, Random House. 1998. – p. 57.

students from dominating the questioning, the professor could assign cards to each student. After each question, the questioner gives up one card. Once a student is out of cards, he or she cannot ask another question until all other students run out of cards. Alternatively, if three cards are assigned, a questioner that has two cards remaining may be limited from asking another question until everyone else in the class has only two cards.

Problem-solving debates typically involve eight students. Four students are assigned to each team. One student from each side presents a position based on historical and philosophical arguments. The next two students take the position on why changes are or are not justified. The third set of students propose a plan that would carry-out their position. The final two students summarize the position of their team and provide a closing argument.

2.2. Teaching English through debate in classroom contexts

In modern societies, individuals critically weigh issues, form opinions, and express their ideas through dialogue and debate. Public speaking, debate, and critical thinking play an important role in the classroom, where instructors are working to help prepare students for their future language needs. The communication demands placed on language learners have led to an increasing awareness of the need to integrate meaningful language use across the curriculum. In response to this need, content-based instruction has found its way into many higher education settings.

Content-based instruction integrates language and content in the classroom. There are several approaches to content-based instruction, demonstrating a continuum between language and content focus.

According to Harmer[1], there are three vital characteristics of a content-based instruction program: The core of the course is based on content, the course includes authentic text, and the course is adapted to the needs of a

---

[1] Harmer Jeremy. The Practice of Teaching English. – Longman. 2000. – p.386.

particular group of students. This adaptation is what makes content-based instruction useful in a wide range of language learning contexts. Content-based instruction combines language, content, and strategy objectives to assist the learner in accomplishing his or her goals. Tasks, or the lessons and activities used in the classroom are a fundamental component of content-based curricula and are used to implement these objectives daily. Instructors prepare each lesson with objectives appropriate to the setting and goals of their class. These objectives may range from the learning of specific vocabulary to broad conceptual content. In many CBI classrooms, one of the objectives often explicitly stated is critical thinking development. While more specific goals are still important, many teachers strive to teach their students learning skills they can take with them to future settings. Beyond the teaching of isolated skills in the language classroom, we are looking to support autonomous learners, ready to manipulate and manage language as well as content in meaningful articulate ways!

Additional public speaking activities can be used as building blocks to debate, and therefore are included in the discussion. Critical thinking is developed throughout the debate process. Let me first describe what I mean by public speaking and debate activities. Public speaking includes any task where the participant addresses an audience orally. This may include: informative and persuasive speeches, panel presentations, public interviews, and debates. Debate is an interactive public speaking activity that usually requires a greater degree of organization than other speech tasks. Debates can be held with two or more students, and range from casual to highly structured. This chapter will focus on debate tasks in classroom contexts. Additional public speaking activities involving role-play (ie, mock trials, model UN) are beyond the scope of this chapter. Debate relies on authentic language use and communication toward an audience. The inclusion of these activities in content-based instruction aids in meeting stated objectives for language,

content, and strategy use, and integrates these objectives in meaningful ways. Below is a partial list of core language objectives supported through debate activities.

Core language objectives

• Students will increase academic vocabulary

• Students will improve academic writing skills

• Students will improve listening as well as note-taking skills and strategies

• Students will learn to skim and scan readings for relevant information

• Students will read articles on topics of interest in-depth

• Students will incorporate critical thinking skills

• Students will receive a great deal of input of authentic material

• Student output will be meaningful and contextualized

• Students will improve public speaking and communication skills[1]

Debate tasks may cover some or all of these language objectives, depending on the nature of the task. In addition, these activities naturally support content learning goals because the content is the focus of the task. Debates require students to master content and gain conceptual knowledge of a topic as they sort through information and make decisions about what to include in their presentations. Conceptual knowledge is developed as students decide what information is most important, and how this information relates to their background knowledge. There are several advantages to using debate in the language classroom. Here, I have highlighted only some of the most noteworthy.

Debate promotes a variety of critical thinking skills, as well as specific language skills and strategies. While preparing for debate, students are asked to develop a perspective, explore beliefs and theories, analyze arguments,

---

[1] Ur P. A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory, – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1996. – p. 279.

evaluate the credibility or bias of a source, and distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information. Students are encouraged to question deeply, develop and assess solutions to problems, compare and contrast, make inferences, recognize contradictions, and explore implications and consequences. The insights gained throughout the process allow students to approach materials with a critical eye, and these skills can be transferred to new materials and contexts.

Debate reinforces all four language skills. Students will become involved listeners and more effective speakers through their presentations, and they will develop strong reading, writing, and note-taking skills during debate preparation. Students must skim and scan a wide variety of sources during their search for information, and read key materials in depth in order to prepare for debates. Writing practice is highlighted as students take notes, and complete argumentative essays can be assigned during the preparation phase. Students then practice careful listening during debates because participants are required to take notes and respond to the speeches of others. There is a strong focus on speaking, and language is the key to delivering a clear, coherent speech. Individual presentations can be used as building blocks for debates, and contribute to this integrated skills practice.

Public speaking skills. Oral presentations have become increasingly required in university classrooms, and students will benefit from the practice of demonstrating knowledge and participating in this type of exchange. Many universities now include an introductory public speaking class as part of their undergraduate requirements, and with communicative language learning there has been an increased emphasis on student presentations and oral participation in classroom lessons. Debate activities push students to develop their public speaking skills and help prepare them for academic work, while boosting their confidence and language learning.

Research skills. Debate helps teach students to conduct research and develop support for their arguments. In my classrooms, I usually utilize a prepared debate format, meaning that the students know the issue that they will debate well ahead of time. Once the topic has been identified, students must conduct an extensive search of materials using library and online search tools. Then they must skim, scan, and read select articles in depth to expand their knowledge base. This process promotes strong organizational skills and encourages students to discriminate between primary and secondary information. They can also learn about bias in reporting and the difference between interesting trivia and important facts. As students bring several sources of information together, they must synthesize their findings into cohesive arguments with logical support. In addition, new information will need to be integrated with existing knowledge so that learners can make sense out of what they find in order to develop clear and consistent arguments.

Autonomous and collaborative learning. Debate activities promote autonomous learning by requiring students to do independent research. Students are given the freedom to explore topics or arguments that are meaningful to them and take on an increased role in their own learning. This helps increase student motivation and interest, and creates more responsible learners.

Debate also reinforces collaboration and co-operation by having students work in pairs or teams to share ideas, resulting in a dynamic learning environment. Research in Concept-oriented reading instruction has shown that social collaboration increases learning through the sharing of ideas and background knowledge.[1] Taken together, the autonomous and collaborative learning opportunities in debate offer the best of both worlds, making

---

[1] Tannen D. Argument culture: Moving from debate to dialogue. – New York, Random House. 1998. – p. 58.

students capable of responsible independent learning and able to reap the benefits of rich information exchange.

Positive assessment and improved learning. Debate is an ideal way for students to display their knowledge because they are provided with the opportunity to demonstrate what they have learned rather than focus on shortcomings. This form of assessment pushes students to synthesize knowledge from a variety of sources and take on a teaching role; they choose the focus and explain their position to the rest of the class. This type of selfexplanation has been found to correspond with higher levels of comprehension and conceptual understanding. Students learn more through having to explain information to others. Additionally, planning for debates and preparing for questions from their peers leads to deeper processing and a more complete understanding of the content. It has been proposed that tasks involving planning lead to more complex and fluent language use. Debate is a method of performance assessment which taps many of the instructional goals of the language classroom.[1]

Preparation. The debate activities described above require planning and involvement but are well worth the effort. Debate activities provide extended input, meaningful output, and feedback. They also teach critical thinking skills as students learn to develop and evaluate arguments, compare and contrast ideas, support positions, identify contradictions, synthesize information from multiple sources, and respond to opposing viewpoints. In preparation, students practice reading and note-taking skills and construct written arguments. Debate preparation requires extensive collaboration and co-operation among teammates as they collect information and develop ideas. The preparation and participation in debate addresses the issue of opposing viewpoints and helps to create "positive tension". This happens when students are encouraged to approach topics critically and integrate new information and

---

[1] http://www.pbs.org/now/classroom/debate_rubric.pdf

perspectives into their knowledge base. Students will learn that there is more than one way of approaching or viewing an issue. Whether you choose to integrate basic public speaking or debate into your curriculum, your students will certainly reap the benefits of enhanced critical thinking, language, and content learning. Students will gain confidence in speaking and learn to express themselves in clear and articulate ways.

Nevertheless, there is no minimum requirement necessary for including public speaking and debate into your curriculum. If researched debates feel overwhelming at first, oral presentations can be used as a formal culminating activity in thematic units, or at the end of a single lesson to sum up information and make connections with previous work. Presentations can also be used to prepare students for later debates. Some teachers may be intimidated by the amount of organization and planning they anticipate with class debates. I have had several instructors ask me "how do you start", and my answer is "just do it". Debates only need to be as formal and extensive as you want them to be, and your students can help shape the project. You can use a prepared debate to conclude a thematic unit and synthesize information, or you can begin a class with an impromptu debate to get students to tap their background knowledge and start thinking about a topic. You can also put students in pairs for unstructured mini debates as a class warm-up.

Debate may be central or supplementary to your lessons; there are advantages to including debate at all levels. Of course, the planning and organizational phases of formal debates provide more extensive opportunities for a wide range of learning.

It is important to adapt debate activities to the specific needs and level of your students. You need to ask yourself questions that will guide the integration of these activities. Debate activities are flexible and can contribute to a variety of different learning environments, but it is important to first identify core

language and content goals. It is easy to incorporate debate activities into thematic units. The preparation involved in debate requires students to analyze, synthesize, and utilize content, which leads to better conceptual learning. Students need to analyze information in order to determine what is important and what is secondary. Then, they must synthesize information from multiple sources and integrate it with what they already know about the topic. This conceptual knowledge is then used to present the information in an organized fashion. These steps lead to a deeper understanding and better retention of the content material.[1]

In order to illustrate the use of debate in the classroom, let me describe these activities within a thematic unit on tolerance. It is important to note that debate can be used with a number of different themes and are not limited to any specific content. The following activity is well suited for high intermediate to advanced language learners studying at university level, but you can easily adapt these lessons for your specific learner population.

Debate activities are well suited for thematic units involving tolerance. As students practice looking at issues from various perspectives, they learn to become more tolerant of other viewpoints. In this way, the content of the lesson can be fully integrated into the activity. Examples of broad topics that can be explored in depth include: cultural differences, religious expression, diversity, and peace education. The topic areas will be determined by the specific content of your course. You can introduce the class to any controversial issues faced in society that produce opposing viewpoints, and require us to recognize perspectives different from our own. It is very important to select topics that have fair ground to debate on either side. An example of a controversial and debatable topic would be to question whether the United States should seek global hegemony. As long as you can

---

[1] Goodwin James. Students' perspectives on debate in content area classes. –Communication Education, 52(2), NY., 2003. – p. 159.

find evidence to support both sides of the issue, the topic will help promote the understanding of your tolerance theme. Assign students to either side of the issue and ask them to research the arguments for and against their side. Introduce a format for the debate ahead of time that specifies a set amount of time for arguments and questions. Students can collaborate and share ideas in groups in order to identify the strongest arguments as well as the crucial weaknesses to the position. A variation of this activity is to have students switch sides half way through the debate. Students will soon realize that there is no absolute truth and that are multiple sides to any issue. Debating a controversial topic encourages students to look beyond their own beliefs and recognize other viewpoints.

Participating in a debate over the topic incorporates lessons on tolerance in a very meaningful way. Students need to critically analyze all the information presented and provide responses to counter arguments. Following the debate, students should be asked to reflect on what they have learned, as well as the ways their opinions may have been reinforced or changed during the task.

Debate can be used with many different content areas including: literature, science, history, and current events. The idea is not to focus on the specific rules of debate, but rather to approach public speaking and debate tasks with much broader educational goals. These tasks integrate critical thinking skills and promote a deeper understanding of material in any subject. If you choose to use these activities with literature, you may have students debate a central conflict in the novel (ie, human vs nature, human vs human, human vs society), support a character's position, or speak on a related issue in their own lives.[1] In history and current events, students can compare past dilemmas to current issues, debate actions than must be taken from two opposing perspectives, or support/reject a current or proposed policy. A

---

[1] Melvin K. Rating class participation: The prof/peer method. Teaching of Psychology. – Cambridge Univ. Press. 1998. – p. 137.

science debate might include support for and against genetically modified food, pesticides, genetic cloning, or space exploration. There is no limit to what you can do with public speaking activities and the ways you can use these activities to increase student‟s engagement with the material.

2.3. Students' Perspectives on Debate Exercises in Content Area Classes

Teaching experience as well as empirical research affirms that debating helps students develop content mastery, as well as argumentation and communication skills.[1] I therefore build debate exercises into most of my courses. But I am not the most important person in the classroom. Students learn. Far from empty vessels waiting to be filled with instruction, they bring to class theories, attitudes, skills and habits that shape the success or failure of the activities they will pursue there.[2] I have become curious, therefore, to learn what students think about the debate exercises they undertake with me. Do they find debating helps them learn? If so, what, in their experience, does it contribute? To focus these broad questions, my experience and the literature suggest three specific concerns that warrant particular attention. These concerns pertain to three specific reasons students may have for considering debate exercises unhelpful in content area classes:

First, since arguing requires open disagreement, students may associate it with negative interpersonal or emotional qualities like hostility and fighting. In this case, some students may understandably be quite reluctant to engage actively in debate exercises.

Second, students may find the competitive nature of this specific form of arguing-debate-to be intimidating or silencing. In particular, gender differences in argumentation styles may mean that some women are disadvantaged in debates. In this case, students may rightfully object that debate exercises are unfair.

---

[1] Allen M., Berkowitz S., Hunt S., Louden A. A meta-analysis of the impact of forensics and communication education on critical thinking. – Oxford, Oxford University Press. 1999. – p. 20.

[2] Bransford J. D., Brown A. L., Cocking R. R. How people learn, Brain, mind, experience and school (Expanded ed.). – Washington, DC. National Academy Press. 2000. – p. 104.

Finally, students may simply find debate exercises to be unfamiliar. In this case, they may resist the innovation, preferring instead activities such as class discussion and group projects in which they already know how to learn.

I raise these questions out of my own teaching practice; I also raise them from an interest in debate across the curriculum. As long as debate was confined to co-curricular activities and courses expressly devoted to argumentation, students who chose to become involved could be presumed to endorse the value of the activity.[1] But now that debate is spreading beyond these traditional homes, students will encounter it more involuntarily, and their attitudes toward it will matter more. As Bellon has noted, "advocates of debate across the curriculum must produce strong evidence demonstrating pedagogical benefits if such initiatives are to succeed".[2] At least some of this evidence should come from student voices, representing students' perspectives on debate across the curriculum.

In the spirit of classroom assessment I decided simply to ask students what they thought of debate-like activities in one content-area class I was leading. This 70-student, sophomore level course was intended primarily to introduce communication majors to the rhetorical tradition stretching from the sophists to the postmoderns. I focused each weekly unit on one enduring question in rhetorical theory, for example, "Is science rhetorical?" and "Are emotions bad reasons?" Lectures and whole-class exercises on Monday and Wednesday introduced the week's issue and reviewed the readings.

Students also participated in smaller discussion sections of about 20 students meeting on Fridays. Within the discussion sections, students were organized into four- or five-person work groups. Each week of instruction culminated in a Friday debate between two of the work groups in each section. Assessment standards

---

[1] Williams D. E., McGee B. R., Worth, D. S. University student perceptions of the efficacy of debate participation: An empirical investigation. – Argumentation and Advocacy, 37, 2001. – p. 198.

[2] Bellon J. A research-based justification for debate across the curriculum. Argumentation and Advocacy. – Palgrave, Macmillan. 2000. – p. 164.

developed with the class encouraged the debaters to organize their presentations clearly and to draw support from the course readings as well as from their own experience. The students not directly participating in the day's debate were given the opportunity to question the advocates. They then decided the issue by majority vote, and over the weekend these judge/ audience members wrote two-page position papers defending their decisions.

This class provides one model for "debate across the curriculum," since it focused primarily on content mastery and used debate exercises only as a means to pursue that end. The sort of material covered was not significantly different from that which might be found in any humanities course with a theoretical bent-philosophy, historiography, or literary theory. The course had no prerequisites; in particular, no previous exposure to debate was required. There was no extensive instruction in debate. The teaching assistant and I simply enacted the first debate ourselves, and then worked with the students to develop assessment criteria.

Data Collection. To find out what the students thought about the debate exercises, I asked them on the final Friday of the term. This query was conducted as part of a broader review and assessment of the course's impact on their learning. An instructor began the data collection by leading each section through a debriefing in which students were invited to consider the strengths and weaknesses of three ways of learning: "ordinary" discussion sections, debates, and small-group projects. In particular, the instructor asked whether the competitive nature of the debates intimidated or silenced students who might prefer more cooperative modes of communication. After 10 to 15 minutes of whole group discussion, students were invited to take 10 minutes and write, anonymously, a brief essay articulating their views on the questions of whether, and (if so) how, the debate exercises helped them learn. They were also invited to suggest specific changes to the exercises. These written responses constitute the data upon which this report is predicated.

Fifty-two students, representing 73% of the class, submitted usable responses. I performed a thematic content analysis of the essays, compiling phrases that related to the guiding questions for this study.

Results. Debate and Negative interpersonal or Emotional Qualities. Only four students (8% of those responding) voiced a concern about hostility, fighting, anger or other negative interpersonal or emotional consequences of debate exercises. One explained, for example, that "once you have a set position any attack on that position tends to be upsetting." Another commented on the "tension" of debating. Each of the four nonetheless went on to express a positive overall evaluation of their experiences.

Debate and Competition. Despite the explicit prompt that directed students to consider the competitive nature of debate activities, only seven students (13%) mentioned competition or intimidation. Four of these thought that competition was actually a good thing, "because it forced people to prepare extensively." Another student denied being intimidated by debates. Only two mentioned competition negatively, explaining that debating encouraged teams to "say anything to win" or "to take extreme viewpoints." Even these students, however, did not express a feeling of being personally disadvantaged or silenced by the debate format.

Debate and Unfamiliarity. Only three students noted that the debates had initially been unfamiliar; each went on to explain that "in retrospect it was a key element" in their learning. More students, by contrast, took up the explicit prompt and commented on the relation- ship of debate to other learning activities-class discussion and small group work.

The relative advantages of debate in contrast with "ordinary" class discussion received comment from 17 students (33%). The bulk of the responses took debates to be equal to, complementary with, or better than discussion for the following reasons:

(1) Debates require all students to contribute.

(2) Debates bring forward a variety of different points of view.

(3) Debates require "rational format" (perhaps as opposed to mere expression of opinions).

(4) Debates force participants to know what they're talking about.

One student confessed:

Although I admittedly hated preparing for the debates and would have rather just had a discussion section every week (to avoid doing the work), I certainly learned a lot more as a result of the debates. When I have discussion sections in other classes, I simply reword statements made by other members of the class so it looks like I actually know what I'm talking about, when in fact I am completely unprepared. .. The debate and the small group preparation that preceded it was an extremely effective way to facilitate me actually doing the work.[1]

The relationship between debate and another form of classroom communication, group work, was mentioned by more students (25; 48%). Again, all considered debate to be equal to, complementary with, or better than small group discussion; only one student suggested that group work replace some debates. A number of students spontaneously elaborated on the reasons why small group discussions had facilitated the whole-class debates. Their responsibility to other group members encouraged them to prepare and to practice prior to the debate. The small group meetings were a comfortable place to brainstorm, ask questions and "bring different thoughts together." Group work also enabled students "to expand our limited capacities," allowing them to do better work together than any could have done alone.

Other students commented on the reverse effect, noting that the debates helped promote good group discussion because "fear of shame and desire for a good grade" in the debate required the group to "remain focused" and co-operate and because the debate allowed responsibilities to be given to "everyone," as opposed to projects where "one person [is] helping others along." One student articulated the correlation between the debates and the small group work thus:

---

[1] http://712educators.about.com/dlrubricdebate.htm

I think that while the debates were certainly valuable to learning about the course material, what made them so was the small group discussions that my group had every week. During the debate, we tended to focus simply on one side as a debater. We would often ignore or negate very valid points the other side/group made. However, during the small group discussion, there was no need to do this. We threw out ideas on both sides of the argument in order to help us prepare for the debate and/or paper. We learned from each other because we were listening to each other. I do not think that listening necessarily occurred when we were involved in the debate... Since the small group discussions happened because of the debates, we should keep the debates. But the real learning happened in the discussions.

Debate and Learning. All but one of the 52 students responding expressed positive assessments of their debate experiences. Despite some drawbacks, the debates were described as "fun," "enjoyable," "the most/very helpful," "very useful," "worthwhile," "critical," "essential," "the best option," "excellent," "good," and "a good idea." Students went on to observe the value of debate for their learning not only communication and argumentation skills, but also disciplinary knowledge-that is, from the perspective of debate-across-the-curriculum.

As to communication skills, nine students (17%) commented that debates provided a valuable opportunity and incentive to develop their public speaking abilities. For example, one student said:

Fridays were the best part of this class... Not only does the debate format force you to know your material it also helps you better your public speaking skills. Clarity and eloquence help win an argument while presenting the facts forced you to discover the most effective delivery method.

Ten students (19%) thought the course had helped them become better at supporting their own arguments and analyzing those of others. One of these students reported gains on an even more fundamental skill. In his words, "the

debates were the main reason I learned that it is possible to argue both sides of a question. This taught me that I shouldn't be narrow-minded and should hear things out until I make a final decision."

The great majority of students (79%), however, focused on how the debates had encouraged or indeed "forced" them to better learn course content. Three broad themes emerged in these discussions.

First, students thought that the need to debate motivated them to engage the course content deeply. "By having debates at the end of every week," one student commented, "we would be thinking about the material all week long." Others echoed this view; debates encouraged students to go "much deeper into the issues," to "really delve into the topic more," and "to take a deep, detailed, and extensive view of the readings." This meant not only that everyone would do the homework, "more importantly, for the most part, everyone enjoys doing the homework."

Second, students thought that the debates, or (as above) the debates in conjunction with the group work, exposed them to a wide range of viewpoints and thus helped them engage the course content broadly. Some students reported that this broad engagement happened as they listened to the different sides during a debate. By the end, one said, "I'd often changed my mind several times AND had been forced to think about things I hadn't considered." Others explained that they had to grapple with alternative views as part of preparing for debate, in order to be able to meet the opposing arguments. For example:

The info that we would need to know would have to be that of both sides. This enforces us to not be so close-minded about things. Having knowledge about both sides also made our point much stronger, because we knew how to counterstrike when asked questions.[1]

---

[1] Krieger D. Teaching debate to ESL students: A six-class unit. – The Internet TESL Journal, 11, Retrieved May 23, 2011 from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/KriegerDebate.html

Still others reported that "it helped me think about things from a different perspective" in particular "if I was debating [on] a side that I didn't agree with."

Finally, students thought that the debates allowed them to engage the course content personally. As one student admitted, "The debates helped me by forcing me to take a stance on something and create argument(s) to support it. Had I not been forced to do this, I probably would have taken a more passive role in the class." Other students echoed this view, noting the "personal involvement" that debates promoted, which allowed students "to become intimately involved with the material" and to "learn for him/herself." Further, since students were encouraged to draw support for their arguments not only from the readings but from their personal experiences, the debates also helped them "relate rhetoric to other areas of life," and made what "we learned in class feel more applicable to our own lives."

Problems with Debate. Perhaps applying what they had learned about the value of competing viewpoints, 25 students (48%) articulated some negative features of debate in addition to their positive views. These features were diverse, with none raised by more than four students. Some found that listening to the debates was passive and uninformative.

Several commented that some of the questions being debated were poorly formulated-either unclear or unfairly favoring one side. Several wanted more feedback. Two found the debates too highly structured; another, too unstructured. While students did not find the competitiveness of the debate intimidating, they did occasionally think that the element of competition prodded them to ignore the alternate point of view, to become polarized, or to "artificially dichotomize an issue." Some also voiced a sense of frustration. During the debates, the issues often got lost, irrelevant points were made, and no clear decisions were reached. As one student commented:

Sometimes the debates got confusing and the arguments got smeared with each other, you didn't know what was right or wrong or anything like that. Overall,

I think debates are good, but I think some course of action should be taken when arguments get "muddled."

Reflections. I came away from the study with a keener enthusiasm for deploying debate exercises in this and other courses. In particular, the students' comments largely relieved my three concerns about the usefulness of debates. The debate exercises seem largely to have taken an end run around the ordinary equation of arguing with fighting, to have avoided disadvantage to any large segment of the class (i.e., women), and to have overcome any resistance to unfamiliar learning activities. Among these three concerns, I am left with some residual uneasiness regarding negative reactions to competitiveness. While some students did make negative remarks about competition, there was no evidence that competition affected any one group of students unequally. In other student cultures, perhaps ones in which females are less ardent advocates for equity, the disadvantaging of some students might be more conspicuous. In any case, I am determined to monitor student reactions to competition in classes where they debate.

Overall, this study warrants efforts to foster debate exercises in courses beyond communication departments. The student voices articulated in this study highlight two themes of particular relevance to the cross-disciplinary value of debate. The first pertains to the relationship between debating and group work. I had originally organized the discussion sections into teams largely because of the logistical restriction that limited class time imposed on individual debating. As it turned out, preparing for debates proved an excellent small group task, in that each individual conspicuously benefited from the equal contributions of her peers.[1] In addition to their direct effects on student learning, therefore, debate exercises seem to be an excellent way of incorporating group work into courses.

---

[1] Cohen E. G. Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. – Review of Educational Research. London., 1994. 64. – p. 5.

The second theme pertains to the relationship between diverse points of view and student learning. Traditional teaching techniques like textbooks, lectures, and tests with right answers insulate students from the open questions and competing answers that so often drive our own interest in our subjects. Debates do not, and in fact invite students to consider a range of alternative views on a subject, encountering the course content broadly, deeply and personally. Students' comments about the value of disagreement also offer an interesting perspective on the nature of the thinking skills we want to foster. The research has largely focused on the way debate can help students better master the principles of correct reasoning. Although some students did echo this finding, many more emphasized the importance of debate in helping them to recognize and deal with a diversity of viewpoints. Students here seem to be articulating a perspective on critical thinking surprisingly like that proposed by Deanna Kuhn[1]. As Kuhn pointed out, we only begin to seek reasons at all when we understand that a proposition can be doubted- that is, when we realize that others think differently about it. Kuhn's work documented that even college- educated individuals can have trouble imagining, constructing arguments for, and refuting positions other than their own. If this is so, then debate exercises may be an excellent way of leading students to experience the central aspect of truly critical thinking.

2.4. Teacher's Guide to the Mini-Debate Format

Why Mini-Debates?—There are millions of high school students who have never debated and will never debate because current formal debate rules and procedures require a major commitment of time and expertise by teachers, students, and judges. The inherent value of the research, critical thinking and presentation skills found in debate activities are then lost as a learning opportunity for all these students. By simplifying the rules and judging, and decreasing the time needed for the activity, teachers will be motivated to create these engaging

---

[1] Kuhn D. The skills of argument. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1991. – p. 37.

"mini-debates" which provide the excitement and develop the essential skills that students will use in higher education, careers, and decision making in life and citizenship.

Another goal is to encourage schools to include debate as a co-curricular activity in schools that currently do not debate and maybe never have. ProQuest understands that the cost and complexity of formal debate teams and leagues has made debate impossible for small schools and for schools without extensive financial resources.

A third goal is to include debate activities in schools that use block scheduling. Block scheduling provides greater opportunities for debate because of its longer class periods.

Use Mini-Debate Model with Most ProQuest Learning Resources – ProQuest resources provide students with thousands of authoritative current and historic articles and websites to support or refute any real-word issue. These are issues that most students care about and would be easily motivated to research and express their reasoned opinions.[1]

Correlation to State and National Standards – The following statements are typical of those found in state standards particularly those in English Language Arts. Student will be able to:

- Conduct research using multiple sources to support a position in a debate
- Put information from multiple sources into debate format
- Participate in a debate arguing one position in an effective and focused manner
- Connect information and events in text to experience and to related text and sources
- Locate specific information by using organizational features in expository text
- Synthesize information from multiple sources to draw conclusions

---

[1] http://www.pbs.org/now/classroom/debate_rubric.pdf

- Deliver a polished speech that is organized and suited to the audience and that uses resource materials to clarify and defend positions

- Evaluate the effectiveness of informal and formal presentations that use illustrations, statistics, comparisons, and analogies

The ProQuest Mini-Debate Format

1. Two speakers for each side of the issue

2. Teacher determines which students are pro and con on the stated issue

3. Each speaker is to use note cards synthesized from Leading Issues research

4. Teams may flip a coin to determine sides and speaker order

5. Speakers should take notes during opposing speaker presentations for Crossfire questions

Mini-Debate Activities Sequence and Time Limits

Team A Speaker 1 -- 3 minute limit

Team B Speaker 1 -- 3 minute limit

Timeout – 1 minute

Crossfire (between A1 & B1) 2 minute limit

Team A Speaker 2 -- 3 minute limit

Team B Speaker 2 -- 3 minute limit

Timeout – 1 minute

Crossfire (between A2 & B2) 2 minute limit

Timeout – 2 minutes

A1 summary -- 1 minute limit

B1 summary -- 1 minute limit

Grand Crossfire (all speakers) -- 3 minute limit

Timeout – 2 minutes

A2 Last Shot -- 1 minute limit

B2 Last Shot -- 1 minute limit

Total Time Including Timeouts = 29 minutes

Research Instructions—Each speaker for a side will coordinate with and develop at least 3 facts and 3 expert opinions that are different than their partner for their initial presentations. Each will use the editor selected resources of SIRS Leading Issues for the side of the issue that they will present. At the end of case researching and writing, each speaker's cases should be checked to be sure they reflect the following elements:

1. Each speaker for each side of the issue opens with a different set of 3 arguments

2. They fit the 3-minute time limit

3. They include at least 3 of the following examples: real world, philosophical, historical, and economic

4. Numbers, facts, and expert opinions are incorporated

Speaker Instructions—Each speaker will outline the presentation so that it fits into the 3-minute time limit. Each will use separate note cards or papers for each point that you make including examples. When the opposing team speaks, each will take notes for the Crossfires.

Crossfire Instructions—During the Crossfire period, both speakers have the floor and may ask and answer questions during the 2-minute period. The participants are instructed to keep questions and answers succinct; rudeness should not be tolerated. In the Grand Crossfire all four students have the floor. The first question must be posed by the team which did not speak just prior to the Crossfire period.

- One partner can take the role of questioner while the other mollifies the opposition.

- A stronger partner can cover for a weaker partner.

- Partners can mutually intervene to deflect questions from their opponents in order to try to unsettle well-placed attacks.

- Partners can interrupt each other, not just the opposition, to shift the focus of questions and attacks.

Summary Speaker Instructions—Summary speakers will take notes of the most compelling reasons presented by themselves and their partner that are most likely to counter the arguments of their opponents and will rebuild audience connections by refocusing upon the central issue.

Last Shot Instructions—Last Shot speakers choose the one issue which matters the most and use the importance of this issue to frame the final parting shot.

Judging the Debate—Students in the class should be used and be active in judging the debate to determine a winning side based on a rubrics scoring system. The teacher should make copies of the rubrics system for students to use and then the teacher should serve as the timekeeper. When some experience is gained, parents can be invited to participate as judges, using the same rubrics scoring system.

Teacher Rubrics for Evaluating a Mini-Debate. The following are examples of evaluative criteria that the teacher can use to build a rubrics evaluation model for the mini-debate:

Preparation: Preparation includes the research process and the organization of materials to make the presentation.

1. Did the team use the student guide to help organize their research?

2. Did the team coordinate their presentations to minimize redundancy?

3. Did the team prepare appropriate and organized materials to make their presentation?

Evidence: Evidence refers not only to statistics, facts and references to authority, but also to items of common or general knowledge.

1. Did the team show connections between particular events or issues and large social, economic, and/or political concerns, trends or developments?

2. Did the team supply appropriate and sufficient evidence to support its arguments, and apply that evidence clearly and logically?

3. Did the team adequately explain and/or analyze the evidence offered during the debate?

Analysis and Argumentation: Did each team sufficiently address the topic in an organized and consistent manner?

1. Did the team present logical, reasonable, and convincing arguments?

2. Did the team clearly and effectively discuss, explain and evaluate the issues and arguments offered during the debate?

3. Did the team respond directly to opposing arguments, interpretations, and/or analyses, with clear explanations of the weakness of opposing arguments?

4. Did the team apply clear evaluative criteria to the arguments, interpretations, and/or analyses offered during the debate?

5. Did the team demonstrate an understanding of the social, political, and/or economic issues involved in the debate?

Crossfire:

1. Did the debater provide relevant, focused and brief questions?

2. Did the debater respond effectively to questions?

3. Did the debater demonstrate respect for opponents by cooperating in a polite "give and take" without dominating the discussion?

Presentation:

1. Did the debater communicate in a clear, organized, and understandable manner, presenting an easy listening path to follow?

2. Did the debater exemplify the highest standards of language usage, style and vocabulary, avoiding slang, poor grammar, and mispronunciations?

3. Did the speaker use effective body language (poised stage presence, appropriate gestures, facial expression, and eye contact)?

4. Did the speaker use effective oral presentation skills (volume, diction, rate of delivery), and use understandable and persuasive delivery)?

5. Was the debater respectful and courteous to opponents?

Student Tips for Success in the Mini-Debate.

1. Each partner should select at least 3 articles from SIRS Leading Issues that support their side of the mini-debate.

2. Copy/paste facts, opinions, and examples from each article you read into a blank Draft Summary document that will be used to organize information. (pp. 14-16, http://www.proquestk12.com/lsm/pqelib/pdfs/antiplagguide.pdf)

3. Organize your presentation onto separate sheets of paper by copying and pasting the best information from the Draft Summary document.

4. Organize enough information for your opening statement (3 minutes) and coordinate with your partner to make sure you are not both presenting the same information.

5. Create at least 5 questions that you can ask your opponents during the Crossfires. These should be on sheets of papers or note cards for easy reference.

6. Anticipate that your opponents will ask at least 5 questions in the Crossfires. Prepare answers to them on sheets of paper or note cards. What questions would you ask if you were on the opposing team?

7. Prepare a powerful final conclusive argument/statement which will be written at the end of your debate. This should be no longer than 1 minute. Take notes during the debate to tailor this statement to your team's strengths and your opponents' weaknesses.

Conclusion

The research conclusion is presented according with the data which have been analyzed in the previous chapter. From all the data analysis about using debate technique to improve students' speaking skill it can be concluded that:

1. The use of debate technique has been advocated in teaching speaking process. Typically, debate is very interested to be implemented to improve speaking skill. Students have a lot of opportunity to practice speaking and have active involvement in debate. However, they worked very cooperative and tried to defend their team, and they were more active to speak in classroom.

2. The use of debate technique has been advocated in teaching speaking process. Typically, debate is very interested to be implemented to improve speaking skill. Students have a lot of opportunity to practice speaking and have active involvement in debate. However, they worked very cooperative and tried to defend their team, and they were more active to speak in classroom.

In English language teaching and learning at university, the teacher must create enjoyable, fun and interesting situation as possible as the teacher can. The enjoyment ought to be the foremost aims which hopefully will have good effects on the education, because what they dislike, they drop as soon as possible. In other word, the teacher should make learning enjoyable because students love to play and learn best when they are enjoying themselves.

Teaching speaking using debate technique can motivate students to practice speaking more, and it improves student's speaking skill. The researcher suggests the teacher uses this technique because it encourages students to speak in speaking class.

Debate technique is good technique in improving speaking skill in speaking class. It has benefit to improve student's speaking competence in class. This technique is following a) Dividing the students into many groups. b) Selecting debate topic and assigning the groups to debate topic. c) Ensuring that the participants have time beforehand to prepare for the arguments and

to collect supporting data to present during the debate. d) Presenting the topic and format the debate.

The result of the research shows that the use of debate technique can improve students' motivation, interest and achievement. The implementation of debate technique is reasonable because it can give students a great motivation to learn English especially speaking. Thus, debate technique is good to improve students' interest, motivation and competence in learning speaking.

At the end we would like to propose some suggestions, which helpfully would be useful for all subjects.

1. For the teachers

The technique of teaching speaking will influence the students' ability to learn speaking. They should pay attention to the fact that students' motivation during teaching learning process is the important thing which should be increased. The use of various techniques is suggested to make the students more encourage to improve the teaching learning process.

2. For the students

a. Motivation is an important factor in the process of English learning so the students should develop their motivation in speaking lesson.

b. Students should study English harder to reduce their difficulties of English learning.

c. Students should pay attention to the teacher explanation, so if the teacher gives question, they can do perfectly and they can do exercise.

3. To other researchers

It has been known from the result of the study that the use of debate technique can improve students" speaking competence. Hereby, it is expected that the result of the study make the English teacher use an appropriate teaching technique of debate technique on improving student's speaking competence. Based on the explanation, we would like to suggest the other

researcher; the result of the study can be used as additional reference to further research with the different sample and occasions.

The List of used literature

1. Жалолов Ж. Чет тил ўқитиш методикаси. – Тошкент, Ўқитувчи. 1996. – 326 б.

2. Хошимов Ў. Инглиз тили ўқитиш методикаси. – Тошкент, Ўқитувчи. 2006. – 226 б.

3. Рогова Г.В. Methods of English Language Teaching. – M. 1995. – p.312

4. Allen M., Berkowitz S., Hunt S., Louden A. A meta-analysis of the impact of forensics and communication education on critical thinking. – Oxford, Oxford University Press. 1999. – pp. 18-30.

5. Angelo T. A., Cross, K. P. Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers (2nd ed.). – San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1999. p. 67.

6. Barry K. Beginning Teaching. – Oxford, Social Science Press. 2003. – p. 117.

7. Bellon J. A research-based justification for debate across the curriculum. Argumentation and Advocacy. – Palgrave, Macmillan. 2000. – pp. 161-175.

8. Bransford J. D., Brown A. L., Cocking R. R. How people learn, Brain, mind, experience and school (Expanded ed.). – Washington, DC. National Academy Press. 2000. – p. 104.

9. Broughton Geoffrey. Teaching English as a Foreign Language. – Routledge. 2003. – p. 257.

10. Brown H.D. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. – New Jersey, Prentice Hall Regents. 1994. – pp. 72-75.

11. Budesheim T., Lundquist A. Consider the opposite: Opening minds through in-class debates on course-related controversies. – London, The Science Teacher. 2000. – pp. 106-110.

12. Cohen E. G. Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. – Review of Educational Research. London., 1994. 64. – pp. 1-35.

13. Edwards C. Teachers Exploring Tasks in English Language Teaching. – Palgrave, Macmillan. 2005. – p. 311.

14. Fauziati E. Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. – Surakarta, Muhammadiyah University Press. 2008. – p. 59.

15. Freire P. Pedagogy of the oppressed (30th Anniversary ed.). – New York, Continuum. 2002. – p. 97.

16. Fowler F.G., Fowler H.W., Thompson D.F. Speaking. The Oxford Pocket Dictionary of Current English. – Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2000. – p. 127.

17. Garrett M. Debate: A teaching strategy to improve verbal communication and critical thinking skills. – Longman, 1996. – pp. 37-40.

18. Goodwin James. Students' perspectives on debate in content area classes. – Communication Education, 52(2), NY., 2003. – pp. 157-163.

19. Green C., Klug H. Teaching critical thinking and writing through debates: An experimental evaluation. – Teaching Sociology, 18(4), 2004. – pp. 462-471.

20. Harmer Jeremy. The Practice of Teaching English. – Longman. 2000. – p.386.

21. Huryn J. Debating as a teaching technique. – Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1996. – pp. 266-269.

22. Kayi H. Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language. – Retrieved June 30, 2011 from http://iteslj.org/Articiles/Kayi-Teaching.

23. Kennedy Ruth. Tin-class debates: Fertile ground for active learning and the cultivation of critical thinking and oral communication skills. – International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Cambridge, 2003. 19(2), – pp.183-190.

24. Krieger D. Teaching debate to ESL students: A six-class unit. – The Internet TESL Journal, 11, Retrieved May 23, 2011 from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/KriegerDebate.html

25. Kuhn D. The skills of argument. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1991. – p. 37.

26. Melvin K. Rating class participation: The prof/peer method. Teaching of Psychology. – Cambridge Univ. Press. 1998. – pp. 137-139.

27. Nunan D. Research Methods in Language Learning. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1999. – pp. 87-90.

28. Oros Andrew L. Let's Debate: Active Learning Encourages Student Participation and Critical Thinking. – Journal of Political Science Education, 3:3. 2007. – pp. 293-311.

29. Smith R. Are peer ratings of student debates valid? – Cambridge Univ. Press. 2008. – pp. 188-189.

30. Tannen D. Argument culture: Moving from debate to dialogue. – New York, Random House. 1998. – pp. 57-59.

31. Tumposky N. The debate debate. – Clearing House. London, 2004. – pp. 52-55.

32. Ur P. A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory, – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1996. – pp. 274-281.

33. Wajnryb R. Classroom Observation Tasks. – Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1992. – pp. 69-71.

34. Williams D. E., McGee B. R., Worth, D. S. University student perceptions of the efficacy of debate participation: An empirical investigation. – Argumentation and Advocacy, 37, 2001. – pp. 198-209

35. http://education.vic.gov.au/studentlearning/teachingresources/english/literacy/strategies/tsvels3speak.htm

36. http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/10999-speaking.htm.

37. http://debate.uvm.edu/NFL/rostrumlib/ted%20intro%20roberts%2011-02.pdf

38. http://www.ncfca.org/Pages/Debate/LDDebate.html

39. http://www.apdaweb.org/old/guide/rules.html

40. http://www.pbs.org/now/classroom/debate_rubric.pdf

41. http://mh034.k12.sd.us/classroom_debate_rubric.htm

42. http://712educators.about.com/dlrubricdebate.htm

43. http://www.compusmart.ab.ca/adebate/resources/debate%20rubric.pdf