

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE TO TEACH SPEAKING

Moh Haris Firdaus

(English Department of Teacher and Training Faculty Universitas Islam Majapahit Mojokerto)

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to get clear description of the implementation of Australian Parliamentary Debate in the teaching of speaking, and to know the effects of the implementation of Australian Parliamentary Debate in promoting high school students' critical thinking skill. The method which was applied in this research was naturalistic study. It was conducted in SMA Trimurti Surabaya, East Java Province from October – November 2012. The subjects of the research were the teaching and learning of speaking of class XII Science 2 in SMA Trimurti using Australian Parliamentary Debate. The data of this thesis were taken from several techniques including observation and interview. In analyzing the qualitative data, the researcher conducted data reduction, data display, drawing conclusion and verification. The finding shows the following results: (1) The implementation of APD in SMA Trimurti Surabaya encourages students to speak communicatively. (2), The implementation of APD can promote critical thinking ability of students in SMA Trimurti Surabaya.

Key Words: Australian Parliamentary Debate, Speaking, Critical Thinking, Naturalistic Study.

INTRODUCTION

Speaking become very important recently, People from children until adult have an enthusiasm to learn English, whether it is in a course, or learn by themselves, whether they take general English or just conversation class. The trigger of this phenomenon may come from the status of English itself. First, English has become an international language; the second is educational language, and the last is recreational language. English as an international language can be traced from 1919, when the Treaty of Versailles was composed not only in French, the common language at the diplomacy at the time, but also in English (Jain and Patel, 2008: 7). Those who learn to speak English since they were a child will have a significant progress in it comparing to those who are not. But the reality is our education system does not allow us to exposure

our speaking skill massively. The focus of teaching English in our country is just on the rule of it, not how to use it effectively to communicate. The result is that many graduation of high school cannot speak English communicatively, and many of them cannot produce a correct speech or utterances, this is an implication of the lack-exposure of speaking when they were in elementary until senior high school.

Besides, speaking has become something that is difficult to be mastered by some students. They might totally silent if their teacher asks them to speak. There are many reasons why it happens. One of them is students are afraid of making mistakes. Another reason is that they do not understand the meaning of some words or sentences. And also students do not want to be embarrassed by their friends if they make mistakes. According to Jain and

Patel (2008: 52), there are four general objectives of teaching English. The first is to encourage students to speak. The second is to enable students to speak English correct language. The third is to enable the students to write the language properly. The fourth is to enable the students to read the language with ease. The first two objectives are dealing with the speaking skill. Teaching English sometimes is difficult since students are discouraged to speak. It supported by Xu (2011: 1), He states at least four aspects that make students discourage to speak. The first is that the students are afraid of making mistakes. It comes up because there is no enough chance to practice speaking in class. This leads to the result that the speaking skills of most students are comparatively lower than other skills such as listening, reading and grammar. Secondly, they do not want to be embarrassed by their friends if they make mistakes. It is common for some students to laugh at their friends who make mistakes. For students, this kind of thing can avoid them to speak, so they will keep silent in order to prevent being embarrassed by their friends. Next, the topics are not interesting. When conducting discussion at class, teachers are very often chosen the topic by themselves, they do not give the authority to the students for choosing the topics. As a consequence, students are not interesting with the topic, and it makes them lazy to speak. The last is the classroom atmosphere is not encouraging. A class which has a good lighting and air circulation will create a relax condition for the students. And if the class is not clean and is crowded will make students feel uncomfortable.

To overcome this problem, debate can be used as an alternative in teaching speaking. In Indonesia, debate competitions have become the regular

activities done by the universities and high schools. This could be seen as the most significant exposure of speaking skill. But this kind of exposure is merely done not in the formal or classical situation, it means that it is done outside the teaching and learning period. As a result, not all the students are able to speak well, only those who are joining debating club able to speak as well as they debate.

Considering that background, the writer formulates the problem of this study as follows:

1. How is APD implemented in teaching speaking skill on the twelfth grade in SMA Trimurti Surabaya?
2. To what extent does the implementation of APD promote students' critical thinking?

There are some definitions of speaking proposed by the experts. Speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed, those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of a test takers' listening skill (Brown, 2004:140). In addition, Hornby in Lustigova (2011: 3) states that speaking is making use of words in an ordinary voice, uttering words, knowing and being able to use a language, expressing oneself in a words, as well as making a speech. In short, speaking is the ability to perform linguistic knowledge in actual communication. Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that speaking is a productive skill that can be observed empirically in order to perform linguistic knowledge in actual communication.

Based on the EJVED Debaters Guidelines (2008:1), Debating is about developing your communication skills. It is about assembling and organizing

effective arguments, persuading and entertaining an audience, and using your voice and gestures to convince an adjudicator that your arguments outweigh your oppositions. Debating is not about personal abuse, irrational attacks or purely emotional appeals. Another definition is stated by The Open Society Institute, the International Debate Education Association (2010: 2). Debate is a formal contest of argumentation between two teams or individuals. More than a mere verbal or performance skill, debate embodies the ideal of reasoned argument, tolerance for divergent points of view, and rigorous self-examination. Debate is, above all, a way for those who hold opposing views to discuss controversial issues without descending to insult, emotional appeals, or personal biases. A key trademark of debate is that it rarely ends in agreement, but rather, allows for a robust analysis for the question at hand.

Hammond (2007: 76) defines critical thinking as an initially a process of reaction. Someone has strung together a conclusion and some reasons that allegedly make the case for the conclusion. Our task is to decide whether the argument is one we wish to make our own. So any reasoning provides raw material for critical-thinking practice. However, we are all more interested in some arguments than others, for some reasoning seems to have a more significant effect on our lives.

Facione listed sort of critical thinking as follows:

- a. clarity in stating the question or concern,
- b. orderliness in working with complexity,
- c. diligence in seeking relevant information,
- d. reasonableness in selecting and

- e. applying criteria,
- e. care in focusing attention on the concern at hand.
- f. persistence though difficulties are encountered,
- g. precision to the degree permitted by the subject and the circumstances.

RESEARCH METHOD

Related to this study, the writer used qualitative research in the form of naturalistic method. Yin (2011:10) states that qualitative research is defined as research devoted to developing an understanding of human systems. It will be conducted in a natural setting, without intentionally manipulating the environment. It typically involves highly detailed rich descriptions of human behaviours and opinions. The perspective is that humans construct their own reality, and an understanding of what they do may be based on why they believe they do it. In qualitative research, it is not necessarily assumed that the findings of one study may be generalized easily to other settings. There is a concern for the uniqueness of a particular setting and participants. All the characteristic is according to the writer is perfect to use on this research.

The research took place at the SMA Trimurti. It is located on Jl. Gubernur Suryo No. 3, Surabaya, East Java. The research subjects are the students of Twelfth Science 2. This school is chosen for several reasons. First, this school is well known as one of the best public senior high school in Surabaya, and it has been implementing Australian Parliamentary Debate in teaching speaking for years. The second, one of the researcher's partners is the teacher at that school, so that it was easy for the writer to conduct the research.

The way to get the data in a research activity is usually known as a method of collecting data. In this research, the researcher uses observation and interview. Kothari (2004:96) states that observation is used for the purpose of description of setting, activities, people and meaning of what is observed from the perspective of the participants. Observation becomes a scientific tool and the method of data collection for the researcher, when it serves a formulated research purpose, is systematically planned and recorded and is subjected to checks and controls on validity and reliability. According to Yin (2011: 54), interview is a conversation with a purpose. The purpose for doing an interview include, among others, obtaining here and now constructions of persons, events, activities organizations, feelings, motivations, claims, concern and other entities; reconstruction of such entities as experienced information (construction, reconstruction, or projections) obtained from other resources, human, non-human (triangulation) and verification, emendation and extension of constructions developed by the inquirer (member checking).

The researcher used several steps in analysing the data as explained by Miles and Huberman in Kohsy (2005:113)

- a. Data reduction: Data reduction refers to the process of selecting, focusing simplifying, abstracting and transforming the data that appear in the written up field notes or transcription. In this step the researcher does some activities. Because of the data available in many kinds of pattern, the researcher need to select which one is important or not. After that the

researcher transforms it into a written report that can be read.

- b. Data display: After transforming into kind of written report, the data would be display into a kind of graph, chart or network. Koshy (2005:114) also adds the purpose is to make organised information into an immediately available, accessible, compact form so that the analyst can see what is happening and either draw conclusions or move on to the next step of analysis which the display suggests to be useful.
- c. Drawing Conclusion and Verification: In this step, the researcher tries to decide what things means, note the regularities, and explain. The researcher holds this conclusion until all data are more explicit and grounded, besides, the action researcher also draws conclusions as the project progresses (Miles and Huberman in Koshy, 2005:113).

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

FINDINGS

A. Research Findings

1. The Implementation of APD to Teach Speaking Skill on the Twelfth Grade in SMA Trimurti

a. The Teaching and Learning Strategies

a) Opening

APD was taught by teacher ZF in third grade science program 2 on Tuesday, 16th October 2012, the teaching and learning process was started by greeting and listed students' presence. She continued by saying that day would start debating using APD style.

Teacher ZF randomly divided 46 students into groups consists of three students. Before she started the debate,

she opened the lesson by saying Assalamu'alaikum Warohmatullohi Wabarokatuh. Then she continued by asking students' attention, because the class was bit noisy at the moment. She had also arranged which group that should perform first. The motion for that day was THBT government should stop the national examination. Teacher ZF had launched motions a week before the first debate.

A week before the first observation, teacher ZF had thoroughly explained about Australian Parliamentary Debate to the students, and she had divided the class into two groups consist of 24 and 22 students. In the same day, the motions had been launched and she had decided which group that should be performed first, it was the group of 24 students. Those 24 students were divided into eight groups, so there were three students in each group. In every meeting, two groups were performed, and this was chosen randomly by the teacher ZF.

b) Main activity

The first meeting was on the 16th October 2012. When the teacher entered the class, she reminded the students about what they were going to do on that day. The motion for that day is THBT The Government should stop the national examination. She gave ten minutes for the chosen groups to rebuild their case. Since it was the first debate, it seemed so boring. Students could not give a package of clear case and elaboration toward the case and some elements of APD were absence in this first debate. Besides, they were also read their material a lot. Reading the material is allowed in debate, but just a little and just to highlight the main points.

Teacher ZF did not interrupt the students debating activity. He let the debate run as it was without any

interfere from her. The students were quite understand their tasks, there was no any overlap among debaters. At the end of the debate, teacher ZF corrected students debating activity. She told them that they were not defining the definition, and they did not emerging the theme line. In this point, teacher ZF re-explained briefly about the role of the speaker of both sides.

Based on the observation of the first meeting, the debating activity was run on its way even there were some missing such as definition and the theme line. Students were quite understand what to do toward the motion. Teacher ZF did not interfere while the students were debating, the correction is done at the end of the teaching learning process.

The motion in this second debate was THBT The Government should take the responsibility of the Human Trafficking. Since this was a difficult motion, students needed many data and evidence to strengthen their case. Again, the first speaker of the government team did not give the definition toward the motion. Fortunately, the first speaker had successfully delivered the theme line. This is different with the negative team, the first speaker of the negative team failed to give theme line, he directly stated the team split without stating the theme line first. There was no rebuttal given by the first speaker negative team. He focused building their team's case without considering other's case weakness. Both first speakers could not use the given time effectively, and the elaboration still on the surface.

In this second debate, both second speakers had successfully delivered their rebuttal. The second speaker negative had tried to play trick to the positive team by stating that there are many bigger cases than human

trafficking such as corruption, jobless people, and poverty. And he stated that this case should be covered by the police, not by the government.

THBT Outsourcing program should be erased was the motion of the third debate. From the motion, actually this was a proposal debate. Proposal debate is a kind of debate containing a particular issue or problem and needs a package of solution (proposal) to solve its problem, and this solution must be delivered by the first speaker of each group. If this solution is delivered by the second speaker, this team will lose.

The first speaker of the positive team had successfully defining the motion, delivering theme line and team split. She stated:

The motion for today is THBT outsourcing program should be erased. Outsourcing program is the labor program that makes the worker not rich, because it is based on contract. Our theme line is because the program is not effective. Our team split is the nature of outsourcing and the future impact of this.

From the observation, the first speaker negative had delivered his thinking toward the motion well. He was succeeding in presenting his split by trying to make a link between the motion and his speech.

Since it was a proposal debate, there should be a package of solution to overcome the issue in the motion. But these two teams were failed in it. They just debating and attacking each other, no proposal at all.

It was the last debate that the researcher observed. The motion was THBT School should be blamed of the fighting among students. In this debate, the first speaker did not define the motion, she directly stated the theme line and team split. It was philosophical debate, meaning that whether the

positive and the negative team agree or disagree with the motion. No need to make a proposal, all the debaters have to do is just persuading the adjudicators. Adjudicators are considered as the “know nothing” people in debate. So that debaters must work hard in persuading them to be in their side.

The first speaker of positive team elaborated students’ activity at school, and her second speaker focused on the reason why school should be blamed. In her statement, first speaker positive confidently blamed school as the one and only the trigger of the fighting among students. The reason is most of the students’ time was at school, not at home. This statement had been rebutted by the first speaker of the negative team by saying:

The third speaker of both teams tried to strengthen the case by attacking their opponent’s case. As long as they do not bring the new case, attacking the opponent’s case is allowed.

c) Closing activity

In closing activity, teacher ZF ended the class by giving comments and oral corrections toward the debate. The corrections are for the grammatical mistakes and some misspelling word. For the comments, she reminded the students about the elements of APD, role of each speakers and the technical procedure of conducting APD style.

APD has its own rule in deciding the winner of the debate, it is based on matter, manner, and method. Besides, she also announced which group that won the debate at the end of the debate. Since they were new in debate, teacher ZF did not ask them to speak in normal time, it is seven minutes.

Teacher ZF close her class by saying that they still have some more debating activity and reminds the next group to make a good preparation for

the debate, she also reminds the motion for the next debating round.

d. Students' role in the teaching and learning activities

In the teaching and learning using APD, students were the main subject who actively involved and respond whatever the material and task given by the teacher. Since this is a transfer of knowledge, students must be able to take any lesson and benefit given by the teachers, and it needs a hard work to get the best result in the teaching and learning process.

Based on the observation, students seemed to be active in the process of teaching and learning. For example, before the debate began, the teacher asked the chosen group to rebuild the case. Case building is the activity done by the students before conducting the debate. The function is to strengthen their case, revising the mistake and do anything necessary toward their case. In this stage, all the students did what the teacher ZF said, they re-write their case, tried to deliver the case, and some of them were using the internet to find the data dealing with the case. They were also actively participate by asking teacher ZF dealing with the motion and the role of the speakers, and it made the class bit noisy. In this case building, students could keep their focus only on what the teacher asked.

The domination of the students comes up in the debating activity. As the teacher asked them to start the debate, they directly did it without any protest. There were six students divided into two groups in each debating round. As the debater, they knew what to do, they were also understand the job description for each speaker. During the debate, the rest of the students who were not performing debate could keep the atmosphere of the class. They were

not talking to each other, they fully paid attention to their friends who were debating in front of the class.

The observation on the students debating activity also revealed that the students' role is not only delivering their case, but also responding the opponents' case. It is shown on the rebuttals among them, the existence of rebuttals shows that students were responding each other. The ability of responding the argument, giving and answering the rebuttals, has proven that students' role demonstrating critical thinking revealed in the process of learning.

d. Students' role in the teaching and learning activities

In the teaching and learning using APD, students were the main subject who actively involved and respond whatever the material and task given by the teacher. Since this is a transfer of knowledge, students must be able to take any lesson and benefit given by the teachers, and it needs a hard work to get the best result in the teaching and learning process.

The observation on the students debating activity also revealed that the students' role is not only delivering their case, but also responding the opponents' case. It is shown on the rebuttals among them, the existence of rebuttals shows that students were responding each other. The ability of responding the argument, giving and answering the rebuttals, has proven that students' role demonstrating critical thinking revealed in the process of learning.

c. The teacher's role in the teaching and learning activities

Based on the observation, it shows that the teacher's roles in the teaching and learning activities are:

1) As a motivator, the one who always keep the good mood of students

to study. One way to motivate the students is by giving them the reward either for their good works or even only for their participation. In the teaching and learning process, teacher ZF gave the reward for the students' participation by asking them to applause. Giving applause may be considered as the simplest reward and it can motivate the students.

2) As a facilitator, the one who make it easier for students to do the learning process. As a facilitator, teacher ZF may be considered also as a guide during the teaching and learning process. 3) As an evaluator, teacher can measure the students' ability in the end of every lesson. Here, teacher can see whether the students achieve the objectives or not. This is called as an evaluation. In this stage, the teacher can correct the students work, criticize it, give the score, or give the final test.

Since this is a debate that has its specific regulation, the evaluation done together with the debating activity. As the students were debating, teacher ZF also started to score their performance based on the APS scoring system. In the end of the activity, teacher ZF evaluate the debate that had been run, she made some corrections dealing with the students' case and the grammatical mistakes.

2. The Effects of APD Implementation on Students' Critical Thinking Abilities

From the observation, it revealed that the implementation of APD can make the students' thinking critically. Critical thinking ability were clearly demonstrated when the students tried to strengthen their case, giving and answering the rebuttal.

Their critical thinking can be observed from their critical argument. Students need to be very careful in

constructing the argument, it should be in line with the motion and their theme line. They should also analysing their opponents' argument. While their opponents delivering the speech, the debaters can take notes to find the weaknesses and make it as the component of rebuttal in the next turn. As stated by Shuster and Meany (2003: 134). In debate, we don't just make arguments; we also analyse them. When we analyse arguments, we ask questions of arguments to determine their viability as well as their potential weak points. Debaters need to learn to think critically about arguments: there is little place for uncritical acceptance in debate, particularly if you want to have the best arguments or rejoinders.

Since the students got the motion, actually they were started to think critically. At that moment, students should be able to think wisely what to do with that motion, how to define the motion, how to construct the theme line based on the given motion, and how to make split of the motion. Those elements can make the students thinking critically, if they do not, they will easily beaten by their opponents.

During the debate, students are also forced to think critically. They must be able to listen very carefully to their opponents' argument, taking notes on the opponents' weaknesses and thinking how to attack those weaknesses. Not all the weaknesses can be used as the component of rebuttal, they must choose one or two weaknesses to be rebutted in the next turn, and it is also need to think critically.

Discussion

1. The Implementation of Australian Parliamentary Debate Encourages Students' to Speak Communicatively

The finding of the research showed that the implementation of APD encourages students' to speak communicatively. This is proven in the debating activity that all the students were able to deliver their argument in an accepted way. It was also proven that many opinion, rebuttal, and defence mechanism that can be delivered by the students during the debate. As stated by Kayi (2006: 1), speaking is a crucial part of second language learning and teaching. Despite its importance, for many years, teaching speaking has been undervalued and English language teachers have continued to teach speaking just as a repetition of drills or memorization of dialogues. However, today's world requires that the goal of teaching speaking should improve students' communicative skills, because, only in that way, students can express themselves and learn how to follow the social and cultural rules appropriate in each communicative circumstances.

During the observation, students were able to speak communicatively. It was proven that there were many rebuttals in it. The rebuttal speech is an opportunity to summarize and extend your critical arguments in the debate, summarize and refute the arguments of the other team, and show why, given the arguments that have been advanced in the debate, your side wins (Shuster & Meany, 2003: 7). Rebuttal speeches must contain a substantial element of refutation. Some debaters see the rebuttal speech as an opportunity for grand, summarizing gestures and little else. While summarizing the debate is an important element of any rebuttal speech, rebuttal speakers must also refute the arguments made by the other team in their most recent speech or speeches in order to win the debate. The effective rebuttal must play offense

and defense. If the debaters only summarize the debate in their final speech, they risk losing the debate on the details of arguments advanced by their opponent team.

The effective rebuttal is like filling the big hole with a big stone, not filling the big hole with the sands. It means that the debaters must be able to find the opponents' big mistake and attack it. If the rebuttal is well constructed, the opponents will lose the point. The existence of rebuttal indicates that the students are speaking communicatively.

2. The Implementation of Australian Parliamentary Debate Can Promote Students' Critical Thinking Ability.

From the research, it revealed that the implementation of APD can promote students' critical thinking ability. This is proven in the debating activity, students were able to create competitive debates. A statement given by Shuster and Meany (2003: 7) indicates that debate and critical thinking is closely related. All students can benefit from training in oral communication and argumentation.

In constructing debate, students showed the ability of critical thinking. Firstly, they had understood the motion, they could define the motion, developing the time line, and composing the split from the given motion, and the cases are always linked back to the motion.

Secondly, they could choose which arguments that should be taken to compose rebuttal. When we analyse arguments in debate, we're not just trying to figure out what kinds of arguments they are. We are also trying to figure out which arguments are important and why. In every debate, some arguments are more important than others. If you can identify which

arguments are the most important, you will have learned an important skill. Part of debate is convincing the judge that your arguments are the most important (Shuster & Meany, 2003: 138). In one round of debate, it is possible to catch many weaknesses from the opposition, and not all those weaknesses can be used as the component of rebuttal. Debaters need to choose the most significant weakness to attack the opposition case, and this is not an easy job, and it needs a critical thinking to do.

Conclusion, Implication, and Suggestion

A. Conclusion

In this part, the research that had been conducted thoroughly on the topic The Implementation of Australian Parliamentary Debate to Teach Speaking, finally brought the researcher to the conclusions. Firstly, the implementation of Australian Parliamentary Debate encourages students' to speak communicatively. It reveals from the debating activity that students were able to deliver their argument in an accepted way. Students were also able to construct good debates, it is proven that there were many rebuttals during the debate. The existence of rebuttal indicates students were able to create a communicative debate.

Secondly, the research shows that the implementation of Australian Parliamentary Debate can promote students' critical thinking ability, proven by the students' ability in constructing argument in debate session. They could define the motion, developing the time line, and composing the split from the given motion, and the arguments are always linked back to the motion.

B. Implication

The result of the research confirms that the teaching and learning using APD can be used to teach speaking and promote students' critical thinking ability, especially for students in XII Science B SMA Trimurti Surabaya.

According to the result of the study, the implementation of APD is an appropriate way to teach speaking and promote students' critical thinking. This result also can be an alternative reference for teachers in developing their teaching quality. Besides, teachers also can apply APD to improve students' critical thinking ability.

C. Suggestion

From the research, some suggestions can be drawn as follows:

For teachers, they should be creative in teaching, since English is not an easy subject for some students. Teachers also need to know the psychological condition of their students, so that they could create such an enjoyable learning activity. Teachers also need to know what the students like and dislike dealing with the teaching style, and use it wisely as the key in teaching English.

For students, they should keep in mind that mastering English is very important. Besides, they should be able to think critically to decide what to do dealing with any problem they got.

References

- Brown, H. D. 2004. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco: San Fransisco State University.
- _____. 2001. *Teaching By Principles an Interactive Approach to Language*

- Pedagogy*. San Fransisco: San Fransisco State University.
- Depdiknas (2006). *Peraturan Pemerintah No. 23 Tahun 2006*. <http://www.dikti.org/55/html>
- D’Cruz, Ray. 2003. *The Australia – Asia Debating Guide*. North Melbourne: Australian Debating Federation.
- Ennis, Robert H. 2000. *Teaching critical Thinking: A Few Suggestion*. University of Illinois. Available on <http://CriticalThinking.Net>
- Facione, Noreen C and Peter A. Facione. 2008. *Critical Thinking & Clinical Judgment*. The California Academic Press/Insight Assessment. Available on <http://www.insightassessment.com>
- Facione, Peter A. 1990. *Critical Thinking: A Statement of Expert Consensus for Purposes of Educational Assessment and Instruction, The Delphi Report: Research findings and Recommendations prepared for the committee on pre- college philosophy*. American Philosophical Association. ERIC Doc. No. ED 315-423.
- Facione, Peter A. 2007. *Critical Thinking What is It and Why It Counts*. Insight Assessment/California Academic Press. Available on <http://www.insightassessment.com/t.html>
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Hammond, Eugene R. 1989. *Critical Thinking, Thoughtful Writing*. New York: Mc Graw Hill
- Halvorsen, Andy. (2005). *Incorporating Critical Thinking Skills Development into ESL/EFL Courses*. The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. XI, No. 3, March 2005. Available: <http://itesjl.org/>
- Herawati Hetty. 2007. *The Implementation of Genre-Based Approach in the Teaching of English at SMAN 1 Karanganyar and Its Effects In Promoting Students Critical Thinking (Thesis S-2)*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.
- International Debate Education Association (n.d) About Debate: What is Debate? [On Line]. Available: <http://www.idebate.org/debate/what.php> [Nov 2010].
- Jianing, Xu. (2011). *Storytelling in the EFL Speaking Classroom*. The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. XIII, No. 11, November 2007. Available: <http://itesjl.org/>
- Junaidi. 2011. *Using Critical Debate Technique to Improve Student’s Speaking Ability (Thesis S-2)*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.
- Kayi, Hayriye. (2006). *Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in A Second Language*. The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. VII, No. 8, November 2006. Available <http://itesjl.org/>
- Koshy, Valsa (2005). *Action Research for Improving Practice*. New

- Delhi: Paul Chapman Publishing
- Kothari, C. R. 2004. *Research Methodology: Methods and Technique*. New Delhi: New Age international Publishers.
- Lustigova, L. 2011. *Simplified Debates As A Learning Tool At The University*. ERIES Journal.
- Meany, J., & Shuster, K. 2003. *On That Point! An Introduction to Parliamentary Debate*. New York: International Debate Education Association.
- Patel, M., & Jain, P, M. 2008. *Language Teaching: Methods, Tools & Technique*. Jaipur: Sunrise Publishing.
- Rieke, R. D, Sillars, M. O., et al. 2005. *Argumentation and Critical Decision Making*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Rosidi, I. 2008. *Improving the Students' Speaking Competence through Debate (Thesis S-2)*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.
- Thornbury, S. 2008. *How to Teach Speaking*. London: Longman Universitas Indonesia. *EJVED Debater's Guidelines*. (UI Press). 2008.