Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa dan Sastra, **Vol. 10, No. 4, 2024**

The Effectiveness Of English Debate In Enhancing Eleventh Grade Of Students' Speaking Skills

Hilma Safitri[1]
Lisahnes Suntari[2]
[12]Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia

[1]dosen00609@unpam.ac.id
[2] lisahnessuntaril123@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of English debate on the speaking skills of eleventh-grade students at SMA Yadika 10 Kosambi, Tangerang Regency. By employing a pre-experimental design with pre- and post-tests, the study utilized a quantitative approach to analyze data collected from student actions, verbal expressions, and supplementary written documents, pictures, or statistical data. The study's theoretical framework was grounded in Sibuea's (2021) theory of debate, which posits that engaging in debate fosters critical thinking, communication, and language development. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS 20. Descriptive statistical analysis revealed a substantial improvement in students' speaking skills. The average pre-test score was 1.18 (standard deviation 0.39), while the average post-test score was 2.32 (standard deviation 0.55). This significant increase suggested that the debate intervention positively affected students' speaking skills. Further analysis revealed a positive correlation ($r = 0.425$) between pre-test and post-test scores, indicating that the observed improvement was directly attributable to the intervention. A paired samples t-test confirmed this finding, revealing a mean difference of -1.14 with a t-statistic of -23.897 ($p < 0.001$). This highly significant difference strongly supported the conclusion that the debate method significantly enhanced students' speaking skills in terms of grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation. These improvements were evident in the post-test scores, demonstrating the effectiveness of English debate in fostering holistic speaking development.

Keywords*: Debate, Effectiveness, English, Speaking Skills*

Introduction

English is the most influential foreign language in the world and is often referred to as an international language. It is considered very important by society for several reasons. One reason is its role in various social and cultural aspects, including politics, business, media, and education, where dependence on English is common. As a result, English has become the language of global communication, leading to a growing need to learn it for easier communication. In Indonesia, English is a foreign language that many people are interested in mastering due to its promising prospects in the international community. Recognizing its importance, English is widely taught from elementary school through college, and many institutions offer English courses.

There are four skills in learning English, namely listening, writing, reading, and speaking which are taught in school. Speaking is one of the skills taught. In speaking the students are required to have five aspects such as grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation (Safitri et al., 2020) (Apriliani et al., 2021). Similarly, Suadi (2019) adds word choice, self-confidents and creativity are other aspects. While Nur. M et al., (2021) says that motivation was one of the aspects. However, not all the students

studying English particularly the speaking skills. Some problems were found regarding to the students' speaking skills.

Anita et al., (2023) mention the problem such they students had difficulties to use some words in appropriate way in in order to construct sentences when speaking English. Similarly, Soreh et al., (2022) found that the students were not able to construct sentences, therefore, they felt shy and. Meanwhile according to Faizah & Fitria, (2021) the students had difficulties to use some aspects of speaking such as pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary.

Motivation may one of some factors (Maulana & Lolita, 2023). Take an example of the students leaning English at SMA Yadika 10 Kosambi, Tangerang Regency during school observations. Based on initial interview conducted with few teachers in grade 11 to gather accurate information, it was found that many students faced difficulties in learning English for several reasons such as (1) lack of interest or motivation, which makes them reluctant to study, (2) limited vocabulary and the use of traditional teaching methods in class, (3) limited opportunities to practice speaking English outside the classroom because most of their peers speak Indonesian. Hence, the writers were interested to conducted some researches regarding to improve the student's ability in speaking by using debate.

Debate can be defined ad organization activity included conversation and discussion in order to discuss a topic in such detail (Elisabeth et al., n.d.), to consider a problem and to present opposite ideas (Afri et al., 2021). Debate can be defined as the simulation of issue proposed by teams in per se regarding their opinion (Apriliani et al., 2021).

Debating is usually organized according to certain rules and has a clearly defined structure. Debate techniques can make an active learning process. The students will learn more through the process in debate. Debate is presented as a valuable learning activity for teaching critical thinking and improving communication skills. Debating is an effective pedagogical technique because of the level of responsibility for learning and active involvement by all students. Moreover, the importance of debate is that it actively engages students in the real use of language, builds critical thinking skills, broadens horizons on contemporary issues, and improves speaking and listening skills. In debate, a teacher may provide some topics to be discussed. A few students will present their opinions and facts concerning the topics. At the end the students may response toward the student's questions and comments.

The global landscape of debating encompasses a diverse range of formats, including United States Parliamentary, Asian Parliamentary, Australian Parliamentary, and British Parliamentary (BP) (Zahra, 2019). While each style possesses unique characteristics, BP has emerged as the standard format at the university level. This prominence can be attributed, in part, to the decision of the World Universities' Debating Council in 1994 to adopt BP as the official style for all future World Championships (Zahra, 2019). This decision has had a significant impact on the spread of BP, leading to its adoption in countries like Indonesia (RISTEKDIKTI, 2019). British Parliamentary debate, deeply rooted in the traditions of the United Kingdom's Westminster Parliament, adheres to certain conventions of the House of Commons. The debate is structured into two opposing sides: government and opposition, each with opening and closing teams. A total of eight speeches are delivered, with each speaker allotted an equal amount of time (7 minutes and 20 seconds). Each speaker fulfils a distinct role within the debate, contributing to the overall argumentation and strategy of their respective side. Opponents have the opportunity to interrupt speeches with Points

of Information (POIs) between the first and sixth minutes of a speech, signalled by a single clap. These interruptions allow for clarification, challenges to arguments, and the introduction of new perspectives, contributing to a dynamic and engaging debate.

Opening Government	Opening Opposition
√ The Prime Minister	√ The Leader of Opposition
√ The Deputy Prime Mini Whipster	√ The Deputy Leader of Opposition

Closing Government	Closing Opposition
√ The Government Member	√ Opposition Member
√ The Government Whip	√ Opposition Whip

Figure 1. British Parliamentary Format

There were some related studies regarding to improve the students' speaking skills by using debate. The first study was conducted by Pane et al., (2021) with a title *Effectiveness of Active Debate Method in English Speaking Skills of Students in SMAN 3 Padangsidimpuan.* This study investigated the effectiveness of the debate method in enhancing students' English-speaking skills. Specifically, it aimed to: 1) determine the effectiveness of the debate method in improving speaking skills, and 2) compare the speaking skills of students who participated in debate-based learning with those who did not. Data were collected using pre- and post-tests and analyzed quantitatively. The results revealed a significant difference in speaking skills between the experimental group (receiving debate-based learning) and the control group (receiving traditional speaking instruction). This difference was indicated by a post-test t-test, where the calculated t-value (2.882) exceeded the critical t-value (1.994) at the 5% significance level with 70 degrees of freedom. These findings suggest that incorporating the active debate method into English language instruction significantly improves students' speaking skills.

The second study was conducted by Afri et al., (2021) with a title *Enhancing Students' Speaking Skills through Debate Techniques.* The aim of the research was to impro students speaking skill by using debate. It was conducted by using class room action research with two cycles in which each cycle consists of steps such as planning, action, observing and reflection. The results indicated that the use of debate had improved the students' speaking skills since the final score consisted of in cycle one 71% passed, and 29% failed; 92% and 8% failed in cycle two. Hence, the significance laid in cycle 1 and cycle 2 was 21%. This indicated that debate may improve the students' speaking skills.

The last study was conducted by Widiawati et al., (2020). The study aimed to investigate the significant effects of a debate technique on students' competencies. This quasi-experimental research involved 70 students who were randomly assigned from two social science classes, one serving as the experimental group and the other as the control group. Tests were administered using established rubrics, and the data were analyzed through both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. The results indicated that the mean score of the experimental group was 79.79, compared to a mean

score of 75.25 for the control group. Furthermore, the results of the t-test revealed a significance value (Sig. 2-tailed) of .000, indicating a statistically significant difference in mean scores between the two groups.

As seen on the three related studies mentioned before that there some similarities which lay on the technique used namely debate and the method used were quantitative ones. Some differences were on the subject, the finding and the methodology implemented. The first and the last related studies adopted quasi experimental methods. However, the second related study adopted an action research methodology. The findings of the three related studies show differences in term of their results. This indicates that not all studies may have similar findings.

In regard to the issue mentioned before, the writers decided to carry out a study entitled *The Effectiveness of English Debate in Enhancing Eleventh-Grade of Students' Speaking Skills at SMA Yadika 10 Kosambi.* It is hoped that the students' speaking skills improve after implementing of debate technique. Hence, the research question is as the following:

Is English debate effective to teach students of grade eleventh the speaking skills at SMA Yadika 10 Kosambi by using English debate?

Method

The method used in this study was the quantitative method. The process of measurement is central to quantitative research because it provides the fundamental connection between empirical observations and the mathematical expression of quantitative relationships. The quantitative view is described as 'realist' or positivist. that is, truth is out there, and it is the job of the writer to use law-like logic in an objective way to uncover the truth (Hamied, 2017). The writer collected the data by conducting pre-test and post-test. The form of the pre-test and post-test was in terms of oral test taken for about 90 minutes in a classroom. The data quantitative collected were analyzed by using SPPS 20 and reexplained by implementing descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics is an initial exploration of quantitative data that helps us obtain a summary of the data by organizing data, calculating the central tendency (i.e. mean median and mode), dispersion (i.e. standard deviation), and percentile rank (Hamied, 2017).

In regard to the population in this research, there were 27 students of eleventh grade SMA 10 Yadika Kosambi seniors high school at Jalan Raya Salemba no. 26 Cengklong, Kec Kosambi, Kab Tangerang, Prov Banten, Indonesia in the academic year 2022/2023 enrolled during the implementation of debate during learning sessions.

The procedure of debate in per se is at the following:

1. Material Distribution: The instructor provided relevant materials aligned with the day's lesson plan.
2. Group Formation: Students were divided into groups, from which debate teams were formed. Each team consisted of four students, representing the affirmative and opposition sides.
3. Motion Introduction: A distinct motion was presented for debate in each session.
    - Session 1: *Indonesia Threatens to Shut Down Facebook if Privacy Breached*
    - Session 2: *Internet*
4. Judgement Guidelines: The instructor provided clear instructions to the judges

on maintaining objectivity during the debate evaluation.

5. Preparation Time: The timekeeper allotted three minutes for each team to confer and prepare their rebuttals.
6. Debate Commencement: The chairperson initiated the debate, allowing each team member 1-3 minutes to present their arguments. Equal participation from both members was enforced.

Results

The followings data show the students' overall scores in the pre-test such as in the areas of grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation which can be seen as mean.

Grammar

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics of Grammar in the Pre-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Grammar	24	1	1	2	1.08	0.282
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 1 above shows the pre-test grammar scores of 24 respondents ranged from 1 to 2, with a mean of 1.08 and a standard deviation of 0.282. No missing values were present in the data, allowing for a complete analysis of all 24 participants. These descriptive statistics provide insights into the distribution, variation, and consistency of grammar scores among the participants in the pre-test.

Vocabulary

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics of Vocabulary in the Pre-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Vocabulary	24	1	1	2	1.25	0.442
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 2 above shows that the pre-test vocabulary scores of 24 respondents ranged from 1 to 2, with a mean of 1.25 and a standard deviation of 0.442. No missing data points were present, allowing for a complete analysis of all 24 participants. These descriptive statistics provide insights into the distribution, variation, and consistency of vocabulary scores among the participants in the pre-test.

Comprehension

Table 3 *Descriptive Statistics of Comprehension in the Pre-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Comprehension	24	1	1	2	1.33	0.482
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 3 above indicates that the pre-test comprehension scores of 24 respondents ranged from 1 to 2, with a mean score of approximately 1.33 and a standard deviation of 0.482. All 24 participants had valid scores, indicating that there were no missing data points in this analysis. These descriptive statistics provide insights into the distribution, variation, and consistency of comprehension scores among the respondents in the pre-test.

Fluency

Table 4. *Descriptive Statistics of Fluency in the Pre-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Fluency	24	1	1	2	1.13	0.338
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 4 above informs that there were 24 respondents involved in the measurement of fluency in the pre-test. The range of fluency scores was from 1 to 2, with a minimum score of 1 and a maximum score of 2. The mean of the respondents' fluency scores was approximately 1.13, with a standard deviation of 0.338. The valid N (listwise) values that could be analyzed were 24, indicating that there were no missing values in this analysis. It provides an idea of the distribution of students' speaking fluency scores in the pre-test, as well as the degree of variation and consistency among the scores.

Pronunciation

Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics of Pronunciation in the Pre-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Pronunciation	24	1	1	2	1.13	0.338
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 5 above indicates that the pre-test pronunciation scores of 24 respondents ranged from 1 to 2, with a mean of 1.13 and a standard

deviation of 0.338. No missing data points were present, allowing for a complete analysis of all 24 participants. These descriptive statistics provide insights into the distribution, variation, and consistency of pronunciation scores among the participants in the pre-test.

The following data presents the mean scores of students in the post-test for grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation.

Grammar

Table 6. *Descriptive Statistics of Grammar in the Post-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Grammar	24	2	2	4	2.21	0.509
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 6 above provides an overview that indicate the post-test grammar scores of 24 students ranged from 2 to 4, with a mean score of approximately 2.21 and a standard deviation of 0.509. All participants provided valid scores, indicating no missing data points. These descriptive statistics provide insights into the distribution, variation, and consistency of grammar scores among respondents in the post-test. This analysis allows for a deeper understanding of the students' overall grammar knowledge following the assessment.

Vocabulary

Table 7. *Descriptive Statistics of Vocabulary in the Post-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Vocabulary	24	2	2	4	2.46	0.588
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 7 presents information that indicate the post-test vocabulary scores of 24 students ranged from 2 to 4, with a mean score of approximately 2.46 and a standard deviation of 0.588. No missing data points were present, allowing for a complete analysis of all 24 participants. These descriptive statistics provide insights into the distribution, variation, and consistency of vocabulary scores among the respondents in the post-test. This analysis allows for a deeper understanding of the students' overall vocabulary knowledge following the assessment.

Comprehension

Table 8. *Descriptive Statistics of Comprehension in the Post-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Comprehension	24	2	2	4	2.46	0.588
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 8 presents information about the post-test comprehension scores of 24 students ranged from 2 to 4, with a mean score of 2.46 and a standard deviation of 0.588. No missing data points were present, allowing for a complete analysis of all participants. These descriptive statistics provide insights into the distribution, variation, and consistency of comprehension scores among the respondents in the post-test. This analysis allows for a deeper understanding of the students' overall comprehension following the assessment.

Fluency

Table 9. *Descriptive Statistics of Fluency in the Post-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Fluency	24	2	2	4	2.29	0.550
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 9 above provides information about the descriptive statistics table presents the results of the fluency assessment in the post-test for 24 students. The fluency scores ranged from 2 to 4, with a mean score of 2.29 and a standard deviation of 0.550. With a valid N (listwise) of 24, there were no missing values in this analysis, ensuring that all available data were included in the statistical calculations. These statistics provide an overview of the distribution of students' speaking fluency scores in the post-test, as well as the degree of variation and consistency among the scores. Therefore, it provides a more in-depth understanding of students' overall pronunciation after taking the test.

Pronunciation

Table 10. *Descriptive Statistics of Pronunciation in the Post-test*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Pronunciation	24	2	2	4	2.21	0.509
Valid N (listwise)	24					

The descriptive statistics table 10 presents the results of the pronunciation assessment in the post-test for 24 students. The pronunciation scores ranged from 2 to 4, with a mean score of approximately 2.21 and a standard deviation of 0.509. With a valid N (listwise) of 24, there were no missing values, ensuring that all available data were included in the statistical calculations. This provides an overview of the distribution of students' pronunciation scores in the post-test, along with the degree of variation and consistency among the scores. Consequently, this analysis offers a deeper understanding of students' overall pronunciation abilities following the assessment.

Furthermore, the preceding tables summarize the mean scores and standard deviations of students' pre-test and post-test results. This information is organized in tabular format for clarity and ease of interpretation. The tables illustrate both the average scores and the level of variation or dispersion among students' scores before and after the intervention. Such data is crucial for evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional methods applied during the learning process. By examining the differences between pre-test and post-test scores, the reader can assess the extent of progress made by students in various evaluated aspects. The tables facilitate a more comprehensive and objective analysis of the research findings. Now see the table below:

Table 11. The Mean Scores and Standar of the Pre-test and Post-test

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Devition
Pre-test	120	1.00	2.00	1.1833	0.38856
Post-test	120	2.00	4.00	2.3250	0.55250
Valid N (likewise)	120				

Table 11 presents descriptive statistics for the pre-test and post-test scores of 24 students, each assessed in five language skills (grammar, vocabulary, etc.). A total of 120 data points were analyzed for both pre-test and post-test scores. The pre-test scores ranged from 1.00 to 2.00, with a mean of 1.1833 and a standard deviation of 0.38856. This indicates the average pre-test score and the degree of variation among students' scores. The post-test scores ranged from 2.00 to 4.00, with a mean of 2.3250 and a standard deviation of 0.55250. This indicates an increase in scores from the pre-test to the post-test, although variations in scores persisted among students. No missing data points were present in the analysis, ensuring a complete dataset of 120 valid data points. The table 10 above provides a clear overview of the changes in scores between the pre-test and post-test across various aspects of students' language abilities.

Table 12. *Paired Samples Correlations of the Pre-test and Post-test*

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Significance
Pair 1	Pre-test & Post-test	120	0.425	<, 001

Based on table 12 above it can be seen that paired samples correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between pre-test and post-test scores of 24 students across five assessed language skills. The analysis involved 120 pairs of data, revealing a correlation coefficient of approximately 0.425 between pre-test and post-test scores. This positive correlation indicates a direct relationship between the two sets

of scores: higher pre-test scores tend to correspond with higher post-test scores, and vice versa.

The significance value of less than 0.001 suggests a highly statistically significant correlation. This finding implies that the observed relationship between pre-test and post-test scores is unlikely to be due to chance. It suggests that the intervention or treatment implemented during the study period may have contributed to the changes in student performance. Therefore, these results from the paired correlation analysis provide further evidence supporting the existence of significant changes between students' pre-test and post-test scores. The results also confirm the appropriateness of the test results in relation to the intervention or treatment provided.

Table 13. *Paired Samples of the Pre-test and Post-test*

Paired Samples Test

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of		t	df	Significance
Pair 1	Pre-test Post-test	-1.14167	0.52334	0.04777	-1.23626	-1.04707	-23.897	119	<, 001

The analysis of paired samples, as presented in table 13, reveals the differences between pre-test and post-test scores for 24 students across five assessed lessons. The calculated mean difference between the pre-test and post-test scores was approximately -1.14167, indicating that, on average, post-test scores were higher than pre-test scores. Additionally, the standard deviation of the score differences was about 0.52334, which reflected the variability of the score differences among the students. The standard error of the mean was approximately 0.04777.

The 95% confidence interval for the score difference ranged from -1.23626 to -1.04707. This interval suggests a statistically significant decrease in scores from the pre-test to the post-test. The t-statistic is -23.897, which quantifies the deviation of the mean difference from zero in terms of standard deviation units. With 119 degrees of freedom and a significance level of less than 0.001, these results indicate that the difference between pre-test and post-test scores were highly statistically significant.

Consequently, the outcomes of this paired samples test provide robust evidence that the intervention or treatment administered to the students significantly influenced the changes observed in their scores from pre-test to post-test.

Discussion

The analysis of pre-test and post-test results revealed a significant improvement in post-test scores compared to pre-test scores. The average post-test scores were markedly higher than the average pre-test scores, indicating that participation in the English debate program positively influenced students' speaking skills. Nonetheless, several issues warrant consideration:

1. Low Initial Performance: The relatively low average pre-test scores suggest that many students exhibited limited speaking skills prior to their involvement in the English debate program. This finding underscores the critical need for interventions aimed at enhancing students' speaking capabilities before the initiation of the debate activities.

2. Variation Among Students: Despite the overall improvement in post-test scores, the high standard deviation observed in both pre-test and post-test scores indicates considerable variability in students' progress. This variability suggests that individual responses to the English debate activities differ significantly; therefore, some students may require tailored approaches or additional support to achieve considerable improvement in their speaking skills.
3. Sustainability of Improvement: It remains essential to ascertain whether the enhancements in speaking skills evident in the post-test endure over an extended period. Further research is required to evaluate the long-term impact of the English debate activities on students' speaking abilities.

Therefore, while there has been a significant enhancement in students' speaking skills following their participation in the English debate activities, several issues still need to be addressed to maximize the activities' effectiveness. This indicates a necessity for further research and targeted program development to achieve optimal outcomes. In general, it can be said that debate is effective in improving students' speaking skills in term of grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency and pronunciation.

Conclusion

The findings of this study demonstrate a significant improvement in students' speaking ability following the implementation of the intervention. This conclusion is based on a comprehensive analysis of pre-test and post-test data, which revealed a notable increase in students' scores across all assessed aspects of speaking: grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation.

Descriptive statistical analysis revealed a substantial difference between the average pre-test score (1.18) and the average post-test score (2.33), indicating a marked improvement in students' overall speaking proficiency. Furthermore, the positive correlation between pre-test and post-test scores (0.425) suggests a significant relationship between initial ability and final outcome, implying that the observed improvement was not a result of chance but rather a direct consequence of the intervention.

The paired samples t-test analysis further reinforces this conclusion. The statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores (mean difference = -1.14, t-statistic = -23.897, $p < 0.001$) provides strong evidence that the implemented learning method effectively enhanced students' speaking abilities in a measurable and meaningful way.

References

Afri, E., Marpaung, E. E., & Maulina, I. (2021). *Enhancing Students ' Speaking Skills through Debate Techniques Research Methodology*. *2*, 141–146.

Anita, Sa'diah, S., Kheryadi, Hasuna, Ahmadi, Y., & Razali, K. (2023). *Students ' Speaking Practice : Problems and Solutions*. *13*(2), 1456–1463.

Apriliani, E., Harmayanthi, V. Y., & Fitriani, D. (2021). *A Use of Debate Technique to Improve Speaking Skill*. 98–106.

Elisabeth, M., Timbu, I., Bhoko, M. L., & Keli, E. W. (n.d.). *Improving Students Speaking Skills Through Debate Strategy*. *X*(1). https://doi.org/10.33479/klausa.v6i2.625

Faizah, C., & Fitria, N. (2021). *An Exploration on Students ' Problems in Speaking English at the English Department of Serambi Mekkah Banda Aceh*. *9*(7), 1205–1214.

Maulana, I., & Lolita, Y. (2023). *The Effectiveness of Role- Play To Improve Student ' s*

Speaking Achievement. *3*(2), 122–135.

Nur. M, S., Syam, U. K. S., & Muhsin, M. A. (2021). Improving Students Speaking Skills through Retelling Story by Using Pitcure Series. *Jurnal Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan (JKIP)*, *8*(2), 142–155.

Pane, K. J. br, Rangkuti, R., & Yusuf, M. (2021). *The Impoliteness Strategies of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Twitter*. *2*(2), 24–37.

Safitri, H., Rafli, Z., & Dewanti, R. (2020). International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding Improving Student s ' Speaking Skil ls through Task-Based Learning : An Action Research at the English Departmen. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, *7*(6), 88–99.

Soreh, R., Pelenkahu, N., & Muntuuntu, M. (2022). Problems Encountered by the Students' in Speaking English at Twelveth Grade of SMAN 2 Gemeh. *JoTELL Journal of Teaching English, Linguistics, and Literature*, *1*(5), 576–587.

Suadi. (2019). Improving Students ' English Speaking Skill By Using Their Speaking Video Recording. *SALEE*, *1*(1), 1–10.

Widiawati, P. S., Ratminingsih, N. M., Ayu, D., & Agustini, E. (2020). *The Effect of Debate Technique towards Eleventh Grade Students ' Speaking Competency*. *4*(3), 242–246.