



---

**THE INFLUENCE OF DEBATE TECHNIQUE, AND STUDENTS' CRITICAL THINKING TOWARDS THEIR SPEAKING ABILITY**

**Djena Ali<sup>1</sup> Threesje Roza Souisa<sup>2</sup>**

English Teacher at SMA N 11 Ambon<sup>1</sup>

English Language Education Study Program of FKIP Pattimura University<sup>2</sup>

email: [djena@yahoo.co.id](mailto:djena@yahoo.co.id)

---

**ARTICLE INFO**

***Article History:***

Accepted 19 Februari 2019

Available Online 20 April 2019

---

***Keywords:***

*Debate Technique, Critical Thinking, Speaking Ability*

---

**ABSTRACT**

This study is aimed at a) describing the students speaking ability and their critical thinking level, b) finding out the significant influence of speaking ability between the students who are taught with debate technique and those who are taught with group discussion technique, c) finding out the significant differences in speaking ability between the students who have high critical thinking and those who have low critical thinking, and d) finding out the significant interaction in speaking ability between teaching techniques and critical thinking skill. The quasi-experiment method under a quantitative approach was used to conduct the study. The design of the study is 2x2 with pre-post-test control group design. In analyzing the data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. The results show that the students' speaking ability is in the high level, whereas in critical thinking skill there were 48 students who can be categorized as having high critical thinking and 32 students who have low critical thinking. The students who are taught by using debate technique have better achievement in speaking ability than those who are taught with discussion technique. There is a positive

---

---

and significant influence on students speaking ability between the students who are taught by debate technique with those who are taught with discussion technique. There is a positive and significant difference in speaking ability between the students who have high critical thinking and those who have low critical thinking. There is a positive and significant interaction of speaking ability between the teaching techniques and critical thinking.

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

According to Brown (2004: 140) speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving processing information'. It can be implied when students like to express their ideas about something; they have to process the information so they are able to make meaning depending on their own context of thinking. As stated by Lipman (1988; 39) critical thinking is "skillful, responsible thinking that facilitates good judgment because it 1) relies upon criteria, 2) is self-correcting, and 3) is sensitive to context". Furthermore, in delivering a speech with thoughtful thinking, people have to analyze the issues and use reasoning or they have to be rational with their ideas. Empowering students' critical thinking when they deliver their ideas in the form of speech or debate is needed for EFL senior high school students.

The result of the preliminary study conducted by testing the students 'speaking ability showed that the students have the average speaking ability and they need to empower their critical thinking skills. It can be denied that even the students still have problems in lack of pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy, but they have good knowledge and comprehension and less to hardly think critically. As a result, their speaking proficiency in communication did not develop. In fact, the students were not used to think critically about the issue. In arguing or debating an issue, they did not provide evidence and couldn't give good reasons. Meanwhile, from their attitude, it is found that most students still lack confidence in delivering their arguments. Students seem to underestimate the conversations during the class discussion. In order to develop good communication, students should pay a lot of attention to what they want to say, think for a moment to help them manage their argument because the quality of students' communication is very dependable their responses to the information that they received. In other words, if the students were not provided with appropriate skills and strategies and as arguing appropriate criticizing and judging. From the interview, it was reported that the teachers realized that the technique she used less to encourage the students to be effective thinkers in developing their critical thinking skills.

To minimize and solve the problems, the researchers proposed the debate technique which assumes that brings the significant influence on students'

communication and critical thinking skills. Nisbett (2003:210) states, "Debate is an important educational tool for learning analytic thinking skills and for forcing self-conscious reflection on the validity of one's ideas." Using debate in speaking classroom activities can stimulate students to be active in delivering and arguing an argument. Tumposky (2004) in Darby (2007) also mentioned that debate can ultimately compromise and distort the process of learning; students can work to be effective in influencing the thinking of others at the expense of being accurate. Both of them also added that classroom debate is an approach which involves learners in the learning process, give them the chance to express themselves, develop the higher order thinking, prevent rote memorization and misunderstanding, motivate the learners, and assist them to stay away from prejudice, and make informed decisions and judgments based on valid sources of data. In this case, it is an active process in which students can learn more through a process of constructing and creating, working in a group to share their knowledge.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

Quasi-experimental was applied to conduct the study. Tuckman (1999) stated that "quasi-experimental designs are partly, but not fully true experimental designs meaning that they control some but not all sources of internal invalidity".

The design of this study was non-equivalent control group design in which the intact group is used rather than random assignment group (Tuckman, 1999). In other words, the use of the intact group is used to prevent or to control the problem of selection bias in this design. This study was designed to find out the influence of debate technique and critical thinking towards students speaking ability. The study is conducted in two classes in which the students in the experimental class will be treated by using debate technique meanwhile the students in the control group will be taught by using group discussion. The design of this study used the 2x2 factorial design for pretest-posttest non-equivalent control group design in order to represent an independent variable (debate technique) and the two level of moderator variable (critical thinking).

The instrument of critical thinking for pre and post-test is written in Bahasa Indonesia. The pre-test is done with aimed at finding out the students' ability in critical thinking before they are treated with the debate technique and post-test is conducted to measure the improvement of their critical thinking after they have been taught with debate technique. To measure the students' critical thinking, the written test is applied with aimed at helping the students to have a deep understanding about the topic, therefore, they will explore it deeply when they answer the questions into Bahasa Indonesia. In assessing the students' critical thinking, six components such as analysis, critique, evaluation, generatively, precision, and synthesis are provided. The rubric is adopted from Matthews (1997).

To measure the students' speaking test, an oral test is done by providing several topics for the students and they presented their ideas based on the topic they have it. The students took the pre and post-test individually and assessed their test by three

raters. In presenting their ideas, they have 3-5 minutes and they can answer or share the ideas with the given guided question provided by the researcher. In assessing the students' speaking skill, the scoring rubric is developed by Uswatun Hasanah (2015) and is adapted from Harry's Theory (1974) which consists of 5 components. This rubric consists of 5 elements such as; pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. T-test with factorial design 2x2 was applied in analyzing the data.

## **RESEARCH FINDINGS**

### **The Description of Students' Critical Thinking**

In measuring the students' critical thinking, it is done through written test which the students have to answer it. The test is conducted after the students have been treat with the debate technique in the process of speaking classroom activities. The purpose of this test is to measure the improvement of the students' critical thinking. The essay test is consists of 5 questions and assessed through Matthew's critical thinking scoring rubric, (1997) with the scale starts at 1 to 6 point. It is conducted for the students consist of 80 students then it continued to analyze the result by using descriptive statistics. The result of analyzing the critical thinking test can be seen in the following table.

**Table 1. Students' Critical Thinking Profile**

<b>Elemen</b>	<b>Description Post-Test of Critical thinking in both of</b>
N	
Mean	23.15
Median	24.00
Std. Dev	6.23
Variance	38.83
Range	26.00
Min	8.00
Max	34.00
Average	23.15

From the table, it shows that the average score of students' critical thinking is. 23.15 Whereas the highest score is 34.00. Then the lowest score is 8.00. The range of the score is 26.00, the deviation standard is 6.23, the variant is 8.83 and the median is 24.00.

### **Description Pre Test of Speaking Skill**

In pre-test of speaking skill, the data is gained through the oral test in which the students have to deliver their ideas based on the given topic. In delivering their ideas they are guided by several questions provided by the researcher. Before the instrument of speaking skill is used to gain the data, the validity and reliable of this instruments have already tested in the tryout phase. After obtaining the data then it

continued with analyzing step with descriptive statistics. The result of the Pre-test of speaking skill can be presented in table 2a bellows

**Table.2a.** The Pre-Test of Speaking skill in Experiment and Control Group

Elements	Teaching Strategy	
	Control Group (Group Discussion) (XI-MIA 2)	Experimental Group (Debate) (XI-MIA 4)
	40	40
Mean	12.32	12.57
Median	12.83	12.33
Std. Dev	2.82	3.05
Variance	7.96	9.30
Range	10.67	11
Min	8.00	8.00
Max	18.67	19.00
Average	12.33	12.57
Total score	13.96	14.20

Based on the data above, it presents that the mean score for pre-test of speaking skill in the control group is 12.32 while in the experimental group is 12.57. The median score in the control group is placed in the score 12.83 whereas in the experimental group is 12.33. The variant score of the pre-test for the control group who are taught with group discussion is 7.96 with deviation standard is 2.82 and an experimental group who are taught with debate technique, the variants score is 9.30 with deviation standard is 3.05. From the result of the descriptive analysis, it also shows that the upper score in control group is 18.67 and the lower score is 8, therefore, the range is 10.67, meanwhile, in the experiment group the upper score is 19.00 and the lower score is 8, so the range score is 11. Meanwhile, the results of pre-test of speaking skill from both groups can be presented in the following tables and graphs.

**Table 2b.** The result of Pre-test of speaking skill

Elements	Description Pre-Test of Speaking in both of Group
N	80
Mean	12.45
Median	12.50
Std. Dev.	2.92
Variance	8.53
Range	11
Min	8
Max	19
Average	12.45

The tables above show that the mean score of speaking ability from both groups is 12.45, the median 12.5. The variant score for both groups is 8.53 with deviation

standard is 2.92. The maximal score is 19 and the minimum score is 8 so that the range of score for both groups is 11.

**Description Post- Test of Speaking Skill**

The post-test of speaking skill is gained from the oral speaking test after the students have been treated through Debate teaching technique and group discussion. The datum can be grouped based on the result of their speaking skill and the students' critical thinking then it analyzed through descriptive statistic. The results can be shown in the following table 3.

Table 3a. The Result of Descriptive Analysis of Post-Test

Elements	Teaching Strategy	
	Control Group (Group Discussion) (XI-MIA 2)	Experimental Group (Debate) (XI-MIA 4)
	40	40
Mean	13.10	13.24
Median	13.67	13.00
Std. Dev	3.02	3.16
Variance	9.16	9.96
Range	11.33	11.00
Min	8	8.33
Max	19.33	19.33
Average	13.11	13.24
Total score	14.52	14.58

The table above reports that the mean score for post-test of speaking skill in the control group is 13.10 while in the experimental group is 13.24. The median score in the control group is placed in the score 13.67 whereas in the experimental group is 13.00. Variants score of post-test for the control group who are taught with group discussion is 9.16 with deviation standard is 3.02 and the experimental group who are taught with debate technique, the variants score is 9.96 with deviation standard is 3.16. From the result of the descriptive analysis, it also shows that the upper score in control group is 19.33 and the lower score is 8, therefore, the range is 11.33, meanwhile, in the experiment group the upper score is 19.33 and the lower score is 8.33 so the range score is 11.00. The following tables presented the summary results of post-test in speaking skill which is classified into high and low critical thinking.

Table 3b. The summary of students' post-test in speaking skill and critical thinking skill

CT Technique	Level	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Debate technique	High	15.1592	2.05521	25
	Low	10.0440	1.72341	15
	Total	13.2410	3.15519	40
Group Discussion technique	High	15.2748	1.60289	23
		10.1765	1.70762	17

	Low	13.1080	3.02663	40
Total	High	15.2146	1.83382	48
	Low	10.1144	1.68845	32
	Total	13.1745	3.07268	80

From the table above, it can be explained in detail about the result of students' speaking ability in the post, and their critical thinking in the following paragraphs.

**The Result of Students' Speaking Ability from the Students Who are Taught in Debate Technique and Group Discussion.**

The subject of the experimental group is 40 students and the control group is 40 students too. So the total subjects of this study are 80 students. Based on the result of descriptive statistics, it is shown that the mean score of speaking ability for both groups is 13.75, the median score is 13.33. The variant score of both groups is 8.44 with deviation standard is 3.07. The maximum score is 19.33 whereas the minimum score is 8.00 so that the range score for both groups is 11.33. The profile of the students' result of post-test can be presented in the following graphic.

The Table 3c. The Students' Post-test of Experimental and Control Group  
**Description Post-Test speaking based on the use of strategy in both of Group**

	80
Mean	13.75
Median	13.33
Std. Dev	3.07
Variance	8.44
Range	11.33
Min	8.00
Max	19.33
Average	13.17

The next step is finding the interval class of speaking ability. For this purpose, to count the score and interval class modified methods of grading in Summative Evaluation from Bloom, Taxonomy elaborated with Harry' speaking assessment is adapted. The highest score is 19 while the lowest score is 8. The score that has much frequency goes to the interval class 14 – 16 with the total students is 29 students or it is about 36. 25 %. Then it continued to interval class 11- 13 with 24 students or it is about 30 %. The interval class 8 – 10 with 18 students or it is about 22.5 %, and last, interval class 17 -19 with 9 students or it is about 11.25 %.

**The Result of Students' Critical Thinking from Experimental and Control Group.**

From the result of analysis of students' critical thinking test, it is reported that the students who have high critical thinking consist of 48 students and the students



who have low critical thinking consist of 32 students. After obtaining the data, then it is analyzed using descriptive statistics. The summary of it can be shown in the following table.

Table 4. The profile of students' critical thinking

Elements	Level of CT in both of Group	
	High	Low
N	48	32
Mean	16.28	6.88
Median	27	18
Std. Dev	2.89	5.01
Variance	8.35	25.10
Range	11	14
Min	23.00	8
Max	34	22
Average	27.13	17.19

The data above shows that the mean score of the students who have high critical thinking is 16.28 with deviation standard is 2.89, meanwhile, the mean score of the students who have low critical thinking is 6.88 with deviation standard is 5.01. The highest score is 34 for the students who have high critical thinking and the lowest score is 23, therefore, the range score is 11. The maximum score of the students who have low critical thinking is 22 and the minimum score is 8 so that the range of the score is 14. The next step is finding the interval class of critical thinking skill. Critical thinking skill consists of only two level; high and low level. For category high critical thinking skill, there are 48 students whereas there are 32 students in the low level of critical thinking.

**There Is a Positive and Significant Difference In Speaking Ability Between The Students Who Are Taught With The Students Who Are Taught With Group Discussion Technique**

The following table 5 describes the result of testing hypothesis to answer the first research question in this study. From the table, it is reported that in Pre-test, the mean score of speaking ability of debate technique is 12.5660 while in group discussion is 12.3247. After the students have treated with debate technique as a manipulated variable then the result of post-test shows that the mean score of speaking ability in experiment group is 13.2410 and in control group is 13.1080.

Table 5a. Group Statistics

Technique	N	Mean	Std.	Std. Error
Speaking_pre-test Debate technique	40	12.5660	3.05058	.48234
Group Discussion technique	40	12.3247	2.82147	.44611
Speaking_post-test Debate technique	40	13.2410	3.15519	.49888
Group Discussion technique	40	13.1080	3.02663	.47855



**Table 5b. Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Speaking_Pretest Equal variances assumed	.155	.695	.367	78	.714	.24125	.65701	-1.06676	1.54926
			.367	77.529	.714	.24125	.65701	-1.06689	1.54939
Speaking_Posttest Equal variances assumed	.001	.976	.192	78	.848	.13300	.69130	-1.24327	1.50927
			.192	77.865	.848	.13300	.69130	-1.24331	1.50931

From the table above, it is reported that F count for teaching techniques is 0.01 with the significant value is 0.976 indicated that F count is greater than alpha value 0.05 ( $p > 0.05$ ) means that the data is homogenous. The table also reports that the t- the test is 0.848 which mean that t-test is greater than t-table ( $p > 0.05$ ). The result shows that there are significant differences in speaking ability between the students who are taught with debate technique than those who are taught with group discussion. The mean score of speaking ability in experiment group is 13.2410 whereas in control group is 13.1080. This finding implied that the students who are taught with debate technique have better speaking ability than those who are taught with group discussion even it has a little bit differences speaking ability between both groups.

**There Is a Positive And Significant Difference In Speaking Ability Between The Students Who Have High Critical Thinking And Those Who Have Low Critical Thinking**

The table bellows show that the amount of students is 80 students which consist of 48 high critical thinking skill and 32 students have low critical thinking. The mean score of students who have high critical thinking is 15. 2146 while the mean score of the students who low critical thinking is 10.1144. The results can be seen in table 6a.

**Table 6a. Group Statistics**

CT Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Speaking Postest High	48	15.2146	1.83382	.26469
	32	10.1144	1.68845	.29848

The table 6a reports that the significant value of the t-test is 0.000 with the means that the t-test is less than t-table. Thus, the results show that there are significant differences in speaking ability between the students who have high critical thinking and those who have low critical thinking.

**There Is a Positive And Significant Interaction In Speaking Ability Between The Students Who Are Taught With Debate Technique And Their Critical Thinking And those Who Are Taught With Group Discussion And Their Critical Thinking.**

To indicate that the independent variables whether have strong and weak coefficient correlation, the guidance of interpretation value of coefficient correlation from Sugyono (2013) is used. The value of R is 0.819 which indicates that the coefficient correlation is very strong. So that it can be concluded that there is very strong interaction influence between the teaching techniques and critical thinking towards speaking ability.

**Tabel.7a. Model Summary**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Speaking Postest	.422	.518	12.573	78	.000	5.10021	.40565	4.29262	5.90780
Equal variances assumed									
Equal variances not assumed			12.785	70.267	.000	5.10021	.39894	4.30461	5.89581

. Predictors: (Constant), CT Level, Technique

**Table 7b. ANOVA**

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	499.731	2	249.866	78.167	.000 <sup>a</sup>
Residual	246.135	77	3.197		
Total	745.867	79			

a. Predictors: (Constant), CT Level, Technique

b. Dependent Variable: Speaking-Post-test

**Table 7c. Coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1(Constant)	20.140	.832		24.200	.000
Technique	.122	.400	.020	.306	.761
CT Level	-5.107	.409	-.819	-12.499	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Speaking-Post-test

Moreover, Table 7b reports that the F test is 78.167 with the value of significant is 0.05 means that the F test is less than F table ( $p < 0.05$ ). The findings concluded the data is not significant in linear regression or in other words the model of regression for the data is not gained regression criteria.

## DISCUSSION

### The Description of Students ‘Speaking Ability

The result of the study shows that students’ speaking ability for the students who taught with debate technique is in high level. The highest score is 19 while the lowest score is 8. The score that has much frequency goes to the interval class 14 – 16 with the total students is 29 students or it is about 36.25 %. Then it continued to interval class 11- 13 with 24 students or it is about 30 %. The interval class 8 – 10 with 18 students or it is about 22.5 %, and last, interval class 17 -19 with 9 students or it is about 11.25 %. The result shows that the second-grade students of SMA Negeri 11 who are in Science program have the high level of speaking ability. As it is written in the theoretical review, the ability of speaking means that the ability to share information, message or ideas for others people. It is one of the communicative competencies that the students have. The students at the school have the high level in oral language skill implied that when they communicate, they can argue or debate

their ideas, information, and messages with logical reasons so that others can reject or accept their ideas, opinions or even simple messages.

In the process of speaking classroom activities, the students are treated to improve their speaking ability by using debate techniques and to assess their speaking ability, the researcher adapt Analytical speaking assessment from Harry & Mc.Can Theory (1994) which consists of The pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

Pronunciation is very important in speaking because if students do not have appropriate pronunciation thereby the meaning of the word will be miss interpreted by the teacher. In other meaning, pronunciation holds the important role for students to manage their language conversation for better communication. Those statements are supported also by Hornby (1995: 928). He states that pronunciation is the way in which a language is spoken, the way in which a word is pronounced, the way a person speaks the words of a language. So, it will be indicated that students should learn to use the language carefully and try to practice their pronunciation in their real-life situation because "having a good pronunciation of the language can help in normal communication, particularly intelligibility". (Derwing and Munro, 2005).

Furthermore, mastering vocabulary is also the important component as the first step of knowledge in order to speak English. If students do not master vocabulary, they cannot utterance what are their purpose. According to Snow, Griffin, & Burns (2005), students' vocabulary knowledge is a building process that occurs over time as they make connections to other words, learn examples and not- examples of the word and related words, and use the word accurately within the context of the sentence.

Fluency refers to speech that is smooth or flowing. Fluent speech means that sounds are connected in a way that sounds natural and uninterrupted. Richards (2006) stated that 'fluency is natural language use occurring when a speaker engages in meaningful interaction and maintains comprehensible and ongoing communication despite limitations in his or her communicative competence ". He also stated that "Fluency is developed by creating classroom activities in which students must negotiate meaning, use communication strategies, correct misunderstandings and work to avoid communication breakdowns". In speaking, students must speak fluency because listeners are able to response what they say.

The last component is comprehension which stands for a complex process that has been understood and explained in a number of ways. In speaking, comprehension is not misunderstanding will happen between speaker and listener and the communication cannot run well.

### **The Description of Students' Critical Thinking Skill**

The place of students' critical thinking in this study as the moderate variable which means that this variable is not manipulated but it is assumed that this variable has already existed inside the students and has influence for improving the students' speaking ability. Due to students' critical thinking, it is reported that there are 48 students who have high critical thinking and 32 students who have low critical

thinking. In assessing the students' critical thinking, Matthew Ventura et.al (2017)'s Critical thinking assessment is to adapt. The components consist of analyzing, critic, evaluation, generatively, précises and synthesis. 5 questions are provided in the form of Essay test in which the test is written in Indonesia language with the purpose at giving students' more chance to have deep exploring the answer when they think in their first language. It is easier for them to conceptualize their mind than using the English language.

In analyze phase, the students demonstrate critical thinking through well-reasoned and developed methods of breaking down problems, issues, or questions into meaningful parts or segments, beyond simple differentiations relative to form or chronology, beyond the perfunctory and obvious. In critique ideas, the students demonstrate critical thinking through the careful deconstruction of information provided, evidence assembled, arguments made, claims, warrants, or practices performed, beyond simple differentiations or obvious, perfunctory criticisms, toward both identifying weaknesses and strengths. For the evaluation phase, they demonstrate critical thinking through the careful consideration of multiple available critical lenses toward an appreciation/expression of value beyond the perfunctory and the obvious.

Generatively phase, the students demonstrate critical thinking through creating new knowledge or meaning, through anticipating outcomes, implications, and responses, and/or through metacognition based on new understanding, beyond the pedestrian and familiar. Whether in précises phase, the students demonstrate critical thinking through accurate language, inference, reference, articulation, and/or selection of most salient issues and/or in recognition of limits of assertions, theories, findings, or conclusions, beyond received conventions and habits of thinking. For synthesis, the students demonstrate critical thinking through clear evidence of holistic thinking and understanding, meaning making, articulating interrelatedness, considering implications, and/ or metacognition around a otherwise segregated information or data, beyond the students' common knowledge.

### **The Influence of Debate Technique towards Students' Speaking Ability**

The result of testing hypothesis shows that there is a significant difference in students' speaking ability between the students who taught with debate technique and those who taught with group discussion. From the analysis of the data, the mean score of students' speaking ability who are treat with debate technique is 13.24 whereas the mean score of students' speaking ability who treat with group discussion is 13.10. The result indicated that the debate technique is more influence in improving the students' speaking ability than group discussion technique even the result shows the small influence.

This finding supports the previous relevance study which is claimed that debate can be used as the teaching technique in classroom activities. When the students are trained in the debate technique their communication skill is improved. As it is stated by Shumin (2002) that speaking is one central element of communication. It is the interaction between two people or more in getting information where there

are a speaker and listener. By speaking, someone can express his or her feeling, emotion and idea. Moreover, Cameron (2001:40) said that speaking is an active use of language to express meanings so that other people can make sense of them. In speaking someone is required to be able to use the spoken language well that can be understood by other listeners. In this case, a speaker should be able to use the most appropriate words and the correct grammar to convey meaning accurately and precisely. The speaker also needs to organize the content so that a listener will understand. Speaking is the ability to produce, to receive and to process the information. Aungwatanakun (1994) pointed out that in foreign language teaching and learning, the ability to speak is the most essential skill since it is the basis for communication. This is the reason why speaking is one of the important language skills to be mastered in order to communicate with others so they can deliver and receive the information or the message

In debating the ideas or information, the students produce, receive and process the information. They express their ideas, emotion, even feeling when they argue about the topics. They interact with their friends among groups; they train their listening skills and empower their critical thinking skill. They communicate with others so that their communicative competence is improved.

The findings above support the previous relevance study from Rubiati (2010) who conducted the study entitled *Improving Students' Speaking Skill through Debate Technique at English Language Teaching Department Tarbiyah Faculty, IAIN Walisongo Semarang in the Academic Year of 2010/2011*. The findings of her study reported that debate is the appropriate technique used to improve students' speaking skill.

### **The Influence of Students' Critical Thinking towards Students' Speaking Skill**

The result of testing hypothesis shows that the mean score of students who have high critical thinking is 15.21 while the mean score of the students who low critical thinking is 10.11. It is indicated that students' critical thinking have the significant effect in improving the students speaking skill. The students who have high critical thinking skill have better than achievement in their speaking skill than those who have low critical thinking skill.

Due to the theory of critical thinking, Paul and Elder (2006), defines Critical thinking is self-directed, self-disciplined, self-monitored, and self-corrective thinking. Where they refer to process of methodologies that employ reasons and sensibility in order to criticize and evaluate an issue or topic. Quality of reasoning has a big effort to end in thoughtful communication. In other definition, Wohlpert (2007) states that "critical thinking as a mode of thinking where the thinker consciously analyzes an issue or problem, while at the same time assessing the thinking process". Zhang (2003) pointed out that "critical thinking requires both able to think critically and disposition (propensity for thinking critically)".

The findings of this study support the previous relevance study by Sanavi and Tarigat (2014) who conducted the study entitled *"Critical Thinking and Speaking*



Proficiency: A Mixed-method Study of Iranian EFL learners In Tehran, Iran". The study is aimed at finding out the impact of students' attitude towards explicit-critical thinking content. A mixed-method approach was employed in the analysis of the data. In the quantitative analysis, a quasi-experimental method was adopted to investigate the impact of teaching critical thinking skills of the experimental group in comparison with the control group. The results indicated that teaching critical thinking explicitly has a significantly positive impact on the speaking proficiency of female Iranian adult intermediate EFL learners. Through the qualitative approach, the participants' attitudes towards their training in critical thinking were studied during in-depth interviews.

The difference research findings between the previous study by Sanavi and Tariqat with the researcher's findings are; 1) the researcher only use quantitative approach while the previous one use mix approach, 2) the researcher placed critical thinking as moderate variable while the previous one place it as independent variable, 3) the participants of the researcher's study use mix gender while in the previous one just took female participants.

### **The Significant Interaction between Debate Technique and Critical Thinking towards Students' Speaking Ability.**

In testing the last hypothesis of this study, the findings show that there is a very strong interaction between teaching techniques (debate technique vs. group discussion technique) and students' critical thinking towards their speaking ability. It can be shown by the value of the coefficient correlation is 0.819 in the table 4.10.a. Even in the regression model, the result of data is not the linear regression as it is gained through regression criteria. This result support previous relevance study by Zare and Othman (2015) who conducted the study about students' perceptions toward Using Classroom Debate to Develop Critical Thinking and Oral Communication Ability. The purpose of this study was to make inquiries about students' perceptions of employing classroom debate to improve critical thinking and oral communication ability. The result of this study concluded that the students believed the classroom debate was a constructive learning activity. They believed that the debates helped improve their critical thinking skills and oral communication ability because they claimed debates bring some benefit include mastering the course content, boosting confidence, overcoming the stage fright, and improving teamwork skills.

### **CONCLUSION**

From the result of research findings, testing hypothesis and the discussion of it, it can be concluded that: 1) The second grade students who are in the science program at SMA Negeri 11 Ambon have high English ability, 2) The students' critical thinking skill can be categorized in high level and low level. The students who have high critical thinking consist of 48 students while the students who have low critical thinking are 32 students, 3) The students' speaking ability is significantly influenced by Debate Technique. The students who are taught with Debate technique



have better achievement in speaking ability than those who are taught with group discussion technique. 4) The students' speaking ability is significantly influenced by critical thinking skill. The students who have high critical thinking skill are significantly different in their speaking ability with the students who have low critical thinking skill. 5) There is a significant interaction between debate technique as a teaching technique and students' critical thinking towards the students' speaking ability.

Some suggestions are provided and explained for English teachers such as; a) In applying debate as a teaching technique at speaking classroom activities, English teachers should consider the students' level in English, the chosen topics, the time, and the procedures of debate technique. With consideration of the factors, the application of debate as the teaching technique is more effective in improving the students' speaking ability, b) The selected topics should be up to date and contextual with the students' life, therefore, the students are more encouraged to explore the topics deeply and as a result their critical thinking skill can be sharpened too, c) It is very important to know, to study and to understand the students' characteristic which is related to their speaking ability. Critical thinking is one of the moderate variables which assume it has influence in speaking ability. Other moderate variables such as students' aptitude, students' attitude, self-efficacy, self-confidence can be influenced by speaking ability. d) It is crucial for English teachers to place their role in English teaching and learning process when applying debate as a teaching speaking technique. As much as English teachers will be a resource person and facilitator, they will be better to produce challenging and enjoyable classroom activities for improving their students' speaking and critical thinking skills.

## REFERENCES

- Aungwatanakun, S. (1994). *English Teaching Methodology*, (2nd), Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press. <http://ijssh.org/papers/164-A10036.pdf>
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principle and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Cameron, Lyne. 2001. *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Trumpington Street: Cambridge University Press. <http://ejournal-s1.stkip-pgri-sumbar.ac.id/index.php/Inggris/article/view/1306/1297>
- Derwing, Tracey M. and Munro Murray J. (2005). Second Language Accent and Pronunciation Teaching: A Research-Based Approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol.39, No. 3 (Sep. 2005), pp. 379-397 Published by Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL) <http://www.hawaii.edu/eli/resources/listening/readings/Derwing%20&%20Munro%202005.pdf>
- Harry, M & P. McCan (1994). *Assessment*. Oxford: OUP Hornby, A.S (1995). *Oxford Advance learner's Dictionary*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press. <http://download.portalgaruda.org/article.php?article=9794&val=627>
- Lipman, Matthew (1988). Philosophy for Children and Critical Thinking. *The Journal of Philosophy for Children*, 7(4);40-42.

- Nisbett, Richard E. (2003). *The Geography of Thought*. New York : Newbury House.
- Paul, R. and Elder, L. (2006). *The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools*. Dillon Beach: Foundation for Critical Thinking Press.
- Richards, J.C. (2006) *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.  
[http://repositori.uvic.ca/bitstream/handle/10854/3365/trealu\\_a2014\\_paulista\\_sandra\\_application\\_communicative\\_language.pdf?sequence=1](http://repositori.uvic.ca/bitstream/handle/10854/3365/trealu_a2014_paulista_sandra_application_communicative_language.pdf?sequence=1)
- Rubiati. R. (2010). Improving Students' Speaking Skill Through Debate Technique (A Classroom Action Research with First Semester Students of English Language Teaching Department Tarbiyah Faculty at IAIN Walisongo Semarang in the Academic Year of 2010/2011).  
<http://library.walisongo.ac.id/digilib/files/disk1/122/jtptiain-gdl-richarubia-6100-1-skripsi-p.pdf>
- Sanavi. R. V & Tarighat. S. (2014). Critical Thinking and Speaking Proficiency: A Mixed-method Study. Islamic Azad University, Roodehen Branch, Tehran, Iran. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 79-87, January 2014. © 2014 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland. doi:10.4304/tpls.4.1.79-87 <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol04/01/12.pdf>
- Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to Consider: Developing Adults EFL Students' Speaking Abilities in Richards. W. Renandya (Eds.) *Methodology in Language Teaching*.  
<http://lap.najah.edu/sites/default/files/Developing%20Adult%20EFL%20Students%27%20Speaking%20Abilities.pdf>
- Tumposky NR. (2004) The Debate. *The Clearing House*. Vol. 78: 42-55.  
<http://faculty.piercecollege.edu/kudlers/Debate%20Article.pdf>
- Wohlpart. Jim. (2007). *Critical Thinking: Read and Analyze Arguments*. Spring.
- Zare. P & Othman. M. (2015). Students' Perceptions toward Using Classroom Debate to Develop Critical Thinking and Oral Communication Ability. *Asian Social Science*; Vol. 11, No. 9; 2015. ISSN 1911-2017 E-ISSN 1911-2025. Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education. <http://cset.org/journal/index.php/ass/article/download/47157/5544>
- Zhang, L. (2003, November). Contributions of Thinking Styles to Critical Thinking Dispositions. *Journal of Psychology*, 137(6), 517-543.
- Ventura, M, Lai, E & DiCerbo, K. (2017). *Skills for today: What we know about teaching and assessing critical thinking*. London: Pearson.