Teaching Integrated English Productive Skills Using British Parliamentary Debate

Ira Atika Zahra[1] Sonya Puspasari Suganda[1,*]

[1] *Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia*
[*]*Corresponding author. Email:* sonya.puspasari@ui.ac.id

ABSTRACT
Media in teaching and learning languages keeps evolving for years. Parliamentary debate is a student-centered activity that integrates the four language skills and it promotes Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Most parliamentary debate activity has been done in informal learning context, therefore the debaters only focused on their speaking fluency than the accuracy. Second, this study discusses teaching productive English skills in an integrated way by using the British Parliamentary debate as media in a formal learning context. The aim of the study is twofold. First, it examines how British Parliamentary debate can be implemented in a formal English language learning. Second, it investigates the improvement gained from the teaching program to the extent of the students' debating ability, speaking accuracy, and writing skills. This study is an exploratory mixed-method that employed pre-experimental research using design one group pretest-posttest, questionnaire, and field notes. The results indicate that British Parliamentary debate could be implemented in formal English language learning and could improve students' debate ability, speaking accuracy and writing skills. The study suggests the use of British Parliamentary debate for teaching integrated English skills in a formal learning context.

Keywords: Productive Skills, Accuracy, English, British Parliamentary debate

1. INTRODUCTION

The current development and technology have influenced the novelty of foreign language teaching, especially in English pedagogy. The first is in the method/approach used by teachers from structural language teaching which evolves to communicative language teaching (CLT). The second is the variety of media used in face-to-face learning in the classroom (offline) which is facilitated using technology, online learning, and both (blended/hybrid language learning). In communicative language teaching, the teacher's role is a facilitator who can make the learners master the target language they are learning. This relates to how teachers can guide learners to master language features such as grammar, vocabulary, and four language skills properly. Therefore, the attention of communicative language teaching is to prioritize integrated learning which can create communicative situations in the classroom.

In teaching language skill, the integrated skills learning is not a new thing and has already happened in the classroom; like in speaking class, the learner will automatically listen to the other person so that speaking and listening skills have been integrated indirectly [1]. Debate is an activity that involves four language skills in an integrated way. First, the debater should read the topic or material that will be debated. Second, they write and arrange the arguments. Third, they present the arguments within the specified time as well as listening to opponents' arguments or proposals to provide rebuttals/interruptions [2] [3] [4].

The use of parliamentary debate in English learning in Indonesia is still an informal language learning context such as students' extracurricular activities. Informal language learning is a learning process that naturally occurs by involving natural settings and circumstances [5]. Following informal context, debate activities do not focus on learning language features so that the acquisition of debaters' language occurs naturally which has a positive impact on their speaking fluency, however, it is not in line with their speaking accuracy in using the target language. Language accuracy includes the use of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation properly and correctly [6] [7] [8]. Fluency and accuracy are part of the competence in second language acquisition. In terms of accuracy, learners are advised to construct grammar properly and correctly in both spoken and written forms [9]. Fluency and accuracy should be obtained equally, however, it is not always easy, especially in an informal learning context.

There are two types of previous studies related to debate. First, the studies based on concepts, and second, the studies based on practice. Previous studies based on practice are discussing on the implementation of debate in the classroom by using different debate systems for example the Karl Popper debate [3], the two large group size which consists of government and opposition councils [9] [4] and the British Parliamentary [10]. Those studies examine the effect of debate on vocabulary mastery, critical thinking, collaborative learning, multimodality in a debate, and teaching plans for teaching integrated four language skills. This study

modifies the learning activities for teaching integrated four language skills by Zare and Othman [4] and Aclan and Aziz [10]. The difference in this study from previous studies lay in the implementation of the British Parliamentary debate system which focuses on productive skills (speaking and writing) in a formal learning context. Generally, previous studies on debate above only focused on speaking skills, used a free debate system, and had been conducted in an informal learning context. The studies also tend to focus on the students' speaking fluency only, whereas this study pays attention not only in fluency but also in the speaking accuracy aspect. Therefore, this study can be said as different research from previous studies.

1.1. British Parliamentary Debate

There are many different styles of debating around the world, for example, the United States Parliamentary, Asian Parliamentary, Australian Parliamentary, and British Parliamentary or BP, for short [11]. British Parliamentary is the standard form used at the university level. In 1994, the World Universities' Debating Council decided to adopt BP as the style for all future World championships [12]. Therefore, Indonesia also adopts the format [13]. British Parliamentary (BP) debate grew out of the traditions of the United Kingdom parliament in Westminster and follows some of the conventions of the House of Commons. The debate is divided into government and opposition with opening and closing benches. There will be eight speeches, with every speaker getting equal time (7 Minutes 20 Seconds). Every speaker plays a slightly different role. Opponents can interrupt speeches with POI, and it is around after 1 minute – 6 minutes signed by one clap.

Figure 1 British Parliamentary Debate

1.2. Role of Speakers

In the debate, each team plays a role that should be fulfilled so that there are no overlap roles among the debaters. The Opening Government (OG) plays the privilege of deciding which proposals, policies, actions they wish to propose, defining motions, and arranging scenarios. Opening Opposition (OO) plays the counter-proposals from the government by providing detailed counter policies, actions, and goals that they want to achieve. The Closing Government (CG) should have a consistent case with the Opening Government, however, taking a different perspective and reasons, so they are not

repetitive. Closing Opposition (CO) also should not conflict with their Opening Opposition such as taking new cases; however, they can develop other perspectives that in line with the motion.

Table 1. Role Of Speaker

No.	Speaker 1	Speaker 2
1. Opening Government (OG)	• Define motion • Describe the OG case • Make arguments	• Support the Prime Minister case • Make new arguments • Rebut the OO case
2. Opening Opposition (OO)	• Provide a counter-proposal • Describe opposition case • Make arguments • Rebut the OG case	• Support Leader of Opposition case • Make new arguments • Rebut the OG case
3. Closing Government (CG)	• Describe CG case • Make arguments from a new perspective • Rebut OO cases	• Rebut all opposition bench arguments • Summarize all proposals and highlight the CG strength • Provide further evidence and analogy from Government Member arguments
4. Closing Opposition (CO)	• Describe CO case • Make arguments from a new perspective • Rebut OG and CG cases	• Rebut all government bench arguments • Summarize all proposals and highlight the CO strength • Provide further evidence and analogy from Opposition Member arguments

1.3. The anatomy of an argument

To make a good argument in a debate, it is needed instruction to avoid assertions without further analysis. Most of the debaters use the "AREL" concept to build their arguments. AREL stands for Assertion, Reasoning, Evidence, and link-back. However, if an argument does not have one of the AREL elements, the argument is still considered an argument, but, it is imperfect.

1. The assertion refers to a concept or statement that the debater wants to prove. It could be a principal and philosophical idea, agree, or disagree. The statement should be in line with the motion and proposal such as defending the death penalty is an effective way to prevent crime.

2. Reasoning is a way to justify and develop a statement so that it can invite other people into the thought that the debater believes in. The analysis required complex reasoning by finding urgency, the burden of proof (BoP), characterizing actors, and finding the root of the problem and the effect of a

motion so that the audience understands that the arguments presented by the debater are true. Arguments are arranged in several sentences, logical and structured from the results of reasoning/analysis.

3. Evidence can be in the form of statistics such as the pre- and post-policy, the person's experience or facts, and the general philosophy presented by a study or analogy.

4. Link-back is the conclusion or common threads of the arguments built so that it makes it easier for others to relate to the argument.

Furthermore, the researcher wants to collaborate on productive skills activities to achieve language accuracy by using parliamentary debate as a platform. The importance of accuracy in second language acquisition is to minimize misunderstandings in communication. Accuracy is also necessary for foreign language learners because they will be the linguists (professionals) are responsible for their scientific fields. Therefore, the researcher wants to know the use of debate for teaching integrated language skills, the effect on students' accuracy in productive skills, and the challenges that might be faced by teachers. The findings from this study are expected to be an alternative for teaching language skills in an integrated way in a formal language learning context.

Based on the background of the problem above, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How can the British Parliamentary debate be implemented in a formal learning context?

2. What is the effect on students' speaking accuracy, writing skills, and debate ability?

3. What are the challenges that will occur in the classroom?

2. METHODS

This study used a mixed-method of quantitative and qualitative data to collect and analyze the data obtained from all participants. The type of method design used in this study is exploratory sequential. This method design starts with the analysis of qualitative data and continued by the analysis of quantitative data. This study was a pre-experimental design using one group pretest-posttest.

2.1. Participants

The population of this study was 4th semester university X students. The total participants in this study were 20 students, 13 of them were female, and 7 were male students. This study was conducted during the 2019/2020 academic year.

2.2. Data Collection Techniques

The data collected in this study were tests, audio and video recorder transcript, field notes, and questionnaires. This study is testing the students' productive skills and accuracy. The tests are a pretest before the treatment and a posttest after the treatment. The scoring rubric was adopted from WUDC speaker scale and adapted speaking accuracy by Heaton [14] and writing an argumentative essay by Hyland [15]. The aspects that being analyzed were argumentation analysis, pronunciation and grammatical accuracy, and relevant points, wordings, coherence, variety of structures, and vocabulary in the argumentative essay. The main objective of the debate and writing test is to obtain data about the students' improvement after the treatment. The tests were debating and composing an argumentative essay with different motions and topics for pretest and posttest.

This study used questionnaires to obtain students' perceptions of the British Parliamentary debate. The questionnaire has ten items distributed to the students to portray the students' perceptions. Those items were 7 close-ended and 3 open-ended questions that contain self-assessment, students' obstacle, and perception. The Likert scale has an even number ranging. The students rate how strongly they agreed or not with each statement. The scale did not provide a 'neutral' option since the middle value can reduce the number of evaluative reactions. Field notes are a data-gathering technique that collects data by observing the process of studying.

2.3. Procedure

This study took ten weeks to complete. The pretest took twice in the first and second week due to subject orientation and time limitation. In the test, students were instructed to perform a debate in the classroom and write an argumentative essay at home which was submitted on Sunday night through email. The following eight weeks were used to give the treatment to students included raising awareness sessions. In the five initial meeting sessions, learning activities are carried out in the classroom. In the five last meeting sessions, learning activities were online due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In testing students' productive skills, the pretest and posttest activities were conducted in the same way, debating and composing an argumentative essay, however, the topics given were different. The table below shows the debate motions:

Table 2. Debate Motion

Pretest	Posttest
This House Would Legalize Plastic Surgery	*This House Would Allow Children to Sue Their Parents for Religious Indoctrination*
This House Would Legalize Abortion	*As Modern Society, This House Would Leave Religion*
This House Would Sue Ex-Es for Breaking Promises	*This House Regrets the Trend of Teenagers Having Celebrity Idol*

This House Would Promote Save Sex at Schools	This House Would Legalize LGBTQ in Indonesia
This House Would Abolish Monarchy	This House Would Charge China for COVID-19 Spreading

The researcher provided several options/suggestions for the motions, and students might choose one of them that they preferred to perform at the pretest and posttest. However, students tend to ask the researcher to determine which motion they were supposed to perform at the pretest. If a topic had selected, the remaining groups should select another topic (the same motion is not allowed). The topic is also adjusted for the difficulty level. At the pretest, the topics were general topics whose is intended for beginners while the posttest is quite difficult. The topics difficulty were determined by the burden of proof/BoP, background, problems, policies, and proposal justification such as This House Believe That Indonesia Should Aggressively Invest in Nuclear Energy and Weapons is more difficult than This House Would Legalize Plastic Surgery. Furthermore, for the writing test, the students composed an argumentative essay. The students might choose their topic that they want to agree with or disagree with. The students may also choose a topic according to the debate topic that they had debated. The writing provisions at the pretest and posttest are the same such as the number of pages 2-5 pages, Times New Roman, 12 for the letter size, normal margin, A4 for the paper size, 1.5 space, and submitted at 22.00 on Sunday through the e-mail.

2.4. Analysis

The analysis of this study combines qualitative and quantitative analysis. Data collected from tests were analyzed using the SPSS program version 24. The scores of debate performance, speaking accuracy, and argumentative essay tests before and after the treatment were analyzed using t and N-gain test. This analysis is to see whether there were any notable differences. The video and audio transcripts, questionnaire, and field notes were analyzed using descriptive analysis. The students' perspectives on the implementation of British parliamentary debate as a platform in learning productive skills depend on the percentage of the questionnaire answers.

3. DISCUSSION

There are three results in this study. First, the teacher/lecturer's guidelines on how to apply the British Parliamentary debate activities in a formal learning context in teaching productive skills and maximized the effect on students' debating ability, speaking and writing accuracy. Second, the pretest and posttest scores result were collected from researcher and lecturer. Furthermore, the students' scores indicate an improvement which is shown by using t and N-gain test result. Third, the challenges that occurred during the

implementation of the British Parliamentary debate activities.

3.1. Debate Activity

Before starting the debate activity, students should be divided into several teams. The first team was acting as debater which consisted of 8 people. The second team was acting as adjudicators which consisted of 8 people to have notetaking or write important arguments that were spoken by the debaters and provided constructive feedback. The adjudicators' team is usually determined from the order of the teams (pairing teams' system) such as if the first team performed a debate, then the second team becomes the adjudicators and so on. Next, the third and fourth teams were the readers who discussed the materials related to the motion during the debate section. Each team consisted of 8 students. There will be 16 students. After debate performance, the readers' teams present their discussion results in the classroom.

Next, in a debate activity, there are four stages which are described below. However, these stages can be modified by the teachers/lecturers based on the class needs.

1. The first stage is team position/roles and motion launch.

   There are 4 groups consisting of 2 students so that the total players are 8 students in one debate round. The teacher/lecturer provides opportunities for students to determine their teammates. After that, each team representative takes the draw for determining their position. After the position result, the teacher/lecturer launches the motion that will be debated by the students. The teacher/lecturer only provides motion context and interpretation to avoid misleading. Regarding the motion, the teacher/lecturer can prepare 5 - 7 motions or based on the total number of the groups with a similar theme.

2. The second stage is the case-building.

   The teacher gives 10 minutes for each team to prepare their cases, arguments, and rebuttals. The opposition teams build their case outside the classroom and the government teams are in the classroom. In case-building, students are prohibited from searching the information related to the motion on the internet. Additionally, both government (opening and closing government) teams or opposition teams are independent, so they are not allowed to discuss. Every team stands for its own ground. In developing the case and speech, students are allowed to use mind mapping, make important points, or write the entire speech.

3. The third stage is debating

   The debate activity will take about ± 1 hour. Each student gets 7 minutes 15 seconds to deliver the speech and base on their turn. The timekeeper will

clap one time if it has one minute speech, one clap in the sixth minute, the seventh minute will be two claps, and the seventh minute and fifteen seconds will be three claps and the debater should end the speech immediately. Students can download the debate keeper application on the Playstore to make it easier. Students (the other debaters) who do not present the speech are hearing and note-taking important points made by their opponents to make rebuttals, provide interruptions (point of information/PoI), and avoiding repetitive points. PoI offered by raising hand or standing up. The PoI rule begins among the first minute and the sixth minute which is marked by one clap. Interruptions were also given at 30 seconds intervals. Students do not allow to use harsh language/ curse against their opposing team such as saying, "shame on you". It is prohibited to maintain a conducive situation in debate activities.

4. The verbal adjudication stage

In the debate activity, the researcher becomes the adjudicator that oversees assessing the students' debating performance. After the debate was over, the researcher asked the students who acted as adjudicators about the winners of the debate, and they could also provide feedback for their friends. Furthermore, the researcher gave a verbal adjudication. There are three parts to give verbal adjudication. First is an opening or general explanation of the debate that has taken place, second is announcing the rank and justifying the decision, and the last is providing constructive feedback.

For online sessions, the researcher explained the material for 15 minutes. Then, having a debate with prepared motion which have given 30 minutes before the class started. Only the teams who performed a debate were allowed in the online classroom where other students were in the waiting room. Teachers/lecturers required all students to mute their microphones before entering the online classes except for those who delivered their speech. This is important to do to avoid noise and echo from the students' devices or the environment sounds surround them. After the debate activity was over, the researcher provided constructive feedback. At the end of the class, the researcher gave writing argumentative paragraphs as a weekly assignment.

3.2. Discussion Group

Discussion groups aimed to ensure that students play an active role in the classroom during the debate. After the debate activity ended, the readers' teams presented the results of the discussion in front of the class regarding the theories related to the motions such as the human rights or the first principle in the debate guide material. It

also helped maximize the lesson plan and achieve the learning goals.

3.3. Writing Activities

Writing activities were carried out as a student's weekly assignment. Writing activity exercises were re-case of a motion that had been debated by the students and given constructive feedback by the researcher. The re-case served the students to practice in developing their arguments, paying attention to their language used, and step by step in composing an argumentative essay. Therefore, this activity could serve as an additional awareness-raising session.

3.4. Questionnaire

The questionnaire results show students' conditions and perceptions on the implementation of British Parliamentary debate in the formal learning context. The students are low proficiency learners. This is also proofed by some students who still spoke Indonesian in their debate speech because they still have difficulty in speaking English. Next, 15 students (66.7%) were unfamiliar with the British Parliamentary debate. Therefore, most of them had difficulty in learning the British Parliamentary debate. Moreover, the British Parliamentary debate is student-centered learning. From the observations, researchers found that most of the lecturers still apply teacher-centered learning so that students should adapt to students-centered learning activities.

The debate materials which require students to search from various sources independently to enrich their knowledge and arguments are also difficult for the students. Students also find it difficult to adapt the online learning. Furthermore, many technical issues were experienced during the online class such as networks, devices, and noise. Those issues can be time-consuming. During the online learning, the researcher/lecturer had extra materials and assignments. These caused students' load to increase. The students' felt tired. Even if so, 87.8% (16 students) said they experienced an improvement in their productive skills after the treatment. The students' self-assessment which was adopted from the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) showed that most of the students felt that they had B1 level proficiency for their productive skills.

3.5. Quantitative Data Analysis

The pretest and posttest results on students' debate ability, speaking accuracy, and writing analyzed by the t and N-gain test were obtained from researcher and lecturer scores. Based on the t test and N-gain, it was concluded that the lowest improvement was in the students' debate ability which can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. The Average Scores of Debate Ability

Description	N	Average Score by The Researcher	Average Score by Main Lecturer
Pretest	20	65.70	66.30
Posttest	20	68.80	69.60

Based on the table above, the pretest and posttest from both averages had shown improvement in the students' debate ability.

Table 4. *t-test* Result for Debate Ability

	Pretest – Posttest
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

The results of the scores obtained from researchers and lecturers are the Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05, so there is a significant result in students' debate skills from the pretest and posttest data.

Table 5. The Average Scores of Speaking Accuracy

Description	N	Average Score by The Researcher	Average Score by Main Lecturer
Pretest	20	68.50	67.80
Posttest	20	79.25	78.30

From both pretest average scores are smaller than the posttest average scores so, it had also shown improvement on the students' speaking accuracy.

Table 6. *t-test* Result for Speaking Accuracy

	Pretest – Posttest
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

The results of the scores obtained from researchers and lecturers are the Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05, so there is a significant result on students' speaking accuracy from the pretest and posttest data.

Table 7. The Average Scores of Writing Skills

Description	N	Average Score by The Researcher	Average Score by Main Lecturer
Pretest	20	72.60	72.00
Posttest	20	81.50	80.70

From both pretest average scores are smaller than the posttest average scores so, it had also shown improvement in the students' writing skills.

Table 8. *t-test* Result for Writing Skills

	Pretest – Posttest
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

The results of the scores obtained from researchers and lecturers are the Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05, so there is a significant result on students' writing skills from the pretest and posttest data.

3.6. N-Gain Test

The average result of the N-gain test from the pretest and posttest data on students' debate ability obtained from researchers and lecturers is 0.1, which means that the N value is less than 0.3 (g ≥ 0.3) so that the increase in debating ability is categorized into low increase. Next, on students' speaking accuracy which was obtained from the researcher was 0.37 and the lecturer was 0.32 which means that the N value was greater or equal to 0.3 (0.3 ≤ g ≤ 0.7) so that the increase in the accuracy of the students' speaking was categorized into a moderate increase. Finally, the average N-gain test result on students' writing skills obtained from researchers and lecturers is 0.32 which means that the N value is greater or equal to 0.3 (0.3 ≤ g ≤ 0.7) so that the increase in students' writing skills is categorized into moderate increase.

3.7. Interrater Reliability

The reliability test was conducted because there were scores differences between the researcher and the lecturer. Interrater reliability results showed that the correlation value is more than > 0.50 which can be seen in the following table.

Table 9. Interrater Reliability

Interrater reliability	Pretest			Posttest		
	Debate	Accuracy	Writing	Debate	Accuracy	Writing
Average measures	0.610	0.984	0.885	0.801	0.961	0.568

Based on the table above, the average correlation coefficient and consistency between the two raters are more than > 0.50. Thus, the results of the student's debate, speaking accuracy, and writing assessments on the pretest and posttest of the researcher and lecturers showed stability, so it was concluded that the raters had the same perception of the students' scores.

4. CONCLUSION

The implementation of British Parliamentary debate activities in a formal language learning context for teaching integrated productive skills refers to three important things as the research objectives in this study. First, to discover whether it can raise students' awareness in using the language which affects the accuracy of students' speaking skills. Second, to discover whether there is a significant difference in students' debate ability. Third, to discover the challenges that will occur in the classroom. In this study, the British Parliamentary debate which involved awareness-raising sessions, corrective and constructive feedbacks were given as the treatment.

The following is the conclusion of the findings in this study.

The findings in this study, based on the t test, there is a significant effect of debate ability, accuracy, and productive skills (.000) after the treatment. The average result is 3.10 for debate skills, 10.75 for speaking accuracy, and 8.90 for writing skills. Furthermore, based on the N-gain test, it shows that debating ability is the lowest improvement while the accuracy and writing skills have moderate. Based on the results of the t and N-gain tests, the implementation of debate activities in a formal language learning context can improve the students' accuracy. However, the students' debating ability experienced as the lowest improvement. It happens because the parliamentary debate could not be mastered in a short period of time.

Based on the questionnaire results which had been given to students, it was shown that students experienced difficulties in studying the British Parliamentary debate. This happens because the students have low proficiency, so it is difficult for them to speak English spontaneously, the debate system is new for students, the variety of materials and the workload is quite a lot during the online learning process. Even if so, students feel motivated to learn productive skills by using the British Parliamentary debate as the platform. Students perceive that debate can increase their productive skills, self-confidence, and insight. Students also conducted a self-assessment that was adopted from the CEFR. The results of their self-assessment indicate that students feel that their productive skills have increased at B1 level. The improvement felt by students was also seen from the pretest-posttest results based on the t-test and the N-gain test.

The challenges faced during the debate activities in the classroom are firstly the time distribution of activities in the large class should be done appropriately to maximize learning activities, especially in online learning. Second, mastering the system, the role of debaters, materials, judging, and assessment in the British Parliamentary debate is considered as difficult. Third, the mixed abilities of students in the classroom that should be facilitated appropriately by the lecturers. Fourth, the application of student-centered learning requires an adaptation by giving the learning and workload gradually.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by Ira Atika Zahra and Sonya P. Suganda. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Ira Atika Zahra and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

[1] P. Davies. (1990). The Use of Drama in English Language Teaching. TESL Canada Journal. 8(1), pp. 87-98. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v8i1.581

[2] Ginther, A. (2013). Assessment of Speaking. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

[3] Zafar, M. (2009). Monitoring the 'Monitor': A Critique of Krashen's Five Hypotheses. Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics 2(4), pp. 139-146. https://doi.org/10.3329/dujl.v2i4.6903

[4] Wang, Z. (2014). Developing Accuracy and Fluency in Spoken English of Chinese EFL Learners. English Language Teaching, 7(2), pp. 110-118. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1075642

[5] Najafi, M., Motaghi, Z., Nasrabadi, H. B., & Heshi, K. N. (2016). Debate Learning Method and Its Implications for The Formal Education System. Educational Research and Reviews, 11(6), pp. 211-218. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2015.2316

[6] Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. White Plains. NY: Longman.

[7] Gautam, P. (2019). Integrated and segregated teaching of language skills: an exploration. Journal of NELTA Gandaki, 1, pp. 100-107. https://doi.org/10.3126/jong.v1i0.24464

[8] Krashen, S. D. (1981). Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Pergamon Press Inc. http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/sl_acquisition_and_learning.pdf

[9] Liu, D. (2015). A critical review of Krashen's input hypothesis: Three major arguments. Journal of Education and Human Development, 4(4), pp. 139-146. http://dx.doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v4n4a16

[10] Alasmari, A., & Ahmed, S. S. (2013). Using debate in EFL classes. English language teaching, 6(1), pp. 147-152. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1076807

[11] Zahra, I. A. (2019, December). The Effect of Debate Activity in English Four Skills: The Students' Perspective. In UICELL Conference Proceeding, 3 (pp. 57-67). https://journal.uhamka.ac.id/index.php/uicell/article/view/4135

[12] Mitchell, R., Myles, F., & Marsden, E. (2019). Second language learning theories. Routledge.

[13] Blake, R. (2016). Technology and the four skills. Language Learning & Technology, 20(2), pp. 129-142. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44465

[14] Heaton, J. B. (1988). Writing English Language Tests: Longman Handbook for Language Teachers (New Edition). Longman Group UK Ltd.

[15] Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.