# MEASURING THE ABILITY IN DEBATE DEALING WITH FLUENCY AND ACCURACY OF THE THIRD SEMESTER STUDENTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

**Mardiana**
**A. Muhammad Syukri**
English Education Department of UIN Alauddin Makassar
*andimuhammadsyukri@gmail.com*

**ABSTRACT:** This study aimed to describe the ability of speaking skill in form of debating based on the fluency and accuracy rate capability. The study was designed in the form of qualitative descriptive study. The subjects in this research were six third semester students of English Education Department. The data were collected by using the methods of observation. Data were analyzed through fluency accuracy data, accuracy mesurement rubric and autenthic debate assessment rubric.

The result indicated that (1) the ability of students' at the third semester in conducting the debate still in the low level, as the fact that the frequency of stutters was significantly high and the tension attempted were quite visible and audible; (2) the outcome result of the rate of accuracy of the third semester students of Englsih Education Depertment in conducting a debate was still low. The fact was gained by the actual fact in the field during the observation where pronunciation errors and basic grammar mistakes were still spotted in several places; (3) the debate ability of the third semester students of English Education was still low and need a further guide and developement

Based on these findings, it can be concluded that the overall capability of students' in conducting the debate was still unsatisfying. And as a suggestion that a three-stages structured debate forum club empowerment among students was highly recomended as a form of concern to enhance the intereset as well as the ability of the students to perform a public-speaking skill such as debating.

**KEYWORDS**: Debate Ability, Fluency, Accuracy

## A. INTRODUCTION

A debate, the main topic which the researcher wants to observe, is a situation in which the speaker who are involved in must be able to maintain this kind of a virtue and courtesy in order to achieve an effective debate. Debate consists of elements that support it and also separate it from any other factual forum. In a debate, everything has their own structure and place. The main core of a debate is a matter or the topic or the issue which are going to be proposed. Matter is the content of the speech which covers the presentation style or manner and the structure of the speech or method. As any other forum goes, matter in debate can be contrasted with the arguments, evidence presented to support argument, support and analysis.

As for the accuracy and fluency, these two elements of speaking are sometimes compared each other if we are talking about learners' level of speaking. Accuracy itself refers

to the mechanics of the language. It covers clear and articulate speaking, free from grammar mistakes, word pronounced correctly and appropriate language toward the situation. Fluency in some aspect deals with the flow of the language. Whether or not sentences are spoken smoothly with few pauses, questions are responded quickly and so on. Briefly, the concept of fluency emphasizes learners to participate more in a forum rather than just react to it.

After all, if a learner speaks English with a high level of accuracy it means she/he speaks correctly, with very few mistakes. If they speak fluently it means they speak easily, quickly and with few pauses.

The researcher then linked the three aforementioned variables with the factual field experiences in several occasions and may as well add the weight of the reason why the researcher emerges with the probability of problems in that kind of an academic area. On $20^{th} - 24^{th}$ April 2014, the researcher participated on a national-scale debate competiton at a university in Java. The competition went well and was pleasing. But the contingent the researcher delegated finished at the table $19^{th}$ at the champion rank.

However, a suprising thing that the researcher discovered was that he figured out that the level of ability in debate of the home university the researcher was on behalf of remained medicore compared to those of Javanese who dominated the top row. It was the lack of fluency and accuracy that the researcher perceived as the main contributor why there were so many gap of ability in debate. What was more? Almost the rest of the participant swept over the whole session of the debate with an outstanding pace of speech. They nearly spoke 20 words every five seconds with the average of mistakes approximately lower than 30%. But after all, the researcher thought it was only a philosophical perception and was somehow absurd to drag the issue come at stake to compare one's ability since the researcher himself was also quite capable of carrying out the debate.

Not until the next opportunity, however, the researcher took part in another national-scale debate competition on behalf of the same house and yet another curious result hatched. Fluency and accuracy in debate, in fact, paid off. The researcher then realized that fluency and accuracy play an essential role in a brainstorming forum such as debate. It is in reality that debate is all about argumentation, data, examples, and proof, but it will be difficult to configure and address them properly if a debater is lack of ability of fluency and accuracy of speaking.

Based on what the researcher have gone through for several occasions, he would like to know the competence of debating of the students of the major in which he is currently studying to avoid further less-experienced partaking as well as to enhance the students' passion in order to be interested in improving the debate community in the faculty. It all drove the researcher to conduct a research with the title: "*Measuring the Ability in Debate dealing with Fluency and Accuracy of the Third Semester Students of English Education Department*". Hence, at the end of the research, the researcher expects to comprehend the level of ability of debating

of the students and will use the information to develop and/or to upgrade their ability in conducting a good and effective debate. At the end of the research, the researcher expected that he can find the level of fluency in conducting a debate at the third semester students of English Education Department (1); find the level of accuracy in conducting a debate at the third semester students of English Education Department (2); know the ability of debate of the third semester students of English Education Department (3).

## B. LITERATURE REVIEW

The previous research in related to the debate in terms of the element of speaking was quite elusive. Yet, in broader topic, such research was abundant. A researcher Zainul Muttaqin (2009) Tarbiyah Faculty IAIN Walongo Semarang had conducted a study "Teaching Conversation Gambits to Enhance Students' communicative competence in English debate (An action research with WEC Walisongo English club of IAIN Walisongo Semarang year 2008 /2009)". This research found that students of WEC got a good level to the five components of students' communicative competence in English debate such as the ability in using gambits, vocabularies, grammatical structure, fluency and speech contest. In the last result students got average score 8.0 that mean the students had a good level in English debate after being taught the gambits.

Carna Wiwitanto (2010) Languages and Arts Faculty Semarang State University in his study "The use of Australia-Asia parliamentary debate system as an English interactive program based on disciplined eclecticism approach to implement KTSP in teaching speaking (an action research of the year eleven of science program of senior high school 11 Semarang in academic year 2009/2010)". He concluded that debate which was applied to teach students class XI students of senior high school was an effective technique. It could encourage the students to explore their knowledge as well as to speak and it was proven by the statistical result analisys of pre and post-test that by using debate to teach speaking could improve the Students' speaking skill. The T – test result (13.64) was higher than table (1.55) at 0.05 alpha level of significant.

Improve the Students' speaking skill. The T – test result (13.64) was higher than table (1.55) at 0.05 alpha level of significant. Both these are difference from this thesis. The first previous thesis stated that the research was conducted to the member of WEC at IAIN Walisongo Semarang. The thesis was focused on the teaching conversation gambits in enhancing students' communicative ability in Englh debate. The second previous research talked about teaching speaking use Australia-Asian parliamentary debate system to implement KTSP. This research conducted in the eleven grader of senior high school. This research of course difference from both previous theses. This thesis focused on students' speaking skill. The researcher observed the ability of debate in terms of fluency and accuracy in order to measure students' debate skill.

**Debate**

Simon Quinn (2005) defined debate as something which is a more formal way of communicating. It builds confidence and self esteem in people. If we can speak publicly and convey our ideas and thoughts coherently and passionately, we have a valuable tool that can aid us in our public, private and future lives. Meanwhile, Paulette and James (2000) stated that debate is a speaking situation in which opposite points of view are presented and argued. A debate is about the real or simulated issue. The learners' roles ensure that they have adequate shared knowledge about the issue and different opinions or interest to defend. At the end of activity, they may have to reach a concrete decision or put the issue to a vote.

Karl Popper (2014) said that the objective of the debate program is to aid in developing the skills, capabilities and knowledge of participants in an attractive way. The academic debate should in a balanced way educate, form but also include competitiveness and social aspects. Prioritizing one or several of these requirements to the detriment of other means incomprehension of the basic principles of academic debate. However, because of the age of participants, it is necessary to take the formative part as a key area, because the life attitudes and values are being formed in this age.

In conducting a debate, debaters must agree on several rules applied. They are: adhering to to principle of fairplay, decent behavior and mutual respect to the best of their abilities, not to knowingly use the untrue or false information, and so on. in the world of debating, commonly people acknowledge several style of debate. Each debate system has their own structure, format, and rules. The likes of World Parliamentary Style, American Parliamentary Style, and The British Parliamentary Debate System are some peculiar debate style which are largely known and vastly used across the world. However, the researcher in this research only used The Australian Parliamentary Debate System for the effectivity matter.

**Fluency**

As Lennon (1990: 403) suggested, fluency measures can be classified into two aspects: temporal measures which deal with the speed of delivery, and hesitation markers that represent disfluency phenomena such as repetition and false starts. A number of researchers have attempted to identify appropriate measures of fluency.

Kormos and Dénes (2004) offered the most recent credible results with the largest number of participants and the use of computer technology to identify length of pauses, leading to an empirical justification for using certain measures over the others. They conducted, by means of various measures of fluency, a validation study in which they correlated human ratings of how fluent the speech was with quantified results. Among the temporal measures that were validated in their study, the speech rate and the mean length of runs correlated the most with fluency ratings (Kormos and Dénes, 2004: 148). So, in the current study it is decided to include these two temporal measures to see if they correlate

highly with the levels of the speakers and also discriminate among them.

**Accuracy**

Accuracy refers to how well the target language is produced according to its rule system (Skehan, 1996:23). The measures include: the percentage of error-free clauses, errors per 100 words (Mehnert, 1998); and the percentage of correct use of target features (Wigglesworth, 1997; Crookes, 1989; Skehan and Foster, 1997).

In contrast to Kormos and Dénes (2004), none of the above research included a validation study. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) suggest that target-like verbal morphology is suitable for syntactic accuracy for focused tasks that are intended to elicit certain grammatical features. This is also the case for the SST narrative tasks (i.e. past tense) which are used in this study (explained later). Target-like verbal morphology is a specific measure for accuracy. For general measures, the percentage of error-free clauses appears to be frequently selected. However, Bygate (2001) suggests that calculating the number of errors per unit might be more sensitive because it does not obscure the actual occurrences of errors, as is the case with counting error-free units. On the other hand, Mehnert (1998: 86) argues that the amount of errors per 100 words may be suitable for relatively lower proficiency speakers since it does not deal with the definition of clauses and units which is often problematic. As there is no way of knowing which of these measures *were sensitive, it  decided to include all four measures in this study.*

## C.   RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the researcher used a qualitative descriptive. The qualitative descriptive was used to diagnose the capability of students in conducting the debate. Previously, the researcher observed the essential elements to debate, in this case, fluency and accuracy. The researcher inspected both elements in accordance to the rubric requirement of a good and effective debate. The research applied qualitative descriptive in the form of observation. The researcher observed the capability of debate of the students by having them perform debate. There were series of points or mark that emerged at the end of the observation that the researcher previously analyzed and as well as drew a conclusion.

The main subjects in this research were the third year students of English Education Department of UIN Alauddin for 2013/2014 academic year. The research population employed three classes in that academic year.

In the research "Measuring the Ability in Debate dealing with Fluency and Accuracy", the researcher picked up the research subject partially from the whole third semester students of English Education Department. Since the research mainly portrayed debate as the object of observation in which the amount of the students involved has been proportionally determined, the researcher initiated the sampling by quota sampling. Quota sampling,

according to Arikunto (2013) stated that quota sampling is chosen based on the specified proportion. In this case, the debate quota proportion accommodated only six students in total. Yet, the researcher involved the whole third semester students to select whoever individual may meet the requirement of a debater.

Since the researcher conducted the research via observation, the researcher used observation sheet as framework to gather data. The data from the first observation result became temporary information to be synthesized later on. In this situation, for the result of the observation to be more reliable, the researcher initiated various observation sheets for each fluency, accuracy, and debate assessment to measure debate ability they are Fluency Friday Plus: Syllable Speaking Analysis Form and Fluency Friday Plus: Timed Sample

The Syllable Speaking Analysis Form enabled the researcher to see the structure of the rate of fluency did by the objects of the research during the field observation. At the end of the observation, there was a clearance of the frequency of fluency and/or disfluency based on the amount of the syllable uttered by the students. There was a general data about the object which were observed, but the names of the students were not attached on the sheet to avoid a subjective scoring. Also there was an instruction of how the data gained from the observation were processed which was explained further ahead in the data analysis.

The timed sample allowed the researcher to see the amount of disfluency of the debaters based on the time when they were speaking. What distinguished this kind of observation to other observations was that the debaters were solely marked only when they were speaking. The aim of this observation was to see the comparison of frequency of the disfluency per minute of speaking for each student. The elements attached in this observation sheet were as usual the general data of the observation sheet (no name mentioned for the scoring matter) and the percentage average of students' disfluency per minute of total speaking time.

The research procedures involved in this study were plan, action, observation, and reflection. The procedures as follows:

At the beginning, the researcher had the students to conduct the debate based on the regulation of the Australian Parliamentary Debate System. The researcher himself acted as the adjudicator. The researcher told the students that they were going to be observed at the first place. However, the researcher did not tell them what exactly the research would observe about. They did not know what aspect of debating they need to increase during the observation. This act was done so that they conducted the debate based on their natural pace. The students' natural pace of speaking behavior led to a clear blueprint of their level of ability in debate. On the other hand, letting the students know that the research sought to measure their fluency and accuracy would cause them to focus only at those aspects only and more likely to exaggerate them. Moreover, worst thing could happen, the students might not have enough self-confidence to perform debate since they know that they would be judged if they

cannot perform well.

During the debate took place, the researcher did the documentation by placing a stative camera facing to the forum table where each and every speaker of both side addressed their argument. On the other spot, on the forum table, the researcher put a tape recorder, a really sensitive one to catch even a slightest intonation of the speaker.

Thirdly, after both activities were already done, at the end of the debate session, the researcher did the assessment. The assessment to decide whose side was the winner and whose side lost the debate. The researcher used the Australian Parliamentary Debate assessment. The assessment itself gave mark/point for every speaker of both sides. In deciding the debate victor, the researcher sum up the total point of both sides. The result of the debate, however, did not become the conclusion of the hypothesis of the research. It, in fact, became the additional groundwork to be added on as the supporting matter of the problem statement "Whether or not fluency and accuracy determines a good and effective debate?" was it really obvious or convincing that the side whose the rate of fluency and accuracy higher than the other would prevail in debate? Or was it the other way round?

Finally, after all the complete data had been gathered, along with the debaters mark, the researcher then synthesized the overall data to be calculated and to be processed later on.

## D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In measuring the level of fluency, the researcher depicted the result of students' debate script analysis (written exacly the same as what they have uttered) encrypted into numeric form and displays it in a table –one table for each student along with the written analysis. The important thing to notice was that the researcher marked the number of dysfluencies spotted during the speech. The researcher depicted the general highlight of the speaking result for each student; the table accomodated the minutes elapsed by the students, the number of words, the total syllable uttered, and the total minutes of speaking (The number of minutes of speaking was obtained as the result of the timed speaking moment. The researcher counted the time only when the students spoke, and stopped it if they stop talking. This procedures was done for the requirement of the formula of Timed Sample).

The researcher also provided table of the more detailed analysis of the number of dysfluency (stutters) of each student. In the table, the researcher displayed the common kinds of stutters english learners may encounter. The researcher put a code for each stutter; they are: hesitations (Hes), interjections (Int), revisionns (Rev), unfinished words (Unw), phrase repetitions (Px) word repetitions (Wx), prolongations (Pro) and blocks (Bl). (Yaruss, 1997).

To sum up, the researcher employed two Fluency Friday Plus formulae (Yaruss, 1997) in measuring the level of prominence in speaking for each student.

**Table 1.** *Students' overall score and percentage in fluency*

| Sample | Hes | Int | Rev | Unw | Px | Wx | Pro | Bl | Swpm | Perc. |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|----|------|-------|
| S1 | 16 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 20,35 | 11,68% |
| S2 | 18 | 7 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 19,07 | 15,01% |
| S3 | 11 | 5 | 15 | 9 | 8 | 7 | - | 1 | 16,27 | 11,35% |
| S4 | 17 | 13 | 17 | 7 | 13 | 20 | 2 | - | 20,31 | 12,5% |
| S5 | 3 | 14 | 7 | - | 8 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 12,72 | 8,48% |
| S6 | 6 | 30 | 10 | 3 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 19,5 | 14,00% |

**Table XVII. Normative fluency data by Hugo Gregory (1996)**

| Normal | < 2% | None |
|--------|------|------|
| **Borderline** | 2% - 3% | Infrequent signs of tensions |
| **Mild** | 3% - 8% | Multiple stutters occuring; tensions visible and audible |
| **Moderate** | 8% - 12% | Greater sign of stutters (visible and audible) |
| **Severe** | 12% or more | Significantly high; audible/visible tension |

The total average fluency percentage of the whole six student observed was divided by six and then was multiplied by 100. Hence, the result showed that the overall percentage reached 12,17%. If the final percentage was referred into the Normative Fluency Data by Hugo Gregory (1996), then the frequency of students' at the third semester in conducting the debate remained severe, as the fact that the frequency of stutters was significantly high and the tension attempted quite visible and audible.

**Students' accuracy level**

Mispronounced words, grammar mistakes, and inapropriate usage of words were three major points needed to diagnose the frequency of inaccuracy of the students' speech. In order to analyze the how accurate the students' speech were, the researcher provided the statistic of mispronounced words, grammar mistakes, and inappropriate word usage of each students.

**Table XVIII. Students' statistic in accuracy**

| Sample | Mispronounced words | Grammar mistakes | Inapropriate words | Total |
|--------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Student 1 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 23 |
| Student 2 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 19 |
| Student 3 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 20 |
| Student 4 | 5 | 11 | 9 | 25 |
| Student 5 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 15 |
| Student 6 | - | 20 | 5 | 25 |

The table 18 portrayed the number of accuracy-error analysis result obtained from the

recorded speech and was as well as supported by the students' speech script during the debate. It was shown that students tend to make errors on grammar mistakes (including clause-error and subject-verb agreement error). This was proved by the amount of mistakes was shown more on that elements which was higher than the other two categories. Meanwhile, mispronunced words and inapropriate word usage depicted a mild span of frequency.

To retrieve the average percentage of students' accuracy, the following formula was applied:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\text{total errors}}{\text{total words}} \text{ x } 100$$

These were the data gained from the calculation of the formula:

**Table XIX. Students' overall score and percentage in accuracy**

| Sample | Words | Mispr. Words | Grammar mistakes | Inap. words | Total | Perc. |
|--------|-------|--------------|------------------|-------------|-------|-------|
| Student 1 | 551 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 23 | 4,17 % |
| Student 2 | 374 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 19 | 5,08 % |
| Student 3 | 441 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 20 | 4,53 % |
| Student 4 | 638 | 5 | 11 | 9 | 25 | 3,91 % |
| Student 5 | 352 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 15 | 4,26 % |
| Student 6 | 349 | - | 20 | 5 | 25 | 7,16 % |

**Table XX. Accuracy rating scale for the lower intermediate level**

| | |
|--|--|
| 84%-100% | Pronunciation is only very slightly influenced by the mother-toungue. Two or three minor grammatical and lexical errors. |
| 67% - 83% | Pronunciation is slightly influenced by the mother-tongue. A few minor grammatical and lexical errors but most utterances are correct. |
| 50% - 66% | Pronunciation is still moderately influenced by the mother-tongue but no serious phonological errors. A few gramatical and lexical errors but only one or two major errors causing confusion. |
| 33% - 49% | Pronunciation is influenced by the mother-tongue but only a few serious phonological errors, some of which cause confusion. |
| 18% - 33% | Pronunciation seriously influenced by the mother-tongue with errors causing a breakdown in communication. Many 'basic' and lexical errors. |
| 0% - 17% | Serious pronunciation errors as well as many 'basic' grammatical and lexical errors. No evidence of having mastered any of the language skills and areas practised in the course. |

Adopted from English Language Test (J.B. Heaton, 1988:100)

As the overall percentage of every student's accuracy rate was summed, and then was divided by 6 (the number of students observed)  and was multiplied by 100, it reached percentage of 4,85%. The next phase was referring to the accuracy assessment rubric table by J.B. Heaton (1998), the outcome result of the rate of accuracy of the third semester

students of English Education Depertment in conducting a debate was still a bit severe. The fact was gained by the actual fact in the field during the observation where pronunciation errors and basic grammar mistakes were still spotted in several places.

**Students' level ability of debate**

As an extension to what had been observed in the previous findings, a blueprint of the ability of the debate skill of the third semester students of English Education Department began to take the shape. Concerning that the skill quality of the debate was determined by how prominent the students were in speaking and how precise the speech they carried on. Referring to the finding of the fluency, the students generated full of long and unnatural pauses with limited ability to link simple sentences. Very halting and fragmentary in delivering the speech. In fact, in some ponts, the students were very limited in terms of expression range. For the finding outcome based on what occurred in the actual field, the average percentage the students got the range of fluency by 12,17% which was equivalent to a severe rate of stutter.

Secondly, the range of accuracy finding brought about a point where it could be rated as poor accuracy. This finding was highlighted since the actual observation indicated that the students were yet to show a quite prominence evidence of satisfying speakers. Serious pronunciation errors as well as many basic grammatical and lexical errors with lack evidence of having mastered the language skills. The research subjects produced basic sentence forms and some correct simple sentences but subordinate structure were rare.

As the reference from both fluency and accuracy result, and with their strong connection and relation in influencing the debate quality, the researcher found that they matched one after another. The researcher figured out that the quality of accuracy and fluency created a strong correlation to the quality of the debate. It was proved based on the detail analysis did by the researcher. The researcher discovered that during the debate, the information addressed somehow had some major inaccuracies or was usually not clear. The counter-arguments though were relevant, but not very much accurate to the topic with the points of information were not really supported by theories. Most of the arguments were clearly tied to an idea or premise and were orgainsed in old-fashion structure. The drawbacks were proven by both video and tape recording of documentation during the debate took place. And on top of that, the debate script which was written exactly the same to what the speaker said showed more clear view of how severe the quality of the debate was.

**E.   CONCLUSION**

The research conclusion is presented according with the data which have been analyzed in the previous chapter. From all the data analysis about Measuring Students' Ability in Debate Dealing with Fluency and Accuracy on the Third Semester of English Education Department, it can be concluded that first, the ability of students' at the third semester in

conducting the debate remains severe, as the fact that the frequency of stutters is significantly high and the tension attempted quite visible and audible. (2) The outcome result of the rate of accuracy of the third semester students of English Education Depertment in conducting a debate still low. The fact is gained by the actual fact in the field during the observation where pronunciation errors and basic grammar mistakes were still spotted in several places. (3) The debate ability of the third semester students of English Education is still low and need a further guide and developement.

**Recommendation**

This reserarch has found the basic pattern of speaking at the third semester students of English Education Department. What needs enhancing is that they have to keep focusing on mastering the whole skills of learning the second language, specially speaking. Concerning about the debate, it is important to consider that one of the reasons the students are not yet to be ready to compete with other debaters from other universites is because they are lack of preparation. Many solution to such kind of problems such as by making a debate club. Debate meeting club allows the students to train their insight and knowledege about debating. It is hard to assume, but in doing so, the students and the instructor are no longer in confusion of what kind of training that they should conduct to repare the student to be able to compete with other debaters of other universities. In accordance to the primary problem to the students of English Eduation Department in conducting a debate, the researcher proposed a structured organization of how the debate forum club is supposed to be. To begin with, the researcher came up with an idea of splitting the blueprint of the forum club into several stages. In broader highlight, they would appear as (1) pre-class stage, (2) practice stage, and (3) extention stage.

To be more spesific, the pre-class stage of the debate forum club employs the very basic skill of speaking of the students. This is also called the preparation phase in which the students are given the prior description of the debate; the history, the developement, the variations, the implementation of the debate in academic lives and so on. Here the students are given the brain-storming or the introduction to the debate. And most importantly, they are given what topics are common proposed on a debate forum. About this point, the researcher would recommend a book by Robert Trap, The Database Book which covers over 125 topic of interest to the modern debating and is still updating year after year according to the common local, regional, as well as global issues. The thing is, by doing so, the learners would have an enermous source of what they have to say, what matter intacted to the topic, and what support are relevant to the argument. It is clear that the learners speech filled with blocks, interjections (lack of accuracy and fluency) is because they just do not know what should they presentate. Even if there is, it would be not that plenty or rellevant enough causing them to be less wothed in terms of argument weighing. Without any preparation before speaking, learners find it very challenging to handle all the speaking processes of

conceptualization, formulation and articulation simultaneously. Therefore, learners should be given enough time to plan what to say and how to say it before speaking.

Secondly, practice stage. In this phase the learners enter the rehearsal and performance stage. With the combination of cognitive and afective aspect, they are more likely to be more competitive. However, before they practice what they have learnt early on, it is very much essential to have a model to perform a professional debate. By having a model to follow the suit, the learners will have a picture of sufficient input in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar and so on. It is also vital to the learners that they can learn a new startegies in debate by generating a new ideas in speaking by imitating the models. After that, the students then perform their own forum. A different topic would be very enhancing, the point is that by simultaneously performing the debate will make the learners familiar about the structure of the debate. Just like what happened on the third semester students, they did not have any idea about the structure of the debate they were performing. Make them familiar with the organization of the debate will ease such kind of a problem.

And the last phase is extention stage program. It includes the evaluation of the performance of the students. Examining what aspects are in need of further developement and improvisations. learners should be offered chances to notice the correct use of language so as to improve their speaking accuracy. learners should be offered chances to notice the correct use of language so as to improve their speaking accuracy. What is crucial to the skill of speaking is repetition; by means of repetition, learners can develop a fluent and accurate speech. extension practice is significant to reinforce learners' language use, for task repetition helps learners to develop fluent and accurate spoken English.

## REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2013.

Bygate, M. *Effects of Task Repetition on the Structure and Control of Oral Language.* Oxford University Press, 2001.

Crookes, G. *Planning and Interlanguage Variability. Studies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Culatta, R., & Goldberg, S.A. *Stuttering Therapy: An Integrated Approach to Theory and Practice.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.

D'Cruz, Ray. Australia-Asia Debating Guide. Melbourne: The Australian Debating Federation, 2003.

Ellis, R. *Grammar Teaching –Practice or Consciousness-raising?* In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. *Analysing Learner Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. *The Influence of Planning and Task Type on Second Language Performance. Studies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Goh, C.C.M. *Teaching Speaking in the Language Classroom.* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, 2007.

Gregory, H., Hill, D. *Stuttering Therapy Manual: Workshop for Specialists.* Illinois: Northwestern University, 1996.

Heaton, J. B. *Writing English Language Tests.* New York: Longman Handbook for Language Teacher, 1988.

Hornby, A.S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary.* Oxford: University Press, 1974.

Inoue, Chihiro. *Investigating the Sensitivity of the Measures of Fluency, Accuracy, Complexity and Idea Units with a Narrative Task.* Lancaster: Lancaster Universty, 2010.

Kromos, J., & Denes, M. *Exploring Measures and Perceptions of Fluency in the Speech of Second Language Learners.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004.

Lennon, P. *Investigating Fluency in EFL: A Quantitative Approach. Language Learning.* Michigan Language Learning Research Club, University of Michigan, 1990.

Menhert, U. *The Effects of Different Lengths of Time for Planning on Second Language Performance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Muttaqin, Zainul. *Teaching Conversation Gambits to Enhance Students' Communicative Competence in English Debate.* A thesis of IAIN Walisongo Semarang, 2009.

O'Malley, J. *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners.* New York. Longman, 1996.

Pikulski, J.J., & Chard, D.J. *Fluency: Bridge between Decoding and Reading Comprehension.* Delaware: International Reading Association, 2005.

Popper, Karl. *Karl Popper Debate Format.* Retrieved on August 12 2015 from: http://www.debate-motions.info

Quinn, Simon. *Debating.* Melbourne: published electronically by the aouthor, 2005.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. *The Influence of Task Structure and Processing Conditions on Narrative Retellings.* 1999.

Trapp, Robert. *The Debatabase Book.* Yogyakarta: International Debate Education Association, 2007.

Wigglesworth, G. *An Investigation of Planning Time and Proficiency Level on Oral Test Discourse,* 1997.

Wiwitanto, Carna. *The Use of Australasian Parliamentary Debate System as an English Interactive Program Based on Disciplined Eclecticism Approach to Implement KTSP in Teaching Speaking.* A Thesis of UNS, 2009.

Yaruss, J.S. *Real-Time Analysis of Speech Fluency: Procedures and Reliability Training.* New York: Thieme Medical Publisher, 1997.

Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. *The Effect of Pre-task Planning and On-line Planning of Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy in L2 Monologic Oral Production,* 2003.