

## **MODE OF ARGUMENTATION IN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY DEBATE CHAMPIONSHIP (NUDC) 2021**

Zeli Wahyu sang Putri, Ririn Putri Ananda  
Universitas Muhamadiyah Bengkulu

Correspondent:

[zeliwahyusangputri21@gmail.com](mailto:zeliwahyusangputri21@gmail.com)  
[rananda@umb.ac.id](mailto:rananda@umb.ac.id)

### **ABSTRACT**

Debate is an activity to fight for the team's argument by presenting strong and relevant evidence so that the team's argument wins, convincing the jury that the team's argument is valid, strong, and true. Therefore, debate participants need to know the mode of their argument. The purpose of this study is to identify and describe the dominant mode of argumentation used by debaters at the 2021 National University Debating Championship (NUDC). The research design of this study used a qualitative descriptive method. The instrument used is an observation sheet. The subjects of this study were the participants of the Open Quarterfinals room D1 (NUDC) 2021, Open Semifinals D1 (NUDC) 2021, and Novice Grandfinals (NUDC) 2021 debates. The results of this study indicate that the debate participants used all the argumentation modes in NUDC and the most used or the most dominant argumentation mode was evaluative argumentation. For future researchers, it is recommended to conduct an in-depth investigation of the debate.

**Keywords:** *Speaking, Debate, Mode, Argumentation*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Debate is one of the subjects that allow students to express their opinions and demonstrate their abilities based on their knowledge. Debate is the process of two competing parties proposing ideas or views and attempting to justify their position. According to Zahra (2019) "debate is the process of inquiry and advocacy, a way of arriving at a reasoned judgment on a proposition to reach a decision in their minds alternatively, individuals or groups use it to bring others around to their way of thinking". The debate begins with the granting of a motion which is followed by an argument in which this argument supports the statement of the motion. Argument is a collection of statements or opinions that show that what we say is believed to be true and supported by facts. Therefore, speaking for debate can help students to speak English fluently and can give opinions and improve their public speaking skills.

For English debate participants, the most difficult part of the debate competition is expressing opinions or arguments. Many debate participants failed to present the correct argument according to the mode of argument used in the debate. Ananda (2018) "presenting a well founded argument in writing as a realization of analytical and critical thinking styles for students, will be even more difficult for those who do not use English as their first language". Hadiningrum (2020) "there is a large amount of research on debate competitions". Conducted a research on Speech Functions Realized by the First Speakers of English Debate Competition. The results of this study indicate that the speech function realized by the first speaker of the affirmative team is the opening and continuation speech function. (Li et al, 2020) conducted a study Exploring the Role of Argument Structure in Online Debate Persuasion. This study found that incorporating the features of argument structure played an important role in achieving better predictive performance in assessing the persuasiveness of arguments in online debates. And also (Jacobs & Jacobs, 2020) researching the Restoration and Reconstruction of the Principles of Academic Debate as a Dialectical Model: An Outline of the Procedural Model of Argumentative Rationality, the results of this study indicate that the Restoration and Reconstruction of the Principles of Academic Debate shows that students are able to argue differently of different types. rationality which is the focus of logical and rhetorical theory.

Researcher chose this title because no one has researched it before, in this title there are problems that can be examined in the National University Debate Championship 2021, where there are still many debate participants who do not understand how to give correct arguments according to the theory of Scholar Robert Trapp (in Johnson, 2018). There are some participants just giving arguments but they don't know what mode they are using. So, by conducting this research the researcher hopes that the debate participants can know what mode they are using, not just giving arguments. And this research can see what mode is used and what mode is dominant. This research is important to do because by providing the right argument in accordance with the existing motion makes the argument given more reliable and focused according to the mode of argumentation. Faize (2018) "in a debate supported by at least one reason and involving at least two or more people. more". Therefore, an appropriate pattern of argumentation is needed so that the public can understand the scope of the debate.

Therefore, researcher interested in conducting this research based on the theory of Scholar Robert Trapp (in Johnson, 2018) identifies three modes of argumentation: descriptive, relational, and evaluative. Descriptive argumentation focuses on concerns about the nature and definition of something, relational argumentation about the relationship between things, and evaluative argumentation regarding value. Based on the description above, the researcher will conduct research on one aspect of the debate assessment namely Mode of Argumentation in National University Debate Championship (NUDC) 2021.

## A. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research used the descriptive qualitative method. The Subject of this research are debaters in Open Quarterfinal room D1, Open Semifinal room D1 and Novice Grandfinals National University Debate Championship 2021. There were 8 debaters divided into 4 team in each competition. In this research there are 24 debaters from three videos. For NUDC 2021 Open Quarterfinal room D1 in the opening government coming from University of Mataram, opening opposition from University of Diponegoro, in closing government from Institute Pertanian Bogor and closing opposition from University of Sanata Dharma. For NUDC 2021 Open Semifinal room D1 in the opening government coming from University of Lampung, opening opposition from University of Mataram, in closing government from University of Sebelas Maret and closing opposition from University of Diponegoro.

For NUDC 2021 Novice Grandfinals in the opening government coming from University of Bina Nusantara, opening opposition from University of Islam Indonesia, in closing government from University of Udayana and closing opposition from University of Warmadewa. The data in this research collected by this step below: (1) Researcher watched videos of debate competition in [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com). (2) Researcher has chosen the type of video debate competition on YouTube. (3) Researcher downloaded video of novice grandfinal NUDC 2021. (4) Researcher makes a script from the video that has been downloaded.

## B. FINDINGS

The data used by the researcher is the debate video at the National University Debate Championship. This data was obtained through watching videos on YouTube. All videos obtained by researcher amounted to 3 videos in three times of data collection.

### 1. Mode of argumentation in NUDC 2021 in Quarter room D1

Mode of Argumentation	Debater								Total	%
	PM #8	LO #8	DP M #8	DLO #8	MG #8	MO #8	GW #8	OW #8		
Descriptive Argumentation	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	62,5
Relational Argumentation	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	4	50
Evaluative Argumentation	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7	87,5

As indicated in table 4.1.1, is displayed of students' in providing an mode of argumentation for the National University Debate Championship 2021, especially in the quarter room D1 session. They use all mode of argumentation and the most widely used is the evaluative argumentation mode. The following are the results and examples of these three aspects.

### **Descriptive argumentation**

**Motion: This House believes that music streaming services should distribute compensation from users only to the specific artist that they listen to, as opposed to equal distribution to all artists within that particular genre**

#### **Example 1:**

*music streaming services allocate the distributions equally to all artists within one particular genres so many musics are actually reproduced to the most popular genre as opposed to which one is the artists more comfortable about or which type of audiences that they want to appeal to for example because the connection between the music or arts that are um produced by one particular artist are very impactful towards certain audiences which means that currently there are more of like pop and hip hop rnb and k-pop music's compared to like countries and so on and forth even if it does exist educator it is very few moreover the artists that are within a stay within the less popular genres are actually underrated and they would be like this number one the money allocations are equal.*

As shown from the example above, that students use descriptive argumentation mode. the result obtained at the National University Debate Championship 2021 in the quarter session is 62.5%. students can use descriptive mode in giving opinions in debates, this is indicated by students being able to describe or explain the definition of something in general.

### **Relational Argumentation**

**Motion : This House believes that music streaming services should distribute compensation from users only to the specific artists that they listen to, as opposed to equal distribution to all artists within that particular genre**

#### **Example 2:**

*That one particular artist who plays different genre might be less likely to get money what the opposition's case then they need to actually try harder and doing self-evaluations educators and doing different initiatives to work better that's why the audio exploitations are going to be more exclusive under opening government we don't buy their arguments right this is the thing we think that this is going to be positive impact they are going to push to create innovations or maybe create music that's more viable by the people.*

As shown from the example above, students use relational argumentation which explains cause and effect, showing a result of 50% indicating that students can use relational argumentation.

### Evaluative Argumentation

**Motion :** This House believes that music streaming services should distribute compensation from users only to the specific artists that they listen to, as opposed to equal distribution to all artists within that particular genre

#### Example 3:

*I will explain further why now understand that the money allocations is not only uh distributed toward the producers and songwriters or creative content writers or creators but to produce this um to produce the songs for example this particular artist also need to fight to find and explore life to get inspired to actually for them to get like more of a personal experience for them to actually go travel and so on and so forth but now it is limited due to the idea that the number of the money is not equal to the hard work right i will talk about two things why is it going to be bad because it is going to glorify the idea of cruel plagiarism and capitalist and number two why is it going to be very hard for uh it is going to be less creative on number one r, now underrated or most artists are not having enough money to create concerts yet adjudicated to get another um source of money for example which means that they only solely like get it through music streaming apps or even if for example they create like concerts it is only in a small scale which means that it is harder for me to to get noticed because understand in the status quo the idea of privilege within the already very mainstream and like popular artists the divas are actually like having the privilege.*

As can be seen from the example above, it shows that 87.5% of students use evaluative argumentation which explains the definition of something more clearly, in detail and more specifically.

#### 2. Mode of argumentation in NUDC 2021 in Open Semifinals room D1

Mode of Argumentation	Debater								Total	%
	P M #8	LO #8	DP M #8	DLO #8	M G #8	M O #8	G W #8	O W #8		
Descriptive Argumentation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	100
Relational Argumentation	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	62,5
Evaluative Argumentation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	100

As indicated in table 4.1.2, students are shown giving arguments for the National University Debate Championship 2021, especially in the open semifinal room D1. They use all modes of argumentation and the most widely used are descriptive

argumentation and evaluative argumentation. The following are the results and examples of these three aspects.

### Descriptive Argumentation

**Motion:** This House believes that the state should teach the development of cognitive empathy as opposed to emotional empathy In cognitive empathy, one develops empathy using mainly intellect, logic, and perspective. Examples for this include research, studies, and debating. In emotional empathy, one develops empathy by simulating the feelings of others. Examples for this include lived-in experiences and direct immersive interactions.

#### Example 4:

*The first the only one issue which is about the society expectation come from the state in the south and why cognitive empathy can fit into the expectation hence the development. We are going to uphold can be achieved, under ourselves the house right? Okay moving into my substantive, on these society expectations right? I think society expectation to the state is that number one they expect that this kind of the state can be equal as well as possible. In terms of the making decision.*

As shown from the example above, that students use descriptive argumentation mode. the results obtained in the 2021 National University Debate Championship in the open semifinal session are 100%. all students can use descriptive mode in giving opinions in debates, this is indicated by students being able to describe or explain the definition of something in general.

### Relational Argumentation

**Motion:** This House believes that the state should teach the development of cognitive empathy as opposed to emotional empathy In cognitive empathy, one develops empathy using mainly intellect, logic, and perspective. Examples for this include research, studies, and debating. In emotional empathy, one develops empathy by simulating the feelings of others. Examples for this include lived-in experiences and direct immersive interactions.

#### Example 5:

*For those who come from privileged background and uniqueness but the moment when that happens governments are going to lost the targeted repairs because most likely those privileged students don't have tendency to harm people because they don't have the urgency to simply doing criminal and whatnot those people who live under rural areas that have been oppressed by the ideal capitalists and less fortunate for example you should be the main target of this teaching empathy in urdu christ most likely they the pre-existing belief that willing to do such exactly run away from that toxic poverty education that's why the audio empathy lies within their secondary particulars because they're more than why they're willing to actually kill people.*

As shown from the example above, students use relational argumentation which explains cause and effect, showing a result of 62,5% indicating that students can use relational argumentation.

**Evaluative Argumentation**

**Motion:** This House believes that the state should teach the development of cognitive empathy as opposed to emotional empathy In cognitive empathy, one develops empathy using mainly intellect, logic, and perspective. Examples for this include research, studies, and debating. In emotional empathy, one develops empathy by simulating the feelings of others. Examples for this include lived-in experiences and direct immersive interactions.

**Example 6:**

*main goal at the first place is actually to help in maintaining social integration and helping a society member to actually enter the society itself and therefore by giving them the knowledges that they need we have to actually do this qualification whether it will actually uh when they enter the society will they be able to contribute to society as good as not and whether it is actually relevant to the problems and issues that the society is actually facing at that moment to so that they can function overall now the thing is that uh before we move on the difference between the opening government and also the closing government is that when they are talking more about how the demonstrations and the uh implications that created towards these people when they finish education for example now they fail to actually give us the context of how they are actually going to teach this development of cognitive empathy and also giving us an in-depth analysis of the implications and how this development will actually affect these people your actors themselves uh wait a second and therefore from that differences we see that they are closing government is going to give you more elaborated uh on that subject before with one yes do you think that those conservative parents who will we will have same definitions what's called as human.*

As seen from the example above, it shows that 100% of students can use evaluative arguments that explain the definition of something more clearly, in detail and more specifically.

**3. Mode of argumentation in NUDC 2021 in Novice Grandfinals**

Mode of Argumentation	Debater								Total	%
	PM #8	LO #8	DPM #8	DLO #8	MG #8	MO #8	GW #8	OW #8		
Descriptive Argumentation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	100
Relational Argumentation	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	50
Evaluative Argumentation	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	87,5

As indicated in table 4.1.3, students are shown giving arguments for the National University Debate Championship 2021, especially in the novice grandfinal.

They use all modes of argumentation and the most widely used are descriptive argumentation. The following are the results and examples of these three aspects.

### Descriptive Argumentation

**Motion: This house believe that indonesian environmental activists should significantly aim for positions in the government (such as regional heads, job ministries, legislators, etc) as opposed to incorporations ( shareholders upper management consultants and etc).**

**Example 7:**

*panels girls believe that the goals of the indonesian informative activities is to create a better environment right we want for these people to start to care more in fact environment to be better and everything is becoming more environmental friendlier so he said that in order to do that um indonesian for the position in foreign which is being legislators being a general health administrator that incorporation in which that only like apparently mentioned, how does the things that have a hypothe.*

As shown from the example above, that students use descriptive argumentation mode. the results obtained in the 2021 National University Debate Championship in the novice granfinal session are 100%. all students can use descriptive mode in giving opinions in debates, this is indicated by students being able to describe or explain the definition of something in general.

### Relational Argumentation

**Motion: This house believe that indonesian environmental activists should significantly aim for positions in the government (such as regional heads, job ministries, legislators, etc) as opposed to incorporations ( shareholders upper management consultants and etc).**

**Example 8:**

*first of all let's see what what the urgency that i've been going on in the status quo indonesia right now it's not it's really bad in the field of environment right there's a lot of source that of actions that destroy the environment of indonesia for example like enjoying a way transgressively using single-use plastic using personal vehicles many forests getting destroyed and transporting the judges and too much vehicles and so forth it all creates a bad environment in the end of the day and the problem itself that indonesian government does not really tackle the problem of environmental environment right we do not really heard about in news about how indonesia will try to take on money everything just going on about economy political things and so on and so forth so we said that if we if if opposition outside of going to sale but how corporations will be better so they can make a more environmental.*

As shown from the example above, students use relational argumentation which explains cause and effect, showing a result of 50% indicating that students can use relational argumentation.

### Evaluative Argumentation



**Motion:** This house believe that Indonesian environmental activists should significantly aim for positions in the government (such as regional heads, job ministries, legislators, etc) as opposed to incorporations (shareholders upper management consultants and etc).

**Example :**

first idea of comparison right let's compare the let's cover the likelihood of their proposal towards ours right so they are relying on the idea that oh it's like more accessible to get into government right let me tell you that in government side notice how like some people this is notice that like in the current political atmosphere it is actually relying on like identity politics right which actually focus on like poverty identity education things that are that are like more based are like more directly uh more directly felt by the people we wouldn't have noticed that to get any position of power you actually got to have like relations with political parties which so far only have like similar very similar identities right none of them has actually brought the idea of like climate change or even like have like as clear a difference as like for example between like republican and democrat that that og has already said the the fact that even like even if the market is actually bringing the kind of a green new deal or like climate change idea to the table and it's super different than than the republicans that do not care about climate change at all there is still a huge huge a huge um wave against green new deal in itself right because because the fact is that environmental measures are super super difficult and super um expensive to begin with when you will actually cost you like trillions of dollars.

As seen from the example above, it shows that 87,5% of students can use evaluative arguments that explain the definition of something more clearly, in detail and more specifically.

#### 4. Mode of argumentation in NUDC 2021

Mode of Argumentation	Debater								Total	%
	PM #24	LO #24	DP M #24	DLO #24	MG #24	MO #24	GW #24	OW #24		
Descriptive Argumentation	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	21	87,5
Relational Argumentation	2	0	2	2	3	1	2	1	13	54,2
Evaluative Argumentation	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	22	91,7

The table above describes all the results of the mode of argumentation in the National University Debate Championship 2021. It can be seen that students implemented all aspects of the mode of argumentation in the quarter, open semifinal and novice grand final sessions. Furthermore, the results found in the descriptive argumentation aspect showed a result of 87.5%, this indicates that students are able to

use descriptive argumentation in giving opinions in debates. on the aspect of relational argumentation, the result is 54.2%, proving that more than half of the students are also able to use relational argumentation in debating. 91.7% for the evaluative argumentation aspect, this shows that students are more dominant in imposing evaluative argumentation than other mode of argumentation.

In other words, it can be concluded that the mode of argumentation in the National University Debate Championship 2021 with a sample of 8 students in the quarter, 8 students open semi-final and 8 students novice grand final sessions is that students are able to use all of the three modes of argumentation. The most dominant mode of argumentation used in National University Debate Championship 2021 is evaluative argumentation.

#### **D. DISCUSSION**

The aim of this study is to know and describe the mode of argumentation of students in giving opinions and the most dominant mode of argumentation in the 2021 national university debate championship. According to Scholar Robert Trapp (in Johnson, 2018) there are three aspects of mode of argumentation, namely: (1) descriptive argumentation; (2) relational argumentation; and (3) evaluative argumentation. The Data was obtained from three sessions, namely quarter, open semifinal and novice grand final. The results in this study that students use all modes of argumentation and get the most dominant evaluative argumentation used in the NUDC 2021.

National University Debating Competition in Indonesia is a prestigious annual event where university debate teams from across the provinces gather to compete in rigorous intellectual discussions. Participant engage in debates on various topics, showcasing their argumentative and public speaking skills. This championships often promote critical thinking, effective communication and the exchange of diverse ideas among students. The format and rules may vary, but the goal is to foster a competitive yet respectful environment for cultivating debating talents at the national level. According to NUDC Guidance Book (2021) This competition applies British Parliamentary Debating consisting of 8 members namely Prime Minister, leader of opposition, Deputy prime Minister, Deputy of leader Opposition, Member of Government, Member of Opposition, Government Whip, and Opposition Whip.

The result of this research show that there are 4 mode of argumentation found in NUDC 2021. Firstly, students can use descriptive argumentation. This aspect is based on their arguments in the video debate during the quarter session, open semifinal and novice grand final. Based on the theory of Scholar Robert Trapp (in Johnson, 2018) descriptive argumentation defines something and provides a general explanation. In this aspect, students who act as participants are able to implement very well. Secondly is relational argumentation. Students can use relational argumentation in giving opinions. The results show that only relational argumentation is the least used mode of argumentation in the national university debate championship 2021. The third is evaluative argumentation. In this aspect, students can use evaluative argumentation well. Based on the results of the research above, evaluative argumentation is the most dominant mode of argument used in the national university debate championship 2021.

The mode of argumentations above are supported by the present of argument elements such as claim, reason, data, warrant, backing and rebuttal to create strong argument in a debate. Elements of arguments are crucial for effective communication and persuasion. Clarity ensures that the message is clearly and easily understood, relevance keeps your points significant, evidence supports your claims, logic ensures a coherent structure, and a well-crafted delivery enhances overall persuasiveness. Each element plays a vital role in making the argument compelling and convincing. According to Ananda et al (2018) stated that one of the crucial things to be considered in building strong argument is applying the elements of argument to measure the quality of the argument itself. In addition, there are several factors that contribute to persuasiveness in argument such as including logical reasoning, compelling evidence, a well structured presentation, addressing counterarguments, and using persuasive language to appeal to emotion and values. In line with Rusfandi (2015) who explains that learning the factor that contribute the persuasiveness is important to strengthen the argument.

In the end, the researcher concluded that the debate participants used all the mode of argumentation in NUDC and the most used or the most dominant argumentation mode was evaluative argumentation. The results of this study will help provide information related to the mode of argumentation that can be used to build strong arguments in debates. For future researchers, it is recommended to carry out the deepest investigation on the debate. This research is expected to provide a reference for further research, namely the stasis point in the National Higher Education Debate Championship.

## **E. CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the results and discussion in the previous chapter, this study found that students used all modes of argumentation, namely descriptive argumentation, relational argumentation and evaluative argumentation and the most dominant mode of argumentation used is evaluative argumentation in providing opinions on the National university Debate Championship 2021. The current study has limitations. For starters, the study did not assess the extent to which particular arguments in NUDC 2021 were persuasive. The current study only looked at the presence of the argumentation mode in NUDC 2021. Second, the researcher did not focus on whether the present form of argumentation enhances or detracts from the persuasiveness of the argument. As a result, it is proposed that other researchers who wish to perform additional research on this topic conduct a more extensive coding system in measuring the argument in order to determine whether the usage of these modes affects the persuasiveness of the arguments.

## **REFERENCES**

- Ariani. 2019. *Debate As A Learning Interaction Device To Activate Students To Speak English*. Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.
- Ananda, R. P., Arsyad, S., & Dharmayana, I. W. (2018). Argumentative features of

- international english language testing system (ielts) essays: A rhetorical analysis on successful exam essays. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v2i1.4768>
- Destiyana Rambe, Z. A. (2019). Journal of English language teaching: Nov-Dec19. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 178–186.
- Dewi, R. S., Kultsum, U., & Armadi, A. (2016). Using Communicative Games in Improving Students' Speaking Skills. *English Language Teaching*, 10(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n1p63>
- Faize, F. A., Husain, W., & Nisar, F. (2018). A critical review of scientific argumentation in science education. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 14(1), 475–483. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/80353>
- Hadiningrum, I. (2020). Speech Functions Realized by the First Speakers of an English Debate Competition. *J-Lalite: Journal of English Studies*, 1(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jes.2020.1.1.2747>
- Ipa, P., & Di, S. (2017). *Improving Student's Speaking Ability Through Debate Technique*. Tanjungpura University.
- Jacobs, C. S., & Jacobs, S. (2020). *Scholarship at UWindsor Recovery and Reconstruction of Principles of Academic Debate as Dialectical Model: An Outline of a Procedural Model of Argumentative Rationality Recovery and Reconstruction of Principles of Academic Debate as Dialectical Model: A*. 0–18.
- Johnson, L. S. (2018). Winning Debates. In *Argumentation* (Vol. 22, Issue 1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2015.1056916>
- Li, J., Durmus, E., & Cardie, C. (2020). *Exploring the Role of Argument Structure in Online Debate Persuasion*. 8905–8912. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.716>
- Musrifah, M. (2019). the Effectiveness of Debate Method To Improve Students' Speaking Skill. *Didaktika*, 11(2), 210. <https://doi.org/10.30863/didaktika.v11i2.167>
- Nurcahyo, et al. (2021). National University Debating Competition (NUDC) 2021. Puspresnas.
- Rusfandi. (2015). Argument-Counterargument Structure in Indonesian EFL Learners English Argumentative Essays: A Dialogic Concept of Writing. *RELC Journal*, 46(2), 181-197.
- Yousif, N., Cole, J., Rothwell, J. C., Diedrichsen, J., Zelik, K. E., Winstein, C. J., Kay, D. B.,

Wijesinghe, R., Protti, D. A., Camp, A. J., Quinlan, E., Jacobs, J. V, Henry, S. M., Horak, F. B., Jacobs, J. V, Fraser, L. E., Mansfield, A., Harris, L. R., Merino, D. M., ... Dublin, C. (2018). *The Use Debate Technique in Increasing Student's Speaking Ability*. Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.

Zahra, I. A. (2019). *The Effect of Debate Activity in English Four Skills: The Students' Perspective*. November, 21–22.