

An Analysis of Adjudicators' Feedback Strategy in Competitive Debate

THESIS

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirement for the Degree
of “Sarjana Pendidikan” (S1)**

By:

Misna Aura

1711060004



**UNIVERSITAS
BINA BANGSA GETSEMPENA**

**ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION COLLAGE
BINA BANGSA GETSEMPENA BANDA ACEH**

2021

LIST OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF CONTENT	iv
LIST OF TABLE	vi
LIST OF CHARTS	vii
LIST OF APPENDIX	viii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of study	1
1.2. Research problem.....	6
1.3. The Objective of Study.....	6
1.4. Scope of Study	7
1.5. The Significant of Study.....	7
1.6. Definition of key term	8
1.6.1 Debate	8
1.6.2 Competitive debate	9
1.6.3 Adjudicator.....	9
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Debate.....	10
2.2.1 Definition of debate	10
2.2.2 Various type of debate	11
2.1.1.1 Parliamentary debate.....	11
2.1.1.2 Mace debate.....	11
2.1.1.3 Public debate	12
2.1.1.4 Australian debate	13
2.1.1.5 Presidential debate	13
2.2 Competitive debate.....	14
2.3 Feedback in competitive debate.....	14
2.3.1 Matter.....	15
2.3.2 Manner	15
2.3.3. Method	17
2.4 Definition of speaking	17
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 Research Design.....	20
3.2 Research subject.....	21
3.3 Research location	21
3.4 Research instrument	22
3.5 Data Collection	22
3.5.1 Uses of document analysis (content analysis).....	23

3.5.1.1 Exploring the topics	24
3.5.1.2 Initiating the search	24
3.5.1.3 Storing and organizing	24
3.5.1.4 Selecting/deselecting information	25
3.5.1.6 Analyze the information	25
3.5.1.7 Present the report	25
3.5.2 Types of content analysis	26
3.6 Data analysis	26
3.6.1 Data condensation	26
3.6.2 Data display	27
3.6.3 Data conclusion	28
3.7 Data Validity	28
CHAPTER IV RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION	30
4.1 Research Finding	30
4.1.1 Document analysis	30
4.1.1.1 First recording	30
4.1.1.2 Second recording	41
4.1.1.3 Third recording	52
4.1.1.4 Fourth recording	59
4.1.1.5 Fifth Recording	66
4.2. Discussion	72
4.2.1 First Recorded	72
4.2.2 Second Recorded	73
4.2.3 Third Recorded	74
4.2.4 Fourth Recorded	75
4.2.5 Fifth Recorded	76
4.3 Result	77
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	80
5.1 Conclusion	80
5.2 Suggestion	81
References	82

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the researcher writes some point that related to the theoretical of study. Those points are background of the study, the research problem, the objective of study, the scope of study, the significance of study and definition of key term.

1.1 Background of study

The debate is a speaking opportunity that encourages individuals to think critically about a variety of issues from many perspectives. The debate's goal is to persuade judges to trust all of the assertions made (Syahputra:2020). According to Wahyuni (2020), debate can encourage students to think and maintain their opinion in order to persuade others. On the other side, debate is speaking opinions, building up argument, and rebottles based on the fact and data about the issue which consists of two opposing groups. It can improve students' critical thinking and communication skill where it is proposed to analyze a problem critically.

Currently, competitive debate has existed in the country. It is the place where many critical people connected. According to Wahyuni (2020), competitive debate is a type of debate that is frequently held in academic contexts. It should be creative and competitive activities because people cooperate to decide the best way to solve the problem or compete to promote their positions. The part of debate is argumentation and requires to logic, analogies, practical and principles that force debater to be critical. Now, there are a lot of competitive debates to be

run by the government or trusted institution, such as National university debating championship (NUDC), National school debating championship (NSDC), Kompetisi Debat Mahasiswa Indonesia (KDMI), Java overland varsities English debate (JOVED), etc.

On the other side, evaluation is the important thing to give a systematic method to evaluate a study. In order to determine what works well and what could be improved for debater, we need to do an evaluation that call as feedback. The use of that feedback is directed and clears of each team. Currently, this feedback is provided almost exclusively in each round where a judge should give the decisions with the clear reasons. In competitive debate, it is judged on content (matter), style (manner) and strategy (method).

First, matter basically refers to the speech's content (Ashari:2017). It covers the stated arguments as well as the general strength of the evidence, example, and analysis used to support and justify the argument (Harvey:2011). Furthermore, there are three types of arguments: substantive, rebuttal, and point of information (when a debate style uses it). Coherence and relevance are two essential factors in matter. Obviously, since the strength of the argument is so important, matter appears to be the most challenging aspect of the debate. According to Smith (2011), every speaker must engage in critical thinking as a solution to the motion and construct credible arguments.

Second, according to Ashari (2017) manner is considered as the way of a speaker in presenting the speech. Gestural/body language, eye-contact, and voice expression are the most common characteristics in manner. When delivering an

argument, a debater will usually make a typical gesture. The characteristics showing a speaker's persuasiveness are the reason why technique is included in one of the assessment considerations. Sari (2019) found that confident speakers are more credible than stuttering speakers.

Third, The structure or organization of the speech is defined as method (Sari:2019). The structure of each member's speech, as well as the team's, is important in debate. In general, a speaker's speech structure includes an introduction, arguments, conclusion, and proper timing. However, in this case, an introduction is not the same as one that would normally occur in a conversation. It's more about the overall line of the contested subject, based on the team's point of view (Pradana:2017).

Those kinds of judgment are important to improve students' critical thinking by feedback. Beside in debate, in teaching speaking also has a feedback. The common aspect that evaluate in speaking are pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and accuracy (Wahyuni:2020). Intelligibility of pronunciation is a crucial sub skill in the speaking examination, according to Sari Louma (2004:125), because it impacts overall comprehensibility and is a component of speech that examiners may improve on after they receive feedback on students' performance. Based on Syahputra (2020) explanation, fluency is an ability to speak quickly and automatically. Then, Vocabulary is a combination of single words, compound terms, and idioms that are commonly employed when discussing a topic. Last, the capability to make phrases or statements with correct grammar is known as accuracy. The lackness of teaching speaking feedback, there

is no critical content that could be a standard to evaluate. Therefore, adjudicators feedback in competitive debate is an essential alternative for teaching speaking feedback.

In the competition, an adjudicator decides the winning and losing team. There is no automatic loss or win on the debate because it looks how persuasive they are when building an argument, whether they can satisfy an adjudicator to bring a case or not. Each adjudicator has different satisfaction standard. For example, Opening Government brings an excellent case with the ordinary argument and analysis, closing government has uncommonly analysis and argument even there is no case. First adjudicator agrees opening government as the winner but second adjudicator thinks closing government as the winner. Here subjectivity still exists when giving the decision because it looks based on adjudicators' perspective. First judge has the standard that when providing an excellent case is the best debate and deserve to be a winner, but second judge believes that a good debate when having an excellent analysis. This satisfaction becomes an arbiter for them to win or lost. Therefore it is hard for a loser to accept it.

Deciding a team who lost or win with adjudicators' perspective will be hard to accept because based on their assumption only. Consequently, having a strategy is the best way to solve the problem. Right now in competitive debate, they have a strategy to minimize it. For instance, National University Debating Championship (NUDC) still exists as the high class of debate competition. It has the feedback, judging and evaluation to decide the winner. If NUDC still exist,

means that they give feedback very well. Because all of the team could accept it even they are loose.

There are some reasons of their accepting. First adjudicator accreditation, it is a judge that qualified by a formal test and requires in-depth understanding of debating rules which is necessary to facilitate individuals in making a decision for the rounds. Second, Standards in competitive debating constantly evolves, following the new standards introduced and employed in World Universities Debating Championship every year. 'Good judging' in the past might not be relevant in today's context. Next trusted competition, those kind of competitive debate are come on by the government or trusted institution that into National or International. It means that they have a good image to attract social trust, preparation and following the judging standard. So, it will easy for debater to accept adjudicator feedback.

In a competitive debate, delivering feedback is hard to debater, but adjudicator success to present it. It proofs that they have a good strategy and capacity when giving the feedback. Therefore this research will provide the analysis of adjudicators' feedback strategy in competitive debate to be used for some stakeholder who needs it, such us teacher, adjudicator, debater, etc.

There are some researchers that conducted the same research but just focused on improving speaking skill and oral communication ability. The first research Uswatun Hasanah (2012) entitled "The Implementation of Debate Technique to Improve Students' Speaking Skill (Classroom Action Research at

the Second Year of MTs SA Miftahul Huda Pabelan, Semarang Regency 2011/2012”, English Department Of Educational Faculty of State Islamic Studies Institute (STAIN), Salatiga. The result of this research debate can be found that debate technique has benefit to improve students speaking competence in class and encourage students confidence.

The second research by Pezhman Zare and Moomala Othman (2014) is that “Students’ Perceptions toward Using Classroom Debate to Develop Critical Thinking and Oral Communication Ability”, Department of Language and Humanities Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia. In addition, the result is the students claimed, other benefits of the debates included mastering the course content, boosting confidence, overcoming the stage fright, and improving team work skills.

It is different with the researchers above that discuss about debate, the writers of this research focus on adjudicators strategy while giving feedback.

1.2 Research problem

The problem on this research is what are the judge feedback strategies in a competitive debate?

1.3 The Objective of study

The purpose of study is to investigate the judges’ giving feedback’s strategy in a competitive debate

1.4 Scope of study

The research will only take place on the method or strategy of adjudicators' feedback through competitive debate that exist in Indonesia. It was taken from the documentation of National University Debating Champion (NUDC) 2020.

1.5 The significant of study

This study is expected to give benefit due to its' credibility and quality of the adjudicators' ensurement for some stakeholders such as adjudicator, debater, teacher, student, and researcher.

1. Debaters

Feedback is the most important for debater to improve their capability. When the adjudicator has the strategy, it will easier for them to accept the feedback and correct their mistake.

2. Adjudicators

Having a good feedback strategy is important for adjudicator who have direct role in giving the evaluation. So, an adjudicator should know the pattern of feedback strategy. Then, for adjudicators who are unaccredited, it helps them to look for the excellent feedback strategy and imitating the way to get accreditation. Therefore, it could be beneficial toward an adjudicator in order to gain their ability while giving feedback.

3. Teachers

Right now, there is no standard or pattern for teacher when giving feedback for teaching speaking to students. So, teacher can imitate the way of adjudicators'

feedback strategy which the strategy has been internationally recognized. The writer hopes the strategy can apply by teacher in learning.

4. Students

A good feedback will beneficial toward the improvement of the students in learning. However, it needs the pattern to give a feedback. Feedback strategy at competitive debate has a standard and format that has been applied through the debating world. Therefore, when student get a good feedback from teacher, hoping it can improve their ability.

5. Researchers

This study will useful for researcher to enlarge the writers' capability about adjudicators' feedback strategy in competitive debate.

1.6 Definition of key term

1.6.1 Debate

Debate is a method for improving speaking skills that involves a debate in the form of debating and exchanging ideas between government (pros) and opposition (cons) viewpoints (Pradana, 2017). Debate is about developing communication skills. It organizes effective argument, be persuading and framing an audience. Debating is not about personal abuse, irrational attacks or purely emotional appeals. A debate usually involves two sides talking about a topic or motion.

1.6.2 Competitive Debate

In competitive debates, Teams compete against one another, with the winner determined by a set of criteria centered on the ideas of content, delivery, and strategy (Cambridge Union Society:2015). Competitive debate can be in the form of a formal, disciplined, and rule-governed contest/competition that is conducted within a set framework. A debate may comprise single participants or teams that include several individuals. It is not enough for a team to simply deliver individual speech without any structure or argumentation. A team expected to bring a case.

1.6.3 Adjudicator

The adjudicator is the person who will judge or give the evaluation during debate. It usually classifies at three different aspects. The common classification is matter (content), manner (delivery), and method (structure).

1.6.4 Accreditation

Accreditation is a quality assurance procedure in which an external agency evaluates and verifies the services and operations of educational institutions or programs to determine whether applicable and accepted criteria are satisfied (Sutopo:2019). Accredited judges are crucial in debates since they are well-known and have passed a set of tests to evaluate a debate.