

## IMPROVING STUDENTS AFFECTIVE DOMAIN THROUGH ASIAN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE TECHNIQUE

Purwanto

English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Bandar Lampung University  
Corresponding author e-mail: pspurwanto3@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT** - *The objective of this research is to see the improvement of the students' affective domain through Asian parliamentary debate technique at English club of SMK Negeri 3 Terbanggi Besar Lampung Tengah. Affective Domain is related to the students' motivation, value, attitude and behavior. Affective domain consists of some levels, receiving, responding, valuing, organization, characterization which also consists of some operational verbs in each level. Affective domain is one of the domains that should be improved during teaching and learning process. Observation, interview and questioners were used to collect the data. The researcher conducted observation for 3 times, interview for 2 times. The result of this study revealed that most operational verbs in each level were achieved during the Asian debate activity. However, at the level of characterization only some operational verbs were not well achieved based on the result of the questioners. Moreover, the student's perception during interview was figured out that there was some improvement before and after the debate. Therefore, teachers are expected to implement the Asian debate technique to see the improvement of the students' affective domain in learning English.*

**keywords:** Affective Domain, Asian Parliamentary Debate

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The roles of teacher in education field are not only to give or to transfer knowledge to students, but also to facilitate the students' learning needs. A good teacher has to try hard to change the students' attitude. A good teacher cares more about their students' learning than they do about their own teaching [1]. Teachers are required to have a comprehensive preparation before, when, and after the teaching. Making a lesson plan is one of the teachers' tasks before teaching. Teacher should decide the material which is appropriate for the level and decide the objectives and indicators of their teaching and learning process. Indicator is used as a basis to arrange an instrument of assessment by using some operational verbs [2]. The operational verbs which are used contain some domains, cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains which are known as Bloom's Taxonomy.

In addition to the teachers' roles, teachers are assigned to deliver material to students using interesting technique. Technique is a particular trick stratagem, or contrivance used to accomplish an immediate objective [3]. So using more interesting technique may create the atmosphere of teaching and learning process to be more comfortable and will motivate students to learn better to accomplish the learning objectives. In teaching English as a foreign language, teacher should motivate the students to be active to speak in order to improve their ability in speaking. It means that students are expected to be able to apply their ability in a real situation for example students are motivated to communicate in the target language. Individual motivation is seen as innate behavior which is influenced by the outcomes and the process of a task, and the role of external factors such as teachers in influencing individual motivation [4]. For this, it is an appreciable chance for teacher to develop their teaching to improve students' motivation, ability and also students' attitude which are discussed in relation

to the domains of Bloom's Taxonomy. The three domains of Bloom's Taxonomy are cognitive (knowledge), affective (motivation, attitude, and value) and psychomotor (physical ability). Cognitive domain is about intellectual aspect, for example knowledge and thinking skill. Affective domain is about emotional of students which includes motivation, value, and attitude. Psychomotor domain involves behaviors that require neuromuscular coordination. Furthermore, affective domain includes the manner which deals with things emotionally, such as feelings, values, appreciation, enthusiasm, motivation, and attitudes [5]. There are some levels in affective domains. They are receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization. Receiving is the ability to show an attention and to respect other persons for example, students listen to another persons' opinion in a discussion. Responding is the ability to actively participate in learning for example; students participate in a discussion and respond some information. Valuing is the ability of students to determine which one is bad and good for example; students propose opinion in discussion when there is different perception. Organization is the ability to form a value system by harmonizing different value, for example dealing different opinion in a discussion. Characterization is to control behavior and to improve intrapersonal and interpersonal social relation for example students confidently to get involved in discussion [6]. The present situation in teaching and learning process does not proportionally cover the three domains. Teacher only focuses on the cognitive (knowledge) domains which refer to the ability of the students to identify the social function, text structure/ grammar, and the elements of narrative text for instance. The Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia (TEFLIN) claimed that there is unequal result on students' attitude and has not achieved to affective and psychomotor

domains. However, the purpose of learning foreign language is that students are able to use the language in communication. The motivation of EFL (English as Foreign Language) student is still a problem in Indonesian school context. The problem is that students in Indonesia show low motivation (affective) in learning English. They come to class to fulfill the requirements that students have to be present in class. Most of them are passive in teaching and learning process. Only few are brave to communicate in English. They are shy to speak English. Even they feel hesitant that they think they will produce a lot of mistakes when they communicate in English [7]. In order to find solution to the problem, teacher should select interesting techniques for the teaching and learning process. An interesting technique may create class atmosphere to be more joyful and improve students' motivation and performance. Interesting technique can minimize students' nervousness and hesitation. One of the example techniques which can be used by teacher is a debate. More specifically it is Asian Parliamentary debate technique. Debate is as an educational strategy that fosters clinical reasoning and thinking skills as well as heightens awareness of attitudes, values, and beliefs [8]. It means that debate can foster students to think critically by giving some evidences trustfully and good manner in communication. Generally, debate is an activity to exchange ideas between 2 persons or more in which the idea influences other persons in the team to receive suggestion. Debate seems to be a suitable technique which can improve students' motivation, attitude, and value (affective domain). There are three kinds of debate technique which are usually used in debate competition. They are British Parliamentary debate technique, Australian parliamentary debate technique, and Asian Parliamentary debate technique. British Parliamentary debate technique consists of 4 teams and 2 speakers in each team. Asian and Australian Parliamentary debate technique consists of 2 teams and there are 3 speakers in each team. The team that supports the topic is called the government and the team that opposes the topic is called the opposition. Each speaker speaks for 7 minutes in alternating order. There are some terms used in debate, such as motion, case building, and point of information, rebuttal, and definition of motion. In this study, the researcher decides to carry out a research entitled "Improving Students' Affective Domain through Asian Parliamentary Debate Technique". Students' affective domain is hoped to be improved by using Asian Parliamentary debate technique which is applied in teaching and learning process. Furthermore, Asian Parliamentary debate technique is expected to give good motivation for students to communicate in English.

## **2. MATERIALS AND METHOD**

Materials Bloom Taxonomy Bloom's Taxonomy was created in 1948 by psychologist Benjamin Samuel

Bloom and several colleagues. It was originally developed as a method of classifying educational goals for student performance evaluation. Bloom's Taxonomy focuses on three major domains of learning: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. Cognitive domain is about intellectual aspect, for example knowledge and thinking skill. Affective domain is about emotion of students which includes motivation, value, and attitude. Psychomotor domain involves behaviors that require neuromuscular coordination.

### **Affective Domain**

Affective domain is about emotion of students which includes motivation, value, and attitude. Furthermore, affective domain refers to emotions as well as outward expression. Emotion is at the core of the affective domain. This is because emotion is often seen as involving three subcomponents: feeling, cognition, and behavior. Feeling is the psychological sensation one experiences. Cognition is the subjective thoughts that accompany the sensation. Behavior, which might be facial display, body positioning, or a variety of other actions, is related to both feelings and accompanying cognition [9]. Emotion is an impetus to act, an instant plan to solve a problem [10]. Affective domain was the emotion side of human behavior, and it may be juxtaposed to the cognitive side [11]. The development of affective states or feeling involves variety of personality factors, feeling both about ourselves and about others whom we come into contact. There are some levels of affective domain, they are: Receiving is the first level of affective domain. In this level, persons must be aware of the environment surrounding them, be conscious of situations or phenomena and be willing to receive and to tolerate a stimulus. Responding is the second level that persons or students are willing to respond voluntarily without coercion, and receive satisfaction from that response. Valuing is the third level which takes on characteristics of beliefs or attitudes as values are internalized. Individuals do not merely accept a value to the point of being willing to be identified with it, but commit them to the value to pursue it, seek it out, and want it. Students actually begin the process of learning as they compare and contrast new material with their existing ideas, beliefs and attitudes [12]. The fourth level of affective domain is organization. This is organization of value into a system of beliefs, determining interrelationships among students, and establishing a hierarchy of values within the system. Characterization is that individuals act consistently in accordance with the values they have internalized and integrate beliefs, ideas, and attitudes into a total philosophy or worldview. More than that, in every level of affective domain consists of some operational verbs. The operational verbs at the level of receiving are: Ask, choose, describe, follow, give, identify, select, reply and use. The operational verbs at the level of responding are, assist, discuss, conform, present, read, select, tell, write, answer, practice, report, comply. The operational verbs at the level valuing are, complete, describe, explain, follow, form,

initiate, invite, join, propose, share, justify, study and work. The operational verbs at the level of organization are, arrange, combine, generalize, identify, integrate, modify, order, organize, prepare, relate, synthesize, defend, complete. The operational verbs of characterization are, act, display, influence, listen, modify, perform, practice, propose, qualify, question, serve, solve, use, verify and revise [13].

#### Concept of Debate

It has been stated that debate is as an educational strategy that fosters clinical reasoning and thinking skills and heightens awareness of attitudes, values, and beliefs. There are 3 styles of debate which are used in some debate competitions. They are British Parliamentary Debate, Australian Parliamentary Debate, and Asian Parliamentary Debate. A debate guide that is written by Morgan explained that British Parliamentary Debate is one of the standard forms used at university level, particularly for international competition, and is the chosen format for both the World and European University Debating Championship (WUDC, and EUDC, respectively) on page 4. British Parliamentary Debate consists of 4 teams of two speakers, opening government, and opening opposition, closing government or opposition, closing opposition. Australian Parliamentary Debate is almost the same as Asian Parliamentary Debate. It consists of 2 teams of 3 speakers. There is PoI (Point of Information) in Asian Parliamentary Debate, but there is no PoI in Australian Parliamentary debate. There are 2 teams which consist of 3 speakers in each team in Asian parliamentary debate technique. The team that supports the topic is called the Government and the team that opposes the topic is called Opposition. Each speaker speaks for 7 minutes in alternating order. There are 3 speakers from government (affirmative) they are first, second, and third speaker. And it is the same as government, the speakers from opposition (negative) are first, second and third. Moreover, there are some parts of the debate. They are, motion, definition, argument, status quo, rebuttal and PoI (Point of Information). Motion is an issue that will be debated [14]. The issue should have positive and negative aspect. It is phrased in a sentence that favors one side. Motion is also called as a topic that will be debated. Motion is usually begun with "This House"; This House Believes That "THBT" and also "THW" This House Would. If motion uses THW, it means that the speaker in debate should make a proposal that contains some policies related to the motion. The example of a motion is "This house would legalize drug for athlete". Definition is that the speaker should define the motion. Argument is reason why the speaker should agree or disagree to the motion. Status quo is that a situation that is occurring, a hot issue. Attacking in every argument by showing strong evidence is rebuttal. Point of Information is a formal question by member of the opposing team [15].

#### Benefits of Debate

There some benefits of debate. Debate will give opportunity to see new people and new ideas [16].

Giving opportunity is exact time for speaker or debater to stand up and to argue with someone in public. Debate will foster students to be active to participate in front of public to solve an issue that is being debated. This means that when the speaker stands up in front of the public, he/she communicates to each other. Moreover, debate will improve the students' soft skills. Affective is related to the students' soft skills. A soft skill is the ability of someone to communicate to another people (inter-personal skills) and the ability to manage their self (intra-personal skills). Inter-personal skills for example students are able to communicate, have good relationship building, motivation, leadership skills, public speaking skills, negotiation skills etc. Intra-personal skills, students are able to manage their self for example, transforming character, transforming beliefs, change management, stress management, time management, creative thinking process etc [17].

#### 2.1 Method

This was qualitative research which focused on case study. Qualitative research focused on the social phenomena and explained how the relation between individual or group in their interaction and communication [18]. Case study may focus on a program, event, and activity process involving individual rather than a group [19].

#### 2.2 Data Resource and Participant

This research used qualitative data which was based on the real situation of the research setting where the debate technique was being carried out. The participants in this research were students of SMK Negeri 3 (Vocational High School) Terbanggi Besar, Central Lampung who are members of GOES 3 (Genk of English of SMK N 3). There were 6 students who got involved to be participants of the debate were being investigated.

#### 2.3 Data Collection Technique

The Data collection technique used triangulation, observation, interview, and questioners. Research question was used during the observation [20],[21]. The research questions were designed by using the operational verbs in every level of affective domain. More than that, the researcher used interview. The type of focus group interview was used because debate is also in a team. By this, the researcher interviewed the team of the debate which consisted of 3 students in every team. Interview was used to know the students' perception before and after learning the debate. Another data collection technique was questioner. The questioners were designed by looking at the operational verbs of affective domain in every level. The questioners consisted of a hundred questions. The questioners were shared to 22 respondents/student Data Analysis

After collecting the data, researcher re-read the data from observation and interview. After reading the data, researcher coded the data. Coding was conducted by labeling some information which was noted during observation. The researcher described the coding by relating it to the operational verbs of affective domain.

### 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Result of the first observation

The first observation was conducted on Monday, 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015 at 14.00 p.m. in one of classes of SMK N 3 Terbanggi Besar. There were 6 students who participated in the debate. They were divided into 2 teams, affirmative team and negative team. The researcher as the participant observer prepared a piece of paper and wrote down number 1-6. The students were asked to take the number. Then the researcher asked to every student to mention what number she was. The researcher wrote down the number on the white board. The affirmative team was number 3-2-5 and negative team was number 4-1-5. In this first observation the researcher just gave a motion. The researcher did not explain about what was Asian debate technique and also about the debate rules, how to make the argument for instance. The first motion was about *This House Would Allow Students to Date*. After giving the motion, researcher let the team to have a case building. Each team was given 30 minutes to have the case building. Researcher figured out everything which happened during the case building and the debate. During the case building, the researcher found that there were 4 students who were not really capable in debate and 2 students were capable in debate. The 4 students who involved in debate were newbie (beginner) and the 2 students ever joined learning debate before. The two students who ever joined in debate helped the students who were newbie in debate especially how to make the argument. The 4 students who were newbie looked very serious to learn debate; however their ability were different from the students who ever joined learning debate. In the affirmative team the student who was really active only one student. The others just listened to the explanation which was given by the student who ever joined learning debate before. The two students in the affirmative team kept respecting to the explanation of the students who ever learned debate. When the debate was started, the first speaker of negative team looked very shy to deliver the argument. She looked confused and suddenly she stopped her speech to deliver the argument. Additionally, the second speaker of affirmative team was really afraid to stand up to deliver the argument.

#### Result of the second and Third Observation

In the level of receiving, the students were really active. The students were able to ask something which related to the motion. They asked to their friends and asked to the tutor during the case building and the debate. The students were able to choose the appropriate ideas in giving arguments during the case building. The students always worked together to solve the case. They choose some information to give and to strengthen the evidence. For example one of students of affirmative team said her idea *"by using drug, the athlete can be more spirit"*, *"because if use drug, can make dependent the athlete, and drug make the athlete not healthy"*. Additionally, to choose the appropriate argument and to relate to the motion, students select some information from the internet and

every speaker gave their own idea. For example the second speaker of negative team said *"increasing jobless in Indonesia because many cigarettes companies are closed"*.

The students were able to describe and define the motion. For example one of the students of affirmative team define the motion *"drug is metter danger can to make a people addictive, so drug can to make a people crazy and death"*, and *"athlete is some people hobbies sport and have talented sport it"*. Moreover, the students were able to follow the explanation which was given by every speaker in the team. During the case building the student who had an average understanding about debate tried to give explanation to the student who had fair understanding about debate. For example one of the students said *"with drug athlete will be more spirit"* and the other students respected to the explanation by hearing and adding more explanation *"first we define and describe what is drug"? and then why they use drug?" to make not sick, increase body endurance and appetite"*. The students were able to identify the case during the case building. Every speaker in every team identified the case by selecting some information from internet. They really supported to each other. Especially when the first speaker explained the reason to other speaker in the negative team *"if the government close one cigarette company, so many employees who will be discharged"*, then the other gave a response *"oh yea discharged and jobless"*. The students were able to replay the ideas from other speaker during the case building. To replay the different ideas, students in every team kept respecting to the other speaker. They elaborated the ideas by using their own word. When the second speaker of negative team dictated, the other students listened and ensured that idea, she said *"How is it?"* then the other student who dictated the sentence did the repetition. One of the students in affirmative team tried to force or to invite the student who was not really capable in debate to find the status quo. She said *"please find the status quo!"*

In the level of responding, the students were able to assist their friends in the team. Especially the first speaker of affirmative team focused to find the information from internet while the other speakers wrote down the information on the book. For example when the motion was this house would close all cigarette companies in Indonesia. The students wanted to know one of the companies which had been closed and fired 2700 employees. Moreover, the student who had a good ability in English tried to help the student who had fair ability in English. One of the students in negative team dictated in English and told the arrangement to deliver the argument. She said *"like this how to say it, ok ladies and gentleman I am the first speaker of the opposition team I want to deliver my argument. This motion is this house believes that drug . . ., our motion today is?"*. The students were able to conform their team. Every student in the team was able to manage their team to determine the duties. For example one of the students as the second speaker said *"you give the example, hurry up!"*. This was the

expression of the second speaker to invite the other speaker in their team to find the example of evidence for their argument. To conform they team, they tried to manage their team by dividing the duties. For example one of the students found the definition of the motion and the others found the status quo. The students were able to create a harmonious condition by greeting to each other. Before delivering their argument, every student greeted to other speakers by saying *“ladies and gentleman good afternoon”*. More than that, the students' performance during debate was challenging. It was very challenging because every student was able to perform bravely. The students who were newbie looked very enthusiastic. They were not afraid and shy anymore to deliver the argument. Every student tried to perform in front of the other speakers. However they brought their book and still read it. Their performance was in consistency. This means that their ability to deliver the argument had close relation to the argument which was delivered by the other speaker. For example, when the first speaker said *“the drug can give negative impact for the athlete and their life is destroyed”*, finally the second speaker added *“smoking makes Indonesia youth addicted to smoking and ruin of the nation”*.

The students were able to tell the hot issue or the status quo which was related to the motion. One of the speakers said the status quo of the motion **This House Believes That Drug Is Good for Athlete**. She said *“what happen in the status quo: I think some people using drugs, he is cannot live good, always fancy, and I think negative impact can to make people crazy and also death”*. Another status quo was uttered by the one of students/speakers by the motion **This House Would Close All Cigarettes Company in Indonesia**. She said *“now welcome to the status quo that smoking makes Indonesia youth addicted to smoking and the ruin of the nation”*.

The students were able to respond the point of information by answering it. The student accepted and answered the PoI from other speakers. Besides that, the students were able to report some evidences which related to the motion. To report the evidence or information, every speaker tried to find from the internet then they discussed it to determine whether the information could support their argument or not. For example when they debated a motion this house believes that drug is good for athlete the first speaker of affirmative team gave evidence *“suffocated body and can make some people crazy”*.

The students were able to comply the rules of the debate. For example, when they did the case building, they were given 30 minutes and they finished it within 30 minutes. Moreover, to make the argument the speaker was able to use AREL formula with the motion this house would close cigarettes company in Indonesia. For example for the Assertion, one of students said *“because the existence of smoking we are slowly tantamount to kill yourself slowly”*, Reason, *“because smoking contain many chemicals”*, Evidence, *“nicotine is the substance that has the impact of negative for smokers because it is just the*

*same as treat drugs and can damage organs gradually”*, Link Back, *“ I think I agree if all close cigarettes companies in Indonesian, because smoking can make people become addicted and wasteful”*.

In the level of valuing, the students were able to complete their discussion on time. For example they spent 30 minutes for case building. They discussed the motion together in order to manage the time. They determined the duties of every speaker in the team. For example when one of the speakers in affirmative team said to other speaker, she said *“athlete who died! Please find athlete who died!”* and also one of speaker of negative team said *“I found the status quo”*. The students were able to explain their argument by using the AREL formula. The students organized their argument in good structure. They were also able to invite the students who were passive to participate during the case building and the debate. During the case building, the ability of the students was different, because there were some students who never joined in debate. They were scrabble player, but they had good motivation to learn debate. The students who never joined in debate guided to the students who never learned debate for example one of the students guided her friend how to speak when they wanted to perform. She said *“Like this how to say it? Ok ladies and gentleman I am the first speaker of opposition team, I want to deliver my argument. This motion is this house believes that drug is”*. Another example was figured out when the second speaker looked very passive, but she became active because the third speaker of the affirmative team invited her to find the information from internet. She wrote down the information which was found from the internet and suddenly she asked to her friend *“what is pemulihan in English?”*. During the observation, the researcher also found that the initiative of every student was really good. Every student respected to the duties which had been determined. For example a student of affirmative team said *“I am browsing yea”*. Another example was the affirmative team, especially the first speaker asked to the third speaker about how to say at the beginning when she wanted to deliver the argument. She said *“I read this one and not this one, right?”*. More than that, to learn every new motion, the students were really curious and tried to work in team to solve the problem. They always asked to the tutor and asked to their friends in the team if they got confused. The students were able to justify their argument. For example, the argument from the third speaker she said *“I think if all close cigarette companies in Indonesia, because smoking can impact the health of smokers and make people become addicted and wasteful, therefore I agree that cigarette companies are closed, as the successor of the nation is good. Should keep away from danger of smoking”*. During the debate, every the student was able to propose and to share different ideas. The different idea which was proposed by every speaker was explained by every speaker to ensure that the idea was appropriate. For example the speaker of affirmative team said *“we use AREL, is it right? Why does athlete use drug, the reason perhaps*

with drug the athlete become more spirit". The third speaker also proposed an idea by saying "the effect can make stroke because the blood vessel is broken". The students were able to deliver their argument in good arrangement. For example, the first speaker of the negative team, when she was called by the tutor, she came in front and greeted to each other, then she delivered her definition of the motion. She explained her motion, she gave the argument for example the motion was THW close cigarettes companies in Indonesia. From the first speaker of negative team she said "good afternoon ladies and gentleman our motion today is this house would close cigarette companies in Indonesia, company is an organization of resources such as materials and labor that was founded by person or group, cigarette is mix tobacco with substances that nicotine and tar which can pose a danger to the body and the environment".

In the level of organization there were some operational verbs which were achieved by the students during the case building and the debate. They were, arrange, combine, generalize, identify, integrate, order, organize, prepare, relate, synthesize, defend and complete. The students were able to arrange their argument into good structure they complied the rules to make the argument by using AREL. The students were able to combine the different ideas which were shared by every speaker in the team. For example when the second speaker of negative team said "I disagree because it will increase jobless in Indonesia" then the third speaker replied "oh yea firing the workers or the employee." "The employee will be fired, then the country because the tax is high", and the third speaker explained again "jobless first then poverty". The students were able to generalize their explanation during the debate. After delivering the argument, the speaker concluded the speech. For example the conclusion which was given by the third speaker of the negative team. she said "and the conclusion is smoking has negative impact for our healthy", our stance is clear, why we want to disagree drug is good for athlete because the drug negative impact for the athlete, just make tired, weak, sick, not healthy, always fancy, not spirit, the lives is destroyed., crazy and make athlete died". Moreover, to integrate the different ideas every the students added more opinion for example the second speaker of the negative team said "I disagree because it will increase jobless in Indonesia" then the third speaker replied "oh yea firing the workers or the employee." "The employee will be fired, then the country because the tax is high". Finally the third speaker explained again "jobless first then poverty". The speaker of the negative team discussed together to select the appropriate ideas for example the second speaker shared the idea and said "if the cigarettes companies are closed, there will be many jobless and the employee will be fired." suddenly the third speaker said "societies" and the first speaker added "I think it is not for the societies, now this is for the company". Students were able to relate the argument to the motion and able to defend their argument. To relate

the argument to the motion, the student in every team tried to dig more reasons and the evidences. For example one of the student argued "I think I agree if all close cigarette companies in Indonesia. Because smoking can impair the health of smokers and make people become addicted and wasteful". To defend their argument, students were able to give the real fact of the status quo to strengthen their argument. They tried to rebut the argument from the opponents and to explain their rebuttal. The second speaker of negative team said "before I bring my argument I will give rebuttal from second speaker of the affirmative team, I don't agree that smoking make me confident but smoking is not good activity, because smoking cannot make smoker relax from the world activity of the day but it will kill them". "I disagree with you said smoking is very relax. I think smoking can make people unhealthy and many people cause to death ehmm, make people death".

In the level of characterization, the students were able to act bravely and in a good manner to deliver the argument. Students were able to verify their arguments. Students were able to influence the passive students to be more active. Students were able to qualify the rules of the debate when the performed. Students were able to solve the motion. Students were able to revise their utterance during the performance. To verify the arguments, students gave more evidences which are related to the motion. They tried to find the information from social media. They discussed the information which was got with their friends in the team. For example when they debated the motion this house believes that drugs are good for athlete. One of speakers in negative team said welcome to the status quo: for example in Jakarta not only the people using drug but the athlete using drugs, there is also the fact of their lives not well ordered and just the winning the future course and besides create crazy, drug also lead to death". Additionally, the speaker of negative team gave example of the reason to defend the argument. She said "cigarette companies evoke a sense of nationalism Indonesian citizens who have sunk. Indonesian cannot be separated from smoking because it has penetrated almost all of aspects of live". During the debate and the case building, not all students were really active. There were also passive students. To influence the passive students, the active students always helped the passive students. The students who had good ability in English helped the students who had low ability in English. The second speaker of the negative team directly guided the first speaker who asked how to say at the beginning to deliver the argument. The second speaker said "like this how to say it, ok ladies and gentleman I am the first speaker of negative team" then the third speaker added and said "I am the first speaker of negative team "ehh is it the first? This house believe that, good afternoon" the second speaker guided again "I am the first speaker from negative team, I want to deliver my".

To qualify the rules of the debate, students could finish their case building on time. However, they were

not really able to speak within 7 minutes to deliver their argument because most of the students were newbie and only 2 students who ever learned debate. So they brought their note and read it. This was their first time to join in the debate. To solve the problem, students worked together, they assisted each other. They tried to find some information from the media; they filtered the ideas from their friends. For example, the speaker of the negative team discussed together to select the appropriate ideas which related to the motion. The second speaker for instances, she said “*if the cigarettes companies are closed, there will be many jobless and the employee will be fired*” Then suddenly the third speaker said “*societies*” and the first speaker said “*I think it is not for the societies, now this is for the company*”.

3.3 Result of Interview

To report the result from the interview, the researcher also gave an example of the students’ talk during interview which related to the questions. The questions were developed by the researcher by looking at the operational verbs of affective domain. During the first and the second interview, the researcher asked about the students’ experience to learn English from elementary school until senior high school. Most of them told that learning English in senior high school was different because they also joined in English club. So they were able to develop they English ability in English club. Moreover, they told that to learn English in the class was not really enough because they said that the English teacher just gave them dialog and more exercises to answer some questions. In English club, the students could find many kinds of interesting ways to learn English especially scrabble, speech, debate and conversation. The researcher asked about their perception during learning the debate. Students told that debate was interesting, sharpening togetherness, and improving their creativity, creative thinking and critical thinking for instances. One of students said “*really good, because we are forced to be brave to speak, we learn*

*to be brave to express our ideas, using our own language*”. Debate could motivate students to develop their vocabularies and gain more information. For example student said “*opening dictionary and finding new words which can be memorized*” Before learning the debate, students were afraid and could not express their ideas. They did not have broad knowledge especially about information nowadays. They always got confused in the first time to learn debate and nervous because they did not know what should they do. The researcher gave an example which was uttered by the student during interview “*afraid, doesn’t have broad knowledge*”, “*cannot express the idea, confuse, nervous and do not know what should be done*”. Students also explained that debate had many values for them especially to improve their motivation to read much information, to perform to speak English and to engage students to be more active. Students were able to work together, to respect to others’ ideas, to value a bad and good impact which was related to the motion. Debate made students to be more socializing with each other. This was proved by one of students during the interview. She said “*To socialize with another school, so we can get information about debate competition or new motion*”. Moreover, the students explained that debate could improve their ability in managing time and managing their team. They said that debate made them to be more discipline to use time specially when they did the case building within 30 minutes. One of students said “*for me, especially about the time, we are able to be more respect to the time by? Debate, we know the time which is given to the participants, because the time is limited so we can respect it*”. In managing their team, students always invited their friend who was passive in the discussion. For example the active students asked to do something during the case building. “*i admonish her, lead, after that yea.. if she is still passive, yea... we give her duties or we ask her to note or ask her opinion*”. 3.4 Questioners

Table 1. the result of the questioners in the level receiving

Operational verbs	Before learning the debate				After learning the debate			
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Level of Receiving</b>								
Ask	27.27%	54.54%	13.63%	4.54%	31.81%	54.54%	4.54%	0%
Choose	22.72%	40.90%	27.27%	9.09%	50%	54.54%	0%	0%
Describe	31.81%	59.09%	9.09%	0%	31.81%	63.63%	0%	0%
Follow	18.18%	68.18%	4.54%	4.54%	31.81%	63.63%	4.54%	0%
Give	18.18%	54.54%	27.27%	0%	45.45%	54.54%	0%	0%
Hold	27.27%	18.18%	45.45%	9.09%	40.90%	45.45%	9.09%	4.54%
Identify	13.63%	77.27%	9.09%	0%	13.63%	86.36%	0%	0%
Replay	36.36%	31.81%	22.72%	9.09%	31.81%	68.18%	0%	0%

Table 2. the result of the questioners in the level responding

Operational verbs	Before learning the debate				After learning the debate			
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Level of Responding</b>								
Assist	4.54%	50%	36.36%	9.09%	27.27%	63.63%	0%	9.09%



Conform	18.18%	31.81%	45.45%	4.54%		27.27%	54.54%	9.09%	9.09%
Greet	9.09%	45.45%	22.72%	22.72%		45.45%	45.45%	0%	9.09%
Perform	27.27%	50%	18.18%	4.54%		40.90%	50%	4.54%	4.54%
Present	27.27%	45.45%	18.18%	4.54%		31.81%	59.09%	9.09%	0%
Read	40.90%	31.81%	18.18%	9.09%		31.81%	54.54%	13.63%	0%

**Table 3. the result of the questioners in the level valuing**

Operational verbs	Before learning the debate					After learning the debate			
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Level of Valuing</b>									
Complete	27.27%	54.54%	18.18%	0%		40.90%	54.54%	4.54%	0%
Explain	31.81%	36.36%	31.81%	0%		31.81%	54.54%	4.54%	9.09%
Form	13.63%	50%	36.36%	0%		31.81%	68.18%	0%	0%
Initiate	18.18%	36.36%	31.81%	9.09%		50%	50%	0%	0%
Invite	27.27%	36.36%	36.36%	0%		40.90%	45.45%	13.63%	0%
Join	13.63%	27.27%	50%	9.09%		22.72%	68.18%	9.09%	0%
Justify	13.63%	31.81%	45.45%	9.09%		27.27%	59.09%	13.63%	0%
Propose	9.09%	36.36%	50%	0%		27.27%	63.63%	9.09%	0%
Share	13.63%	36.36%	36.36%	13.63%		27.27%	63.63%	9.09%	0%
Study	54.54%	36.36%	4.54%	4.54%		50%	50%	0%	0%
Work	40.90%	40.90%	9.09%	9.09%		31.81%	63.63%	0%	4.54%

**Table 4. the result of the questioners in the level organization**

Operational verbs	Before learning the debate					After learning the debate			
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Level of organization</b>									
Arrange	54.54%	36.36%	9.09%	0%		40.90%	54.54%	4.54%	0%
integrate	22.72%	54.54%	13.63%	4.54%		31.81%	63.63%	4.54%	0%
Generalize	31.81%	36.36%	31.81%	0%		13.63%	77.27%	4.54%	0%
Combine	31.81%	54.54%	13.63%	0%		36.36%	59.09%	4.54%	0%
Modify	54.54%	40.90%	4.54%	0%		36.36%	63.63%	0%	0%
Order	31.81%	31.81%	27.27%	9.09%		31.81%	54.54%	13.63%	0%
Organize	40.90%	45.45%	13.63%	0%		18.18%	68.18%	13.63%	0%
Relate	27.27%	63.63%	9.09%	0%		22.72%	77.27%	0%	0%
Synthesize	18.18%	63.63%	9.09%	9.09%		18.18%	77.27%	9.09%	0%
Defend	36.36%	27.27%	36.36%	0%		18.18%	72.72%	0%	9.09%

**Table 5. the result of the questioners in the level characterization**

Operational verbs	Before learning the debate					After learning the debate			
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Level of characterization</b>									
Act	36.36%	31.81%	9.09%	18.18%		22.72%	68.18%	9.09%	0%
Display	13.63%	68.18%	18.18%	0%		27.27%	63.63%	4.54%	4.54%
Influence	22.72%	36.36%	27.27%	9.09%		45.45%	50%	4.54%	0%
Listen	63.63%	31.81%	4.54%	0%		31.81%	59.09%	9.09%	0%
Question	40.90%	27.27%	22.72%	9.09%		36.36%	54.54%	0%	0%
Serve	50%	31.81%	13.63%	4.54%		18.18%	68.18%	13.63%	0%
Solve	36.36%	50%	13.63%	0%		31.81%	54.54%	45.45%	4.54%
Verify	36.36%	63.63%	0%	0%		31.81%	50%	13.63%	0%
revise	54.54%	36.36%	9.09%	0%		36.36%	63.63%	0%	0%

### 3.2 Discussion

From the result of the first, second, third observation, interview and the questioners, the researcher figured

out that there was improvement of the student's affective domain by debating. When the first observation was conducted there were only one



student of affirmative team who gave more contribution in solving the problem during the case building and the debate. Also in the negative team only one of students who let the team to solve the problem. The two students who was mentioned actually ever joined to learn debate before. In the first observation, students look confused and didn't know anything about the debate. The utterance bellow was an example from the interview:

*Confuse, nervous, don't know what should be done, the way to arrange". Afraid doesn't have broad knowledge, so cannot express the idea". (A-7),*

*After entering, it is enjoyable, we brave to speak, to read more, read news". (A-8), I am shy to speak in front of many people, but during I join in debate, I am confident". (B-27)*

The example above meant that there was good improvement of the students' motivation, emotional to learn debate. More than that, to discuss the result of the research, the researcher would like to describe the data which was related to the affective domain and the operational verbs in every level of affective domain.

#### **Level Receiving**

In the Level of receiving was explained that students were able to participate in a discussion. Students were able to respect another's ideas. This was the same that during the case building and debate, students were able to ask to their friends when they got difficulties, students were able to choose appropriate ideas to make an argument, students were able to describe the motion, students were able to follow the explanation which was given by every speaker/student in a team, students were able to identify the case, students were able to select appropriate ideas from different idea which was got from medias and also from their friends' ideas, students were able to reply the idea from other speaker. The students were able to ask to their friends and also the tutor during the case building and the debate. For example, during the case building one of the students of affirmative team asked to the second speaker to find the opinion and the reason. The example bellow is quoted from the students' utterance during the case building.

*"You find the opinion and the reason!". To answer the response, she asked again "what do you mean". Suddenly the second speaker of affirmative team asked to the first speaker "what is relaksasi, aktifitas in English?"*

This means that there was an emotional/willingness which rose from the students that the students curiously wanted to get information. Students also had good relationship building in their team to solve the problem because they help and ask to each other. Moreover, during the interview students also stated that when they got confused they said:

*"Questioning, so we communicate to each other, so it improves socializing values from our self"*

Students were able to identify and to select appropriate ideas to make an argument. For example the negative team work together to decide the arguments:

*"Increasing jobless in Indonesia because many cigarette companies are closed and decreasing job vacancies".*

This was also the example of the students' attitude that they were able to determine the bad impact of drug. Additionally, when the students worked together, this was a social skill which was showed by the students. When students help each other, it was meant that the students had good empathy to their friends in solving the problem.

The students were able to follow the explanation from their friends and to reply their friends' explanation. For example when the students in the team divided the duties for every speaker, first speaker find the status quo, second speaker find evidence, third speaker make the conclusion. During the case building, students who had an average understanding about debate tried to give explanation to the student who had fair understanding about the debate, for example she said:

*"With the drug athlete will be more spirit".*

*First we define and describe what is drug?" and then why they used drug?" "to make not sick", increase body endurance and appetite".*

And the others follow the explanation by respecting and hearing it. In dividing the duties, this was also the ability of the students to learn how to manage their team and this was a leadership skill. Another example of the team management was uttered by one of the students during interview

*"I give a warn, and lead her. I give her job to find information, to note, get her opinion".*

Moreover, there was good improvement which could be compared from the questioners. For example, before learning the debate there were 27.27% students said strongly agree that they were not able to choose the ideas to make argument. It increased to be 50% students said strongly agree that after learning the debate students were able to choose and decide the ideas to make argument. Based on this improvement, it could be figured out that they were good improvement of the students' attitude in choosing the appropriate ideas based on their own perception. Because, in choosing ideas it was also the students opinion.

In the level of responding is that students were able to select attention and heard stimulus from others. In this level, students were able to assist their friends during the case building and the debate. Students were able to conform their team to determine the duties, students were able to perform to deliver the argument in front of the others, students were able to tell the status quo during the debate, the students were able to answer the PoI (Point of Information during the debate, Students were brave to speak English during the debate, students were able to report the case during the debate, and students were able to comply the debate rules.

*Confuse, nervous, don't know what should be done, the way to arrange".*

During the case building the students were able to assist each other. For example when one of the student who had good ability in English tried to help the student who had fair ability

y in English. One of the students in negative team dictated in English and told the arrangement to deliver the argument. She said:

*"Like this how to say it, ok ladies and gentleman I am the first speaker of the opposition team I want to deliver my argument. This motion is this house believes that drug is good for athlete"*.

By this, the student who assisted her friend to teach how to speak at the beginning to deliver the argument had good social skill or communication skill. Moreover, this was proved by one of the students during the interview. She said:

*"To socialize with another school, so we can get information about debate competition and new motion"*.

Students were able to conform the team during the case building and the debate. To conform the team, the speaker determined the duties. They were able to manage their duties by running their responsibility as the first, second and third speaker. Additionally during the interview the researcher found that one of the students said:

*"We give idea, let her to elaborate it, so she can learn to do that"*.

This meant that students were really caring to the others and students were able to give a task to improve their skill in working/team work. Again, during the performance to bring the argument in front of the others, this was the inter-personal skills of the students to communicate persuasively. To persuasively communicate, students were confident to convince by giving the reason.

Additionally, it was noted that their ability of the students to assist their team had good improvement. For example, the data from the questioner showed that it is about 4.54% students said strongly agree that before learning the debate students were seldom to assist their friends' problem. After learning the debate, it is about 27.27% students said strongly agree that they liked assisting their friends' problem.

#### **Level of Valuing**

In the level of valuing the students were able to teach them self to be discipline. They were able to complete the case building on time. The example bellow was taken from the student's opinion during the interview:

*"For me, it is about the time, we can respect more to the time. Debate, we know the time which is given to the participants, the time is limited so we can respect more, then we get more information"*.

Additionally, when the students accomplished their discussion on time, it meant that students had good time management especially in team work. Students had a good motivation that they were able to show their initiative to share ideas and to guide the student who didn't know how to say to deliver the argument. During observation she said:

*"like this how to say, ok ladies and gentleman I am the first speaker of negative team"*. Then the third speaker added and said *"I am the first speaker of negative team ehheh this one first ya! This House Believe ..goodafternoon. Finally the second speaker*

guided again. She said *"I am the first speaker from negative team, I want to deliver my...."*.

Students were able to propose their ideas during the debate and case building. this meant students has good communication skill to demonstrate their perception. In demonstrating their perception, this meant that the students' attitude, because they were able to determine the bad and good thing which based on the motion. For example, during the case building student said:

*"The effect can make stroke because the blood vessel is broken"*.

To invite the passive students to participate in the case building or during the debate, it showed that the students had good social skills to have good relationship building.

*During the observation in the case building, one of the students said "athlete who died! Please find athlete who died!"*

More than that, the students gave their solution if there were passive students during the case building during the interview. She said:

*"We divided the duties, for example a team to find the argument, status quo and conclusion"*.

Additionally, from the questioners, it could be figured out that it is about 27.27% of students said strongly agree that before learning the debate they were difficult to complete another people's ideas. It increased to be 40.90% students said strongly agree that after learning the debate students were easily completed other people ideas.

To complete the different ideas, meant that students were able to respect the different point of view. By this, students also transformed believe that they have to be able to convince their ideas to others.

#### **Level of Organization**

In the level of organization, students were able to arrange their argument by complying the rules of making an argument. They had complied the AREL formula to make argument. For example:

*A: The existence of smoking we are slowly tantamount to kill yourself slowly*

*R: Because smoking many contain a chemical*

*E: Nicotine is the substance that has the impact of negative for smokers because it is just the same as treat drugs and can damage organs gradually*

*L: I think I agree if all close cigarette companies in Indonesia, because smoking can make people become addicted and wasteful.*

This meant that students could obey and deal with the rules. They tried to implement the rules of the debate. Moreover students were really flexible to receive much different ideas, and then they integrated the different ideas to be one principle. This example below was coded during the case building.

The second speaker of negative team shared the argument. She said *"I disagree because it will increase jobless in Indonesia"*. Then the third speaker replies *"oh yea firing the workers or the employee"*. *"The employee will be fired. Then the suddenly the third speaker said "societies" and the first speaker said "I think it is not for the societies, now we think for the country"*.

Integrating the different ideas was the ability of the students to negotiate in the team. They respected the different ideas and generalize it. For example, the statement from one of the students during the interview, she said:

*"We have to be friendly to each other, about her opinion/ideas is it right or wrong?"*

It was also proven by the data which was got from the questioner. For example, there were 227.72% students said strongly agree that before learning the debate students got difficulties to integrate the ideas from their friends. However, after learning the debate there were 31.81% students said strongly agree that they could integrate their friends' ideas easily.

#### Level of Characterization

In the level of characterization, the students were able to perform bravely to deliver the argument. The braveness of the students meant that the students had well emotional to act to have a speech. However, the students brought and read their note.

To verify the argument, students gave some evidences by stating the status quo. This meant that students were able to teach them to be honest person, because to debate a motion they have to say accurately based on the fact. The example bellow was coded from the student in the negative team:

*"Cigarette companies evoke a sense of nationalism Indonesian citizen who have sunk. Indonesia cannot separated from smoking because it has penetrated almost all of the aspects of live". (E-2-7)*

The third speaker of negative team said and gave the fact. She said, *"losers is an employee and country. Employee are more termination of the employment relationship for example from PT Sampoerna 2700 employess"*.

The active students were able to influence the passive students during the case building. For example the student guided her friend to write a sentence in English. She said:

*It creates the time refresh". Then the first speaker followed by saying "will hasten" then the second speaker guided again "refresh after exercises"*.

The example above was an example from the observation. It was also a proof that students had good social skill to each other. They had good empathy to each other, because they had a willingness to help a friend in the team.

Moreover, the students were confident to work in team and to serve the reason, evidence during the debate. They tried to filter the ideas from their friends. The example bellow was taken from the observation:

The second speaker said *"if cigarette companies are closed. There will be many jobless and the employee will be fired"*. Then suddenly the third speaker said *"societies"* and the first speaker said *"I think it is not for the societies, now this is for the company"*.

However, the result of the questioners also gave the example that it is about 22.27% students said strongly agree that before learning the debate they were afraid to influence their friends to give ideas. After learning

the debate, it is about 45.45% students said strongly agree that they were brave to influence their friends to give ideas.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The research conclusion was based on data analysis. Based on the data analysis, it was concluded that the use of Asian Parliamentary debate technique had been advocated in teaching English for affective domain purpose. There was improvement that the students were able to achieve all the operational verbs in every level, except the operational verbs of the level characterization. In the level of characterization, there were some operational verbs which were not well achieved. Debate can give students much opportunity to develop their soft skills, inter-personal skills and ability to manage their intra-personal skills. Students are able to improve their creative thinking, critical thinking, public speaking skills, leadership skills and social skills. Moreover debate can improve the students' attitude, especially when they could identify and consider in problem solving during the debate. Teaching through debate can be enjoyable for both teacher and students.

#### REFERENCE

- [1] Harmer, Jeremy, 2006, How to Teach English, Pearson Education, England.
- [2] Niron D, Maria, 2009, "Pengembangan Silabus an Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran dalam KTSP," <http://staff.uny.ac.id/sites/default/files/131476798/modul%20pengembangan%20silabus%20&%20pp%20plpg%20pengawas.pdf>. December 18 2014.
- [3] Kumaradivelu B, 2008, Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Post Method, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher, New Jersey.
- [4] Alshehri, E, Ajlan, 2013, Motivational Strategies: The Perception of EFL Teacher and Students in the Saudi Higher Education Context, a thesis published, <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/31666>, 1 January 2015.
- [5] Bloom S, Benjamin, 1956, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, David McKay Company INC, Canada.
- [6] Kratwohl D R, Bloom B S & Masia B B (1964) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, the classification of educational goals– Handbook II: Affective Domain*, <http://www.learningandteaching.info/learning/reference.htm#KRATWOHL%20BLOOM%20MASIA>, January 21 2015.
- [7] Mattarima, Karim and Hamdan R, Abdul, 2011, "Learners' Motivation and Learning Strategies in English Foreign Language (EFI) In Indonesian Context", <http://eprints.utm.my/15931/1/JOE-1-2011-014.pdf>. 18 December 2014.

- [8] Hall, Dawn, 2009, "Debate: Innovative Teaching to Enhance Critical Thinking and Communication Skills in Healthcare Professionals", <http://ijahsp.nova.edu/articles/Vol9Num3/pdf/Hall.pdf>. 18 December 2004
- [9] Brett A, Smith M, Price E & Huitt, W, 2003, "Overview of the Affective Domain. Educational Psychology Interactive" <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/affectivedev.pdf>. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. December 29 2014.
- [10] Uno, Hamzah B, 2010, *Orientasi Baru Dalam Psikologi Pembelajaran*, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- [11] Brown, H. Douglas, 2007, *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*, Pearson Education Inc, United States of America.
- [12] Allen K & Friedman B, 2010, "Affective Learning: A taxonomy for teaching social work values", <http://www.socialworker.com/jswve>, 29 December 2014
- [13] Arikunto, Suharsimi, 2012, *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan: Edisi 2*, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- [14] Raquel, M. Reyes, Huynh, L. Lelinh, 2011, *Learning English through Debating*, Curriculum Development Institute, Education Bureau, Hong Kong.
- [15] D'Cruz, Ray, 2003, *The Australia-Asia Debating Guide*, Australian Debating Federation, North Melbourne, Australia.
- [16] Quinn, Simon, 2005, *Debating*, Brisbane, Australia.
- [17] Depdiknas, 2008, *Pengembangan Softskills Dalam Proses Pembelajaran di Perguruan Tinggi*.
- [18] Angrosino, Micheal, 2007, *Doing Ethnographic and Observational Research*, SAGE Publication, London.
- [19] Creswell, John W, 2012, *Educational Research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*, Pearson, United States of America.
- [20] Yin, Robert K, 2009, *Case Study Research: Design and Method*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, SAGE Publication, United State of America.
- [21] Miles B. Matthew, Huberman, A. Micheal, Saldana, Johnny, 2014, *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Method Sourcebook*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, SAGE Publication, United State of America.