



Case Study: The Use of British Parliamentary Debate System and Critical Thinking

Frensy M. Nanlohy

Horu Kane English Course, Indonesia

Email: ferenmichelle@gmail.com

M o n i c a*

Pattimura University, Indonesia

**Corresponding Email: vengsa.provide01@gmail.com*

Abstract

This study is a case study research, it aims to find out how the British Parliamentary debate system enhance the critical thinking skills of the debaters from the English Debating Club (EDC) of Pattimura University. This also leads to the extended identification and analysis of critical thinking levels from EDC Debaters. The subjects are debaters from EDC who have been trained using the British Parliamentary Debate System. The data was collected through an In-depth interview, document review, and audiovisual materials. The result indicates two major things that affected critical thinking from the BP system, including “case build” and “four teams’ mechanism” encapsulated the effect to create a platform for critical engagement in global issues to the extended analysis. As an annex, debaters can proceed to the 5th level of critical thinking (Evaluation) which indicates the 5th stage of critical thinking (Advance Thinker). Therefore, the mechanism of BP can also be implemented in the learning and teaching process, especially in the critical thinking aspect.

Keywords: *British parliamentary debate system, critical thinking.*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30598/matail.v1i1.2771>

Introduction

Higher-order thinking skills especially critical thinking has received heightened attention in the era of the twenty-first century. Think critically helps people solving their problems, make decisions, and achieve the goals that make their life decisively. In line with that, critical thinking is obviously important for those who involve in a higher education level, especially University students. Students need to reach the availability of exploring different perspectives of their own taught linearly with related information. As a consideration, the students then are able to face certain problems in order to respond to a case. Contrary, those positive goals actually depend on students' ability on how they can think at a higher-order thinking level.

The ability of students to productively think critically needs more input to ultimately help the students in terms of constructing their taught towards controversial issues in an academic

situation. In line with that, Halpern (2003) claims that considering the importance of critical thinking skills and the greater need for academic purposes, many experts and scholars have started to look into various techniques and methods that might promote and develop critical thinking in the classroom context. Moreover, Brown and Freeman (2000) convince that a lot of evaluative learning activities need to be incorporated in subjects that aim to practice critical thinking. Therefore, it is necessary for students to have such methods in order to develop their critical thinking.

Critical thinking is not the same as, and should not be confused with, intelligence; it is a skill that may be improved in everyone (Walsh & Paul, 1988: 13). This coincides with Mitchell's (1998: 41) suggestion that 'critical thinking ability is significantly improved by courses in argumentation and debate and by debate experience'. Thus, a debate is relevant to the necessity of critical thinking development. In line with this, some schools and universities have been trying hard to develop students' critical thinking through debate activities. Of course, to help developing students' language skills of efficient listening, convincing public speaking, and debate especially British Parliamentary Debate System. In this measure, students can learn the proper competence for developing efficient interpersonal communication as well as getting ready for the challenges of the 21st century.

Apart from this, The British Parliamentary Debating is chosen as the official international debate system because the British Parliamentary Debating system offers some advantages including the improvement of critical thinking. In addition to this, According to Agustina and Bahrani (2016: 80), the essence of British Parliamentary Debating is not limited to the connections you immediately make to debaters around the world. British Parliamentary Debating offer debaters the opportunity to engage a variety of controversial issues. With ample opportunities for debaters to interact through the use of "points of information", the format is particularly appealing to audiences. According to Somjai and Janse's research in 2015, British parliamentary debate can improve students in critical thinking and student's speaking ability in communication. Moreover, the same related study also have been conducted by Othman, M. et. al. (2015) about The effects of Debate Competition on Critical Thinking Among Malaysian Second Language Learners, in which the result shows on the positive improvement of critical thinking skills of students after being exposed to debate due to its factors related, including argumentation, reasoning, explanation and questioning as in the same line with critical thinking skills.

Literature Review

A. Critical Thinking Skills

A.1. The Definition of Critical Thinking

There are various definitions of critical thinking. Steinberg 1985 (cited in Othman, M. et. al, 2015) defines critical thinking as "the mental processes, strategies and representation people use to solve problems". Besides, Ennis 1987 (cited in Zare and Othman, 2015) defines critical thinking in a simpler way that is as reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or to do. Moreover, Halpern 1996 (cited in Scott, 2008) characterized critical thinking as the practice of cognitive skills or strategies to escalate the prospect of a necessary outcome. This also means that the essence of critical thinking indicates positive effect in estimating reasoning and factors deliberated in making decisions. Subsequently, it can be

comprehended that critical thinking skills carried important roles towards learning process belongs with the development. Therefore, critical thinking skills is complex. It is the ability that involves a taught process including problem solving, estimating reasoning and last but not least is making decisions.

A.2. Critical Thinking Skills Based on Bloom's Taxonomy

In 1956, Benjamin Bloom developed a classification of levels of intellectual behavior in learning. This taxonomy consist of levels that described the skills of critical thinking. There are 6 levels in the taxonomy including Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation. Moreover, in 2001, a group of cognitive psychologists, curriculum theorists and instructional researchers published a revision of Bloom's Taxonomy. This updated version points to a more dynamic conception of classification, including; remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate and create.



Figure 1. Critical thinking stages

Revised categorization 2001

A.3. Critical Thinking in Language Education

The importance of critical thinking skills has been recognized in language education in various contexts. The application of critical thinking in language learning started in the United States, but critical thinking skills are now recognized worldwide (Shen &Yodkhumlue, 2013). For the last few decades, researchers and practitioners have paid attention to the development of learners' higher-order thinking in language education (Shen &Yodkhumlue, 2013). As more focus is placed on the communicative ability of language learners, teaching linguistic aspects of a language is not the sole purpose of language education. Language education curriculum targets the actual use of a second language (Natthanan, 2009). In response to such a goal, educating language learners so that the learners can exercise the ability to analyze, provide reasons, solve problems, and evaluate judgment is now an important issue. An effective means of incorporating critical thinking skills is asking higher order questions that are likely to enhance learners' critical thinking skills.

B. The Understanding of Debate

Debate is a speaking situation in which opposite points of view are presented and argued (Dale and Wolf, 2000). A debate is about the real or simulated issue. The learners' roles ensure that they have adequate shared knowledge about the issue and different opinions or interest to defend. At the end of activity, they may have to reach a concrete decision or put the issue to a vote (Littlewood, 1981). As Quinn (2005) said in his book, *Debating*, "Debate gives you the chance to meet new people and new ideas". Best of all, you have the opportunity to stand up and argue with someone in public, in a stimulating and organized dispute about the real issues". It means that debate facilitates students to discuss their ideas and try to convince people. Debating is an important and interesting way to discuss issues facing our society. Hooley (2007) stated that

debate is a path for prospect and asset in our children as productive and strong world citizens. Last opinion comes from Osborn (2005) stated that debate is a particularly actual way of working toward the objectives of personal development and preparation for citizenship. It helps student learn to participate in the academic conversation and in turn in the public discourse of our democratic society as well. Debate helps students to enrich their thoughts through criticizing and comprehending the issues.

B.1. British Parliamentary Debate

British Parliamentary debating system is a common form of academic debate. It has gained support in the United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada, India, Europe, Africa, Philippines and United States, and has also been adopted as the official style of the World Universities Debating Championship and European Universities Debating Championship. In British Parliamentary debating system, there are 4 teams in each round. Two teams represent the Government, and two teams represent the Opposition. The Government supports the resolution (motion), and the Opposition opposes the resolution. The teams are also divided into the Opening and Closing halves of the debate (Husnawadi & Syamsudarni, 2016).

B.2. The Procedure of British Parliamentary Debate

Prime Minister

The debate begins with a seven-minute speech by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has two basic responsibilities: to define and interpret the motion and to develop the case for the proposition.

Leader of the Opposition

The Leader of the Opposition should explicitly accept the definition and interpretation of the motion as presented by the Prime Minister. In extraordinary cases, when the definition is completely unreasonable as to preclude meaningful debate, the Leader of the Opposition has the right to reject the definition. The Leader of the Opposition has two primary responsibilities, refuting all of the Prime Minister's arguments for the motion and presenting one, two, or three arguments against the Prime Minister's interpretation of the motion.

Deputy Prime Minister

The Deputy Prime Minister has three primary obligations: to refute arguments presented by the Leader of the Opposition, to defend the case presented by the Prime Minister, and to add one or more arguments to the case presented by the Prime Minister.

Deputy Leader of Opposition

The duties of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are similar to those of the Deputy Prime Minister. First, the Deputy Leader should advance the refutation offered by the Leader of the Opposition. Second, the Deputy Leader should defend the arguments presented by the Leader of the Opposition. Third, the Deputy Leader should present one or more new arguments against the proposition.

Member of Government

The Member of Government needs to defend the general direction taken by the First Government team and needs to show how the Second Government team has a new and fresh position or somehow is adding something new and dynamic to the debate. The first responsibility of the Member of the Government is to defend the general direction of the debate initiated by the First Government team. Second, the Member of Government should continue refuting arguments made by the First Opposition team. Finally, the Member of Government should develop one or more arguments that are different from but consistent with the arguments offered by the First Government team.

Member of Opposition

Member of Opposition needs to fulfill several roles. First, the Member of Opposition should defend the general perspective taken by the First Opposition team. Second, the Member of Opposition should briefly continue the refutation of the case presented by the First Government team. Third, the Member of Opposition should present more specific refutation of the arguments introduced by the Member of Government. Finally, the Member of Opposition should present an extension—an argument consistent with, yet different from that presented by the First Opposition team.

Government Whip

The whip speakers for both teams have the responsibility to close the debate for their respective sides. The Government Whip should accomplish three goals. The first responsibility of the Government Whip is to refute the extension offered by the Member of Opposition. Second, the Government Whip should defend the extension offered by the Member of Government. The final and the most important responsibility of the Government Whip is to summarize the debate from the perspective of the Government side.

Opposition Whip

The responsibilities of the Opposition Whip are almost identical to those of the Government Whip. The Opposition Whip should refute the extension offered by the Member of Government, defend the extension offered by the Member of Opposition, and summarize the debate from the perspective of the Opposition side. The details of this speech are exactly like those of the previous speech except that they focus on the Opposition side of the debate rather than the Government side. Once again, the primary goal of this speech is to summarize the debate from the perspective of the Opposition side, particularly from the point of view of the Second Opposition team. This summary should fairly support the Opposition side of the debate while focusing on the accomplishments of the Second Opposition team.

B. The Relation between British Parliamentary Debate and Critical Thinking

Debate requires and develops many of the same skills inherent in critical thinking that leads into the essence of how British Parliamentary debate remains a form of critical thinking. The mechanism as previous explanation, imply how debaters are expected to deliver the most fundamental argument, not limited to the importance and significance of an idea towards team's contribution, which trigger to think critically during the debate process. Moreover, Scott (2008) also claimed that the improvements of critical thinking skills are stimulated in all levels of the debate process. In line with that, there are three major parts of critical thinking that is also

belongs to the needs of debate (Bassham et. al: 2010), including a) asking questions, b) answer the questions by reasoning, and c) believing on the result of reasoning. These elements being treated to analyze deeply under the process of British Parliamentary debate system, the extension of a more complex AREL (Assertion, Reasoning, Evidence, and Link-back) as specific as the Elements of Thought, organized by the speaker's role, in providing an argument unto their personal speech, described as follow:

a). Asking Questions. Critical thinking begins with asking questions. The ability to ask questions drives the person especially students to understand the core of the case also to help to see more deep in order to apprehend the case for problem solving. b). b) Answer the Questions by Reasoning. The ability to answer questions by reasoning them out is not as easy as just answering for the sake of saying something as responding. However, it is different from other ways of answering questions. The answer should never according to personal anecdotes (answering simply according to the way someone raised, or their personality either impressionistically).

c). Believing on the Results of Reasoning. Believing in the result might be a rough test or measure of the completeness of critical thinking. This means that, if someone already made an idea as reasoning out of a case, and at the end of reaching out to the conclusion based on the reasoning, found that it is still hard to believe, then it indicates that there is still something less or incomplete in the reasoning. There are four indicates to show when we are not believing on the result of reasoning including; 1. Reason something out, but strong emotions arise with the result, 2. Believing contradictory things, 3. Believing something very strongly, but unable to come up with good reasons to make it convincingly, and last but not least 4. Reasoning something out, but the actions seem not following the reasoning.

Methodology

This study used a case study. The research design of this study is under the qualitative approach, the data analysis and description presented in words to rather than statistics. This has been conducted at English Debating Club (EDC), Pattimura University with the qualification that the researcher set for the study, due to their experiences as debaters with British parliamentary debate system. The instruments used in this study are researcher as the key instrument, in-depth interview, document review and audio visual materials. This study used data analysis procedure by Miles and Huberman (1994) as cited in AECT (2001) to analyze the data. The procedure consisted of data reduction, data display and conclusion.

Findings/Result

The findings of debaters' interview

In order to gain the interview result in this study, the researcher did face to face interview with 10 debaters of EDC. The result provide explanation regarding how they believe British Parliamentary Debate System enhance debaters' critical thinking, in specifically on which component contributed the most in improving critical thinking. Most of the debaters agree that BP does enhance their critical thinking skills. They responsibly explained on how BP enhance critical thinking concluded in two major component, including 4 Teams mechanism and Case-build. Debaters also add specifically in which opening and closing bench does contributed on the way they think.

Regarding major responses on how 4 teams mechanism improve critical thinking, debaters mentioned on how they need to be familiar and being able to see any specific topic/motion in bigger picture regardless the speaker or team position. This mechanism thought the debaters to think not only from simple proposition or opposition stance, but it obliges debaters to go further and analyze what is wrong with other elements in the proposition or opposition. Moreover, the dynamics of four teams expect the debaters in processing large amount of information in limited time and being able to make informed-decision on how they can solve the problems. This will be done in each bench with different opinion in each team. As a matter of fact, Debaters explained how the opening and closing debate also play important role in their critical thinking skills. They argue on how they try to think to develop preemptive argument headed for opposition side of the house, in order to prevent any loophole to be fulfilled by the opening opposition either in closing bench, and vice versa.

“In opening, they got the chance to deliver the speech. They might explain the core argument, in contrast, closing bench supposed to find new material that have not yet been delivered by opening bench. This is quite difficult, since analyzing argument brought by opening and find other argument that is considered as most important and haven’t been brought in the debate. This situation creates 4 types of argument that each bench should possessed. Opening show most fundamental arguments, while closing show most Important and significant one”. WB

“As prime minister, my critical thinking is improved because I have to analyze the motion and contextualize the debate to not only be strategic for my stance but also cater and be debatable for opposition. As leader of opposition, my critical thinking is sharpened once again when I have to reanalyze the contextualization of PM and offer a response and then rebuttal the arguments, scanning through the layers of the argument and pinpointing the weakness and how it directly clashes with my own arguments and stance. As deputy and member, I improve my ability to structure a well layered speech however be flexible to bend and accommodate incoming arguments and POI’s of my opponents. As whip, your critical thinking is challenged to be able to see the debate as a whole and critique each bench and it’s arguments and how it benefit or not benefits the debate as whole”. AM

Equally important, debaters agree on how Case Build as a paramount key in developing their critical thinking. Mostly answered that doing case-build for different type of motions (for any positions) holds a crucial foundation in developing critical thinking. During case building, debaters are obliged to create a case foundation from their knowledge, status quo, or research experiences in better understanding the complex issues. In line with that, preemptive arguments can be easily developed when debater successfully break down the issue and assess if from different actors or by doing what debaters called “stakeholder analysis”; in which debaters analyze how the motion will impact the existing actors, or whether or not it will be harmful.

“Case build, I feel this also contribute to your critical thinking. During 15 minutes case building, you are practicing not only to build your own argument, but also to consider opponent ideas. In addition, you also need to discuss and come into common ground with your partner about the ideas you want to present as a team. It makes you try to understand other people ideas and fit your ideas into theirs to make one coherent argument”. DS

“Firstly during case building, where you are given a limited amount of time to dissect a motion, in those 15 minutes you are required to ask yourself the right questions and to be able to map out various thoughts into a cohesive manner and pinpoint your burden to prove in your stance”. CT

Hence, British parliamentary debate system does hold a paramount key in helping debaters to enhance their critical thinking skills. 4 teams mechanism which consist of opening and closing debate, does trigger debaters to create significant and the most central argument that needs to be brought in the debate, in order to have well-informed decision to create win-win solution in line with solving the problems. Last but not least, case-build does important in developing a well argument for any position, which affected the debaters in also making preemptive argument in more complete analysis. Therefore, those two major points leads the debaters to get used to think and to be able to be more critical.

Discussion

Based on the fundings and results above, this study come to the interpretation some substantial and prominent elaboration on how debaters perceive their critical thinking skills and their level in critical thinking as follow:

1. How debaters perceive their critical thinking skills

A. Four Team Mechanism

The dynamic of 4 teams' mechanism are scrutinized for personal development in the way of thinking. Debaters are expected to solve the problem presented in motion given, making effective argument with estimating reasoning then draws the decision. As the process of critical thinking, which begins with investigating, clearly a fundamental job as a prime minister who firstly set the contextualization by convey the status quo analysis (which encompasses the current condition) and followed by the urgency of the problem. The annex of whether it is imminent danger or very significant problem. To the extend process of interpretation, both prime minister and deputy prime minister will determine clear model/mechanism, including the definition, mechanism of implementation and preemptive measures. These analysis leads to support the stance of the position, convinced by arguments presented and clear reasoning as the evidence of information. The arguments presented as the opening government, needs to prominently encompass the goal, by being strategic of explaining why the status quo is problematic, be through of why the problem needs to be solved immediately, and what will the stance achieve by not overburden the bench. The opening government also needs to be reasonable, specific and grounded within the reason of why The House (government) has interest of responsibility and who are they. Lastly, the needs to extend why motion is the most appropriate to take action while also deliberately comprehend how to solve, by identifying the root cause. Hence, the identification will significantly explore why the action will address and solve problem, including measurement of the exclusive difference with other measures especially status quo. The step importantly be visualized and specific as the strategic decision making which the last process of critical thinking.

As the leader of opposition, the role will mostly intertwine the investigation with interpretation process of critical thinking. It is important to have short response by questioning the problem (does it truly exist? Is it a prevalent issue?), the urgency (does it need to be solved immediately?), the objective (does opposition have the same goal/objective?), the definition (agree or make definition challenge) and the room of debate in which to agree or clarify the Burden of Prove through interpreting the motion. The extend process of interpretation will also happen in how both bench portrays the status quo, and explain how their stance is

better/enough/not worse or even create counterproposal as the mismatched solution (process of judgment).

As both deputy prime minister and deputy leader of opposition, needs to put short responses in investigating the concessions and burden of prove and context. They can manage to bring the rebuttal in the form of argument interpretation or rebuild the rebuttals. Moreover, both deputy expected to include supporting reasoning with inversely analyze stakeholder, sectors/aspects, and perspectives. As one of the prominent primary skill in thinking critically, debaters needs to be able to “care that their believes be true and care to get it right” might explicitly draws by how deputy bring the case summary and glorification, from the extended information why their case is the most fundamental, important, significant, central and relevant to the keyword analysis.

As the member of both government and opposition, the debaters needs to do a very detail investigating, to analyze the opening debate. They need to recap the opening debate in order to create judgment as one of the critical thinking process as what has been explained in literature review. Those investigation includes what is lacking from the opening debate, what needs to be discussed, and interpret the result by introducing the closing case. Moreover, rebuttal as the part of judgment play important role regarding the argument either rebuilt the rebuttal and prioritizing the central argument. As the main essence of Member, the argument presented forbiddingly same with opening case. The reasoning as the foundation of extension including new arguments and new analysis. This phenomena, create a well evaluate judgment of debaters to think beyond what have been presented before, and re-analyze the extension.

As the whip of both government and opposition, interpreting the whole debate process as well as making inferences of drawing conclusion, which essentially a part of a critical thinker. The whip will evaluate the speech by separating the debate into several central issues (contentions). Each contention will then address the points, rebuild side and glorify (Always Glorify) team contribution, as to care to get it right with justifiable decision, which leads to the exclusivity of team who successfully manage to solve the problem with win-win position.

B. Case- Building

In Case-Building, the foundation of all arguments that will be presented in the debate will obviously constructed in the 15 time given. Mostly the debaters will use questions of 5W+1H for the model, and develop the assertion with why and how questions as the higher order thinking questions. These type of questions will also be more elaborated on why the argument is important and so what, to see the extend benefit or harm created specifically by the motion and its correlation with speaker role as mentioned above in 4 teams mechanism. To the extent of this, each speaker will essentially has different type of developing questions based on each stance and goal from benches. Therefore, it can be concluded that a well elaborated and delivered argument are basically coming from a well case building. To put an annex, as what has been discussed about the 8 elements of thoughts, the case-build sessions will cover point of view from debaters, the purpose of stance in debate, question at issue, having evidence to support the assertion, interpretation and inference, providing concepts, assumptions, implications and consequences. To the extent of this, a well case build will never be achieved without various consumption of information. EDC act as a platform to discuss about updated global issues (not limited to history) in every verbal either virtual meeting of debaters, which encompasses the habit of reading or watching news.

In conclusion, both four team mechanism and case building contributed significantly in the development of critical thinking of debaters. The speaker role and the pattern of constructing

argument mostly intertwine with the critical thinking process including investigating, interpretation and judgment. Moreover, the above description will successfully accomplished after a well preparation in 15 minutes case building in which the process and the element of critical thinking fundamentally being used to build the whole speech for specific speaker role. In line with that, a well-informed debater from productive discussion regarding global issues will be the prominent factor to accomplish both case build and four teams' mechanism. As an annex, critical thinker also internalize with problem solver in which related on how debaters solve the problem in status quo with further analysis, estimating reasoning which also a prominent part in analyzing argument created through the ability of asking and answering higher order questions and last but not least is making decision which also correlated with debaters ability to evaluate decision making with its significant contribution to the motion.

2. Debaters' Level of critical thinking

Regarding Bloom Taxonomy, it could be concluded that most of the debaters does can achieve the level which is "Analysis". However, the lack in analyzing further of an idea, preclude the debaters to comprehend missing element to form a complete argument. Moreover, the researcher can measures the stages of debaters' critical thinking based on the previous classification which indicate 2 group of classifications as follow:

Debater		Critical Thinking Stages
Debater 1	WB	4 and 5 : The Practicing Thinker and The Advance Thinker
Debater 2	FT	Stage 2 and 3: The challenged thinker and Beginning thinker
Debater 3	WP	Stage 2 and 3: The challenged thinker and Beginning thinker
Debater 4	FN	Stage 4 and 5 : The Practicing Thinker and The Advance Thinker
Debater 5	AM	Stage 4 and 5 : The Practicing Thinker and The Advance Thinker
Debater 6	DT	Stage 2 and 3: The challenged thinker and Beginning thinker
Debater 7	DS	Stage 2 and 3: The challenged thinker and Beginning thinker
Debater 8	CT	Stage 2 and 3: The challenged thinker and Beginning thinker
Debater 9	MF	Stage 4 and 5 : The Practicing Thinker and The Advance Thinker
Debater 10	WL	Stage 4 and 5 : The Practicing Thinker and The Advance Thinker

Table. 1. Debater and their critical thinking stages

From the table above, debaters from the challenge thinker and beginner thinker (debaters 2, 3, 6, 7, 8) are mostly coming from novice debater. However, the 6th debater is one of the old debater, still in the 2nd and 3rd stage due to her practice intensity. Five of them have the same challenge due to generally relevant argument followed by some explanation of then given (have limited reasoning). However, there may be obvious gaps in logic seen as simplistic argumentation which are vulnerable to competent responses or either peripheral argument (have limited insight into deeper level and lack of systematic plan in rebuild the thinking). On the other side, the rest of the debaters (1, 4, 5, 9, 10) are able to proceed to the 4th and 5th stages including the practicing thinker and advance thinker. Their arguments are almost exclusively relevant, frequently persuasive and pertinent in addressing the key issue with sufficient explanation. Moreover, there might be slight issue with balancing argumentation and refutation or engagement in the debate. Some of the arguments might have limited insight into deeper level but some also able to identify significantly into problem at deeper level. However, the debaters are actively analyze the thinking in the number of domains, as what they did in the stakeholder analysis. In regards the level of critical thinking skills based on Bloom Taxonomy, all of the debaters are able to be in Evaluating (C5) However, most of the debaters still have the gap to full fill the reasoning as the extension of argument presented (i.e Supporting data as the evidence to convince representative stance).

Debater 2 ~ FT

“We disagree with the motion, since we have Presumption of innocent (*no reasoning*)”

“We also need to uphold human right including for suspected terrorism as in law. Even if someone kill people or commit crime, they still have their right that is human right (*why is it justifiable?*). Therefore, they have right to go to trial as the main purpose of trial is to uphold human right (*unreasonable conclusion*)”

- There are no clear explanation as the part of reasoning in this assertion.
- Lack of systematic plan in rebuild the thinking.

Debater 3 ~WP

“Human right is not for the terrorist since they took other’s people right to live (*why it is justifiable?*)”

“This people is qualified and trustworthy. They are an independent body and less control of government. Therefore, we can trust their job (*so what? Why is it enough?*)”

“Why we think by not upholding on this proposal, we will waste time, money and resources. Time: obviously, since through the trial will then took time. Money: no need to invite scientist in the trial to punish the suspect. (*Unnecessary related argument*)”

- Lack of systematic plan in rebuild the thinking.
- There are limited explanation. The implication is unjustifiable.

Conclusion

Based on the findings/results and discussion above, there are two major point to be highlighted as the conclusion of this research study. Firstly, based on what the debaters believe, there are two major things which affected their critical thinking in British parliamentary debate system, including “case build” and “four teams’ mechanism”. As an annex, the prior knowledge of debaters which mostly effected by updated topic discussion, play significant role in expressing their thinking to full fill the speaker’s role as the successful part from case build and the execution of four team’s mechanism, in responsible to analyze the motion given. Secondly, based on the Bloom Taxonomy, the debaters can proceed to the higher order thinking level which encompasses Evaluate (C5) and Analysis (C4). However, debaters are still lack of reasoning in the explanation of elements of thought, in which needed as what speakers’ role obliged them to. As an annex, The stages of debaters’ critical thinking are defined in two groups as the novice and main debaters. The novice debaters are in the 2nd stage (The challenged thinker) and 3rd stage (Beginning thinker), while the main debaters proceed to 3rd stage (The Practicing Thinker) and 4th stage (The Advance Thinker) of critical thinking. In facts, there are one main debater who in the 2nd and 3rd stages due to the intensive practice issues which affected how debaters maximizing the case building elements and 4 teams’ mechanism with the information gained.

REFERENCES

- AECT. (2001). What is Descriptive Research? Retrieved September 15, 2015, from <http://www.aect.org/edctech/ed1/41/41-01.html>
- Bassham.et. al.(2010). What is Critical Thinking? In Basshamet. al Fourth Edition, Critical Thinking: A Student’s Introduction. McGraw-Hill, Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.
- Browne, M & Freeman, K (2000).Distinguishing features of critical thinking classrooms. Teaching in Higher Education, vol 5, 301-309.
- Carter and Mc Carthy, (1997). Exploring spoken English. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York : Cambridge University Press

- Cresswell, J. W. (2014). *RESEARCH DESIGN : Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed Method Approaches 4th Edt.* SAGE Publications, Inc. University of Nebraska, Lincoln. USA.
- Dale, Paulette and James C Wolf. (2000). *Speech Communication Made Simple*, 2nd Ed. NY: Miami-Dade Community College.
- Elder, L. & Paul, R. (2007)a. Critical Thinking: The Art of Socratic Questioning. *Journal of developmental education*. 31 (1), 36-37, *doi:10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.4n.3p.62*
- Elder, L. & Paul, R. (2007)b. Critical Thinking Development : A Stage Theory, with implication for instruction. *Foundation_for Critical Thinking*. Retrieved from <http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/critical-thinking-development-a-stage-theory/483>
- Flynn, Colm. (2014). *Debating Tutorial Handsout*. World Debating Website. Archived from: <https://debate.uvm.edu/dcpdf/bphandbook.pdf>, 1 March 2014
- Halpern, D. (2003). *Thought and Knowledge: An introduction to critical Thinking* (4" ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Hooley, D (2007). The Importance of High School Debate. *The English Journal*, 96. **Vol.96** n5 p18-19
- Husnawadi, H., & Syamsudarni, S. (2016). The role of English debating tournament in the face of the ASEAN economy community (AEC). *Jurnal Dinamika Ilmu* 1(16).
- Lely and Bahrani (2016). The Implementation of British Parliamentary Debating in Mulawarman Debate Society (MDS). *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics* Vol. 1 No. 1. www.indonesian-efl-journal.org
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from www.scirp.org/.../reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=991780
- Lloyd, M & Bahr, N (2010). Thinking Critically about Critical thinking in Higher Education. *LJ-SoTL*. Vol. 4, No 2 Art 9. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl>
- Kennedy R (2007). In-Class Debates: Fertile Ground for Active Learning and the Cultivation of Critical Thinking and Oral Communication Skills. *Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania*. Vol 19 no 2. P 183-190. [oi.org/10.1177/1469787409343186](https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787409343186)
- Natthanan, D. (2009). Teachers' questioning techniques and students' critical thinking skills: English language classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, The United States. *doi:10.5539/ass.v7n9p149*
- O'Malley, M. & L. Valdez Pierce (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners*. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Osborne, A. (2005). *Debate and Student Development in the History Classroom*. New directions for teaching and learning. Rider University, Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.202>. <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/browse/?type=JOURNAL>
- Othman, M. et. al. (2015) The Effect of Debate Competition on Critical Thinking among Malaysian Second Kanguage Learners. *Middle East journal of scientific research* vol. 11, no 9. Canadian center of science and education *DOI:10.5539/ass.v10n14p25*
- Quinn, R. (2005). *Debating*. Brisbane: International Debate Education Association. International Debate Education Association, Electronic Text, Brisbane. Retrieved from <https://debate.msu.edu/debate/photo-gallery/quinn-zemel-and-jack-caporal-2015-ndt>
- Rohmatika, Arina & Ro'is, Syamsuddin. (2014). Penggunaan AREL pada Penyampaian Argumen di Klub Debat Bahasa Inggris STKIP PGRI Ponorogo. *Dinamika Ilmu*, Vol 14 No 2, 2014.

- Rubiati, Richa. (2010). Improving Students' Speaking Skill through Debate Technique, Semarang : IAIN Walisongo Semarang
- Ruggiero V. R (2014). Beyond Feelings: A Guide to Critical Thinking, New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc, p.21.[https://www.academia.edu/10983846/Beyond Feelings_A_Guide_to_Critical_Thinking_NINTH_EDITION](https://www.academia.edu/10983846/Beyond_Feelings_A_Guide_to_Critical_Thinking_NINTH_EDITION)
- Shen, P. &Yodkhmlue, B. (2010). A case study of teachers' questioning and students' critical thinking in college EFL reading classroom. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(1), 199-206.
- Scott. S (2008). Perceptions of Students' Learning Critical Thinking through Debate in a Technology Classroom; A Case Study. *Journal of Technology Studies*, Vol 34. P 39-44. Retrieved from <https://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JOTS/v34/v34n1/pdf/scott>. Pdf The Critical Thinking Co.™, (2005). What is Critical Thinking?, Critical Thinking Cooperation.<https://www.criticalthinking.com/articles/3>
- Walsh, D., & Paul, R. (1998). *The Goal of Critical Thinking: From Educational Idea to Educational Reality*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.
- Yazan, B. (2015). Three Approaches to Case Study Methods in Education: Yin, Merriam, and Stake. Zare and Othman (2015). Students' Perceptions toward Using Classroom Debate to Develop Critical Thinking and Oral Communication Ability. *Asian Social Science* Vol. 11. No9 *URL:* <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i14/3679>