

Enhancing Thai Students' Speaking Skills Through Debate: A Case Study At Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i4.1229>

*Soechi Kurnia, Bambang Panca Syahputra, M.Hum^{abc}

¹²³The Faculty Of Teacher Training And Education University Of Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: soechikurnia69@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

This study aims to examine the effectiveness of using debate as a method to enhance Thai students' English-speaking skills at Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand. The research was conducted using a Classroom Action Research (CAR) design, which focused on the integration of debate activities into the learning process to improve students' speaking proficiency. The participants of this study consisted of 30 students from Class X at Darul Ulum School. The data were analyzed using the paired sample t-test to assess the improvement in students' speaking performance before and after the intervention. The results showed a significant increase in students' English-speaking skills, with a p-value less than 0.000 and a t-count of 6.901, which is greater than the t-table value of 1.669. These findings indicate that the use of debate significantly enhances students' speaking abilities. Debate encourages real-time thinking, promotes critical analysis, and helps students articulate their thoughts more clearly and confidently, making it an effective strategy for improving English-speaking skills in the classroom.

Keywords: *Leadership, Principal, Teacher Professionalism, Teacher Performance.*

Article History:

Received 09th July 2025

Accepted 10th August 2025

Published 18th August 2025



INTRODUCTION

Speaking skills play a vital role in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, as they are essential for effective communication and language proficiency. Unlike passive skills such as reading and listening, speaking requires active language production, real-time processing, and the ability to interact meaningfully with others. In many EFL environments, students often have limited exposure to authentic English communication outside the classroom, making the development of speaking skills even more crucial. Proficiency in speaking not only enhances academic success but also boosts learners' confidence and motivation to use English in real-life situations. Moreover, strong speaking abilities are increasingly demanded in globalized workplaces, international education, and intercultural exchanges. Therefore, fostering speaking skills is a key objective in EFL instruction, requiring interactive, learner-centered approaches that engage students in meaningful verbal communication.

At the tertiary level, good communication skills are essential for the success of EFL undergraduates in their study and their future careers. English learners should be motivated and provided with opportunities to use English for communicating effectively. Good speaking ability is important for the learners' progress in the university, and it is also seen as an essential requirement for getting a job out in the working market. This emphasis on the importance and requirement of effective English speaking skills has spurred educational institutions to focus on training their learners to be effective English speakers in order to prepare them for the employment market. Sharma (2014) explains that students' qualifications should respond to the workplace requirements, and they should be trained in the subject that corresponds to those requirements. Moreover, effective communication is

advantageous for a graduate's career development in the future workplace (Bhattacharyya, Nordin and Salleh, 2009). Consequently, there should be thorough considerations given to the communicative needs of the students so that they can develop their learning and prepare themselves for their future working careers.

In Thailand, it is necessary for Thai people to communicate in English since Thailand now has become one of the members of Association of Southeast Asian Nations or ASEAN. Thus, Thai people should be competent in English language. Accordingly, the Ministry Education of Thai (2002) put great emphasis on English language by specifying that English must be the first foreign language which all Thai students learn at school. Regarding four skills, speaking is claimed to be the most important skill (Ur, 1996). However, Thai people still struggle with speaking English since they have fewer opportunities to expose themselves to the language in daily life. Although there are a range of methods that have been employed to teach learners to improve English speaking ability, it leads to insufficient results

Generally, English instruction in Thailand emphasizes CLT as a major method to develop learners' English language proficiency and learning skills. However, surveys have found that Thai learners have very low English proficiency as shown in the EF Proficiency Index (2019), with Thailand being ranked 74 out of 100 countries. Many Thai students have difficulties in communication skills, especially speaking skills. They are still reluctant to speak and are not able to express their ideas effectively. Several other factors that contribute to Thai students' ineffective speaking skills are low motivation, a lack of confidence, and few opportunities to speak English. Sasum and Weeks (2018) mention that Thai students hardly have a chance to speak English and do not have enough vocabulary to communicate with each other. It is suggested that the students can develop their English skills by practicing English through activities and learning from each other. Thus, it is necessary to integrate a pedagogy that can provide learners with an authentic and communicative context so that they can practice and enhance their speaking skills for communicative purposes

This importance of English speaking ability for English learners has resulted in many attempts to encourage learners to practice speaking skills for effective communication. It is suggested that teachers should prepare the spoken English production section of a lesson in order to allow the students to express themselves in the target language and to cope with various functions of language. Moreover, further encouragement for learners to speak should incorporate authentic speaking activities so that the students are given a format for using real-life conversation. Methods of teaching speaking are also important and should be carefully planned so as to provide support in improving the speaking ability of the learners. Brown (2000) refers to the method of teaching speaking to include a planned design for teaching materials, lesson procedures, and controlling and manipulating the activities for speaking skill.

There are so many methods of speaking that we can learn through debate methods such as arguing about economic issues, online games that damage learning, debate methods is one of the learning methods that can learn in class. Debate is an exchange of opinions between pro and con groups that focuses on learning to speak. We can use this debate to help learn English, especially in speaking skill. Currently, to be able to learn students need more new learning that they have not learned before in speaking. Debate provides an experience by which students' can develop competencies in researching current issues, preparing logical arguments, actively listening to various perspectives, differentiating between subjective and evidence-based information, asking cogent questions, integrating relevant information, and formulating their own opinions based on evidence.

Various studies have reported improvements in students' speaking competence after participation in debates. In El Majidi, de Graaff & Janssen's (2024) study, the debaters perceived that debate improved their speaking skills with a mean of 4.26 on a 5-point Likert scale. All the respondents in the study of Rasyid (2022) found that debates honed their speaking skills. Also, the participants in Linh (2024) studies reported improvements in their speaking skills as a result of debating. Nevertheless, all the studies that have correlated debate participation with oral competency development were based on self-reported data,

questionnaires and interviews in addition to instructors' observations. The debate effectively motivated the pupils to enhance their speaking skills. The pupils who initially feared speaking during the classroom debate were subsequently eager to participate in the discussion. They have made commendable progress despite the limited adjustments due to time constraints; yet, they still wish to participate in the debate.

Debate is a technique that can develop competencies to make students more actively to speak and listen to each other in order to provide accurate information and respect the arguments with disproving the opinions based on the fact among them. Krieger states that debate is an excellent activity for learning language because it engages students in a variety of cognitive and linguistic ways. It means that debate technique is highly effective for developing argumentation skills. Human asked to argue through good way. It means that human have to communicate softly and polite. That's what has been said by Allah in his holybook. In debating, human are asked to express their opinions in polite way.

As per Brown (2000: 140) "talking useful skill that can be straightforwardly and experimentally noticed, those perceptions are constantly shaded by the exactness and effectiveness of the test-takers listening expertise, which essentially compromises the reliability and legitimacy of an oral creation test". Brown (2000: 4) characterizes talking as an intelligent course of building importance that includes delivering, receiving, and handling discourse of sounds and the primary instrument. While Thornbury (2013) says that talking is an intelligent cycle and requires the capacity to collaborate in the administration of talking turn. Bygate in turkey (2006: 33) embracing a meaning of talking dependent on interactional abilities which include settling on choice with regards to correspondence.

Speaking is one of the main abilities to be created and upgraded as a method for powerful correspondence. Talking ability is viewed as one of the most troublesome parts of language. Talking is one of the main abilities to be created and improved as a method for compelling correspondence. learning. Numerous language students think that it is hard to communicate their thoughts in communicated in language. They are for the most part dealing with issues using an unknown dialect to offer their viewpoints viably. They quit talking since they face mental hindrances or can't find appropriate words and demeanors. The cutting-edge universe of media and mass correspondence requires great information communicated in English. This paper targets setting up the need to zero in on the variables influencing language students' English talking abilities. This survey paper follows the term talking, the significance of talking, qualities of the talking execution. As per the audit of writing, suitable talking guidance was viewed as the students' need and a field where they need more consideration. This review can be valuable to instructors and analysts to consider their language students' talking needs in the English language educating and learning to.

Communicating in a foreign language requires more than mastering grammar and vocabulary; it also involves continuously practicing speaking and understanding social interactions in communication (Richard, 2002). Effective oral communication demands appropriate language use, considering elements like voice pressure and intonation, which can pose challenges such as nervousness (Brown, 2000). Key aspects that support fluency include grouping, where students learn to organize phrases cognitively and physically; redundancy, which helps clarify meaning; and subtract forms, like elision and reduced vowels, which are often difficult in teaching. Performance variables such as pauses and corrections reflect natural speech. Students should also be familiar with colloquial language and idiomatic expressions, develop an acceptable rate of delivery, and understand stress, rhythm, and intonation as key pronunciation features. Lastly, interaction plays a vital role, as learning language in isolation limits the development of conversational creativity and negotiation.

According to Miranti (2021), there are three main factors to consider in assessing speaking ability: fluency, intelligibility, and appropriateness. Fluency refers to the smoothness and continuity of speech, including sentence connection, word order variation, omission of structural elements, and aspects of prosody. Intelligibility involves how easily spoken words and sentence patterns are recognized, requiring attention to the phonetic features of English, especially vowel and consonant sounds. Appropriateness relates to the

suitability of language for specific situations, including how informality is conveyed through vocabulary, idioms, and syntax choices.

A debate is a speaking situation in which opposite points of view are presented and argued. A debate is about the real or simulated issue. The learners' roles ensure that they have adequate shared knowledge about the issue and different opinions or interest to defend. At the end of activity, they may have to reach a concrete decision or put the issue to a vote. Debate is data in which people take up positions, per sue arguments and expound on their opinions on a range or matters; with or without some sort of lead figure or chair person (Carter, 1997).

Debate is one of effective speaking activity which encourages students' to improve their communication skill. Debates are most appropriate for intermediate and advanced learners who have been guided in how to prepare for them. Based on the definitions above, It means that debate is a formal discussion expressing different opinion which come from expert or research study When someone criticizes, it must be done with full manners, because searching for the truth is necessary but maintaining the unity of heart must also not be ruled out. Do not let because they want to find the truth, the rope of unity is torn apart. Therefore, debates that are built on the intention of merely wanting to seek victory or seek truth but without courtesy, should be abandoned because there is no benefit (Littlewood, 1981).

According to Miranti (2021), a discussion text follows a structured format similar to other texts, consisting of three main parts: introduction, argument, and conclusion. The introduction states the position taken in the debate, whether it supports or opposes the motion, and may begin with a brief overview of the topic. The argument section presents reasons supporting the chosen stance, backed by relevant facts and evidence to ensure logical coherence. Finally, the conclusion reaffirms the initial position in relation to the motion being debated.

METHOD

This research followed the four systematic steps of Classroom Action Research (CAR): planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. In the planning phase, the researcher identified students' low speaking performance and prepared appropriate strategies, including lesson plans and learning materials. The acting phase involved implementing debate activities over six meetings to improve students' speaking skills. During the observing phase, data were collected through observation sheets, interviews, and speaking tests to monitor student progress and classroom dynamics. Finally, in the reflecting phase, the researcher analyzed the results, including pre-test and post-test scores, to evaluate the effectiveness of the debate method and plan further improvements for the next cycle.

Instruments are essential tools used to gather the data required to answer research questions, and data is considered valid and reliable if appropriate instruments are chosen. In this study, the researcher utilized interviews, tests, and observation sheets for collecting qualitative data, while students' final speaking performances through pre-tests and post-tests provided quantitative data. The interview served as a tool for both the teacher and students, used before and after the Classroom Action Research to identify students' writing difficulties, participation, and teaching strategies. Observation sheets recorded all activities during the teaching-learning process, including both teacher and student behaviors. Tests focused on students' ability to write descriptive texts, aiming to evaluate their speaking skills through debate. The data collection techniques included a pre-test to assess students' initial performance, followed by a treatment phase across six meetings involving varied conversation practices, and concluded with a post-test to evaluate improvement.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. below presents the scores of students' speaking skills obtained from both the pre-test and post-test. The purpose of this comparison is to measure the improvement in students' speaking performance after the implementation of debate activities as part of the Classroom Action Research. A total of 30 students participated in both assessments.

Table 1 The Score Of Students' Speaking Skills in the Pre-Test and Post Test

| No | Respondents | Score of Test (Pre Test) | Score of Test (Post Test) |
|---------|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | S1 | 6 | 7 |
| 2 | S2 | 6 | 7 |
| 3 | S3 | 6 | 7 |
| 4 | S4 | 6 | 9 |
| 5 | S5 | 7 | 8 |
| 6 | S6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | S7 | 8 | 11 |
| 8 | S8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | S9 | 6 | 7 |
| 10 | S10 | 7 | 8 |
| 11 | S11 | 9 | 10 |
| 12 | S12 | 7 | 9 |
| 13 | S13 | 6 | 7 |
| 14 | S14 | 8 | 9 |
| 15 | S15 | 6 | 6 |
| 16 | S16 | 6 | 7 |
| 17 | S17 | 6 | 7 |
| 18 | S18 | 6 | 7 |
| 19 | S19 | 6 | 9 |
| 20 | S20 | 7 | 8 |
| 21 | S21 | 6 | 6 |
| 22 | S22 | 8 | 11 |
| 23 | S23 | 8 | 8 |
| 24 | S24 | 6 | 7 |
| 25 | S25 | 7 | 8 |
| 26 | S26 | 9 | 10 |
| 27 | S27 | 7 | 9 |
| 28 | S28 | 6 | 7 |
| 29 | S29 | 8 | 9 |
| 30 | S30 | 6 | 6 |
| Average | | 6.7 | 8.1 |

Source : Researcher, 2025

In this part, the specialist shows that the understudies' totally in pre-test understudies' scores accuracy, fluency, comprehension introduced in the tables, mean score standard deviation, and rate level of understudies' scores were determined by utilizing SPSS 20. It was arranged by the accompanying table, as follows :

Table 2 The Score Of Students' Speaking Skills in the Pre-Test

| No | Respondents | Three Aspects of Speaking Assesment | | | Score of Test |
|----|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------------|---------------|
| | | Accuracy | Fluency | Comprehension | |
| 1 | S1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 2 | S2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 3 | S3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 4 | S4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 5 | S5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 6 | S6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 7 | S7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 8 | S8 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 9 | S9 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 10 | S10 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 11 | S11 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| 12 | S12 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 13 | S13 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 14 | S14 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 15 | S15 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| 16 | S16 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 17 | S17 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 18 | S18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 19 | S19 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |

Enhancing Thai Students' Speaking Skills Through Debate: A Case Study At Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | S20 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 21 | S21 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 22 | S22 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 23 | S23 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 24 | S24 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 25 | S25 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 26 | S26 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| 27 | S27 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 28 | S28 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 29 | S29 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 30 | S30 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |

Source : Researcher, 2025

The table shows the scoring of understudies talking abilities in the pre-test. The talking expertise has three perspectives comprising precision, familiarity, and fathomability. In this part, the analyst introduced and organized the mean score of understudies' talking capacity on by one, as be viewed as the accompanying tables. As can be seen from the table the highest score of students is 3 and the lowest score is. Besides, it also indicated that the mean score of students' accuracy in the pre-test is 2.13 and the standard deviation error is 0.34575. Through material, the researcher got students' inaccuracy before treatments. The accuracy score presented through the table of rate percentage score can be seen from the table shown as follow :

Table 2 Table Descriptive Statistics

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Accuracy | 30 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.1333 | .34575 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 30 | | | | |

As can be seen from the table the highest score of students is 3 and the lowest score is. Besides, it also indicated that the mean score of students' accuracy in the pre-test is 2.13 and the standard deviation error is 0.34575. Through material, the researcher got students' inaccuracy before treatments. The accuracy score presented through the table of rate percentage score can be seen from the table shown as follow :

Table 3 The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Accuracy in Pre-test

| No | Classification | Rating | Pre Test | |
|----|----------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| | | | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Very Good | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Good | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Average | 3 | 4 | 13,3 |
| 4 | Poor | 2 | 26 | 86,7 |
| 5 | Very Poor | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 3 shows that the score accuracy taken by the researcher showed that no students got very good, good, and very poor categories (0%). The majority of 26 students (86,7%) got a poor score, 4 students (13,3%) average. For taking a gander at the mean score of understudies' familiarity with a pre-test, the analyst determined it by utilizing SPSS 20. The outcome can be introduced in the elucidating measurement table as follow:

Table 4 Table Descriptive Statistics

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Fluency | 30 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 2.1333 | .50742 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 30 | | | | |

It very well may be seen from the table that the most noteworthy score of understudies is 3 and the least score is 2. It likewise showed the mean score of understudies' familiarity with the pre-test 1.13 and the standard deviation is 4577 The fluency score presented through the table of rate percentage score can be seen from the table shown as follow:

Table 5 The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Accuracy in Pre-test

| No | Classification | Rating | Pre Test | |
|----|----------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| | | | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Very Good | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Good | 4 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|----|------|
| 3 | Average | 3 | 2 | 6,7 |
| 4 | Poor | 2 | 22 | 73,3 |
| 5 | Very Poor | 1 | 2 | 20 |

Table 5 shows that the familiarity esteem taken by the analyst shows that there are no understudies who get great, generally excellent, great scores and out of 11 understudies get an awful score (73,3%), on normal 3 most of the understudy (6,6%). One might say that most understudies (6,6%) have a low pretest talking abilities. For looking at the mean students' comprehensibility in the pre-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS 20. The result can be presented in the descriptive statistic table as follows :

Table 6 Table Descriptive Statistics

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Comprehension | 30 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.5333 | .50742 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 30 | | | | |

It can be seen from the table the highest score of students is 3 and the lowest score is 2. It also indicated that the mean score of students' comprehensibility in the pre-test is 1.26 and the standard deviation error is 0,50742. Before treatment, the researcher gives material to know students' comprehensibility. Comprehensibility score presented through the table rate percentage score. It can be seen from the table shown as follow :

Table 7 The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Accuracy in Pre-test

| No | Classification | Rating | Pre Test | |
|----|----------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| | | | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Very Good | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Good | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Average | 3 | 16 | 46,7 |
| 4 | Poor | 2 | 14 | 53,3 |
| 5 | Very Poor | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 7 shows that the comprehensibility score taken by the researcher shows that there are no students who get good, very good, good scores, and from 7 students get a bad score (46,6%), on average 8 the majority of students get a score (53,3%) very bad. Students (0%). It can be said that the majority of students (0%) have low pre-exam speaking skills.

Post-Test

In this part, the specialist shows that the understudies' totally in post-test understudies' scores accuracy, fluency, comprehension introduced in the tables, mean score standard deviation, and rate level of understudies' scores were determined by utilizing SPSS 20. It was arranged by the accompanying table, as follows :

Table 8 The Score Of Students' Speaking Skills in the Post-Test

| No | Respondents | Three Aspects of Speaking Assesment | | | Score of Test |
|----|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------------|---------------|
| | | Accuracy | Fluency | Comprehension | |
| 1 | S1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 2 | S2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 3 | S3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 4 | S4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 |
| 5 | S5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 6 | S6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 7 | S7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| 8 | S8 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 9 | S9 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| 10 | S10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 11 | S11 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| 12 | S12 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| 13 | S13 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| 14 | S14 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 |
| 15 | S15 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 16 | S16 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 17 | S17 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 18 | S18 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 19 | S19 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 |
| 20 | S20 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 21 | S21 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |

Enhancing Thai Students' Speaking Skills Through Debate: A Case Study At Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|---|---|---|----|
| 22 | S22 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| 23 | S23 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 24 | S24 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| 25 | S25 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 26 | S26 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| 27 | S27 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| 28 | S28 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| 29 | S29 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 |
| 30 | S30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |

Source : Researcher, 2025

For looking at the mean score of students' accuracy in the pre-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS 20. The result can be presented in the descriptive statistic tables as follow :

Table 9 Table Descriptive Statistics

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Accuracy | 30 | 2.00 | 00 | 2.4000 | .72397 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 30 | | | | |

As can be seen table the most elevated of understudies is 4 and the least score is 2. In addition, it additionally showed that the mean score of understudies' exactness in the post-test is 2.40 and the standard deviation blunders are 72397. On other hand, the analyst additionally evaluated the understudies' talking capacity, which had been given treatment through discussion to make some noise and it introduced through the table of recurrence appropriation and rate as follows:

Table 10 The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Accuracy in Post-test

| No | Classification | Rating | Pre Test | |
|----|----------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| | | | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Very Good | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Good | 4 | 4 | 13,3 |
| 3 | Average | 3 | 4 | 13,3 |
| 4 | Poor | 2 | 22 | 73,3 |
| 5 | Very Poor | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 10 shows that the percentage of accuracy carried out by this researcher shows that there are no very good students, and very bad (0%). Of 2 students who get a good score get an average score (13,3%) and 11 students got a poor (73,3). For looking at the mean score of students' fluency in the post-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS 20. The result can be presented in the descriptive statistics table as follow :

Table 11 Table Descriptive Statistics

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Fluency | 30 | 2.00 | 00 | 2.6000 | .72397 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 30 | | | | |

As can be seen from the table it shows that the highest score of students is 3 and the lowest score is 2. It also indicates that the mean score of students' accuracy in the post-test is 2.6 and the standard deviation error is 0,72397. After the treatment is done, the researcher gave a material dialogue of debate to speak up to know students' fluency. It is presented through the table percentage score. It can be seen from the table as follow :

Table 12 The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Fluency in Post-test

| No | Classification | Rating | Pre Test | |
|----|----------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| | | | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Very Good | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Good | 4 | 4 | 13,3 |
| 3 | Average | 3 | 10 | 33,3 |
| 4 | Poor | 2 | 16 | 53,3 |
| 5 | Very Poor | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 12 shows that the percentage of accuracy carried out by this researcher shows that there are no very good students, and very bad (0%). Of 2 student get a good score (13,3%)

and 5 student get an average score(33,3%) and 8 students got a poor (53,3%). For looking at the mean score of students' comprehensibility in the post- test, the researcher did it by using SPSS 20. The result can be presented in the descriptive statistic table as follows :

Table 13 Table Descriptive Statistics

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Comprehension | 30 | 2.00 | 00 | 2.9333 | .78492 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 30 | | | | |

As can be seen from the table, the highest score of students is 4 and the lowest score is 2. Besides, it also revealed that the mean score of students' comprehensibility in the post-test is 2.93 and the standard deviation errors are 0,78492. On the other side, the researcher also had made the score of the students' comprehensibility who had been a material dialogue of debate to speak up and It the presented through the table percentage score. It can be seen from the table as follows:

Table 14 The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Post-test

| No | Classification | Rating | Pre Test | |
|----|----------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| | | | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Very Good | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Good | 4 | 8 | 33,3 |
| 3 | Average | 3 | 12 | 40 |
| 4 | Poor | 2 | 8 | 26,7 |
| 5 | Very Poor | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 14 shows that the percentage of comprehensibility carried out by this researcher shows that there are no very good students, and verybad (0%). Then, 4 student get a good score (26,6%) and 6 student get an average score(40%) and 5 students got a poor (33,3%).

Analysis of Paired Samples Correlations of Pre-Test and Post-Test

Table 15 Table the Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Pre-Test and Post

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| PreTest | 30 | 6 | 9 | 6.80 | .997 |
| PostTest | 30 | 6 | 11 | 7.93 | 1.413 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 30 | | | | |

The table is about paired sample statistics of pre-test and post-test above it indicates that the value of standard deviation in the pre-test is 0,997 and 1.413 in the post-test.

Table 16 Table The Paired Samples Correlations Of Pre-Test And Post-Test

| Paired Samples Correlations | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----|------|
| | | N | Sig. |
| Pair 1 | PreTest & PostTest | 30 | .000 |

The table paired sample correlation of pre-test and post-test above presented that the correlation of students' ability before and after treatment - 0,000. It means that there was a significant correlation between students' ability in teaching speaking skills through debate before and after treatment.

Table 17 Table the Paired Sample Test of Pre-Test and Post-Test

| | | Paired Differences | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | |
|--------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------|-------|-----------------|------|
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | PreTest - PostTest | 1.133 | .900 | .164 | 1.469 | .797 | 6.901 | 29 | .000 |

From tabel 17 found that use of debate is effective to enhancing Thai Student in English speaking skill at Darul Ulum School Satun, Thailand. This can be seen from the

Enhancing Thai Students' Speaking Skills Through Debate: A Case Study At Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand

significance value (p) < 0.000 with a t-count value (6.901) > t-table (1.669), which proves that there was an improvement in students' English-speaking ability through the use of the debate method among students at Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand. The debate method is effective because it actively engages students in real-time thinking, encourages critical analysis, and requires them to articulate their thoughts clearly and confidently. By participating in debates, students are exposed to various vocabulary, sentence structures, and perspectives, which enhance their fluency and comprehension. Additionally, the interactive nature of debating helps build students' confidence in public speaking and promotes active use of the English language in meaningful contexts.

Discussion

Based on what the researcher has done during the implementation of the study through the debate method, particularly to improve students' speaking skills, it was found that students became motivated and enthusiastic in the learning process and were also interested in learning because they could compete with one another by using debate techniques to enhance their speaking abilities and expand their vocabulary through the treatment provided by the researcher. The researcher also succeeded in discovering that the debate method, as a teaching strategy in the learning process, encouraged many students to participate actively in class.

They were focused on the lessons, although many of them were still confused about the debate learning technique because they had never practiced debating before. The researcher found that many students were still unsure about how to participate in debate activities. However, throughout the learning process, this debate method was shown to improve students' speaking skills at Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand.

In this examination, the speaking test was given to the understudies that have essential English in class at Darul Ulum School Satun, Thailand. Besides opportunity after did this analyst, the essayist additionally found a few issues in the class, for example: (1) The students are still nervous and shy to stand in front of their friends. (2) The students still read the text to speak because they do not have enough vocabulary it difficult for them to speak without reading the text. (3) The students still open the google translation and open the dictionary when answering the questions. (4) Some students don't pay attention to the researcher. Finally, from the significance value of the study it can be concluded that ($\text{sig}0.000 < p 0.05$). It means that there is a significant difference between the results of the pre-test and post-test. According to descriptive statistics, the post-test was higher than the pre-test so. The study accepted H1 where there was a significant difference. A significant difference between students' speaking skills before and after treatment and rejecting H0 where there is no significant difference between students' speaking skills before and after treatment.

CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of using debate as a method to improve the English-speaking skills of Thai students at Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand. This research was motivated by the observation that many students struggled with confidence, fluency, and articulation when speaking in English. Through the implementation of Classroom Action Research (CAR), students were engaged in structured debate activities over several meetings. Based on the results gathered from pre-tests and post-tests, the findings revealed a notable improvement in students' speaking performance. The average score in the pre-test was 6.7, while the post-test average increased to 8.1. This rise in performance clearly demonstrates that the debate method had a positive impact on students' ability to express themselves more fluently, use a broader range of vocabulary, and organize their thoughts more effectively in English. These results suggest several important implications for EFL teaching and learning. First, incorporating debate into classroom instruction can transform passive learning into active, student-centered participation, where learners are required to think critically, respond spontaneously, and use language purposefully. Second, debate not only enhances speaking skills but also promotes critical

Enhancing Thai Students' Speaking Skills Through Debate: A Case Study At Darul Ulum School, Satun, Thailand

thinking, teamwork, and self-confidence—all of which are essential components of communicative competence in English. Lastly, the success of this approach in the classroom highlights the need for educators to diversify their teaching strategies and adopt interactive methods that engage students more deeply. It is recommended that English teachers in EFL contexts consider using debate regularly as a pedagogical tool to support students in becoming more confident and effective speakers.

REFERENCES

- Amoussou, Franck, and Ayodele A Allagbe. "Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis." *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature* 6, no. 1 (2018): 11–18. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3130601002>.
- Carter, R. (1997) *Exploring Spoken English*, UK :Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Language Teaching Approaches: An Overview*. In *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Third Edition. Marianne Celce-Murcia (Ed). Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- Creswell, J. W. (2012) *Educational Research : Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitatif and Qualitative Research*. Boylston Street, Boston : Pearson Education
- Crisianita, S., & Mandasari, B. (2022). The Use Of Small-Group Discussion To Imprpove Students' speaking Skill. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 61-66.
- Brown H. (2000) *Teaching by Principle : an Interactive Approach to language pedagogy*. New york : Prentice Hall.
- Dwistya, Y., & Jaya, A. (2024). Students'perceptions In Implementing Classroom Debating Strategy To Increase Students' speaking Skill. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 7(2), 736-743.
- El Majidi, A., De Graaff, R., & Janssen, D. (2024). Debate as a pedagogical tool for developing speaking skills in second language education. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(6), 2431-2452.
- Linh, P. T. D. (2024). The Use Of Debate Technique To Develop Students' speaking Skills. *Journal Of Science Educational Science*, 71-82.
- Littlewood, William. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. UK :Cambridge University Press.
- Miranti, M. (2021). *Improving Students Speaking Skill Through Debate At Ma As'adiyah No. 17 Babu'e* (Doctoral Dissertation, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palopo).
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rasyid, F. (2022). Pathway of involvement in debate to critical thinking skills, confidence, and speaking ability. In *ICELT2022 Proceedings International Conference on English Language Teaching* (pp. 365-374). Tadriss Tadris Bahasa Inggris IAIN Kediri.
- Richard, J.C. 2002 *Methodology in Language Teaching : an Anthology of Current Practice*. United State of America : Cambridge University Press.
- Susanto, I. (2023). Speaking Skill Assessment through Debate for University Students. *English Language Education Journal (ELEJ)*, 2(1), 29-43.
- Thornbury, S. (2013). *How to Teach Speaking*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Yulianti, T., & Sulistyawati, A. (2021). Enhancing public speaking ability through focus group discussion. *Jurnal Pajar (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran)*, 5(2), 287-295..