

Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Relizane
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



Investigating the Impact of In-Class Debates on EFL Learners' Communicative Performance

Case Study of M1 EFL Learners at the University of Relizane

Thesis Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Language and Communication

Submitted by:

Mr. DJABOUABDELLAH Benouda

Supervised by:

Dr. HAMDANI Yamina

Board of Examiners

Chairperson: Dr.BENMOKRANE Aicha

Supervisor: Dr.HAMDANI Yamina

Examiner: Dr.BELOUARI Rima

Academic Year

2024/2025

Statement of Originality

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original investigation and research. It has not been submitted previously, in whole or in part, to any university or institution for the award of any academic degree or diploma.

I further affirm that this work does not contain any material that has been copied or plagiarized from any source. All sources and references used have been properly acknowledged and cited in accordance with academic standards.

I take full responsibility for the authenticity and originality of the content herein.

Name of candidate

Mr.DJABOUABDELLAH Benouda

Date 18/6/2025

Dedication

I dedicate this humble piece of work to the pillars of my journey:

To my beloved parents, whose unwavering love, endless prayers, and constant support have been my guiding light. Their sacrifices and encouragement have shaped the person I am today, and I owe every step of my academic journey to their devotion and belief in me.

To my teachers, who sparked in me a passion for learning and nurtured my curiosity with patience, knowledge, and inspiration. Each lesson you shared has played a role in shaping this work.

To my supervisor, whose guidance, insightful feedback, and continuous support have been invaluable throughout this research. Your dedication and encouragement have helped me overcome challenges and develop as a researcher.

To all readers, especially those who, like me, are passionate about learning and discovery. May this work offer insight, spark thought, and contribute—even modestly—to the field.

And to everyone who stood by me, believed in me, and motivated me to keep going—this is for you.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, whose valuable guidance, support, and constructive feedback have been crucial throughout this research journey. Your encouragement and patience have helped me grow academically and personally.

I am sincerely thankful to all my teachers, whose dedication to education and knowledge has inspired me over the years. Each of you has played an important role in shaping my academic path.

I also extend my heartfelt thanks to my colleagues, who were a constant source of motivation, encouragement, and collaboration. Your presence made this journey more enriching and less overwhelming.

To everyone who offered me a word of encouragement, a helpful suggestion, or simply believed in me—thank you.

Abstract

This study explores the significant role of in-class debates within the context of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in enhancing the communicative performance of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. Through a mixed-methods approach that includes questionnaires incorporating both quantitative and qualitative items, the research investigates learners' and educators' perceptions of in-class debates and their impact on fluency, confidence, critical thinking, and engagement. The findings indicate that a substantial majority of students experience improvements in their ability to articulate ideas and engage in meaningful dialogues as a result of participating in structured debates. Teachers similarly affirm the effectiveness of debates in fostering students' confidence and spontaneity in communication. However, challenges such as linguistic barriers, anxiety, and unequal participation were identified, suggesting the need for strategic scaffolding and inclusive practices. Recommendations include pre-debate preparation activities, structured debate formats, and constructive feedback mechanisms to optimize the debate experience for all learners.

Key words: In-class debates, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Communicative performance, EFL learners

List of Abbreviations

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

ESL: English as a Second Language

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

TESOL: Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

TFL: Teaching Foreign Language

ICT: Information and Communication Technology

CPD: Continuing Professional Development

FGD: Focus Group Discussion

List of Tables

• Table 1.1: CLT Classroom Activities: Theory and Practice	23
• Table 1.2: Challenges in CLT and Strategies for Enhancing Communicative Techniques in the Classroom	24
• Table 1.3: Characteristics of In-class Debates as a Communicative Activity	30
• Table 1.4: Types of In-class Debates	31
• Table 1.5: Theories Behind In-Class Debates in Language Learning	35
• Table 2.1: Sample and Participants	44
• Table 2.2: Data Collection Instruments and Key Areas	45
• Table 2.3: Distribution Methods for Questionnaires	46
• Table 2.4: Data Collection Strategies	46
• Table 2.5: Data Analysis Approaches	46
• Table 2.6: Results	50
• Table 2.7: Key Findings from Students' Responses	50
• Table 2.8: Teachers Responses	50
• Table 2.9: Key Findings from Teacher Responses	50
• Table 2.10: Challenges of EFL Students in Communicative Activities	50

Table of Contents

• Statement of Originality	II
• Dedication	III
• Acknowledgments	IV
• Abstract	V
• List of Tables	VI
• List of Abbreviations	VII
• General Introduction	IX

Chapter One: In-Class Debates within the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Framework

• Introduction	10
• Section One: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Definitions and Perspectives	
○ 1.1.2 Defining CLT: Views from Scholars	11
○ 1.1.3 Key Principles of CLT	14
○ 1.1.4 Historical Background and Evolution	15
○ 1.1.5 Learner-Centeredness, Collaboration, and Interaction	18
○ 1.1.6 Teacher and Learner Roles in CLT Classrooms	20
○ 1.1.7 Types of Classroom Activities in CLT	23
○ 1.1.8 Challenges and Strategies for Enhancing Communication	24
• Section Two: In-Class Debates as a Communicative Tool	
○ 1.2.1 Definitions of In-Class Debates	27
○ 1.2.2 Characteristics of Debates in Language Classrooms	30
○ 1.2.3 Types of In-Class Debates	31
○ 1.2.4 Relevance of Debates to CLT Principles	31
○ 1.2.5 Implementing Debates in EFL Classrooms: Reports from Practice	33
○ 1.2.6 Theoretical Foundations of Debate in Language Learning	35
○ 1.2.7 Limitations of Debates in EFL Contexts	36
○ 1.2.8 Previous Studies on In-Class Debates	39
○ 1.2.9 Identifying Gaps in the Literature	41

Chapter Two: Methodology, Results, and Recommendations

• Introduction	44
• Section One: Research Methodology	
○ 2.1.1 Research Design	44
○ 2.1.2 Participants and Sampling	44
○ 2.1.3 Data Collection Instruments	45
○ 2.1.4 Research Procedure	46
• Section Two: Results and Discussion	

○ 2.2.1 Analysis of Students' Responses	50
• Section Three: Recommendations	
○ 2.3.1 For Teachers	56
○ 2.3.2 For Learners	58
○ 2.3.3 Suggestions for Future Research	58
• General Conclusion	59
• List of References	61
• Appendices	63

General Introduction

Background of the Study

Over the years, Algerian universities have adopted more communicative methodologies in language teaching. Still, many EFL learners struggle with spontaneous communication in English due to a lack of real interaction opportunities. Traditional lecture-based instruction continues to dominate in many classrooms, limiting learners' chances to develop fluency, confidence, and communicative strategies. This research emerged from the observation that in-class debates might serve as an effective, underutilized tool for fostering communicative performance among EFL learners at the University of Relizane.

Statement of the Problem

Despite growing awareness of CLT principles, many language classrooms remain teacher-centered, and learners often hesitate to participate actively. Students experience anxiety when speaking in front of others, lack vocabulary for debate, or rely on memorized chunks of speech. Consequently, they do not develop the fluency and critical language skills needed for real-world communication. This study investigates whether in-class debates—when structured and implemented effectively—can address these gaps in learners' communicative development.

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to:

1. Explore the role of in-class debates in enhancing EFL learners' communicative performance.
2. Investigate learners' and teachers' perceptions of using debates in the classroom.
3. Identify the challenges that learners face during debate activities.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do in-class debates enhance EFL learners' fluency and communicative performance?
2. How do EFL students and teachers perceive the use of debates in language learning?
3. What are the main challenges encountered during in-class debates?

Hypotheses

- In-class debates significantly improve EFL learners' communicative skills, including fluency, confidence, and critical thinking.
- Learners and teachers have generally positive perceptions of debates but identify common challenges related to participation and language proficiency.
- Structured preparation and scaffolding techniques can mitigate the obstacles faced during debate activities.

Methodology

This research adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative data collection. Questionnaires were distributed to M1 EFL learners and teachers at the University of Relizane. The data were analyzed to explore patterns in perceptions, performance outcomes, and reported challenges. The study emphasizes a case-study format to provide in-depth insights into the effectiveness of classroom debates in a specific academic setting.

Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is structured as follows:

- **Chapter One:** Reviews relevant literature on Communicative Language Teaching and the use of in-class debates. It defines CLT, explores its key principles, and discusses how debates align with communicative classroom practices.
- **Chapter Two:** Describes the methodology used in the study, presents the results from the student and teacher questionnaires, discusses the findings, and outlines recommendations based on the observed challenges.

Chapter 1: In-class Debates in Communicative Language Teaching Context: Overview

Introduction

This chapter explores the theoretical underpinnings of CLT and situates in-class debates within this pedagogical framework. It first examines the definitions, principles, and evolution of CLT, highlighting its emphasis on learner autonomy, interaction, and communicative effectiveness. It then defines in-class debates, outlines their key characteristics and types, and discusses their pedagogical relevance and limitations in EFL settings. Furthermore, the chapter presents selected theoretical foundations and prior studies to provide a scholarly basis for investigating the role of debates in enhancing communicative performance.

By connecting the principles of CLT with the practice of in-class debates, this chapter lays the groundwork for understanding how structured classroom discussions can serve as powerful tools for language development in EFL contexts.

1.1 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Definitions and Perspectives

1.1.1 Introduction to CLT

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged in the 1970s as a response to the limitations of grammar-based methods, which often failed to prepare learners for real-life communication. The concept of *communicative competence*, introduced by Hymes (1972) in *On Communicative Competence*, laid the theoretical foundation for CLT. He argued that language proficiency requires not only grammatical accuracy but also the ability to use language appropriately in context.

Further development came from Canale and Swain (1980), who expanded communicative competence into four components: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. This framework helped shape modern communicative approaches in language classrooms.

In practice, CLT focuses on fluency, interaction, and meaningful communication. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001) in *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, CLT encourages the use of authentic materials, pair and group work, and tasks that simulate real-life situations.

Littlewood (1981) emphasized that CLT promotes learner autonomy and supports activities that move from controlled to freer communication. Nunan (2004), in *Task-Based Language Teaching*, highlighted how real-world tasks, such as debates, enhance communicative performance and foster learner engagement.

In summary, CLT represents a shift from learning about language to using it purposefully, making it especially relevant in EFL contexts where learners need practical communication skills.

1.1.2 Scholars' Different Views about CLT

Littlewood (1981): Integrating Functional and Structural Aspects

In *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction* (1981), William Littlewood provides a balanced perspective on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), emphasizing that effective communication depends on both functional competence (language use) and structural competence (grammatical accuracy). He argues that while CLT focuses on meaningful interaction, structural knowledge should not be neglected.

Littlewood proposes a two-phase process: pre-communicative activities, which involve controlled practice of language forms, and communicative activities, where learners apply these forms in realistic interactions. This integrated approach ensures that learners not only gain fluency but also develop grammatical precision, allowing them to express themselves clearly and accurately. His perspective supports a version of CLT that combines fluency-building with structured linguistic support.

Nunan (1991): Meaning-Making Over Structural Mastery

In *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers* (1991), David Nunan emphasizes that CLT should prioritize meaning-making over the mechanical practice of grammatical forms. He critiques traditional methods focused on repetition and drills, arguing that real language acquisition happens through engagement in meaningful communication.

Nunan advocates for a task-based approach where learners interact through purposeful, context-driven activities that mirror real-life communication. He suggests that language learning is most effective when students are involved in negotiating meaning, solving problems, and performing communicative tasks. His view reinforces the idea that authentic interaction, not isolated grammar exercises, lies at the heart of communicative competence.

Savignon (2002): The Components of Communicative Competence

Sandra Savignon, in her book *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education* (2002), expands on the foundational concept of communicative competence. She identifies four essential components: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence.

Grammatical competence involves knowledge of syntax, morphology, phonology, and semantics. Sociolinguistic competence covers the appropriate use of language across different social settings. Discourse competence refers to producing coherent spoken or written texts, while strategic competence involves communication strategies used to overcome gaps in language

knowledge. Savignon stresses that CLT must develop all these competencies to prepare learners for real-life interactions, not just fluent speech.

Richards and Rodgers (2001): CLT as an Interaction-Based Approach

In *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed., 2001), Jack Richards and Theodore Rodgers define CLT as an approach that centers on meaningful interaction as both the goal and means of language learning. They contrast CLT with earlier methods like the audio-lingual approach, which relied on drills and form-focused practice.

Richards and Rodgers argue that real language learning occurs when learners negotiate meaning and participate actively in communication. They advocate for student-centered activities such as discussions, task-based learning, and problem-solving tasks. In their view, grammar is still important but is best learned through use, not through isolated instruction. Their work emphasizes that communication should be central to both the process and outcome of language education.

Brown (2007): CLT as a Learner-Centered Approach

In *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (3rd ed., 2007), H. Douglas Brown presents CLT as a learner-centered approach that promotes autonomy, engagement, and active participation. He argues that this methodology shifts the teacher's role from knowledge-giver to facilitator, guiding learners as they interact and construct knowledge collaboratively.

Brown emphasizes the importance of authentic tasks—such as debates, role plays, and group work—that mirror real-life communication. These tasks help learners develop not only linguistic skills but also critical thinking, problem-solving, and confidence. His perspective reinforces the idea that CLT empowers learners to take ownership of their learning and use language meaningfully in diverse contexts.

1.1.4 Historical Evolution of CLT

1.1.4.1 Pre-CLT Language Teaching Methods

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged in the 1970s as a reaction to methods that prioritized grammar drills over real communication. Influenced by Hymes' (1972) concept of *communicative competence*, CLT shifted focus to using language meaningfully and appropriately in context. This view was expanded by Canale and Swain (1980), who outlined four components of communicative competence.

CLT also drew from Wilkins' (1976) notional-functional syllabus and emphasized interaction, real-life tasks, and learner autonomy (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). These developments made CLT a foundational approach in modern language teaching.

Grammar-Translation Method (18th–19th Century)

The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) treated language learning as an intellectual exercise, emphasizing grammar rules, vocabulary lists, and translation of literary texts. It prioritized written accuracy over spoken fluency and did little to develop communicative ability (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Direct Method (Late 19th–Early 20th Century)

The Direct Method emerged as a response to GTM's limitations, promoting immersive instruction in the target language. Influenced by natural language learning theories, it emphasized speaking and listening without translation or overt grammar instruction. However, it lacked a strong theoretical basis and was difficult to apply in contexts lacking native speakers (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

Audiolingual Method (Mid-20th Century)

Rooted in behaviorist psychology and structural linguistics, the Audiolingual Method (ALM) used repetition, drilling, and positive reinforcement to build language habits. Popular in the U.S. military's language training programs, ALM aimed for automaticity but failed to foster meaningful communication (Brown, 2007; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

1.1.4.2 The Shift Towards Communicative Approaches

The evolution of language teaching throughout the 20th century reflects a growing dissatisfaction with methods that prioritized form over function. As scholars and educators began to recognize the limitations of behaviorist and structuralist approaches, attention shifted toward more communicative, learner-centered methodologies. This shift was driven by developments in linguistic theory, syllabus design, and institutional reforms that emphasized the need for language instruction to reflect authentic, purposeful communication. The following developments were instrumental in paving the way for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

Chomsky's Critique of Behaviorism (1950s–1960s)

Noam Chomsky's (1957) critique of behaviorist theories of language learning marked a turning point in linguistic theory. Chomsky argued that language acquisition is not simply a matter of habit formation but involves an innate cognitive ability to generate and comprehend novel sentences. His theory of transformational-generative grammar emphasized the creative and rule-governed nature of language use, challenging the mechanical drills of ALM and paving the way for approaches that valued meaning and communication.

The Notional-Functional Syllabus (1970s)

In response to the need for a more communicative approach, British linguists such as Wilkins (1972) introduced the Notional-Functional Syllabus, which focused on teaching language based on communicative functions (e.g., requesting, apologizing, suggesting) rather than grammatical structures. This shift emphasized the importance of using language in meaningful contexts, laying the groundwork for the principles of CLT.

The Council of Europe and the Communicative Turn

During the 1970s, the Council of Europe played a key role in promoting communicative approaches to language teaching. The development of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) was influenced by the need to standardize communicative language proficiency levels across European countries. This shift reinforced the importance of communicative competence, further shaping the principles of CLT.

1.1.4.3 The Rise and Development of CLT

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged in the 1970s and has since evolved into a leading approach in language education. Rooted in the concept of communicative competence and influenced by sociolinguistic theory, CLT emphasizes using language for real communication rather than memorizing rules. Over time, it has expanded to include task-based learning and the integration of digital tools (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

The Emergence of Communicative Competence (1970s–1980s)

The concept of communicative competence, introduced by Hymes (1972), became a foundational principle of CLT. Hymes argued that knowing a language involves more than grammatical knowledge; it requires the ability to use language appropriately in different social and cultural contexts. This idea was further developed by Canale and Swain (1980), who outlined four key components of communicative competence:

- **Grammatical competence** (knowledge of linguistic structures)
- **Sociolinguistic competence** (understanding social norms and conventions)
- **Discourse competence** (coherence and cohesion in communication)
- **Strategic competence** (using strategies to manage communication difficulties)

These concepts strongly influenced CLT, shifting the focus from language as a set of rules to language as a tool for real-world communication.

1.1.4.4 CLT in Practice: Task-Based Language Teaching (1990s–2000s)

As CLT developed, it incorporated Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), which emphasized the use of tasks as the central unit of language instruction. Scholars such as Willis (1996) and Skehan (1998) advocated for designing lessons around communicative tasks that mirror authentic language use, such as problem-solving activities, discussions, and project-based learning. TBLT became a practical extension of CLT, reinforcing its emphasis on interaction and meaningful communication.

1.1.4.5 The Role of Technology in CLT (2000s–Present)

With the rise of digital technologies, CLT has continued to evolve, integrating tools such as online discussion forums, video conferencing, and artificial intelligence-powered language learning applications. The availability of authentic materials (e.g., podcasts, news articles, and

interactive simulations) has further enhanced the communicative experience, allowing learners to engage with real-world language use beyond the classroom.

1.1.4.6 CLT in the 21st Century: Challenges and Adaptations

Global Implementation and Cultural Considerations

Despite its widespread acceptance, CLT has faced challenges in implementation, particularly in contexts where traditional methods remain dominant. In many non-Western educational systems, where teacher-centered instruction and high-stakes grammar-focused exams persist, the shift to CLT has been gradual and sometimes resisted. Researchers such as Bax (2003) have argued for contextualized communicative approaches, adapting CLT principles to fit local educational and cultural contexts.

Balancing Fluency and Accuracy

One of the ongoing debates in CLT concerns the balance between fluency and accuracy. While CLT emphasizes real-world communication, some critics argue that it does not sufficiently address grammatical precision. As a result, contemporary CLT practices often integrate elements of form-focused instruction alongside communicative activities, ensuring that learners develop both accuracy and fluency.

The Role of Artificial Intelligence and Online Learning

The integration of AI-driven language learning tools, such as ChatGPT and interactive online platforms, has introduced new possibilities for CLT. These technologies enable personalized learning, real-time feedback, and opportunities for learners to practice communication in immersive digital environments. As technology continues to evolve, CLT is likely to incorporate even more blended learning approaches, combining face-to-face interaction with digital tools to enhance communicative competence.

Conclusion

The evolution of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) reflects a broader shift in language education from structure-focused instruction to meaning-driven interaction. Influenced by linguistic, psychological, and pedagogical developments, CLT has transformed the way languages are taught, prioritizing communicative competence over rote memorization. While challenges remain in its implementation, particularly in traditional education systems, CLT continues to adapt, incorporating new methodologies such as Task-Based Language Teaching and technological innovations to meet the demands of modern language learners. As it progresses, CLT remains a dynamic and influential approach, shaping the future of language education worldwide.

1.1.5 Learner-Centeredness, Collaborative Learning, and Interaction in CLT

Learner-Centeredness in CLT

Learner-centeredness shifts the focus from teacher-led instruction to student autonomy and active participation. It is rooted in constructivist theories, where learners actively construct knowledge rather than passively receive information. According to Nunan (1989) and Richards & Rodgers (2001), a learner-centered approach in CLT encourages students to take responsibility for their learning, adapts to individual learner needs, preferences, and interests, emphasizes task-based learning and real-world communication over rote memorization, and promotes problem-solving, critical thinking, and language use in authentic scenarios.

In a learner-centered CLT classroom, teachers act as facilitators, guiding students through discovery and exploration rather than dictating lessons. This approach increases motivation and engagement, as students perceive language learning as relevant to their personal and professional lives. Moreover, learner-centered teaching fosters self-efficacy and lifelong learning skills by empowering students to make choices about their learning strategies and materials.

Collaborative Learning in CLT

Collaboration is a fundamental aspect of CLT, as language is inherently social. Learning occurs through interaction with others, which aligns with Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory, emphasizing the role of social interaction in cognitive development. Breen & Candlin (1980) also highlight that:

- Peer interaction facilitates negotiation of meaning, which strengthens comprehension and retention.
- Group work and pair activities enhance fluency, confidence, and interpersonal communication skills.
- Collaboration enables scaffolding, where more proficient peers support less skilled learners, leading to mutual progress.
- Engaging in collaborative tasks allows students to practice different communicative functions, such as requesting, persuading, and explaining.

Collaborative Techniques in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Collaborative learning is a core principle of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), as it promotes interaction, negotiation of meaning, and authentic language use (Richards, 2006). Several techniques have been widely recognized in the literature for their effectiveness in enhancing learners' communicative competence:

- **Role-plays:** Simulating real-life scenarios allows learners to practice language in meaningful contexts, enhancing their pragmatic competence (Littlewood, 1981). Role-plays encourage spontaneity, cultural awareness, and adaptability in communication (Harmer, 2007).

- **Group discussions:** Encouraging learners to exchange ideas and debate topics facilitates fluency, critical thinking, and collaborative meaning-making (Brown, 2001). Discussions create opportunities for learners to express their viewpoints, negotiate meaning, and develop confidence in spoken communication (Nunan, 1991).
- **Problem-solving tasks:** Engaging students in cooperative decision-making strengthens their ability to articulate ideas, defend opinions, and think critically in a communicative setting (Ellis, 2003). Such tasks promote task-based interaction, reinforcing both linguistic and cognitive skills (Skehan, 1998).
- **Debates:** Structured debates enhance learners' ability to construct arguments, use persuasive language, and develop quick, spontaneous responses (Ur, 2012). Debates also foster engagement and motivation, as they provide a sense of competition and purpose in communication (Thornbury, 2005).

Collaborative learning within CLT fosters a supportive environment where students learn from one another, reducing language anxiety and promoting risk-taking in communication (Dörnyei, 2001). Peer interaction plays a crucial role in language development, as learners provide each other with scaffolding and feedback, leading to greater linguistic and communicative competence (Swain, 2000).

Classroom Interaction in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Classroom interaction is a fundamental component of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), as it fosters meaningful exchanges that mirror real-life communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Through interaction, learners engage in negotiation of meaning, practice fluency, and develop communicative competence (Ellis, 1999). CLT emphasizes three main types of interaction:

Teacher-Student Interaction

- The teacher acts as a facilitator rather than a sole authority, guiding discussions, posing open-ended questions, and providing constructive feedback (Harmer, 2007).
- Scaffolding techniques such as modeling, prompting, and gradual withdrawal of support help learners develop autonomy in language use (Vygotsky, 1978).
- The teacher's role includes encouraging interaction by creating opportunities for meaningful exchanges, adjusting input to learners' proficiency levels, and fostering a supportive environment (Littlewood, 1981).

Student-Student Interaction

- Peer interaction plays a crucial role in second language acquisition (SLA), as learners engage in dialogues, debates, role-plays, and collaborative problem-solving tasks (Swain, 2000).
- According to Long's (1983) Interaction Hypothesis, communication breakdowns encourage learners to negotiate meaning, request clarification, and modify their speech, leading to enhanced comprehension and production.

- Engaging in authentic communication tasks allows students to experiment with language functions such as requesting, apologizing, agreeing, and disagreeing in meaningful contexts (Nunan, 1991).

Student-Content Interaction

- Learners interact with authentic materials such as news articles, podcasts, videos, and real-world case studies, exposing them to natural language use (Richards, 2006).
- According to Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis, exposure to comprehensible input just beyond the learner's current level ($i+1$) facilitates acquisition. Authentic materials provide such input and help learners internalize language structures in context.
- Student-content interaction is reinforced through task-based activities, where learners use language for specific communicative purposes, promoting both linguistic and cognitive engagement (Skehan, 1998).

Ellis (1999) and Swain (2000) emphasize that meaningful interaction enhances language acquisition by exposing learners to various linguistic forms and functions, reinforcing their ability to process, comprehend, and produce language in real-life situations. Classroom interaction fosters fluency, confidence, and communicative effectiveness, making it an essential element of CLT.

1.1.6 Learner and Teacher Roles in the CLT Classroom

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasizes interaction, authentic communication, and learner autonomy in language learning. Unlike traditional teacher-centered approaches, CLT shifts the focus to a learner-centered environment, where both teachers and students have distinct but complementary roles. The teacher facilitates communication rather than acting as the sole knowledge provider, while students engage actively in meaningful interactions to develop communicative competence (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

The Teacher's Role in a CLT Classroom

The role of the teacher in a CLT classroom extends beyond traditional instruction to include facilitation, classroom management, and participation in communicative tasks. Several scholars highlight that teachers in CLT environments act as guides and co-communicators, supporting interaction rather than delivering knowledge passively (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

a) Facilitator of Communication

- One of the core principles of CLT is that teachers are facilitators rather than direct instructors of grammar or vocabulary. Their role is to create opportunities for meaningful communication (Littlewood, 1981).
- Instead of delivering lectures, teachers set up interactive tasks where students can express meaning through real-life communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

- The teacher provides contextualized language input and ensures that students receive adequate exposure to the target language through interactive classroom activities (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

b) Organizer of Activities

- Teachers design and implement communicative activities that encourage students to practice language in authentic contexts (Nunan, 1989).
- Activities include role-plays, discussions, information-gap exercises, and problem-solving tasks (Harmer, 2007).
- CLT also emphasizes the balance between fluency and accuracy, meaning teachers must create activities that allow for spontaneous communication while offering support for language accuracy (Richards, 2006).

c) Monitor and Feedback Provider

- Teachers take an observational role, ensuring that students are engaged in communication and intervening when necessary (Brown, 2007).
- Instead of correcting every grammatical mistake, teachers focus on meaning-based correction and error treatment strategies that encourage self-correction and peer feedback (Ellis, 2003).
- Formative assessment techniques such as feedback loops and reflective discussions help students improve their communication skills over time (Scrivener, 2011).

d) Co-Communicator and Model of Language Use

- The teacher is not only an observer but also a co-communicator, participating in conversations with students to model natural language use (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).
- Through teacher-student dialogues, the teacher demonstrates discourse strategies, turn-taking, and negotiation of meaning, helping learners understand conversational norms (Krashen & Terrell, 1983).
- This role ensures that students see the teacher as a communicative partner rather than an authoritative figure, reducing anxiety and increasing engagement (Dörnyei, 2005).

Student's Role in a CLT Classroom

In contrast to teacher-centered approaches, where students passively receive knowledge, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) promotes learner autonomy and active participation. Scholars emphasize that learners take on various roles—such as negotiators of meaning, problem-solvers, and collaborators—to develop communicative competence (Littlewood, 1981; Nunan, 2004).

a) Active Participants in Learning

In CLT classrooms, learners are encouraged to take an active role in their own development rather than relying solely on the teacher for instruction. According to Breen and

Candlin (1980), students participate in interactive tasks that require them to think critically, respond spontaneously, and engage with language meaningfully. Rather than memorizing rules and vocabulary in isolation, they practice language through real-world communication scenarios, as Harmer (2007) suggests. This active engagement fosters intrinsic motivation, as students find the language tasks relevant to their personal and communicative needs (Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998).

b) Negotiators of Meaning

Another key role of learners in CLT is that of negotiators of meaning. As Swain (1995) emphasizes, students must be able to clarify, confirm, and adapt their language to ensure mutual understanding during communication. This process often unfolds in peer interactions and collaborative tasks, including information-gap activities, where learners encounter and manage breakdowns in understanding (Long, 1996). Such negotiation promotes strategic competence, as learners apply communication strategies like paraphrasing, asking for clarification, and using circumlocution to maintain interaction (Canale & Swain, 1980).

c) Collaborators in a Social Learning Environment

CLT also views learners as collaborators who engage in group and pair work to complete meaningful communicative tasks. Drawing on Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory, classroom activities are designed to foster cooperative learning, where students scaffold one another's language development. Peer interaction plays a crucial role in this process, allowing students to model language, provide feedback, and build understanding in a supportive environment (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003). Furthermore, the collaborative nature of CLT activities helps reduce communication anxiety and increase learners' confidence in using the target language (Horwitz et al., 1986).

d) Autonomous and Reflective Learners

Finally, CLT promotes learner autonomy by encouraging students to take initiative and responsibility for their learning. Holec (1981) defines autonomy as the ability to take charge of one's own learning, a principle that is embedded in many CLT activities. Self-assessment, peer evaluation, and reflection journals are commonly used to help learners track their progress and identify personal learning goals (Little, 1991). While the teacher provides guidance and scaffolding, learners are encouraged to experiment with strategies that best suit their needs and learning preferences (Benson, 2011).

The shift in teacher and student roles in CLT reflects the fundamental goal of developing communicative competence through interaction and meaningful language use. While the teacher facilitates, organizes, and models communication, students actively engage, negotiate meaning, collaborate, and take responsibility for their learning. This approach fosters a learner-centered classroom, where students develop both linguistic and strategic competencies in real-world communication.

1.1.7 Classroom Activities in CLT

The following table presents a synthesis of key classroom activities associated with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). It aligns each activity with its theoretical foundation, a practical classroom application, and the communicative skills it aims to develop. While grounded in widely recognized CLT principles discussed in the literature (e.g., Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Nunan, 2004; Willis, 1996), the examples and structure of the table have been developed by the researcher to illustrate the connection between theory and practice in communicative pedagogy.

Table 01: CLT Classroom Activities: Theory and Practice

Activity Type	Definition	Theoretical Basis	Practical Example	Skills Developed
Role Plays	Students act out assigned roles in simulated real-life situations.	Sociocultural theories emphasizing interaction in context for language learning (Vygotsky, 1978).	Acting as a travel agent assisting a client in planning a trip.	Speaking, cultural awareness, functional language.
Information Gap Activities	Paired or grouped students share unique pieces of information to complete a task collaboratively.	Grounded in the principle of negotiation of meaning, promoting authentic interaction (Long, 1983).	Completing a map by exchanging location information with a partner.	Listening, speaking, problem-solving.
Debates	Learners engage in structured discussions, presenting and defending opposing viewpoints.	Promotes critical thinking, linguistic fluency, and higher-order cognitive skills (Kennedy, 2007).	Debating whether social media positively or negatively impacts education.	Argumentation, persuasion, critical thinking.
Jigsaw Activities	Each student or group works on a segment of a task and collaborates to create a complete picture.	Cooperative learning theories emphasizing interdependence and collaboration (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).	Reading different sections of a news article and sharing findings.	Reading comprehension, teamwork, listening.
Problem-Solving Tasks	Students work together to resolve real-life challenges.	Task-based learning underscores the role of meaningful tasks in promoting active language use (Ellis, 2003).	Planning a community event within a budget while negotiating decisions.	Critical thinking, speaking, decision-making.
Authentic Material	Students engage with real-world	Using authentic materials fosters	Interpreting a train schedule	Reading, cultural competence,

Tasks	materials such as newspapers, menus, maps, and brochures.	practical language use and cultural exposure (Gilmore, 2007).	to plan a trip itinerary.	contextual language.
Surveys and Interviews	Learners conduct surveys or interviews, collect data, and report their findings.	Simulates real-world communication, encouraging fluency and interaction.	Conducting a class survey about students' favorite hobbies and presenting the results.	Speaking, note-taking, presentation.

This table presents various communicative activity types used in language learning, outlining their definitions, theoretical foundations, practical applications, and the skills they develop. It includes Role Plays, which engage students in simulated real-life scenarios to enhance speaking and cultural awareness, and Information Gap Activities, which promote authentic interaction by requiring students to share unique information to complete a task. Debates encourage learners to articulate and defend viewpoints, fostering argumentation and critical thinking. Jigsaw Activities emphasize cooperative learning, where students collaborate to form a complete understanding of a topic. Problem-Solving Tasks focus on real-life challenges, developing decision-making and negotiation skills. Authentic Material Tasks integrate real-world resources to enhance contextual language use and cultural competence. Finally, Surveys and Interviews provide students with opportunities to practice real-world communication, data collection, and presentation skills.

1.1.8 Challenges in CLT and Strategies for Enhancing Communicative Techniques in the Classroom

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has transformed language learning by emphasizing interaction and real-world communication. However, its implementation in classrooms faces various challenges, ranging from cultural barriers to resource limitations. Teachers must navigate these difficulties by adopting strategic approaches to enhance communicative techniques effectively. The following table outlines key challenges in CLT, their impact on classroom practice, and practical solutions to address them.

Table 02: Challenges in CLT and Strategies for Enhancing Communicative Techniques in the Classroom

CLT Challenge	Communicative Technique	Limitations in Classroom Practice	How to Address It
Cultural and Contextual Constraints	Role-Plays and Discussions	In teacher-centered cultures, students may hesitate to express	Start with structured dialogues before moving to open-ended

		opinions freely.	discussions. Use culturally relevant topics and sentence starters to ease participation.
Teacher Training and Competence	Group Work and Debates	Teachers unfamiliar with CLT may struggle to facilitate discussions effectively, leading to off-task behavior.	Provide teacher training on guiding and monitoring discussions. Use clear instructions and error correction strategies.
Resource and Infrastructure Limitations	Task-Based Activities	Large class sizes and limited materials can make interactive activities hard to manage.	Use low-resource techniques like information-gap tasks that promote communication without needing extra materials.
Fluency over Accuracy	Communicative Tasks and Free Speaking Activities	Fluency-focused tasks may lead to fossilization of errors and lack of grammatical accuracy.	Balance fluency and accuracy by incorporating post-task reflection and feedback sessions to analyze errors.
Assessment and Evaluation Issues	Real-Life Simulations	Traditional testing does not effectively measure communicative competence.	Implement performance-based assessments, such as problem-solving presentations or real-world tasks, to evaluate communication skills.
Learner Resistance	Peer Interaction Activities	Learners used to passive learning may feel uncomfortable with collaborative tasks.	Introduce structured peer interaction with clear roles and gradually increase learner responsibility.
Misinterpretation of CLT	Pair Work and Discussions	Teachers may assume that simply pairing students ensures meaningful communication, but students may stay off-task.	Design communicative tasks with clear goals (e.g., problem-solving, decision-making) to ensure productive interaction.

"Adapted from Richards & Rodgers (2014), Harmer (2007), and Brown (2007)."

This table outlines key challenges in implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and provides strategies to address them. It identifies issues such as Cultural and Contextual Constraints, where students in teacher-centered cultures may hesitate to participate in

discussions, and suggests starting with structured dialogues. Teacher Training and Competence highlights the difficulty some educators face in facilitating CLT activities, recommending targeted training. Resource and Infrastructure Limitations address the challenges of large classes and limited materials, advocating for low-resource techniques like information-gap tasks. The Fluency over Accuracy challenge warns of the risk of fossilized errors and suggests post-task reflection. Assessment and Evaluation Issues highlight the mismatch between traditional testing and communicative competence, advocating for performance-based assessments. Learner Resistance is tackled by introducing structured peer interaction gradually, while Misinterpretation of CLT is addressed by designing communicative tasks with clear goals to ensure meaningful engagement.

Despite its effectiveness in developing communicative competence, CLT presents challenges that can hinder its full implementation. By addressing issues such as cultural constraints, teacher training, and assessment limitations, educators can create a more interactive and student-centered learning environment. The strategies outlined above provide practical ways to enhance communicative techniques, ensuring that CLT remains an adaptable and effective approach in diverse classroom settings. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) represents a significant evolution in language education, effectively addressing the shortcomings of traditional pedagogies by emphasizing interaction, learner autonomy, and real-world relevance in language use. Although challenges such as cultural constraints, resource limitations, and assessment issues persist, strategic approaches can enhance the implementation of CLT in diverse educational contexts. By embracing collaborative techniques and fostering meaningful classroom interactions, educators can cultivate an environment where learners are empowered to become effective communicators. As CLT continues to adapt and incorporate modern technologies and methodologies, it remains a dynamic and essential framework for facilitating language acquisition, ensuring that learners are well-prepared for the complexities of real-life communication in an increasingly interconnected world.

1.2 In Class Debates

In-class debates have emerged as a powerful pedagogical strategy in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, facilitating not only language acquisition but also critical thinking, communicative competence, and learner engagement (Krieger, 2005; Kennedy, 2007). By engaging students in structured discussions that require them to present, defend, and critique differing viewpoints, debates encourage active participation and meaningful interaction—core principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Through this dynamic form of learning, learners develop essential skills such as argumentation, negotiation, and public speaking, which are vital for real-world communication (Zare & Othman, 2013). This chapter explores the multifaceted role of in-class debates within the CLT framework, emphasizing their significance across various pedagogical perspectives, types, and practical applications in EFL contexts.

1.2.1 Definitions of In-Class Debates

In-class debate is a structured educational activity where students engage in formal discussions to present, defend, and critique differing perspectives on a given topic. This method is widely recognized as an effective pedagogical tool that fosters active learning, critical thinking, and communicative competence (Kennedy, 2007; Krieger, 2005). Debates challenge learners to research, organize their ideas, and articulate arguments persuasively while responding to opposing viewpoints in a reasoned manner. The interactive nature of debates makes them a dynamic instructional technique, especially relevant in language learning, critical thinking development, and collaborative learning contexts (Zare & Othman, 2013; Dallimore et al., 2006).

1. Pedagogical Perspective

From a pedagogical standpoint, in-class debate is an instructional strategy that engages students in knowledge construction through argumentation and discussion. It moves learners from passive reception to active participation, fostering deeper cognitive processing and promoting inquiry-based learning (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). Debates support constructivist learning principles by encouraging students to interpret, evaluate, and synthesize information through social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978).

2. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Perspective

Within the framework of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), in-class debates are an effective technique for developing learners' communicative competence. CLT emphasizes interaction, fluency, and the ability to use language in meaningful contexts. Debates align with these principles by simulating real-life communicative scenarios where students must construct arguments, provide justifications, and engage in spontaneous discussions (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Richards and Rodgers (2014) assert that debates foster negotiation of meaning, requiring learners to process language in real-time, formulate responses, and adjust their discourse based on their interlocutors' arguments. Unlike traditional rote learning methods, debates encourage

learners to use language naturally, facilitating fluency development while reinforcing accuracy through meaningful practice.

3. Critical Thinking and Academic Skills Perspective

Beyond language development, in-class debates play a significant role in fostering students' critical thinking and academic reasoning. Effective participation requires learners to analyze complex issues, evaluate evidence, anticipate counterarguments, and construct well-supported responses—skills that are central to higher-order thinking (Kennedy, 2007; Duschl & Osborne, 2002). This process cultivates cognitive flexibility and strengthens learners' abilities in logical reasoning, argument construction, and problem-solving, which are essential competencies in academic and real-world contexts.

Brookfield (2012) describes classroom debates as platforms for fostering analytical reasoning, evaluative judgment, and intellectual engagement. Through debates, students are challenged to critically assess different perspectives, detect biases, and refine their argumentation strategies. This analytical process is aligned with higher-order thinking skills outlined in Bloom's Taxonomy, particularly in areas such as application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

Furthermore, debates enhance academic discourse skills by fostering structured argumentation, logical coherence, and evidence-based reasoning. These skills are critical in academic settings where students must write research papers, engage in discussions, and defend positions in scholarly dialogue (Andrews, 2007; Zare & Othman, 2013). Through practice in formulating and articulating arguments, learners become more adept at constructing coherent ideas and supporting them with relevant evidence. In this way, debates act as a bridge between classroom interaction and the academic competencies required for higher education and professional communication.

4. Collaborative Learning Perspective

From a collaborative learning perspective, in-class debates create opportunities for social interaction, teamwork, and cooperative problem-solving. Johnson and Johnson (1994) emphasize that debates encourage students to work together in teams, distributing tasks and responsibilities to develop cohesive arguments. This collaborative aspect fosters a sense of shared learning, where students must listen to and engage with different perspectives while working toward a common goal.

Debates also provide an inclusive learning environment where students can challenge assumptions, question viewpoints, and refine their understanding through peer interaction. By engaging in debates, learners develop essential interpersonal skills such as active listening, respectful disagreement, and constructive feedback. These skills are not only beneficial for academic settings but also for professional and social communication (Bellon, 2000; Zare & Othman, 2013). Additionally, debates help students develop confidence in public speaking by providing structured yet dynamic opportunities to express their opinions in front of an audience. This process reduces anxiety associated with speaking in front of others and builds students'

ability to articulate ideas persuasively in various real-world contexts (Kennedy, 2007; Krieger, 2005).

5. EFL and Communicative Performance Perspective

Brown (2007) highlights that debates encourage learners to practice language functions such as explaining, persuading, justifying, and refuting, all of which are crucial for advanced communication. Additionally, debates expose students to new vocabulary, discourse markers, and grammatical structures, reinforcing both fluency and accuracy.

Moreover, debates help reduce foreign language anxiety by providing a structured yet interactive learning environment. Many EFL learners experience hesitation and fear of making mistakes when speaking in a second language. However, debates offer repeated opportunities for practice, allowing learners to build confidence gradually (Horwitz et al., 1986; Zare & Othman, 2013). The supportive nature of debates, where students collaborate and provide peer feedback, further enhances motivation and participation (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003).

Another key benefit of debates in EFL contexts is their role in improving pragmatic competence. Debates require learners to adjust their language based on context, audience, and purpose, reinforcing their ability to use English appropriately in different social and academic situations (Taguchi, 2011). This aspect is particularly important for learners who aim to use English in professional or international settings.

In-class debates are a multifaceted instructional technique that align with various pedagogical, linguistic, and cognitive learning objectives. Whether viewed through the lens of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), critical thinking, or collaborative learning, debates offer students opportunities to develop essential language skills, academic discourse, and critical reasoning (Kennedy, 2007; Krieger, 2005). In EFL contexts, debates are particularly valuable for enhancing learners' oral fluency, argumentation skills, and interactive competence (Zare & Othman, 2013).

By engaging in debates, students not only improve their ability to communicate effectively but also develop skills essential for academic success, professional development, and lifelong learning (Bellon, 2000). Educators can maximize the benefits of debates by providing structured guidelines, fostering an inclusive learning environment, and incorporating meaningful feedback mechanisms (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003). Ultimately, in-class debates serve as a powerful tool for enhancing communicative performance, cognitive development, and collaborative engagement in the language classroom.

1.2.2 Characteristics of In-class Debates as a Communicative Activity

In-class debates reflect core principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) by promoting interaction, spontaneity, autonomy, and real-world language use. They help learners develop skills like turn-taking, argumentation, and clarification. Table 03 outlines the main characteristics of debates and their theoretical foundations in EFL contexts (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Long, 1985).

Table 03: Characteristics of In-class Debates as a Communicative Activity

Characteristic	Description	Theoretical Support
Interactive and Dialogic	Debates require meaningful exchanges, turn-taking, and active listening, fostering real-time interaction.	Long's (1985) Interaction Hypothesis; Harmer (The Practice of English Language Teaching)
Learner-Centered	Students construct arguments independently, promoting autonomy and active participation.	Holec (1981) Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning; Nunan (1988) Communicative Language Teaching
Purpose-Driven	Each debate has a clear goal, such as persuasion or negotiation, enhancing communicative competence.	Hymes (1972) Communicative Competence; Nunan (Task-Based Language Teaching)
Focus on Functional Language	Emphasizes practical language functions like persuasion, clarification, and disagreement.	Halliday (1978) Systemic Functional Linguistics
Simulative of Real-Life Communication	Mirrors authentic communication to prepare learners for real-world language use.	Brown (1994) Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy
Collaborative and Competitive	Encourages teamwork while integrating a competitive element to enhance engagement.	Slavin (1995) Cooperative Learning; Dornyei (2001) Motivation in Language Learning
Dynamic	Requires spontaneous thinking and real-time responses, promoting critical thinking.	Krashen (1982) Input Hypothesis; Swain (1995) Output Hypothesis

This table highlights key characteristics of debates in language learning, linking each to relevant theoretical support. Interactive and Dialogic nature ensures real-time exchanges and active listening, supported by Long's Interaction Hypothesis. Learner-Centered debates promote autonomy and active participation, aligning with theories on learner independence. The Purpose-Driven aspect emphasizes clear communicative goals such as persuasion and negotiation, drawing from Hymes' concept of communicative competence. Focus on Functional Language ensures learners practice essential discourse functions like persuasion and disagreement, rooted in Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics. The Simulative of Real-Life Communication characteristic prepares learners for authentic interaction, supported by Brown's teaching principles. Collaborative and Competitive elements enhance engagement by combining

teamwork with motivation theories. Lastly, the Dynamic nature of debates fosters critical thinking and real-time language use, aligning with Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Swain's Output Hypothesis.

Note. Table developed by the researcher based on theoretical models in communicative language teaching and second language acquisition literature (e.g., Harmer, 2007; Krashen, 1982; Long, 1985; Nunan, 2004).

1.2.3 Types of In-Class Debates

In-class debates can take various formats, each offering unique opportunities for developing communicative, critical thinking, and collaborative skills. Different debate structures promote diverse interaction patterns, learner roles, and cognitive engagement. Table 04 presents common types of classroom debates used in EFL settings, highlighting their core features and instructional benefits (Kennedy, 2007; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003).

Table 04: Types of In-class Debates

Type of Debate	Description
Team Debates	Students collaborate in groups to defend a position, promoting shared responsibility and collective reasoning.
Role-Playing Debates	Participants assume assigned roles (e.g., activists, policymakers), simulating real-world perspectives.
One-on-One Debates	Individual learners represent opposing viewpoints, focusing on personal articulation and defense of ideas.
Fishbowl Debates	A select group debates while the rest observe, offering feedback and reflecting on arguments presented.
Devil's Advocate Debates	Learners argue against their personal beliefs to foster understanding of alternative perspectives and critical reasoning.

This table categorizes different types of debates used in language learning, highlighting their distinct features. Team Debates involve group collaboration, encouraging collective reasoning and shared responsibility in defending a position. Role-Playing Debates require participants to adopt specific roles, such as activists or policymakers, to simulate real-world discussions. One-on-One Debates focus on individual articulation, with learners presenting and defending opposing viewpoints independently. Fishbowl Debates create an observational learning environment where a select group debates while others analyze arguments and provide feedback. Lastly, Devil's Advocate Debates challenge students to argue against their own beliefs, fostering critical thinking and deeper understanding of alternative perspectives.

Note. Table developed by the researcher based on common classroom debate structures found in communicative and task-based language teaching literature (e.g., Kennedy, 2007; Krieger, 2005; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003).

1.2.4 Relevance of In-Class Debates in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

In-class debates serve as an effective communicative activity in language classrooms, aligning with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). They provide learners with authentic opportunities to develop their communicative competence by engaging in meaningful, purposeful, and interactive discussions. The relevance of in-class debates in CLT can be explored through the following key aspects (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Kennedy, 2007).

1. Emphasis on Meaning

In communicative approaches to language teaching, the primary goal is to convey meaning effectively rather than focusing solely on grammatical accuracy. In-class debates reinforce this principle by requiring students to articulate their opinions, construct arguments, and engage in discussions where comprehension and message clarity take precedence over flawless syntax. This aligns with the idea that fluency and real-world applicability should take priority in language instruction (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Savignon, 2002). Debates allow students to communicate despite errors, focusing on message delivery, which is central to CLT.

2. Development of Functional Language

A crucial aspect of communicative competence is the ability to use language for real-life functions. Debates provide opportunities to use language for purposes such as persuasion, clarification, and disagreement. Formulaic expressions and discourse markers—like “I strongly believe...,” or “Could you clarify your point?”—help structure speech and support spontaneous interaction. This reflects Halliday’s (1978) functional view of language as well as the practical, task-oriented use emphasized in CLT classrooms (Nunan, 2004).

3. Interactive Learning

CLT emphasizes interaction as essential for language acquisition. Debates inherently involve negotiation of meaning, turn-taking, and peer collaboration. These interactions promote communicative competence through real-time language use and mutual adjustment of meaning (Long, 1983; Swain, 1995). Debates turn students into active participants who construct knowledge through dialogue, rather than passive recipients of input.

4. Learner Autonomy and Responsibility

Learner autonomy is a key principle in CLT. In debates, students research topics, analyze sources, and prepare arguments, which promotes independence and responsibility in learning. This process encourages learners to extend language use beyond the classroom and engage in critical thinking (Holec, 1981; Benson, 2011). The integration of academic skills and language production reflects CLT’s emphasis on learner-centered instruction.

5.Cultural and Social Relevance

Debates often involve current, culturally significant, or ethically relevant topics, fostering awareness of diverse perspectives. This aligns with CLT's goal of developing sociolinguistic competence—using language appropriately in varied social and cultural contexts (Hymes, 1972; Byram, 1997). By engaging in meaningful, socially situated discourse, students see language as a tool for real-world communication and cross-cultural understanding.

In-class debates align with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching by fostering interactive, purposeful, and meaningful language use. They create an engaging and dynamic classroom environment where students actively participate in constructing and expressing ideas. Through debates, learners enhance their fluency, develop essential functional language, and gain confidence in communicating effectively. Additionally, debates encourage learner autonomy, promote cultural awareness, and simulate real-world communication, making them a powerful pedagogical tool in EFL and ESL classrooms.

1.1.6 Exploring Theoretical Foundations of In-Class Debates in Language Learning

Table 05 outlines key learning and language theories that underpin the pedagogical value of in-class debates, highlighting how each theory supports various dimensions of debate-based learning.

Table 05: Theories Behind In-Class Debates in Language Learning

Theory	Key Concepts	Relevance to In-Class Debates
Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky)	Social interaction, cognitive development, zone of proximal development (ZPD)	Debates provide a platform for learners to engage in meaningful dialogue, fostering language development through social interaction and peer collaboration.
Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1983)	Language acquisition through interaction, negotiation of meaning	Debates offer opportunities for learners to exchange ideas, clarify misunderstandings, and adjust language, promoting effective communication and language acquisition.
Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller)	Cognitive load, information processing, problem-solving	Debates stimulate cognitive processes, enhancing critical thinking and problem-solving skills, while balancing cognitive load to avoid overwhelming learners.
Constructivism (Piaget, Bruner)	Active learning, construction of knowledge through interaction	Learners actively engage with diverse viewpoints during debates, constructing knowledge and refining their understanding through reflection and participation.
Discourse Theory (Foucault)	Language, power dynamics, construction of reality	Debates require learners to present and analyze arguments, reflecting how language constructs social reality and influences power dynamics in communication.

Sociolinguistic Theory (Labov)	Language variation, social context, adaptation based on audience	Debates expose learners to various forms of discourse, helping them understand language variation in different contexts and how to adapt language according to social factors.
--------------------------------	--	--

This table outlines key theories supporting in-class debates and their relevance to language learning. Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky) highlights how debates facilitate meaningful dialogue, fostering language development through peer interaction. Interaction Hypothesis (Long) emphasizes the role of negotiation of meaning in communication, which debates naturally promote as learners exchange ideas and refine their language use. Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller) links debates to critical thinking and problem-solving while ensuring cognitive processing remains manageable. Constructivism (Piaget, Bruner) supports the idea that debates help learners actively construct knowledge through engagement with diverse perspectives. Discourse Theory (Foucault) connects debates to language's role in shaping social realities and power dynamics. Finally, Sociolinguistic Theory (Labov) underscores how debates expose learners to language variation, enabling them to adapt their speech based on social and con

Note. Table developed by the researcher as a synthesis of key theories supporting the use of in-class debates in language learning (e.g., Vygotsky, 1978; Long, 1983; Sweller, 1988; Bruner, 1996; Foucault, 1972; Labov, 1972).textual factors.

1.1.7 Limitations of In-Class Debates in EFL Contexts: Scholarly Perspectives

Several scholars have explored the limitations of using in-class debates in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Although debates can foster communicative competence and critical thinking, their implementation may be hindered by cultural norms, linguistic difficulties, psychological factors, and institutional constraints (Alasmari & Ahmed, 2013; Zare & Othman, 2013).

Cultural Constraints

Cultural background significantly influences learners' engagement with debates. In some collectivist societies, such as those in parts of Asia and the Middle East, argumentation is perceived as confrontational and disrespectful. This perception leads to reluctance among learners to challenge others' ideas or express dissenting views. Alasmari and Ahmed (2013) argue that in such contexts, debates may be viewed as a violation of group harmony and face-saving communication. Moreover, Hofstede (1991) explains that learners from high power-distance cultures, where authority figures are seldom questioned, may be uncomfortable with the learner-centered structure of debates, especially when they are expected to critique peers or take initiative independently.

Linguistic Challenges

Debates are language-intensive and require learners to possess a broad vocabulary and the ability to use it spontaneously. Tuan and Nhu (2010) note that EFL learners often lack the lexical and grammatical resources necessary to articulate complex ideas or counterarguments. As a result, students may rely on memorized phrases, which limits authentic communication. In addition, learners frequently experience tension between the desire to speak fluently and the need to be grammatically accurate. Thornbury (1999) argues that the pressure to maintain both fluency and accuracy simultaneously in high-stakes situations like debates can overwhelm learners and hinder their communicative performance.

Psychological Barriers

Psychological factors also present a considerable barrier to successful participation in debates. Public speaking anxiety is common among language learners and may be exacerbated when learners are asked to perform in front of their peers. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) identify communication apprehension as a major contributor to foreign language anxiety, which directly affects students' willingness to speak in class. Additionally, learners often fear making mistakes and being judged by others. As Young (1991) explains, fear of negative evaluation can significantly reduce learner participation in communicative tasks like debates, particularly in classrooms where peer criticism is not handled sensitively.

Teacher-Related Issues

The teacher's role is crucial in facilitating effective in-class debates. However, many teachers are not adequately trained in debate management. Richards and Rodgers (2014) assert that facilitating debates requires balancing structure and learner autonomy—skills that demand specific pedagogical knowledge. Inadequate training can lead to poorly managed activities that do not support learner development. Furthermore, teachers may unintentionally show favoritism or bias in moderating debates. Harmer (2007) notes that when teachers pay more attention to confident or outspoken students, others may feel excluded, which can discourage participation and reduce the inclusivity of the learning environment.

Classroom Dynamics and Practical Challenges

Institutional and classroom constraints also impact the successful use of debates. Time limitations often restrict the depth and preparation required for meaningful debate activities. As Nunan (1991) points out, language classrooms frequently prioritize exam content or grammar instruction, leaving little room for extended oral activities. In addition, large class sizes can make it difficult to ensure that every learner has a chance to contribute meaningfully. Carless (1999) observes that in overcrowded classrooms, teachers struggle to manage participation and give individual feedback. The lack of sufficient resources also poses a challenge. Qaddumi (2001) highlights that many EFL learners, especially in under-resourced settings, lack access to research materials, internet connectivity, or even basic reference texts, which undermines their ability to prepare for debates effectively.

Evaluation and Feedback

Assessment is another complex issue when implementing debates in EFL settings. Unlike traditional grammar or vocabulary tests, debates involve evaluating multiple dimensions—content, delivery, fluency, and interaction. Bachman (1990) argues that traditional testing frameworks are not well-suited to measure communicative performance in holistic tasks such as debates. Without appropriate rubrics and assessment tools, grading can become inconsistent and subjective. Moreover, many learners do not receive detailed feedback after debates. According to Savignon (2002), constructive and timely feedback is essential for learners to improve their communicative competence, yet it is often overlooked due to time constraints or lack of training.

Pedagogical Limitations

Certain pedagogical aspects of classroom debates can inadvertently reinforce unequal learning opportunities. In mixed-ability classes, more confident or proficient students tend to dominate discussions, while quieter learners are sidelined. Zare and Othman (2013) emphasize the need for inclusive teaching strategies that ensure balanced participation in oral tasks. Additionally, the competitive nature of debates may undermine the collaborative spirit that CLT aims to foster. Johnson and Johnson (1999) caution that excessive emphasis on winning can reduce opportunities for cooperative learning and create anxiety among learners who are less assertive or linguistically confident.

While in-class debates offer numerous pedagogical benefits in promoting communicative competence, critical thinking, and learner autonomy, their implementation in EFL contexts is not without challenges. Cultural norms, linguistic limitations, psychological barriers, and practical constraints can all inhibit the effectiveness of debates. Furthermore, teacher preparedness and classroom conditions play a crucial role in shaping learners' experiences. Recognizing these limitations is essential for educators aiming to adapt debate activities to suit the linguistic, cultural, and institutional realities of their learners. By addressing these concerns through thoughtful planning, inclusive strategies, and supportive feedback mechanisms, educators can better harness the potential of debates as a dynamic tool for language learning.

1.1.7 Previous Studies on In-Class Debates in EFL Contexts

Incorporating in-class debates within the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) framework in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms has been the subject of various studies, highlighting multiple pedagogical benefits. These studies suggest that debates can improve critical thinking, oral fluency, communicative competence, perspective-taking skills, classroom cohesion, motivation, and higher-order cognitive skills.

A. Enhancement of Critical Thinking Skills

Several studies have explored the relationship between in-class debates and the development of critical thinking skills. Alasmari and Ahmed (2013) examined how engaging in structured debates helps EFL learners develop their ability to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information. Their findings revealed that debates serve as an intellectually stimulating activity

that requires students to consider different viewpoints, construct logical arguments, and respond to counterarguments in real time. This process enhances higher-order thinking skills, such as evaluation and problem-solving, as students must justify their reasoning using logical evidence rather than relying solely on memorization.

B. Improvement in Oral Fluency and Communicative Competence

Debates provide a communicative environment in which students are encouraged to use the target language fluently and confidently. AlRubaiie (2024) conducted a study with first-year EFL students, examining the impact of in-class debates on oral fluency and communicative competence. The study concluded that debates allow students to engage in sustained discourse, requiring them to think on their feet and articulate their ideas with minimal hesitation.

C. Development of Perspective-Taking Skills and Classroom Cohesion

Another significant benefit of debates in EFL classrooms is their role in developing students' ability to adopt different perspectives. Iadarola (2015) explored how structured debates help students understand and articulate viewpoints that may differ from their own, fostering empathy and classroom cohesion. The study found that debating topics from multiple perspectives enhances students' sociolinguistic awareness, helping them recognize how language is shaped by cultural and contextual factors.

D. Increased Student Motivation and Engagement

Motivation is a crucial factor in second language acquisition, and studies suggest that debates increase student engagement by making learning more interactive, challenging, and personally relevant. Ahmed (2018) conducted research on the role of debates in enhancing student motivation in EFL settings. The findings indicated that debates encourage active participation, as students feel a sense of ownership over their learning.

E. Promotion of Higher-Order Cognitive Skills

In-class debates have also been linked to the development of higher-order cognitive skills, as they require students to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information rather than merely recalling facts. A systematic review by Alzebaree and Yavuz (2017) examined the role of CLT strategies, including debates, in fostering cognitive engagement and problem-solving skills among EFL learners. The review suggested that debates are particularly effective because they require learners to:

In summary, integrating in-class debates within the CLT approach in EFL classrooms provides multifaceted benefits that extend beyond linguistic proficiency. Research suggests that debates enhance critical thinking, oral fluency, communicative competence, motivation, engagement, and perspective-taking skills, making them a valuable pedagogical tool in language

education. Additionally, debates simulate real-life communication, preparing students to use English in academic, professional, and social settings.

1.1.8 Gaps in Existing Literature about In-Class Debates

While in-class debates are widely recognized as an effective tool in EFL classrooms, existing research has primarily focused on aspects such as fluency, motivation, and critical thinking. However, limited attention has been given to how debates impact learners' communicative performance in a more comprehensive sense. This section highlights key gaps in the literature, including the need for a more targeted exploration of how debates shape specific communicative skills, their long-term impact on learners' ability to engage in real-world communication, and the perspectives of both teachers and learners regarding debates as a pedagogical strategy. Addressing these gaps could provide deeper insights into the effectiveness of debates in fostering meaningful and strategic communication in EFL learners.

Focus on Communicative Performance

Many studies on debates in EFL classrooms tend to focus on aspects such as fluency, motivation, or critical thinking. While these factors are important for language development, they don't directly assess or measure the communicative performance of learners during debates. There is a lack of research exploring how debates affect specific communicative skills, such as learners' ability to organize ideas, express themselves persuasively, and engage in meaningful discussions. A more focused investigation into how debates influence these aspects of communication could provide valuable insights into how debates contribute to the development of learners' real-world communicative competence. Investigating how debates help EFL learners to not only communicate fluently but also to strategically structure their arguments, engage with opposing viewpoints, and maintain clarity and coherence throughout their discussions..

Long-Term Impact on Communication

While many studies examine the short-term benefits of debates, such as improvements in learners' fluency and confidence, there is little research on the long-term impact of in-class debates on EFL learners' communication abilities. The sustained impact of debates on learners' communicative performance after the debates have concluded is not well explored. It is important to understand if the skills gained through debating are transferred to real-life contexts (e.g., job interviews, presentations, or informal conversations) or whether they fade over time.

Longitudinal studies that track learners' development in communication performance over time could shed light on whether debates lead to lasting improvements in learners' ability to communicate effectively outside the classroom setting.

EFL Teachers' Views on Debates

Debates are widely recognized as a dynamic teaching strategy for fostering language development, yet little attention has been given to how teachers perceive their impact on learners' communicative performance. For instance, do teachers observe that debates enhance

learners' fluency, critical thinking, or ability to articulate persuasive arguments? Exploring teachers' perspectives could shed light on how they evaluate the role of debates in helping students build confidence and engage in meaningful, real-world communication. Additionally, understanding whether teachers view debates as a platform for developing skills relevant beyond the classroom—such as public speaking, effective negotiation, or professional interactions—could highlight the broader implications of using debates as a teaching tool. Interviews or surveys could be used to explore teachers' insights into how debates contribute to learners' communicative growth and their overall effectiveness as a classroom activity.

EFL Learners' Perceptions of Debates

While debates are widely regarded as an effective method for improving language skills, learners' perceptions of how debates enhance their overall communicative performance are often overlooked. There is limited research into how EFL learners themselves view the benefits of debates. For example, do they feel that debates help them improve their spontaneous speaking, ability to persuade others, or engage in complex discussions? Understanding learners' perceptions of their own language development during debates could provide a deeper understanding of how debates impact learners' communicative abilities in both academic and non-academic contexts. Investigating learners' attitudes towards debates and whether they perceive debates as a tool for improving real-world communication skills (e.g., in public speaking, job interviews, or casual conversations) would provide insight into the subjective value of debates in the EFL classroom. This could include interviews or surveys to assess how learners perceive their communication growth through participation in debates.

Conclusion

The existing body of research on in-class debates in EFL settings leaves several critical areas unexplored. While debates are often associated with improvements in fluency and confidence, their precise impact on learners' communicative performance—such as structuring arguments, engaging with opposing viewpoints, and maintaining coherence—remains insufficiently examined. Moreover, the long-term influence of debates on communication skills beyond the classroom is not well understood, making it essential to investigate whether these skills are retained and transferred to real-life contexts. Additionally, the perspectives of teachers and learners regarding the effectiveness of debates in enhancing communicative abilities require further exploration. By addressing these gaps, future research can offer a more comprehensive understanding of how debates contribute to communicative competence and inform more effective pedagogical approaches in EFL education.

In summary, integrating in-class debates into the EFL curriculum offers a rich array of benefits that enhance not only language proficiency but also critical thinking and collaborative skills. While existing research highlights the positive impacts of debates on fluency, motivation, and engagement, significant gaps remain regarding their influence on learners' communicative performance, long-term effects on communication skills, and the perspectives of both teachers and students. Addressing these gaps through future research will provide valuable insights into refining debate methodologies, thus optimizing their effectiveness as a pedagogical tool in EFL classrooms. Ultimately, the strategic implementation of debates aligns seamlessly with the

principles of Communicative Language Teaching, equipping students with the skills necessary to thrive in diverse communicative contexts and fostering a more engaging and inclusive learning environment.

Chapter Two: Methodology, Results, Discussion and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology, key findings, analysis, and recommendations of the study.

2.1.1 Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive and analytical approach, utilizing a mixed-methods research design to comprehensively investigate the role of in-class debates in enhancing EFL learners' communicative performance. The mixed-methods approach integrates both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, allowing for a more holistic understanding of the phenomenon under study.

The quantitative component of the research involves the collection of numerical data through structured questionnaires distributed to EFL learners and teachers. This data is analyzed statistically to identify patterns, trends, and correlations regarding the impact of in-class debates on learners' communicative skills. The quantitative approach ensures objectivity and enables the researcher to measure the extent to which debates influence learners' ability to express themselves effectively.

On the other hand, the qualitative component focuses on gathering in-depth insights into participants' perceptions, experiences, and attitudes toward using debates as a teaching technique in EFL classrooms. Open-ended responses within the questionnaire allow participants to elaborate on their perspectives, providing nuanced explanations that complement the numerical data. This qualitative aspect is essential for capturing the subjective and experiential dimensions of classroom debates, which may not be fully reflected in statistical analysis.

By combining these two methodologies, this study aims to provide a balanced and well-rounded analysis, ensuring that both measurable outcomes and personal insights are taken into account. The descriptive nature of the study helps in illustrating how debates function within the classroom context, while the analytical component facilitates the interpretation of findings to draw meaningful conclusions regarding their effectiveness in improving communicative performance.

2.1.2 Sample and Participants

This study investigates the perspectives of both M1 EFL students, and EFL teachers at Relizane University regarding the impact of in-class debates on learners' communicative performance. The participants were selected based on their familiarity with communicative language teaching (CLT) strategies, including debates.

Table 01: Sample and Participants

Category	Details
Population	M1 EFL students and teachers at Relizane University
Sample Size	28 students (learners) and 10 teachers
Sampling Method	Convenient Sampling

The student participants are enrolled in an English language program and have been exposed to various communicative activities, including debates, as part of their coursework. Their participation provides insights into how classroom debates influence their ability to communicate effectively in English.

The teacher participants have experience integrating communicative strategies into EFL instruction. Their perspectives contribute valuable reflections on the role of debates in fostering students' fluency, confidence, and engagement in spoken English.

The study employs a convenience sampling method, selecting participants based on their accessibility and willingness to participate. While this method allows for efficient data collection, it may introduce limitations in terms of generalizability. However, the selected sample is considered representative of the broader population of EFL learners and instructors at Relizane University who engage in communicative learning practices.

2.1.3 Data Collection Instruments

To gather comprehensive data on the role of in-class debates in enhancing EFL learners' communicative performance, two questionnaires were designed: one for students and another for teachers. Each questionnaire was structured to explore different aspects of debate-based learning, ensuring that both learner and instructor perspectives were adequately captured.

Table 02: Data Collection Instruments and Key Areas

Instrument	Target	Key Areas
Student Questionnaire	28 students	Perceptions of in-class debates, impact on fluency, engagement, and confidence
Teacher Questionnaire	10 teachers	Effectiveness of debates in teaching speaking skills, observed challenges, and recommendations

The student questionnaire aims to assess learners' perspectives on the use of debates in their EFL classrooms, focusing on how this technique influences their fluency, engagement, and confidence when speaking English. The questions explore the extent to which debates help students develop spontaneity in speech, articulate their thoughts effectively, and interact with peers in meaningful discussions.

The teacher questionnaire is designed to gather instructors' insights into the effectiveness of debates as a communicative teaching strategy. It examines teachers' observations regarding students' progress, the challenges encountered in implementing debates, and their recommendations for optimizing debate-based learning.

Both questionnaires include a mix of closed-ended and open-ended questions. The closed-ended questions provide quantifiable data, allowing for statistical analysis, while the open-ended questions encourage qualitative insights, enabling participants to elaborate on their views and experiences. This combination ensures a well-rounded understanding of the impact of debates on EFL learners' communicative performance.

2.1.4 Procedure

The research procedure to assess the impact of in-class debates on EFL learners' communicative performance was meticulously planned and executed through a structured, four-stage process. This approach ensured a comprehensive collection and analysis of data, combining both quantitative and qualitative insights to provide a well-rounded understanding of the phenomenon.

1. Designing the Questionnaires

The initial phase of the study involved developing detailed questionnaires for both students and teachers, ensuring that the questions aligned with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and effective debate techniques. These questionnaires were designed to assess the impact of in-class debates on learners' communicative performance by focusing on key dimensions such as:

- **Fluency:** Evaluating how debates influenced students' ability to express ideas smoothly and naturally.
- **Engagement:** Measuring learners' participation, enthusiasm, and willingness to communicate during debates.
- **Confidence:** Identifying whether engaging in debates improved students' self-assurance when speaking in English.
- **Teaching Effectiveness:** Examining teachers' perspectives on how debates contributed to language development and communicative competence.

To comprehensively capture these dimensions, the questionnaire design followed a structured and research-informed approach:

Question Structure

The questionnaires included a combination of closed-ended and open-ended questions to balance quantitative and qualitative data collection:

- **Closed-Ended Questions:** Used Likert-scale and multiple-choice formats to facilitate statistical analysis, allowing for measurable comparisons of learners' progress and teachers' observations.
- **Open-Ended Questions:** Allowed participants to provide detailed and nuanced responses, offering deeper insights into their experiences, challenges, and perceptions of debate-based learning.

Literature-Based Development

The development of the questionnaires was grounded in existing research on CLT and debate-based learning, ensuring that the items accurately reflected both theoretical and practical aspects of the teaching technique. This process involved:

- Reviewing scholarly works on CLT, communicative competence, and debate methodologies to formulate relevant and research-backed questions.
- Incorporating insights from previous studies on debate-based learning (e.g., Fukuda, 2003) to align with best practices in assessing fluency, engagement, and critical thinking.
- Ensuring validity and reliability by carefully wording questions to avoid ambiguity and ensure consistency across responses.

By designing the questionnaires with both pedagogical and research rigor, this phase laid the foundation for gathering meaningful data on how in-class debates influence EFL learners' communicative performance and classroom engagement.

2. Distribution

To maximize reach and participation, the questionnaires were disseminated using two different methods tailored to the participant groups:

Below is a table that clearly summarizes the distribution methods for both students and teachers:

Table 03 : Distribution Methods for Questionnaires

Participant Group	Distribution Method	Key Features/Benefits
Students	Printed copies distributed in person	- Ensures students complete the questionnaires under controlled conditions. - Minimizes the risk of non-response or incomplete submissions. - Allows for immediate clarification of any ambiguities.
Teachers	Electronic versions sent via email and available through online survey platforms	- Provides flexibility and ease of access. - Allows teachers to complete the questionnaire at their convenience. - Facilitates efficient data collection and organization.

This table succinctly captures the key points regarding the distribution of the questionnaires for each participant group.

3. Data Collection

The data collection phase spanned two weeks, allowing sufficient time for thoughtful and accurate responses:

Table 04: Data Collection Strategies

Key Strategy	Description & Benefits
Clear Instructions	- Participants received detailed guidelines to ensure clarity and reduce misinterpretation. - Encouraged honest and thoughtful feedback by explaining the purpose and importance of the study.
Extended Period	- A two-week window was provided to accommodate participants' schedules. - Ensured a high response rate and reduced potential response bias by allowing ample time for completion.

This table summarizes the strategies employed during data collection to enhance clarity and participant engagement.

4. Data Analysis

A mixed-methods approach was used to process and interpret the collected data:

Table 05: Data Analysis Approaches

Analysis Type	Description & Benefits
Quantitative Analysis	- Responses from closed-ended questions were analyzed using percentage-based methods. - Helped identify key trends and patterns within the data. - Provided measurable insights into students' fluency, confidence, and communicative development.
Qualitative Analysis	- Open-ended responses were thematically coded to categorize data into recurring themes and patterns. - Offered deeper insights into participants' perceptions and experiences. - Captured nuances in learners' engagement, motivation, and self-perceived progress.

This structured approach ensured that the findings were both **data-driven** and **reflective of real-world experiences**, enhancing the **reliability** and **depth** of the conclusions on the role of in-class debates in improving EFL learners' communicative performance.

By integrating these four stages, the research ensured that the findings were both data-driven and reflective of the participants' real-world experiences. This structured approach not only enhanced the reliability of the conclusions but also contributed significantly to understanding the role of in-class debates in improving the communicative performance of EFL learners.

2.2 Results and Discussion

The analysis of student responses provides valuable insights into their perceptions of in-class debates and their impact on communicative performance. The following table summarizes the key findings:

Table 06 : Results

Aspect	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Debates improve fluency	50%	30%	10%	5%	5%
Debates boost confidence	45%	35%	10%	5%	5%
Debates encourage active participation	60%	25%	10%	3%	2%
Debates help in structuring ideas	55%	30%	10%	3%	2%

Key Findings:

Table 07: key findings from students' responses

Aspect	Findings & Insights
Fluency and Confidence Improvement	- 80% of students strongly agree or agree that debates enhance fluency and confidence in spoken English. - Suggests that regular participation in debates improves spontaneous speech and ease in expressing ideas.
Enhancing Logical Structuring of Ideas	- 85% of learners believe that debates help them organize and present ideas more coherently. - Reinforces the role of debates in developing structured thinking and argumentation skills.
Active Participation and Engagement	- 60% strongly agree, 25% agree that debates encourage active participation. - Indicates that debates create an interactive and engaging learning environment.
Neutrality and Disagreement	- ≤10% of students expressed neutral or negative opinions. - Suggests that some learners may experience anxiety, lack of confidence, or difficulty keeping up with debate dynamics. - Highlights the need for further investigation into barriers affecting participation.

Overall, the student responses reinforce the effectiveness of debates as a communicative teaching strategy, supporting the argument that debates enhance fluency, confidence, engagement, and structured thinking in EFL learners.

2.2.2 Teacher Responses Analysis

The analysis of teacher responses provides valuable insights into the effectiveness and challenges of using in-class debates as a communicative teaching strategy. The following table presents a summary of their feedback:

Table 08: Teachers Responses Analysis

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Comments
Do you believe debates enhance students' communicative skills?	90%	10%	Highly effective in engaging learners.
Do debates help in reducing hesitation?	85%	15%	Encourages spontaneous speech.
Are debates suitable for all proficiency levels?	60%	40%	Beginners struggle without structured guidance.
Do you use debates regularly in class?	75%	25%	Used alongside role-plays and discussions.

Key Discussion Points:

Table 09: Key Findings from Teacher Responses

Finding	Description & Implications
Strong Support for Debates in Language Learning	A vast majority of teachers (90%) affirm that debates significantly enhance learners' communicative skills, particularly in boosting confidence, fluency, and engagement. This strong endorsement highlights the perceived effectiveness of debates in creating an interactive learning environment where students actively participate and improve their speaking abilities.
Reducing Hesitation and Encouraging Spontaneous Speech	85% of teachers agree that debates help students overcome hesitation and develop spontaneous speech skills. This suggests that debates provide a safe and structured platform for learners to practice speaking in real-time, improving their ability to express ideas naturally and without excessive pauses or self-correction.
Challenges for Lower-Proficiency Learners	While 60% of teachers believe that debates can be adapted to different proficiency levels, 40% express concerns that beginners struggle without structured guidance. This finding emphasizes the need for scaffolding techniques (e.g., providing language support, guided practice, and simplified debate formats) to make debates more accessible and manageable for lower-level learners.
Integration with Other Communicative Activities	75% of teachers report regularly incorporating debates into their teaching, often alongside role-plays and discussions. This suggests that debates are viewed as a valuable complement to other communicative activities, reinforcing the importance of a varied and interactive approach to speaking instruction in EFL classrooms.

Implications for Teaching Practice

The findings suggest that while debates are widely regarded as beneficial for EFL learners, their effectiveness can be maximized by adapting them to different proficiency levels. Teachers emphasize the importance of structured preparation and support to ensure that all learners, regardless of their fluency level, can actively participate and benefit from debate-based activities.

To address the challenges faced by lower-proficiency learners, teachers may consider implementing the following strategies:

Scaffolding Techniques

Scaffolding plays a crucial role in supporting students as they develop their debating skills. By providing sentence starters, key phrases, and model debates, teachers help learners structure their arguments and express ideas more effectively. Sentence starters such as “I strongly believe that...,” “One reason for this is...,” or “On the contrary, some may argue that...” give students the linguistic tools they need to articulate their thoughts. Additionally, exposing students to well-structured model debates allows them to observe and internalize effective argumentation strategies. These supports are particularly beneficial for lower-proficiency students who may struggle with spontaneous speech but can gain confidence through structured practice. As learners progress, scaffolding can be gradually reduced to encourage more independent and spontaneous language use.

Progressive Difficulty Levels

A step-by-step approach to debating helps students develop confidence without feeling overwhelmed. Introducing debates in a simplified format—such as having students express basic opinions before engaging in structured debates—allows them to ease into the process. For beginners, teachers can use guided debates, where students receive pre-written arguments and practice delivering them with proper intonation and fluency. As learners become more comfortable, they can move on to semi-structured debates, where they generate their own ideas with the support of outlines or brainstorming activities. Finally, advanced learners can participate in impromptu debates, which require them to think and respond spontaneously. This progressive model ensures that students build their speaking skills at a manageable pace while gradually developing the ability to argue persuasively in real-time discussions.

Collaborative Preparation

Preparing for debates in pairs or small groups enhances learning by allowing students to brainstorm ideas together, organize their arguments, and anticipate counterarguments. This process encourages peer learning, as students can support each other in refining their arguments and providing constructive feedback. Working collaboratively also reduces speaking anxiety, as learners enter debates feeling prepared and supported by their peers. Additionally, allowing students to research and structure their arguments together fosters critical thinking and information literacy, as they must evaluate sources, synthesize information, and formulate logical arguments before presenting them in a debate.

Role Assignment

Assigning specific roles within debates ensures that all students can actively participate, even if they are not yet comfortable engaging in direct argumentation. Teachers can designate students as moderators, who oversee the discussion and ensure that all participants have a chance to speak; speakers, who present arguments and counterarguments; and timekeepers, who help manage the debate's structure and timing. Other possible roles include note-takers, who summarize key points for later reflection, and questioners, who challenge speakers with critical inquiries. Rotating these roles allows students to develop multiple skills over time, ensuring that even hesitant learners find a way to engage in the debate process at their comfort level.

Integration with Other Speaking Activities

To maximize the benefits of debates, they should be combined with other communicative activities that reinforce speaking and argumentation skills. **Role-plays** provide learners with authentic scenarios where they must use persuasive language, storytelling enhances their ability to articulate ideas coherently, and discussions allow for more flexible, informal exchanges of opinions. By incorporating debates into a broader communicative approach, teachers can prevent learners from feeling pressured by the debate format alone while still fostering fluency, confidence, and critical thinking. Additionally, using debates as a follow-up activity to reading comprehension tasks or current events discussions can help students develop deeper engagement with course materials and apply their speaking skills in meaningful contexts.

By implementing these adaptive strategies, debates can become a more inclusive and effective tool for enhancing communicative competence in EFL classrooms.

2.2.3 Challenges Identified

The analysis of student and teacher responses highlights several challenges associated with using debates in EFL classrooms. The table below presents a comparative perspective on these challenges:

Table 10: Challenges of EFL Students in Communicative Activities

Challenge	Student Perspective	Teacher Perspective
Anxiety in speaking	Some students feel hesitant due to fear of making mistakes.	Hesitation reduces with consistent exposure, but initial reluctance is common.
Time management	Debates can take longer than planned, limiting time for other	Requires structured timing strategies, such as limiting speaking time per

	activities.	turn.
Limited vocabulary	Some students struggle with finding the right words to express their ideas.	Teachers suggest pre-teaching key vocabulary and phrases to support fluency.
Participation issues	Less confident students tend to speak less and avoid active engagement.	Grouping techniques and role assignments can help balance participation levels.

This table presents key challenges in in-class debates from both student and teacher perspectives, along with potential solutions. Anxiety in speaking affects students who fear making mistakes, while teachers observe that consistent exposure helps reduce hesitation over time. Time management can be an issue, as debates may extend beyond planned durations, requiring structured timing strategies to maintain balance. Limited vocabulary hinders students from expressing ideas effectively, prompting teachers to pre-teach key vocabulary and phrases for support. Participation issues arise when less confident students avoid engagement, which teachers can address by using grouping techniques and assigning specific roles to encourage balanced involvement.

Discussion of Key Challenges and Possible Solutions

1. Overcoming Speaking Anxiety

One of the primary challenges identified in the study is students' fear of making mistakes, which can significantly hinder their willingness to participate in debates. Many learners feel anxious about mispronunciations, grammatical errors, or struggling to express their ideas fluently, leading to hesitation or avoidance of participation.

Teacher Insights:

- Teachers observe that consistent exposure to debates can help students become more comfortable speaking in front of their peers.
- Over time, learners develop confidence as they practice formulating and articulating arguments in a structured format.

Possible Solutions:

1. Creating a Supportive Classroom Environment:

- Encouraging a non-judgmental atmosphere where mistakes are seen as learning opportunities rather than failures.
- Promoting positive reinforcement, such as praising effort rather than just accuracy.

2. Using Peer Encouragement:

- Pairing students with supportive debate partners or assigning small-group debates before whole-class discussions.
- Implementing peer feedback activities, where students provide constructive comments rather than criticism.

3. Incorporating Low-Pressure Debate Formats

To help students gradually build confidence in speaking, low-pressure debate formats can be introduced before transitioning to fully structured debates. These formats allow learners to develop their fluency, argumentation skills, and critical thinking without the stress of formal evaluation.

2. Managing Time Effectively

Challenge:

Both students and teachers acknowledge that debates can extend beyond the allocated lesson time, disrupting lesson plans and limiting time for other classroom activities. Without structured timing, some students may dominate discussions, while others struggle to contribute.

Solution:

To maintain efficiency, the following strategies can be implemented:

1. Strict Time Limits for Speeches

- Assign a fixed speaking time for each participant (e.g., 1–2 minutes per turn).
- Encourage students to rehearse concise arguments to improve clarity and efficiency.

2. Using Timers to Regulate Debate Flow

- Utilize countdown timers or visual cues to track speaking time.
- Set buffer time for summary points and conclusions.

3. Setting Clear Debate Structures

- Follow structured formats (e.g., Oxford-style debates) to ensure an organized discussion.
- Divide the debate into clearly defined phases (e.g., opening statements, rebuttals, and conclusions).
- Encourage moderators (teachers or students) to intervene if discussions go off-topic.

By applying these strategies, debates can remain engaging, time-efficient, and well-structured, allowing students to maximize their speaking opportunities without disrupting lesson flow.

3. Addressing Limited Vocabulary

Challenge:

Many students struggle to find the right words during debates, leading to frequent pauses, hesitation, or reduced participation. This issue affects their fluency and ability to articulate arguments effectively.

Teacher Recommendations:

- Pre-teaching key vocabulary related to debate topics.

- Providing students with useful expressions for structuring arguments, agreeing, disagreeing, and transitioning between ideas.

Solution:

To enhance learners' ability to express their ideas confidently, teachers can incorporate lexical preparation activities such as:

1. Vocabulary Lists & Phrase Banks:

- Introducing topic-specific vocabulary before debates.
- Providing ready-to-use expressions for stating opinions, supporting arguments, and countering opposing views (e.g., "*I strongly believe that...*", "*In contrast,...*", "*To support my argument,...*").

2. Guided Brainstorming:

- Encouraging students to list key terms and synonyms related to the debate topic.
- Using mind maps or word webs to visually organize vocabulary and ideas.

3. Reinforcing Vocabulary through Practice:

- Implementing quick vocabulary-building exercises before debates, such as matching words to definitions or sentence-completion tasks.
- Encouraging students to use new vocabulary actively in discussions and debates.

By integrating these lexical support strategies, students can expand their vocabulary, improve fluency, and participate more confidently in debates.

4. Encouraging Equal Participation

Challenge:

Some students, especially those who are less confident or shy, tend to participate less actively in debates. This can lead to an imbalance, where more outspoken learners dominate discussions while others remain passive.

Teacher Recommendations:

- Using strategic grouping to ensure a mix of confidence levels.
- Assigning specific roles to give each student a defined responsibility.

Solution:

To promote balanced participation, teachers can implement the following strategies:

1. Assigning Specific Roles

- **Speaker:** Presents the main argument.
 - **Rebuttal Presenter:** Responds to opposing arguments.
 - **Moderator:** Ensures fairness, time management, and turn-taking.
 - **Note-Taker:** Records key points for later discussion.
 - **Questioner:** Asks follow-up questions to keep the debate dynamic.
- By rotating roles across debates, students gain confidence in different aspects of public speaking.

2. Using Small-Group Debates Before Whole-Class Discussions

- Pairing or grouping students into smaller teams makes participation less intimidating.
- Practicing in small groups builds confidence before engaging in larger discussions.
- Teachers can monitor groups to ensure that all students contribute.

3. Implementing Turn-Taking Systems

- Using a speaking order system (e.g., numbered turns or a pass-the-microphone approach).
- Encouraging the use of sentence starters or prompt cards for hesitant students.
- Setting a rule that every participant must speak at least once before any student speaks again.

By incorporating these strategies, debates can become more inclusive, giving every student the opportunity to contribute and develop their communicative skills effectively.

Conclusion

While in-class debates offer significant benefits for developing communicative skills, their effectiveness can be maximized through structured strategies. By reducing anxiety, managing time efficiently, supporting vocabulary development, and ensuring equal participation, teachers can create an inclusive and engaging debate environment. These measures help all learners—regardless of proficiency level—actively participate and improve their speaking skills in EFL classrooms.

2.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed to optimize the use of debates in EFL classrooms:

2.3.1 For Teachers

Implement Pre-Debate Activities

- Incorporate vocabulary-building tasks, such as word banks, collocations, and sentence starters, to support lower-proficiency students in expressing their ideas effectively.
- Use brainstorming sessions to activate prior knowledge and generate ideas related to the debate topic. These sessions can include mind maps or small-group discussions.
- Provide guided discussions with leading questions to help students explore different perspectives and prepare structured arguments before the debate.
- Assign role-specific preparation, such as having some students research supporting arguments while others explore counterarguments, ensuring a more balanced and engaging debate.

Use Structured Debate Formats

- Adopt well-defined debate formats such as Lincoln-Douglas debates, parliamentary debates, and team debates to ensure fair participation and organized argumentation.
- Establish clear guidelines, speaking time limits, and role assignments to encourage equal contributions from all students.
- Rotate speaker roles (e.g., opening speaker, rebuttal, conclusion) among students in different debates to help them develop various speaking skills.
- Introduce modified or scaffolded formats for beginners, such as informal debates or opinion-sharing rounds, before transitioning to formal debates.

Provide Constructive Feedback

- Focus on communication effectiveness, including clarity of speech, coherence of arguments, and persuasiveness, rather than emphasizing grammatical accuracy.
- Use a rubric-based evaluation system that considers fluency, argument strength, engagement, and use of supporting evidence to provide structured feedback.
- Offer both oral and written feedback, allowing students to reflect on their performance and set improvement goals.
- Encourage peer feedback sessions, where students analyze and comment on each other's strengths and areas for growth in a supportive environment.

Gradually Increase Topic Complexity

- Start with simple, relatable topics (e.g., social media effects, school rules) to build confidence and engagement.
- Progress to controversial or abstract topics (e.g., ethical dilemmas, globalization, artificial intelligence) to develop critical thinking and higher-order reasoning.
- Use scaffolding techniques, such as providing background readings or structured outlines, to help students prepare for more complex debates.
- Incorporate current events and real-world issues into debate topics to enhance relevance and encourage students to engage with authentic materials.

Encourage Reflection and Self-Assessment

- After each debate, have students complete self-reflection journals to analyze their strengths, challenges, and areas for improvement.
- Use self-evaluation checklists with criteria such as argument clarity, confidence, use of evidence, and engagement.
- Organize peer discussion sessions where students provide constructive feedback and exchange strategies for improving debate skills.
- Introduce video recordings of debates, allowing students to review their performance and observe their progress over time.

Integrate Debates with Other Language Skills

- Connect debates with reading activities by having students research and analyze articles, case studies, or opinion pieces related to the debate topic.

- Encourage writing tasks such as argumentative essays, debate summaries, and counterargument responses to reinforce critical thinking and structured writing skills.
- Use listening exercises, such as watching formal debates or TED Talks, to expose students to persuasive speaking techniques and discourse markers.
- Incorporate collaborative projects, where students work in teams to prepare debate materials, fact-check information, and create persuasive presentations.

2.3.2 For Learners

- **Engage in Peer Discussions Before Formal Debates:**
 - Participate in informal discussions and brainstorming sessions with peers to explore different viewpoints before engaging in structured debates.
 - Use small-group debates or role-play activities to develop confidence in expressing ideas in a low-pressure environment.
 - Exchange feedback with peers on argument clarity, vocabulary use, and delivery to refine debate skills.
- **Utilize Note-Taking Strategies During Debates to Enhance Argument Organization:**
 - Develop a structured note-taking method (e.g., Cornell Notes, mind maps) to track key points, counterarguments, and supporting evidence.
 - Highlight main arguments, rebuttals, and examples to maintain a clear structure and avoid repetition during debates.
 - Use abbreviations and symbols for quick reference, ensuring smooth delivery while speaking.
 - Review notes post-debate to reflect on strengths and areas for improvement.
- **Practice Self-Recording to Evaluate Fluency and Articulation Post-Debate:**
 - Record personal debate performances and analyze speech clarity, fluency, and pronunciation to identify areas for improvement.
 - Listen for fillers (e.g., "um," "uh"), pacing, and intonation, adjusting for a more persuasive delivery.
 - Compare recordings over time to track progress and set specific language improvement goals.
 - Share recordings with peers or teachers for constructive feedback on strengths and areas needing enhancement.

2.3.3 Future Research Directions

- **Investigating the Long-Term Impact of Debates on Students' Academic and Professional Communication Skills:**
 - Examine how participation in classroom debates influences students' ability to articulate ideas clearly and persuasively in academic writing and presentations.
 - Explore the role of debates in preparing students for professional settings, such as job interviews, workplace discussions, and public speaking engagements.
 - Assess whether students who engage in regular debates demonstrate greater confidence and adaptability in real-world communication scenarios.
- **Examining How Debates Influence Critical Thinking and Argumentation Abilities:**

- Investigate how structured debates contribute to the development of logical reasoning, evidence-based argumentation, and problem-solving skills.
- Analyze whether debate activities help students become more open-minded, improving their ability to evaluate multiple perspectives on complex issues.
- Study the correlation between debate participation and improvements in students' analytical writing and persuasive essay composition.
- **Exploring the Integration of Digital Debate Formats in Online EFL Learning:**
 - Evaluate the effectiveness of **virtual debate platforms** and AI-powered discussion tools in enhancing students' speaking and critical thinking skills.
 - Examine how digital debate formats (e.g., asynchronous video debates, live online debates) compare to traditional in-class debates in terms of engagement and language development.
 - Investigate the potential of gamified debate applications and social media-based discussion forums to support interactive language learning.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the methodology, key findings, analysis, and recommendations of the study. The results indicate that in-class debates significantly enhance learners' communicative performance, improving fluency, confidence, and participation. Through structured debate activities, students develop their ability to express ideas clearly, engage in discussions, and construct arguments effectively.

However, challenges such as unequal participation and language anxiety require structured scaffolding, clear debate formats, and constructive feedback to support all learners. The findings align with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles, reinforcing learner-centered approaches that promote real-world communication and critical thinking.

To maximize the benefits of debates, strategic preparation, guided practice, and reflection activities are recommended. Future research could explore the long-term impact of debates on communication skills and the effectiveness of digital debate formats in EFL learning. Ultimately, debates serve as a valuable tool for fostering engagement, confidence, and communicative competence in EFL classrooms.

General conclusion

In conclusion, this study underscores the significant role that in-class debates play in enhancing EFL learners' communicative performance within the framework of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The findings illustrate that debates not only improve fluency and confidence but also foster critical thinking and collaborative skills among students. While challenges such as linguistic barriers and participation issues exist, implementing structured approaches and supportive strategies can help mitigate these difficulties, ensuring that all learners can actively engage in meaningful communication. The recommendations provided for both teachers and learners aim to optimize the effectiveness of debates as a pedagogical tool, promoting an inclusive and dynamic classroom environment. Additionally, the call for future research highlights the importance of exploring the long-term impacts of debate participation on students' communicative skills and the integration of digital formats in EFL contexts. Ultimately, in-class debates are a compelling method for equipping learners with the practical language skills necessary to thrive in diverse communicative situations, contributing to their overall academic and professional success.

List of References

- Ahmed, A. (2018). The role of debates in enhancing student motivation in EFL settings.
- Alasmari, A., & Ahmed, A. (2013). The impact of structured debates on EFL learners' critical thinking skills.
- AlRubaie, M. (2024). The influence of in-class debates on oral fluency and communicative competence among EFL students.
- Alzeebaree, M., & Yavuz, A. (2017). Fostering cognitive engagement and problem-solving skills through CLT strategies.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing.
- Benson, P. (2011). Teaching and research: Methodology.
- Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2012). Teaching for critical thinking: Tools and techniques to help students ask the right questions.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching.
- Carless, D. R. (1999). Issues in assessing communicative language proficiency.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). Syntactic structures.
- Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). Motivation in language learning: A process-oriented approach.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study.
- Ellis, R. (1999). Input-based and output-based approaches to language acquisition.
- Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching.
- Fukuda, H. (2003). The integration of debates in Japanese EFL classrooms.
- Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning.
- Harmer, J. (2007). The practice of English language teaching.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence.
- Iadarola, G. (2015). The role of structured debates in developing perspective-taking skills.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1994). Cooperative learning: The foundation for active learning.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition.

- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Techniques and principles in language teaching.
- Little, D. (1991). Autonomy in language learning.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative language teaching: An instructional introduction.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/nonnative speaker conversation and the negotiation of meaning.
- Nunan, D. (1989). Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.
- Nunan, D. (2004). Task-based language teaching.
- Piaget, J. (1972). The psychology of intelligence.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). Approaches and methods in language teaching.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching.
- Savignon, S. J. (2002). Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education.
- Slavin, R. E. (1995). Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning.
- Tuan, L. T., & Nhu, N. T. (2010). Developing speaking skills for EFL students at a university.
- Thornbury, S. (1999). How to teach speaking.
- Ur, P. (2012). A course in English language teaching.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.
- Willis, J. (1996). A framework for task-based learning.
- Zare, P., & Othman, M. (2013). Speech anxiety and its causes among Iranian EFL learners.

Appendices

A. Questionnaire for Learners

University of Relizane
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English
Academic Year: 2025/2026

Students' Questionnaire

Dear Participants,

This questionnaire aims to collect data for research on the impact of in-class debates on EFL learners' communicative performance. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and your responses will remain anonymous. Please answer the following questions honestly. Your input is highly valuable and will contribute to understanding how debates enhance language learning.

Instructions: Tick (✓) or cross (X) the correct answers, and add details when necessary.

Section 1: Background Information

1. **What is your gender?**
 - ☐ Male
 - ☐ Female
2. **How long have you been learning English?**
 - ☐ Less than 3 years
 - ☐ 3–5 years
 - ☐ More than 5 years (please specify): _____
3. **How would you rank the following language skills from the one you master the most (1) to the one you master the least (4)?**

Listening ()

Speaking ()

Reading ()

Writing ()

Section 2: Communication Difficulties

4. **What aspect of language are you good at?**
1. ☐ Fluency (smooth communication)
 2. ☐ Accuracy (correct usage)
 3. Both
5. **Do you believe communication skills are essential in language learning?**
- ☐ Yes, I do
- ☐ No, I don't
- Please justify your answer
-
-

6. **What challenges do you face when trying to speak in English? (Select all that apply.)**
- ☐ Difficulty finding the right words
- ☐ Difficulty expressing my thoughts clearly
- ☐ Fear of making mistakes
- ☐ Struggling to organize my thoughts
- ☐ Difficulty understanding others' responses
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____
7. **How do you deal with these issues? (Select all that apply.)**
- ☐ Seek guidance and help
- ☐ Just ignore them
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____
-

Section 3: In-Class Debates Integration in EFL Context

8. **How often do you participate in classroom debates?**
- ☐ Rarely (1–2 times per semester)
- ☐ Occasionally (3–5 times per semester)
- ☐ Frequently (More than 5 times per semester)
9. **In which module(s) do you practice debates?**
-
10. **What aspects of debates do you enjoy the most? (Select all that apply.)**
- ☐ Expressing opinions
- ☐ Listening to different perspectives
- ☐ Teamwork and collaboration
- ☐ Developing arguments
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____
11. **What challenges do you face during debates? (Select all that apply.)**
- ☐ Speaking under time pressure
- ☐ Handling disagreement

- ☐ Lack of preparation
 - ☐ Difficulty structuring arguments
 - ☐ Confidence issues
 - ☐ Other (please specify): _____
12. **Do you think debates should be more integrated into language learning?**
- ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No

Justify your answer
please_____

Section 4: Impact of In-Class Debates on EFL Learners' Communicative Performance

13. **In your opinion, which aspect of your communicative performance have improved the most due to participating in debates? (Select all that apply.)**
- ☐ Fluency
 - ☐ Confidence in speaking
 - ☐ Ability to respond quickly
 - ☐ Ability to structure arguments logically
 - ☐ Use of appropriate vocabulary
 - ☐ Other (please specify): _____
14. **What improvements would make in-class debates more effective for developing your communicative performance? (Select all that apply.)**
- ☐ More preparation time
 - ☐ More feedback from teachers
 - ☐ More guidance on debate structure
 - ☐ More engaging debate topics
 - ☐ Other (please specify): _____

Thank you for your participation!

B. Questionnaire for Learners

University of Relizane
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English
Academic Year: 2025/2026

Dear participants,

This questionnaire is part of a research study aimed at investigating the impact of in-class debates on EFL learners' communicative performance. Your honest responses will be greatly appreciated. The information provided will remain confidential and will only be used for academic research purposes.

Instructions: Tick (✓) or cross (X) the correct answers, and add details when necessary.

Section 1: Teaching Experience

1. **How many years have you been teaching English?**
 - ☐ Less than 3 years
 - ☐ 3–5 years
 - ☐ More than 5 years (please specify) _____
 2. **What is your preferred teaching approach?** *(Select all that apply.)*
 - ☐ Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)
 - ☐ Task-Based Learning (TBL)
 - ☐ Grammar-Translation Method
 - ☐ Audiolingual Method
 - ☐ Other (please specify) _____
 3. **Have you received any training on communicative language teaching methods?**
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ If yes, what type of training? _____
-

Section 2: Students' Communicative Performance

4. **How do your students generally perform in spoken communication activities?**
 - ☐ Very confident and articulate
 - ☐ Somewhat confident but hesitant
 - ☐ Not very confident, struggles to express ideas
 - ☐ Not confident at all
5. **What are the most common weaknesses in students' spoken communication?** *(Select all that apply.)*

- ☐ Lack of fluency
- ☐ Poor pronunciation
- ☐ Limited vocabulary
- ☐ Grammar mistakes affecting communication
- ☐ Lack of confidence in expressing ideas
- ☐ Difficulty organizing thoughts logically
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

6. **What motivates students to participate more actively in communicative activities?**
(Select all that apply.)

- ☐ Interesting and relatable topics
- ☐ Encouragement from the teacher
- ☐ Competitive elements (scoring, judging, prizes)
- ☐ Peer support and teamwork
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Section 3: In-Class Debates in EFL Classrooms

7. **Do you incorporate debates into your teaching?**

- ☐ Yes, regularly
- ☐ Yes, occasionally
- ☐ Rarely

8. **In which module do you use debates as a teaching technique?**

9. **What types of topics do you typically use for debates in your classroom?**

10. **What challenges do you face when implementing debates in the classroom?** (Select all that apply.)

- ☐ Time constraints within the curriculum
- ☐ Students' reluctance to participate
- ☐ Difficulty in managing discussions
- ☐ Lack of resources or training for debate facilitation
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Section 4: The Impact of Debates on EFL Learners' Communicative Performance

11. Which aspects of communication do you think debates enhance the most? (Select all that apply.)

- ☐ Clear expression of thoughts
- ☐ Confidence
- ☐ Critical thinking
- ☐ Persuasive speaking
- ☐ Active listening and responding appropriately
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

12. What additional benefits, do you think debates provide for students' language learning?

Thank you for your participation!