

Grammatical Errors and the Impacts in Australasian Parliamentary Debate

¹Elok Widiyati*, ¹Dinta Amelia

¹English Education Study Program, Faculty of Languages, Literature, and Culture,
Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Indonesia

***Corresponding Author**

Email: widiyati@unissula.ac.id

Received:
3 May 2026

Revised:
7 June 2026

Accepted:
8 July 2026

Published:
20 July 2026

Abstract

Debate is a productive speaking skill where students from pro and cons sides argue their constructive arguments to win. It deals with students' grammar accuracy in showing the exact motion nuance and consistent context delivered. However, there were very limited research conducted in the area of debate inaccuracy dealing with grammar from Australasian Parliamentary debate system. Through the debate class conducted by the students, gaps in the previous studies in grammatical error addressed. Therefore, this article aims to find out the students' grammatical errors types in the debate class and highlights factors, impacts, and strategies to avoid the errors. The researchers used descriptive quantitative research design with an open questionnaire and transcribed video. The respondents were the students of third semester majoring English Education. The researchers gathered the data from offline debate class. The data was analyzed based on the morphological errors. The findings showed that the most frequently error produced was misselection 63.34%, omission 32%, overinclusion 2%, misordering 1.33%, and blend 1.33%. Surprisingly, a new sub type of omission found as adjective. It can be concluded that the grammatical errors in debate dealt with all the types but it did not happen to the all sub types. The regular grammatical errors made by the students had the higher the impacts to the internal aspect compared to the external aspect referring to the technicalities and adjudication. To conclude, it is very important to analyze the students' grammatical errors in their debate performance to boost their clear argument and rebuttal delivery to minimize ambiguity. Therefore, it would be easily understood by the opponents and adjudicators.

Keywords: adjudication; Australasian Parliamentary Debate; debate class; debate technicalities; grammatical error

INTRODUCTION

Debate is a multimodal teaching process where students' learning experiences supported by visual, audio, and kinesthetic modes availability. Audio video debate exhibition helped the students in audio-visualization to minimize the confusion on debate session and to know the debate rules (Fuadah et al., 2020). Additionally, students' movement in debate reflect kinesics. Therefore, debate learning experiences offered a more structured system fostered rational and autonomous individuals (Mulya et al., 2024).

Debate subsumed into team-based activity (Nur et al., 2021) which characterized by fast paced and high-intensity interaction fostering critical thinking (Zhang et al., 2025). Its practices benefits derived from two function. The promising points for improving students' verbal skill development in educational function and generating social entrepreneurial skills in instructional

function (Najafi et al., 2016). These points were proven by Buhaeri et al. (2026) that debate served as an effective model to improve both linguistic competence and 21st-century learning skills.

In educational function, students demonstrated marked progressive ability to construct coherent argument by engaging advanced grammar in structured debate activities (Tarigan & Lubis, 2024). Related to the instructional function, debate was a potentially effective oral communication skills to lead accuracy as language development because it was very fruitful to students' academic and career in a globalized world dealing (El Majidi et al., 2024). Persistently, debates in higher education generate academic pursuits (Dewangga et al., 2024) and job market (Hefner, 2025) influenced from six soft skills: leadership, critical thinking, teamwork, communication, resilience, and problem-solving (Ballester-Miquel et al., 2026). As a consequence of its importances, debate is needed to be more often and robustly used within higher education (Gunasilan, 2022).

In language learning, debate contributed in improving spontaneous arguments (Aziz & Kamilah, 2020), constructing arguments in a good teamwork (Pradana, 2017), speaking skill (Widiawati, 2020; Apriliani et al., 2021), grammar (Parlindungan, 2020), critical thinking on specific topics (Yongzhi, 2024), scientific argumentation skills (Alberida et al., 2026), and collaboration (Bohara & Awasthi, 2026). Moreover, flexibility, adaptability, integration, and skill-based environment improved when debate applied with CLIL technology (Pratama, 2019). It reflected by the module combining debate skills, science technological content, equity, and equality in the debate class.

Australasian Parliamentary Debate

There are three debate forms performed in higher education competitions: Asian form used in JOVED (Java Overland Varsities English Debate) from 1997, Australasian form used in IVED (Indonesian Varsities English Debate) from 1998, and British Parliamentary form used in NUDC (National University Debating Championship) from 2008. However, those various competitions did not effectively make the classroom debate properly used in formal higher education (Pratama & Sakhiyya, 2019). The challenge happened because of students' grammar mastery in debate class (Gunawan et al., 2018). Receptive listening skill in concentrating foreign accent the students' got through rehearsals also led to occasional misunderstanding in grammar (Laia, 2019).

Purposively, the academic formal debate trains students' critical thinking and research-based speech. This debate form found in Australasian Parliamentary (AP) called Australs. It is performed in elementary and junior high school levels in Australia, however, it is commonly used in regional competitions in Indonesian higher education. The AP is very relevant to be rehearsed for compulsory debate class as the basic debate skill before going further to the complex debate style. Both of the proposition and opposition teams have three speakers acted as the first to the third speaker having seven minutes to speak and a reply speaker acted in five minutes. Debaters in AP do not have any single chance to deliver Points of Information (PoI) during the session. This atmosphere supports learners to concentrate in giving detail, update, and constructive data while arguing. The clear and objective adjudication system in this debate is categorized into matter, method, and manner (Hariyanto et al., 2019). In fact, the advantageous benefits of AP, such as: creating positive effect on students' ability to speak argumentatively (Qomariah et al., 2020); overcoming students' speaking problems, and improving the students' speaking skill (Fuadah et al., 2020); improving critical thinking and broadening point of view (Saidah, 2015).

Matter in debate adjudication deals with argument clarity and clear syntactic structure show speakers' credibility. The argument aspects are categorized into structure, quality, and delivery. The argument structure deals with the criteria of evidence and interruption; the argument quality

linked to the length of argument and expression; while the argument delivery related to fluency, pause, volume, and movement. The argument structure observed by Petukhova et al. (2018) consisted of statement, reason, evidence, and restatement. The unclear argument delivery brings the negativity, such as: less adjudicators' understanding so they have to comment unclear arguments, hard meaning caught by opponent team, and low team cooperation affecting debate into below average level. In other side, the positive vibes will come out when clear argument delivered, such as: raising debaters' self-confidence, fatal error avoidance just because of the parts of speech misuse, and qualified debaters' speech (Pratama et al., 2018). Here, verbal adjudication is more helpful in terms of language development especially for students who need more improvement in grammar (Aclan & Aziz, 2015). Debate competence is also measured by grammar accuracy and other language elements beside the function and comprehension (Ridwan, 2017).

Method is the second point in debate adjudication, for examples: interesting opening, clear speech purpose, sequential thinking delivery, argument priority, time management, and strong closing. Time allocation in training sessions completely deals with the time management in the performance (Wahyuni et al., 2020; Hernawan & Yusuf, 2021). Those points became adjudicator's consideration to put scores of appreciation, judgment, and affect (Tarigan et al., 2022). They derive interpersonal skills to attract both adjudicator and audience attention.

Manner used in debate deals with gesture events particularly impression, beat gestures, co-speech gestures, iconic gesture, open gesture, verbal and vocal performances, body posture, confident posture, body movement, facial expressions, eye contact, arm position, hand motion showing confidence predictor (Petukhova et al., 2017). However, debaters used wrong manner in competitions, such as delivering argument in uncontrolled speech rate, contacting eyes to the opponent, inappropriate posture especially hand movement. Therefore, they have to be very attentive in using pause, moving effectively, proper facial expression, and clear speech volume.

In debate, students need to experience grammar as they comprehended in case building and during their performance (Inoue, 2009). They express utterances based on their speaking competence in which grammar belongs to its aspects besides vocabulary, pronunciation, discourse, and strategic competence (Latifa et al., 2015). Debate is assessed from idea accuracy conveyed through accurate use of grammar. Consequently, students in debating team are required to have full grammar proficiency (Hapsari & Wirawan, 2018). The students are required to use grammar correctly and its language rules while defending arguments (Astari et al., 2022). The idea will be different if debater produces errors interfering the meaning. Furthermore, argument quality such as claim, evident, and warrant assessed from accuracy as rigorous standard based on the critical thinking taxonomy (Paul & Elder, 2007).

Grammatical errors in debate

Grammar as speaking element should be mastered in debate, therefore the students need to comprehend grammatical structure (Arung & Jumardin, 2016). When grammar is missing, the intended meaning and message cannot be delivered accurately (Gebremariam, 2024). Verbs as a part of grammar subsumed into argumentative accuracy in debate. The accuracy is indicated by grammatical feature production that is cognitively processed and fully acquired (Tawfik, 2022). Grammar in debate session is scientific because the language pattern used are helpful for the speakers in conveying the description, analysis, and evidence.

The students in advance debate community experienced errors in constructing sentences grammatically although they had gained the tenses materials. It is because errors were randomly produced and could not be predicted (Maldini & Indah, 2020). To handle the problem, the students had to spend more times in autonomous learning for understanding and comprehending grammar

(Wiranti & Widiyati, 2023) both in online and offline classes (Pham, 2023). The students' strategy to avoid complex structure was simplifying speech because they had less sufficient knowledge about grammar rules. The internal factors affecting students' grammatical error in speaking were confusion and doubtfulness (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017). Surprisingly, most of the students were persistent to express their argument in debate although they had grammar problem (Juliansyah et al., 2023).

The new grammatical errors classification are omission, overinclusion, misselection, misordering, and blends errors (James, 2013). Omission takes place when a word or a linguistic element is omitted in a sentence. The omission error affected by inadequate learning, overgeneralization, and simplification (Chania & Amri, 2019). Overinclusion occurs when a redundant word or linguistic element is added to the verb phrase. It is verb-related errors including verbs redundantly (Gazioğlu & Aydın, 2024). Misselection occur when the wrong form of a verb is used in a sentence. Misordering happens because of incorrect word order. Learners cannot arrange words into the right order although they are able to select the correct ones in the proper context (Rizki & Ismar, 2025). Blends are the blending of two well-defined forms which resulted in erroneous form and they occur when learner has used two structures semantically related each other. In another words, an error of fusing two items together during the production of words (Saud, 2018) or combining similar collocation.

Unfortunately, there were only limited numbers of previous researches about grammatical error in debate class and competition. Generally, the research findings had showed the different most frequent errors produced by the students: misformation (Nikmawati et al., 2018); omission (Chania & Amri, 2019); noun (Maldini & Indah, 2020); tenses (Afriansah et al., 2022). Students' low grammar accuracy affected unsatisfying capability in their debate performances. This accuracy level created difficulties in figuring argumentation, data, example, and evidence properly (Mardiana & Syukri, 2016). It can be inferred that insufficient grammar caused students' errors while debating for standing out logical sequence and confronting rebuttal for the opponents. Regarding the limited research, this study aims to provide the comprehensive and updated types of errors produced by the students and its impacts in debate activities.

METHOD

Respondents

The students taking Debate class in the third semester majoring English Education were the respondents of this study. Previously, these 17 students had finished sequential two speaking classes and had joined three grammar classes. Some of them has taken part into English club rehearsing themselves in conversation and debate clubs from the first semester.

Instruments

The researchers accommodated two instruments for the research in the form of video documentation and open-ended questionnaire. The debate videos were under the motions: Netherlands should return artefacts to the former colonies, GMO supports national food stability, and immigrant workers should get equal salary. Those videos gathered from the mid-term test of Debate Class performing Australasian Parliamentary Debate with 36.27 minutes in average and 5.12 minutes per students approximately. In addition, the questionnaire aspects were adapted from Deliana and Ganie (2025).

Procedures

The students attending Debate class for theoretical and practical materials in 7 meetings were allowed to take the mid test. On that moment, the students were compulsory to upload the videos in the learning system management. The video played to know the time allocation for each

speaker and to transcribe the debate speech. Later, the coded transcription to be analyzed further. Meanwhile, the students added the supporting information dealing with the errors they produced by filling in the questionnaire.

Data analysis

The researchers employed the error analysis as it was in line with the research's aim and nature. The adapted following steps were conducted to analyze the subtypes of errors: collecting, identifying, classifying, coding, describing, and evaluating (Shiddiq et al., 2023). It allows the researchers in applying transcription and open-ended questionnaire findings. In classifying the grammatical errors, the researchers used Target Modification Taxonomy by James (2013) specifically in distortions category. Blend was included to the new category with the previous types: omission, overinclusion, misselection, and misordering. In detail, those five types of errors were coded into specific sub types (Gazioğlu & Aydın, 2024). The statistical data was enumerated by percentage formula with categories; low, moderate, and high adopted from Subekti et al. (2019).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Types of grammatical errors produced by debate class

After conducting the sequential data analysis, it was found that five types of grammatical errors based on James (2013) appeared during the debate performances done by the students. The following table shows the detailed types in the forms of grammatical errors sub types. It was the numerical evidence related to the students' grammar proficiency.

Table 1. Types of grammatical errors

Type	Frequency	Percentage	Category
Misselection	95	63.34%	High
Omission	48	32%	Moderate
Overconclusion	3	2%	Low
Misordering	2	1.33%	Low
Blends	2	1.33%	Low

Based on the Table 1, the types of grammatical errors experienced by the students in debate performance clarified that the highly frequent error was misselection with the total number 95 errors and had the highest percentage 62.91%. The second error type was omission with its frequency 48 errors showing 31.79% as the percentage. The third and the fourth types had the same numbers hat was 3 errors, consequently they were in the same percentage level 1.99%. Lastly, the least error was blend which this type merely had 2 errors in 1.32%. The errors types made by the students as reported in Table 1 touched upon the influence of first language (Lu, 2015).

Misselection errors

Misselection became the highest percentage of grammatical error produced by the student, 63.34% depicted in Table 1. It was in line with the study conducted by Yang and Ren (2025) that misselection was the dominant error produced by the students. Misselection contributed in three subtypes: 71 alternating forms errors, 14 regularization errors, and 10 archi forms errors. To show the detail frequency of these three sub types, the Table 2 is provided.

Table 2. Sub types of misselection errors

Sub type	Code	Frequency
Alternating form	MISS_ALF	71
Regularization	MISS_REG	14
Archi form	MISS_ARF	10

The alternating form occurred when the students used the wrong form structure, often due to faulty intralingual transfer. They generalized language rules incorrectly, gave way to the apparently fairly free alternation of various members of a class with each other such as the learner uses she for he, him for he, their for them (Ilmiani et al., 2019). This error became the dominant type in specific grammatical areas, such as the use of action verbs, using likes instead of like in a context requiring the base form, or vice versa. Some students showed these errors while delivering their argument. Meanwhile the debate transcription data had highlighted some of these alternating forms occurred during the students' performances

It's legal, it's fair, it strengthens our economy, and it builds peace and quality in the workplace (MISS_ALF_1)

...increasing labor productivity and creating formal jobs have far more significant long-term impact on poverty. (MISS_ALF_2)

For example, many ancient statues and royal treasures from Indonesia especially from Java and Bali is currently stored in Dutch museums such as the Rijksmuseum and the Museum Volkenkunde. These items were taken during the Dutch colonial period and represent Indonesian civilization (MISS_ALF_3)

In MISS_ALF_1, the student tried in strengthening the concluding argument by using the word linearity from the debate atmosphere. However, he produced the wrong form dealing with the tense linearity that was simple present tense indicating the continuity about the motion. Therefore, it should be strengthened. In MISS_ALF_2, a partial argument showed the past time that was some years ago. In result, the students should have clarified the statement by using the past tense becoming had rather than have. In MISS_ALF_3 also had the same error concerning the adverb of time. Logically, the museums in Dutch had kept many artefacts from Indonesia as one of their colonist countries. This condition affected the use of past tense. As a result, the two verbs would be in the form of past tense becoming was currently and represented. To sum up, alternating form was the misselection subtype and it was frequently found in verb tense errors and structure, often resulting from confusion between similar grammatical choices.

The regularization sub type in misselection error had the issues in countable nouns. Difficulty in distinguishing the subtle differences in meaning and usage often leads to misselection errors (Wang et al., 2025). The students overlooked exception and spread the rules to domain where they did not apply such as womans and dranked. To support the evidence, the following error transcription vividly focusing for different examples.

According to experiment from institutions in Indonesia.... (MISS_REG_1)

...the problem of poverty is more caused by productivity and job opportunities (MISS_REG_2)

Subsidy adjustments are not only an economic issue but also a matter of social trust. (MISS_REG_3)

The use of countable-uncountable nouns is very important. The students had to make the nouns in line with the context. As a result, it would not make the opponent confused about the numbers of evidence in a certain argument. In MISS_REG_1, the underlined noun had to be produced in plural switching into experiments. It was because of the supporting part after the noun indicating the plural noun linearity. It also happened in next two transcription. In MISS_REG_2, showing two problem causes those were productivity and job opportunities. However, the student tended to use the singular for the problem. Finally, in MISS_REG_3 clarified that the linearity of countable noun is significant to be performed. In this case, to scrutinize the subsidy adjustments, the students needed to find the correct form of the following nouns becoming economic issues and matters of social trust.

The third sub type in misselection was archi form. It is the selection of one member of a class of forms to represent others in the class. For example, out of the set this, that, these, or those. The learner may use only one that as in that dog and that dogs as a form misplacement and incorrect class of word representing others. It caused error in helping verb, question word, and personal pronoun of the subject (Masruddin & Karmila, 2018). Moreover, it is characterized by the use of one member of a class of forms to represent others in the class. Additionally, it also caused by the students' confusion in selecting a class member of verb as there are two choices to use, the students' growth of grammar knowledge that make them have bigger or more selection of verb use and the students' comprehension failure of mastering tense (Dahlia & Harnani, 2022). The form selected by the students was archi form. For example, the word of that should be followed by singular and the word of these should be followed by plural. The selection of one variation of a category of forms to represent others within the class is a prevalent aspect of all phases of second language acquisition (Rosida et al., 2024). This error occurs when students use inappropriate pronouns and preposition in a sentence

...this varieties have safety certificate around 5 years (MISS_ARF_1)

This artefact are not only the property of one nation, they represent global cultural heritage (MISS_ARF_2)

This cases show that GMOs may bring short-term yield increase (MISS_ARF_2)

The previous transcription showed that the spoken arguments delivered by the students had error in archi form. It can be detected from the words of this which were not linear to the following statement. In MISS_ARF_1 and MISS_ARF_2 it should be these. The words of these artefacts also needed to be used in MISS_ARF_3.

Omission errors

The omission errors in the students' debate performance had less numbers of sub types compared to the complete sub types from James (2013): 13 conjunction errors, 10 article errors, 8 verb errors, 6 subject errors, 3 auxiliary verb errors, 2 noun errors, 2 pronoun errors, 1 object error, and 1 determiner error. The second highest percentage was article as confirmed by Widiyati and Pangesti (2022) that it was one of the frequent morphological grammatical errors produced besides word orders, inversion, pronouns, regular-irregular words, and countable nouns. Meanwhile, there was a new sub type found as omission for adjective. The numeric data can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Sub types of omission errors

Sub type	Code	Frequency
Conjunction	OM_CON	13
Article	OM_ART	10
Verb	OM_VERB	8
Subject	OM_SUB	6
Auxiliary verb	OM_AV	3
Noun	OM_NOUN	2
Pronoun	OM_PRON	2
Adjective	OM_ADJ	2
Object	OM_OBJ	1
Determiner	OM_DET	1

The following transcriptions are very crucial to discuss related to debate atmosphere context. The context should be formal, strong, and meaningful. Therefore, if the students omitted some necessary words would interfere opponents and adjudicators understanding. It reflected their missed certain parts in argument delivery. There are relevant examples related to that condition, as depicted below.

This means (?) farmer must buy new seeds (?) each planting season because GMO seeds are patented and cannot be reused legally. (OM_CON)

(?) Institutions have advanced technology. (OM_ART)

Rejecting GMOs is rejecting the very (?) tool. (OM_ADJ)

For OM_CON, it is significant for the students not to omit the word that becoming this means that. Although those two versions are correct, omitting the word that representing less formal speech. It caused the students lost the strong argument nuance. The omission also happened in article as depicted by OM_ART. In this argument delivery, the student omitted word of the as the article. By doing such kind of omission, it seemed that the student was not aware about stressing point as the debate action. By using the appropriate article, the given data could strengthen both the argument and rebuttal in the debate. Based on the previous statement, the word of institutions referred to Rijks and Wereld museums in Amsterdam. Clearly, the noun should have been added by the correct article. Additionally, the new sub type was found as the adjective omission. One of the evidences was in the OM_ADJ showing that the student missed the adjective in showing the condition of the tool dealing with the motion about GMO. It was assumed that the adjective could be controversial, destructive, or unimportant. This missing adjective deliberately made ambiguous meaning and incorrect sentence. As a result, the opponents and adjudicators confused to catch the argument stance. The omission of verbs occurs only in nominal sentences because in Indonesian, other word categories such as adjective and noun can function as predicates, creating sentences without any verbs. Auxiliary omission occurring in the data is related to continuous or progressive tenses (Gulö & Rahmawelly, 2018). Admittedly, these grammatical errors made the low speech quality and the ideas were difficult to grasp because some of the head noun, subjects, verbs, direct object, and other components of some sentences were omitted (Zulfariati, 2021).

Overinclusion errors

Actually, there are two sub types of overinclusion error. However, in this study there was merely one sub type found indicated as simple addition. The absence of double marking sub type indicated that the students can overcome more complicated structure. This phenomenon also occurred in the study conducted by Nisa (2021) resulted there was no any double marking error. Different from the two previous sub types, overinclusion was the second lowest level with 3 errors. For all the data was figured out in the following transcription with OV_SA as the code.

Organizations like WHO and FAO have a confirmed that GMO.... (OV_SA_1)

...immigrant workers equally can actually reduce exploitation (OV_SA_2)

And therefore, a more appropriate solution is to increase effectiveness of existing subsidies. (OV_SA_3)

The data shows about the simple addition produced by the students in their debate performance. The use of an item which should not appear in a well-formed utterance (Herlina, 2017). From OV_SA_1, it can be simplified that the utterance did not really need the article *a* before the word confirmed. Therefore, those structure meddling became have confirmed. Another adverb came up in OV_SA_2 before the appropriate one. This delivery argument seemed ineffectively to produce. In other hand, a conjunction was added incorrectly in OV_SA_3.

Misordering errors

Referring to James (2013), there are 3 sub types of misordering; adverbial, interrogative, and adjective. The students arranged the words order incorrectly. In addition, the findings of the study revealed that there was an additional sub type found named noun phrase misordering. Here the detail of adverb and noun phrase misplacement.

...economic advisors in 2023 stated that suddenly reduced energy subsidies could trigger an inflation (MISO_ADV)

...pay taxes house (MISO_NP)

Actually, the words of suddenly reduced is grammatically correct. In contrast, it became inappropriate in MISO_ADV because its use. Concerning to the action focus of subsidy and inflation, it should use reduced suddenly. It was related to the longer time in 2023 and it did not abruptly happen. It symbolizes that the student has to know about the context. The additional misordering found in the form of noun phrase as depicted in MISO_NP. This sub type did not appear in James (2013) but the data showed that this error included into misordering. Sometimes, the student forgot to use the noun phrase structure properly because of the different mother tongue structure. This kind of noun phrase in misordering error also happened in the study conducted by Dewi et al. (2021).

Blend errors

The last error type found in this study was blend. Two alternative grammatical forms combined each other to produce ungrammatical blend. As the compact data transcribed, there were only 2 blend errors. These errors showed the improper word combination.

... immigrants workers people (BLEND_1)

The conflict happened because foreign workers were being paid much higher than local workers even though we they were doing similar jobs. (BLEND_2)

Students' confusion in using the correct form guided them to produce blend errors. Part of speech repetition was categorized into these error type (Limengka & Kuntjara, 2013). There was a difference between those 2 errors. The first error in BLEND_1 had triple noun referring to single subject. It means that the student only needed to use one of those words by choosing immigrants, workers, or people. For the second error in BLEND_2, the student use double subject. It affected confusion among the opponents and the adjudicator to grasp the idea. The student often spoke quickly and stressful in delivering abundant ideas of argument in a very limited time, therefore these blends error happened. The occurrence was as frequent as the two previous error types. Students taking part in debate could not anticipate easily the blends errors both in the form of words and phrase (Maulida, 2023).

Impacts of grammatical errors in debate

The open questionnaire resulted numbers of responses from the respondents about the impacts of grammatical errors they performed in debate. The findings were grouped into two major aspects of debate; debate technicalities and debate adjudication. Here is the following table showing the impacts in frequency and percentage

Table 4. Impacts of grammatical errors

Aspect	Criteria	Percentage
Technicalities	Matter	12.50 %
	Method	25 %
	Manner	35.42%
Adjudication		27.08%

Debate requires matter, method, and manner to finish the excellent performances from both of the teams, affirmative and negative. In discussing the problems about grammatical error impacts in debate, it is explicitly clear to put those impacts into the criteria of the debate. Coming from the idea, it was very precise to categorise it into the Table 4. It shows the aspects of debate, technicalities and adjudication. From the first aspect, it could be derived that matter had the least number 12.50%, followed by method 25%, and manner 35.42%. The rest of the percentage 27.08% belonged to the adjudication. All of the respondents' responses had been referred to certain area.

The students performing the debate had experienced in doing grammatical errors. By having self-reflection through the questionnaire some significant points were provided. They shared that the errors had effected them in delivering both of argument and rebuttal while debating. The two parts belong to the matter of debate. The students relied on their grammar comprehension to share the argument. On the other hand, if they neglected grammatically correct utterances they would create weak argument construction (Najamuddin et al., 2023) and rebuttals (Kargacin, 2002). Individual speech, team jobs, and debate dynamics covered method as the second debate technicalities. Manner reached the most frequent impact among others. This condition showed that the language use got the negative sides because the students did not really focus on fluency and accuracy in accordance with grammatical errors they made (Nhan et al., 2022).

Spoken and written adjudication were based on the overall speakers' performance. The adjudicators would like to skip the constructive argument and strong rebuttal if the speakers delivered unclearly. Unclear statements were supported by the wrong grammatical structure. Therefore, debate adjudication needs clarity and accuracy to decide the margin, the best speaker, and the winning team. To sum up, the impacts of grammatical errors in debate led to internal aspects and external aspect. Those were technicalities and adjudication. The first aspect included matter, method, and manner contributing the higher percentage. This phenomenon proved that the students really needed to build their grammar comprehension in boosting the debate performance.

CONCLUSION

Debate really creates positive and constructive English learning. Australasian Parliamentary style gave the students experiences to create precise speech based on the data for configuring the motion. Practically, the performances were under time because of their capability to conduct appropriate language use. Regular rehearsals in the debate classes could prepare them in bringing the various arguments dealing with certain motion. However, it was still found the numbers of

error types produced by the students, namely misselection, omission, overinclusion, misordering, and blends in sequential frequency. The highest percentage went to alternating forms in misselection and conjunction sub type in omission. As the numerous errors they produced, directly it gave negative sides in the debate impacts. These were grouped into internal and external aspects referring to debate technicalities and debate adjudication. It is wisely suggested that the prospective studies would like to deepen the related research focusing in the method as a part of debate technicality and adjudication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank English Education Study Program, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung for supporting the researchers to produce scientific publication on a reputable journal.

REFERENCES

- Aclan, E.M., & Aziz, N.H.A. (2015). Exploring parliamentary debate as a pedagogical tool to develop English communication skills in EFL/ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4(2), 1-16. <https://doi.org/0.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.2p.1>
- Afriansah, R.Y., Bera, L.K., & Djahimo, S.E.P. (2022). Identifying grammatical errors committed by debaters in debating competition. In Djahimo (ed.). *Work of Academians in Writings and Posters*. (pp. 254-277). Deepublish.
- Alberida, H., Agusni, P., Delia, N., Ardianti, R., & Darussyamsu, R. (2026). Scientific argumentation and writing skills: The effects of implementing a socio-scientific issue-based problem-solving learning model. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 15(2), 389-408. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.15.2.389>
- Apriliani, E., Harmayanthi, V. Y., & Fitriani, D. (2021). A use of debate technique to improve speaking skill. *Seminar Nasional Pendidikan STKIP Kusuma Negara III*. (pp. 98-106). <https://jurnal.stkipkusumanegara.ac.id/index.php/semnara2020/index>
- Arung, F., & Jumardin, J. (2016). Improving the students' speaking skill through debate technique. *Journal of English Education*, 1(1), 70-76. <https://doi.org/10.31327/jee.v1i1.85>
- Astari, R., Yunaz, A., & Faturrahman, M. I. (2022). The grammatical deviations in the Arabic debate competition in Indonesia. *Arabiyat: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Kebahasaaraban*, 9, 178-90. <https://doi.org/10.15408/a.v9i2.29008>
- Aziz, C. N. & Kamilah, A. (2020). Enhancing speaking skills of EFL students through debate. *Journal of English Education, Literature and Linguistics*, 3(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.31540/jeell.v3i2.901>
- Ballester-Miquel, J. C., Perez-Ruiz, P., Gisbert-Muñoz, S., & Enri-Peiró, S. (2026). The role of soft skills in workplace innovation: Leadership and problem-solving as key drivers. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 12, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2025.100901>
- Bohara, N., & Awasthi, J. R. (2026). Role of collaboration in English teacher education: A narrative inquiry. *Exploration*, 4 (1), 144-160. <https://doi.org/10.3126/exploration.v4i1.88734>
- Buhaeri, A. H., Sumarta., & Ridwan, I. (2026). Integrating debate in speaking learning through project based learning: Case study at a senior high school in Bekasi. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(1), 1708-1718. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.1.p.1708-1718>

- Chania, S., & Amri, Z. (2019). An analysis of students' grammatical errors on speaking at SEA debate at English department of faculty of languages and arts of Universitas Negeri Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(4), 515-521. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v8i4.106239>
- Dahlia, A. & Harnani. (2022). Verb formation errors in structuring simple past sentences. *English Journal Literacy Utama*, 7(1). 598-602. <https://doi.org/10.33197/ejutama.vol7.iss1.2021.2655.4585>
- Deliana, D., & Ganie, R. (2025). Using debates in teaching speaking to EFL learners: Perceptions of English department students. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 7(1). 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2025052>
- Dewangga, D. A., Rosadi, I., Muna, N. M., & Indriani, L. (2024). Investigating critical thinking skills in debate class through the use of the case method. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12(1). 117-127. <https://doi.org/10.32332/joelt.v12i1>
- Dewi, R. C., Rangkuti, F. H., & Supriadi, S. (2021). Grammatical errors on EFL students' conversation practice: Surface strategy taxonomy. *Journal of Education and Teaching Learning*, 3(3), 10-17. <https://doi.org/10.51178/jetl.v3i3.266>
- El Majidi, A., De Graaff, R., & Janssen, D. (2024). Debate as a pedagogical tool for developing speaking skills in second language education. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(6), 2431-2452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211050619>
- Fuadah, U., Rachmajanti, S., & Ivone, F.M. (2020). Australasian Parliamentary Debate strategy to foster students' speaking competence. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, 5 (4). 427-433. <https://doi.org/10.17977/jptpp.v5i4.13327>
- Gazioğlu, M., & Aydın, S. (2024). Identifying grammatical errors and mistakes via a written learner corpus in a foreign language context. *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 8(2), 91-106. <https://doi.org/10.51726/jlr.1553484>
- Gebremariam, H. T. (2024). Exploring the effects of written corrective feedback types on grammatical accuracy in L2 writing: Evidence from Ethiopian high school students. *Sage Open*, 14(3), <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241274331>
- Gulö, I., & Rahmawelly, T. V. (2018). An analysis of omission in students' English writings. *Teknosastik*, 16(2), 55-59. <https://publikasi.teknokrat.ac.id/index.php/teknosastik>
- Gunasilan, U. (2022). Debate as a learning activity for teaching programming: A case in the subject of machine learning. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 12(4), 705-718. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-01-2021-0006>
- Gunawan, Y.G.P, Fitriati, S., & Yuliasri, I. (2018). Students' gambits and debate structure in National University Debating Championship (NUDC) 2018 of West Java. *English Education Journal*, 9(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v9i1.26663>
- Hapsari, P. D., & Wirawan, F. W. (2018). The significant connection between communicative competence and cognitive ability in speaking English of English debating team. *Humaniora*, 9(2), 149-159. <https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v9i2.4492>
- Hariyanto, H., Budi, E. S., & As' ad, A. (2019). Assessing speech through English debate to improve speaking ability of university students. *Edulingua: Jurnal Linguistiks Terapan Dan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 6(1). 41-49. <https://doi.org/10.34001/edulingua.v6i1.1094>

- Hefner, C. M. (2025). Education in Indonesia: Critical perspectives on equity and social justice ed. by Zulfa Sakhiyya and Teguh Wijaya. *Journal of Education in Muslim Societies*, 7(1), 161-163. <https://doi.org/10.2979/jems.00045>
- Herlina, H. (2017). The analysis of grammatical errors in speaking activities produced by students at English class vocational high school of Yadika Lubuklinggau. *Channing: Journal of English Language Education and Literature*, 2(2), 65-68. <https://doi.org/10.30599/channing.v2i2.266>
- Hernawan, A., & Yusuf, F. N. (2021). English competitive debating challenges – Teacher's voice. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*. 546. 44-50. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.007>
- Ilmiani, D., Solichin, R. D., & Indrato, I. (2019). Error analysis on students recount composition. *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC)*. 3. (April). 1-6. <https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/4681>
- Inoue, N. 2009. *Let's practice debating in English with advanced exercises from euthanasia debates*. Kyushu University.
- James, C. (2013). *Errors in language learning and use: exploring error analysis*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842912>
- Juliansyah, J., Adi, B. T., & Beressaby, R. A. (2023). Students' perceptions about debate and their ability to debate. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 8(2), 256-262. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v8i2.464>
- Kargacin, T. (2002). The state of the debating in Serbia and the role of coaches in the Karl Popper debate program. In J.E. Rogers. (eds). *Transforming debate: the best of the international journal of forensics*. (p.178). The International Debate Education Association.
- Laia, B. (2019). Improving the students' ability in speaking by using debate technique at the tenth grade of SMK Negeri 1 Aramo. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v4i01.4408>
- Latifa, A., Rahman, A., Hamra, A., Jabu, B., & Nur, R. A. (2015). Developing a practical rating rubric of speaking test for university students of English in Parepare, Indonesia. *English Language Teaching*, 8(6), 166-177. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n6p166>
- Leong, L.M., & Ahmadi S.M. (2017). An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2(1), 34-41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.1.34>
- Limengka, P. E., & Kuntjara, E. (2013). Types of grammatical errors in the essays written by fourth-semester students of English department, Petra Christian University. *Kata Kita: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 1(1), 230-238. <https://doi.org/10.9744/katakita.1.1.230-238>
- Lu, X. (2015). Book Reviews: Automated grammatical error detection for language learners, second edition by Claudia Leacock, Martin Chodorow, Michael Gamon and Joel Tetreault. *Computational Linguistics*, 41(1):149–151. https://doi.org/10.1162/COLI_a_00211
- Maldini, M. Y. I., & Indah, R. N. (2020). Slip of the tongue and gender relation in advance debate community. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 8(4), 360-369. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i4.2828>

- Mardiana & Syukri, A. M. (2016). Measuring the ability in debate dealing with fluency and accuracy of the third semester students of English education department. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 2(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V21.2016.A1>
- Masruddin, M., & Karmila, K. (2018). Constructing WH-questions through an error analysis at junior high school of Indonesia. *Langkawi: Journal of the Association for Arabic and English*, 4(2), 123-137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i2.852>
- Maulida, A. (2023). Slip of tongue produced by debaters in intelligence high school debate episode 5. *ReALL-Research on Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 2(2), 116-124. <https://ejournal.unsap.ac.id/index.php/reall/article/view/1232>
- Mulya, T.W., Sakhiyya, Z., Muslim, A.B., & Suryani, A. (2024). Locally-grounded, embodied, and spiritual: exploring alternative constructions of democratic education with/in Indonesian schools. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 32(5), 1127–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2022.2142840>
- Najafi, M., Motaghi, Z., Nasrabadi, H. B., & Heshi, K. N. (2016). Debate learning method and its implications for the formal education system. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(6), 211–218. <https://doi.org/10.5897/err2015.2316>
- Najamuddin, A.A., Farahdiba, S. & Hasriani, G. (2023). Students' perception on the effect of debate competition toward speaking skills. *Journal of Excellence in English Language Education*. 2(4). 493-498. <https://doi.org/10.26858/joele.v2i4,%20October.54368>
- Nhan, T. T., Nhi, H. N. Y., Thao, N. V. T., & Van Tu, N. (2022). The implementation of debate technique in enhancing second-year English majored students' speaking ability at Dong nai Technology University Vietnam. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(3). 1-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v7i3.4237>
- Nikmawati, A., Indawan, M. P., & Susanti, R. (2018). Grammatical errors in debate arguments made by students of global English language center. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 9(01). 1323-1336. <https://doi.org/10.24297/jal.v9i0.7324>
- Nisa, N.A. (2021). *Grammatical errors analysis on the writing of first-semester students of English education department at Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto*. [Unpublished undergraduate thesis]. English Education Department: Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto
- Nur, R., Latifa, A., & Latifa, M. H. (2021). Modified British Parliamentary Debate technique in teaching speaking to Indonesian EFL learners. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 3(11), 01-11. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2021.3.11.1>
- Parlindungan, P. (2020). Improving the students' speaking skills by using classroom debate. *Jurnal Estupro*, 5(2), 41-48. <https://jurnalugn.id/index.php/ESTUPRO/article/view/463>
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2007). Critical thinking: The art of Socratic questioning. *Journal of developmental education*, 31(1), 36-37. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42775632>
- Petukhova, V., Raju, M., & Bunt, H. (2017). Multimodal markers of persuasive speech: Designing a virtual debate coach. *INTERSPEECH*. August. 142-146. <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2017>
- Petukhova, V., Malchanau, A., Oualil, Y., Klakow, D., Luz, S., Haider, F., & Alexandersson, J. (2018). The metalogue debate trainee corpus: Data collection and annotations. *Proceedings*

of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC).
May. 749-755. <https://aclanthology.org/L18-1120/>

- Pham, T. H. (2023). Fostering learner autonomy in a blended learning environment: EFL teachers' practices at Hanoi University of Industry. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 3(3), 39-56. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.23333>
- Pradana, S. A. (2017). Using debate to enhance students' speaking ability as their character building. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 10(1), 149-163. <https://doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v10i1.881>
- Pratama, H. (2019). Improving scientific and technological awareness through language classroom. In *International Conference on Science and Education and Technology (ISET)*. 443. June. (pp. 573-576). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200620.116>
- Pratama, H., Nurcahyoko, K., Hertanto, M. A., Marina, R., Rosyidah, S., & Kristianto, V. A. 2018. *Panduan debat kompetitif*. Erhaka Utama.
- Pratama, H., & Sakhiyya, Z. (2019). Improving sense of equality through debate class: The integration of equality and equity values in classroom debate. *1st International Conference on Education Social Sciences and Humanities (ICESSHum)* August. (pp. 984-987). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icesshum-19.2019.151>
- Qomariah, I., Syauki, Anasy, Z., E. F. (2020). The effect of the Australasian Parliamentary Debate technique on students' argumentative speaking ability. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 7(1), 48-62. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v7i1.16973>
- Ridwan, R. (2017). Implementing debate to improve the speaking skill of the eleventh-grade students of SMK 17 Agustus 1945 Muncar Banyuwangi. *Jurnal Darussalam: Jurnal Pendidikan, Komunikasi dan Pemikiran Hukum Islam*, 8(2), 218-235. <https://doi.org/10.30739/darussalam.v8i2.97>
- Rizki, J., & Ismar, R. T. (2025). Investigating spoken English errors: Pronunciation and grammar among students of non-English majors. *Indonesian Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5(1), 25-36. <https://doi.org/10.58835/ijtete.v5i1.555>
- Rosida, A., Bahar, B., & Rahayu, R. (2024). An analysis of grammatical errors of selected essay in English writing class of Fajar University on Facebook group. *International Conference on Humanities Studies INCHEs*. January. 300-312. <https://proceedings.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/InCHeS/INCHEs/paper/view/1246>
- Saidah, N. R., 2015. *Debate as an English extracurricular program at a senior high school in Indonesia*. [Unpublished undergraduate thesis]. English Language Education Program: Universitas Brawijaya Malang.
- Shiddiq, S. M., Oktaviani, L., Herwiana, S., & Suryanovika, C. (2023). Lexical and grammatical errors in Indonesian-English translated texts: A text analysis on Indonesian EFL students' translation work. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 8(1). 104-113. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v8i1.1674>
- Subekti, E., Rusilowati, A., & Khumaedi, M. (2019). Teacher evaluation in determining ability minimum completeness criteria subject first high school mathematics. *Journal of Research and Educational Research Evaluation*, 8(2), 133-140. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jere>

- Tarigan, D. N., Zein, T. T., & Harefa, Y. (2022). Appraisal attitude analysis of debate verbal adjudication. *LingPoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research*, 3(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.32734/lingpoet.v3i1.6695>
- Tarigan, R. M., & Lubis, Y. (2024). Qualitative findings on the impact of debate techniques on English language speaking competence. *The Journal of Educational Development*, 12(2), 84-97. <https://doi.org/10.15294/>
- Tawfik, M. (2022). Complexity and interaction across oral, written and online discourse. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 2(1), 272-295. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.222117>
- Wahyuni, S., Qamariah, H., Syahputra, M., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Gani, S. A. (2020). Challenges and solutions to develop critical thinking with the British parliamentary debate system in EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 14(3), 137-156. <https://ijls.net/pages/volume/vol14no3.html>
- Wang, Y. F., Chen, I. J., Katsurada A., & Chen, C. (2025). Acquisition of the Chinese adverb yě ‘also’ by L1-English, L1-Japanese, and L1-Korean learners of Chinese as a second Language. 22(3). 75-132. [https://doi.org/10.6393/JCLT.202509_22\(3\).0003](https://doi.org/10.6393/JCLT.202509_22(3).0003)
- Widiawati, P. S., Ratminingsih, N. M., & Agustini, D. A. E. (2020). The effect of debate technique towards eleventh grade students’ speaking competency. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 4(3), 267-271. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v4i3.26989>
- Widiyati, E., & Pangesti, W. (2022). Project-based learning in teaching speaking to young learners: Is it effective? *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 7 (1), 71-81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.7.1.71-81>
- Wiranti, S., & Widiyati, E. (2023). Exploring the factors and levels of students’ autonomy in language learning. *IJIET (International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching)*, 7(1), 8-21. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v7i1.5139>
- Yang, Y., & Ren, H. (2025) The efficacy of the corpus-based error correction method on revision in writing classrooms. *PLoS ONE*. 20(3). 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0317574>
- Yongzhi, S. (2024). The impact of debate lessons powered by generative AI on student learning. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 12(3), 13-39. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.12.3.01>
- Zhang, Z., Sun, B., & An, P. (2025). Breaking barriers or building dependency? Exploring Team-LLM collaboration in AI-infused classroom debate. *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-19). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713853>
- Zulfariati, Z. (2021). The omission of grammatical components: errors and its effects on students’ academic writing quality. *Ekasakti Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengabdian*, 2(1), 85-97. <https://dx.doi.org/10.31933/ejpp.v2i1.475>

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.