

## Developing Speaking Skills through Debates. Case Study Proposal in Business English

Alina Buzarna-Tihenea (Galbeaza)

“Ovidius” University of Constanta, Faculty of Letters, Romania  
[alina\\_buzarna84@yahoo.com](mailto:alina_buzarna84@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

*This paper tackles the speaking skill, in general, and its role in language teaching and learning, focusing also on various ways of developing it, in particular by the employment of the debate technique EFL/ ESP classes. The theoretical part of the paper further deals with several definitions of the debate technique, with the classification of debates and with the advantages brought by the implementation of debates in EFL/ ESP classes – in particular as far as the enhancement of the learners’ speaking skills is concerned. The practical part of the paper proposes a case study which consists of an experiment that will highlight the benefits of the debate technique when adequately used in the Business English teaching and learning processes.*

**Key words:** speaking skills, debate technique, Business English, ESP teaching, communication

**J.E.L. classification:** Z12

### 1. Introduction

Speaking skills play a major role in the ever-expanding contemporary business environment, where efficient communication is paramount on the path towards success; in order to enhance these skills, teachers should employ various student-centered methods and techniques that increase the class dynamics and collaboration. The debate technique, which permeates our daily activities (Fallahi and Haney, 2011), and which was intensively promoted and used by exquisite scholars in ancient Greece – such as Aristotle, Socrates and Plato – (Vo and Morris, 2006) has proven its efficacy along the centuries, in various contexts.

### 2. Theoretical background

#### 2.1. The speaking skill

Defined as “the act or skill of giving a speech at a public event” and as the action of “using the stated language” (see *Cambridge Dictionary* online), speaking is vital to the communication process. Numerous scholars have endeavored to define speaking in various ways, such as a fertile ability that requires speech in order to transmit meaning (Spratt, 2005); a prolific process that involves ideas, concepts, feelings, and dynamic interactions among speakers and audience (Underwood, 1997); an action requiring at least two participants reacting to what they perceive and hear, with alternating roles of message senders and recipients (Morrow, 1981). In his turn, Scott Thornbury (2005, pp.1-8) describes speaking as an interactive and mainly linear process, that occurs in real time and that, being “part of our everyday life”, “is mostly taken for granted”. Moreover, in the scholar’s perspective, it “requires the ability to co-operate in the management of speaking turns”.

Chomsky (1965) saw the speaking skill as “the speaker-hearer’s knowledge of his language”, such as knowledge of comprehensible sound articulation, appropriate vocabulary, understanding of familiarity with syntax, etc., which are all part of the linguistic competence (for more information on linguistic competence, see Hymes, 1972). De Silva and Burns (1999) envisaged speaking in a

similar way, i.e., as a dynamic process of designing meaning and entailing the generation, reception and refinement of information.

Other scholars, such as Nolasco (1997) profess that the speaking skill does not reside in eloquent speaking, but in conversation, involving thus understanding, attention and feedback carried out in a methodical and even automatic manner. Klippel (1984) emphasizes the above-mentioned ideas by explaining that, when it comes to foreign languages, the teaching process should contribute to the gradual achievement of naturally occurring communication, aimed at exchanging various ideas, feelings and opinions, at cooperating, and sharing knowledge and personal experiences, in order to establish successful social relationships.

Focused on interpersonal/ interactional and transactional objectives, speaking has, in Thornbury's perspective (2005), the function of preserving social relationships and of conveying pieces of information and opinions. Consequently, the same scholar stresses the importance of furnishing learners a wide range of occasions for purposeful interaction-based communicative behavior patterns.

It is noteworthy that, besides speaking, successful communication in foreign language teaching also involves other skills such as listening, meaning negotiation, and knowledge of both verbal and nonverbal cues. This idea is in line with Chaney's perspective (1998, p.13), who envisages speaking as "the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, in a variety of contexts". These statements strengthen the importance of employing modern student-centered teaching methods, such as communicative language teaching and collaborative learning, which – according to Nunan (1991) – furnish learners the occasion to employ language in real-life contexts, for the performance of authentic activities, in an interactive and entertaining classroom environment. Thus, the aforementioned scholar underlines that learners would acquire and develop the capacity to articulate phonological characteristics of the language effectively; they will better handle stress, rhythm, and intonation patterns and exhibit an adequate fluency level; they will boost their transactional, interpersonal, and mediating context abilities; they will be able to take both short and long speaking turns and improve their knowledge as far as the negotiation of the conversation purposes is concerned; they will enhance their conversational listening skills and employ adequate conversational patterns (see Nunan, 1991).

Seen from an integrated perspective, as one of the four language skills, and tightly connected to writing due to its productive nature, speaking "seems intuitively the most important of all the four language skills because it can distinctly show the accuracy and language errors that a language learner makes" (Khamkhien, 2010, p. 184). Consequently, EFL/ ESP speaking tests can be employed in order to assess the learners' development of their pronunciation and communication abilities.

Harmer (2015) explains that in order to generate speech in English, there are four elements that should be envisaged, as they play an important part: "connected speech" (accounting for the production of distinct English phonemes, and for the employment of fluent "connected speech"); "expressive devices" (allowing additional ways to express feelings, for better conveyance of meaning); "lexis and grammar" (dealing with the learners' acquisition of language functions through the employment of various expressions); "negotiation language" (involving the vocabulary we employ for the clarification of meaning and speech structure). Therefore, during the teaching process, learners should be exposed to various oral activities focused on the improvement of connected speech, on the analysis of various verbal and non-verbal cues that reveal the speakers' feelings and attitudes, on expressions used in various speech acts, in order to greet, agree, disagree, etc. (Harmer 2015).

Furthermore, scholars have pinpointed five significant components that should be envisaged when analyzing the speech process, as they greatly contribute to the production of qualitative speaking: pronunciation, grammar, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Acting from scripts (scenes from plays/ text books; see Harmer, 2015), game-based activities (involving describing, forecasting, simplifying, and demanding for feedback; see McDonough and Shaw, 2003), discussions (prepared talks, presentations of various topics, speaking from notes; see McDonough and Shaw, 2003), questionnaires (if adequately designed, they can stimulate the natural employment of receptive language patterns; see McDonough and Shaw 2003), debates (presentations of argued opposite perspectives), simulations of lifelike meetings/ discussions and

role play (stimulating general oral fluency, training for specific contexts) are recommended activities for the enhancement of speaking skills; all these incorporate the above-mentioned four elements necessary in the production of speech and the five components of the speech process. In addition, appropriately chosen and implemented activities, which take into account the learner's level of understanding, contribute to the creation of a relaxing and entertaining atmosphere.

## 2.2. Teaching speaking

Since oral communication is seen nowadays as a reference point as far as foreign language teaching and learning are concerned, scholars have endeavored to identify the most appropriate approach for the acquisition of speaking skills. Having in view that the communication process entails "interpersonal responsiveness, rather than mere production of language that is truthful, honest, accurate, stylistically pleasing, etc." (Paulston, 1976, p. 55), in the language teaching process, the focus should fall on communication efficiency, i.e., on language purposes such as the establishment of social relationships, the demand for, and provision of various pieces of information, etc., especially having in view its harmonization benefits (Nadrag, 2019).

The key to efficient communication in a foreign language is represented by balanced activities that first provide learners the materials necessary in order to start generating language (such as teacher talk, listening, reading, the language employed outside formal contexts) (Maruntelu, 2019). Scholars insist that learners should be encouraged to complete practical tasks that require language production based on the acquired grammar and vocabulary items and communication strategies, i.e., giving or asking for information, presentations, etc. It is noteworthy that, as far as these activities are concerned, successful communication is achieved if learners convey their message, regardless of its accuracy (except when accuracy disrupts the intended meaning of the respective message) (see Nadrag, 2020a).

There are many approaches that should be taken into consideration when teaching and/ or developing the speaking skill. Three interesting ones, explained by Martinez-Flor et al. (2006), are the environmentalist approach, the innatist approach and the interactionist approach. According to these scholars, the first one is based on a "stimulus - response - reinforcement pattern", speaking being conceived primarily as an oral experience, where the learning process includes activities of duplicating, mimicking, and memorizing the language structures and items the learners are exposed to (see Martinez-Flor et al. 2006, p. 144). Thus, learning is mainly influenced by the external context. This approach involves the employment of pattern drills, requires learning verb tenses and consists of activities based on sentence structures (Dunlap and Weisman, 2006). The second one, i.e., the innatist approach, is underlain by the idea that human beings have an innate ability to learn languages, due to an internalized frame of rules (Martinez-Flor et al., 2006).

The third approach, i.e., the interactionist one, described by the aforementioned scholars, which is shaped by cognitive psychology and by the functional and pragmatic perspectives upon language, regards the speaking skill as interactive, dynamic, social, and contextualized; in this situation, communication highlights both the speakers' intentions, and the consequences that they trigger. Furthermore, according to this approach, language is learnt so as to perform various functions in a certain cultural and social environment, speaking becoming thus contextualized (i.e., the cultural and the situational contexts determine the features of the employed language) (Martinez-Flor et al., 2006).

In order to teach the speaking skill successfully, scholars pinpoint to five elements that teachers should take into account, i.e., the learners' features (such as age group, learning objectives, proficiency level, personality, etc.), activity topics (chosen in accordance with the learners' features and interests), curriculum (establishing suitable activities in the teaching plan), the source and the target languages, and the tasks (i.e., speaking vehicles that trigger interaction, if adequately selected) (Folse, 2006).

### 2.3. Debates

*Cambridge Dictionary* (online) defines the term debate as “(a) serious discussion of a subject in which many people take part” or as “a competition in which teams of people, often students, discuss a subject and the team that is judged to make the best arguments wins”. In a similar manner, the *Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries* (online) define the concept of debate as “a formal discussion of an issue at a public meeting or in a parliament. In a debate two or more speakers express opposite views and then there is often a vote on the issue” or as “an argument or a discussion expressing different opinions”. Therefore, these two dictionary definitions associate the debate with other key terms such as “discussion”, “speakers” “subject”, “issue” “views” and “arguments”, suggesting that debates involve the statement, the explanation/ argumentation and illustration of various perspectives upon a certain topic or issue.

*The Online Etymology Dictionary* states that the noun “debate” originates from the early 14<sup>th</sup> century Old French word “debat”, which means “a quarrel, dispute, disagreement” and which, in its turn, comes from the French verb “debatre”. The meaning of this noun evolved and, one century later, it also acquired the “sense of contention by argument (...), a formal dispute, a debating contest, interchange of arguments in a somewhat formal manner” (see *The Online Etymology Dictionary*).

In their turn, scholars defined the word “debate” in instructional terms, focusing on the idea of contradiction of perspectives and arguments (Chang and Cho 2010; Dale and Wolf, 2000) and pinpointing to its advantages in the development of the learners’ language skills. For instance, according to Hanes (2007, pp. 8-9), a debate is “the most fun and most intellectually stimulating activity”, involving “verbal judo: a martial art for your mind”, because of the exposure “to new ideas, (...) the confidence to speak publicly”.

Seen as a teaching technique, the debate contributes to the enhancement of the learners’ speaking skills in an entertaining and creative manner, as they have to take different sides of a certain topic and support their opinion with strong and convincing arguments (O’Malley and Valdez Pierce, 1996). Thus, the interactivity that characterizes debates triggers precious speaking opportunities, by engaging clashing viewpoints on a certain issue, usually in a formal context, coordinated by a moderator and attended by an audience. Fallahi and Haney (2011) highlight the key role played by debates in our daily lives, in various situations and social environments (such as negotiations, elections, etc.), and explain that there is a wide array of debates that are carried out based on well-established rules and that thus focus on different sets of skills.

Besides the improvement of communication, public speaking and active listening skills, debates also contribute to the development of scrutiny, reasoning, and critical thinking skills, as during the debate process, the acknowledgement of the multiple viewpoints to an argument is raised, which permits the audience to envisage elements they may not have noticed (O’Malley and Valdez Pierce, 1996).

It is noteworthy that a thorough investigation of complex issues cannot be performed as the time span is limited in formal debates. Scholars such as Hanes (2007) profess that almost all topics – from a wide range of fields – can be debated and that “through debating current events, you might start to find your own educated answers to these questions” (Hanes, 2007, p.8).

The organizers’ resourcefulness and their ability to accustom during the implementation process to the particularities of each group of participants are vital for a successful debate method. Hanes (2007) implies that, when preparing debates or even during the debate process, people often feel inspired, and soft skills such as empathy, cooperation, teamwork, self-confidence, leadership and emotional intelligence can be boosted. Furthermore, the same scholar highlights that the need to structure one’s discourse in a strategic manner and to employ logical and convincing arguments also requires the enhancement of one’s coherence, clarity, creativity, spontaneity, and even improvisation skills.

Scholars classified formal debates in terms of their formats as follows: parliamentary debates, Mace debates, policy debating - Cross Examination Debate and Public Forum debates, and Lincoln-Douglas debates.

Parliamentary debates (similar to the debating style employed in the Parliament) require two groups on the government’s side and two groups on the opposition’s side, that alternate their seven-to-five-minute speeches; it should be noted that the first and last minute are protected, and pieces of information are given between these times, which represents a significant and interactive part of the process, furnishing interaction occasions for the team members (see Bell, 2020).

Ideal especially for beginners, Bell (2020) pinpoints that Mace debates offer debaters the occasion to prepare themselves in advance, as they receive the discussion topic several days before the debate, which increases the speakers’ confidence. Two teams (each made up of two members) debate an affirmative motion in seven-minute alternating speeches; after the delivery of the first four speeches, the audience can ask questions, which are answered during the four-minute summary speeches (Bell, 2020).

Policy debating, as explained by Hanes (2007), involves two teams of two speakers (i.e., the affirmative and the negative team) who alternate in order to present their arguments for and/ or against a certain subject matter. The aforementioned scholar explained that three speech types are employed in this debate (that also usually include notes and quotations), i.e., constructive speeches (which are extended and introduce new discussion elements), rebuttal speeches (which are shorter and which filter and clarify previously inserted discussion elements), and cross-examination, “which is a question-and-answer period of a speaker by an opponent speaker” (Hanes, 2007, p. 10-11). The judge presiding the debate establishes whether the subject matter was argued in an adequate or in an inadequate manner. As far as the Public Forum debate is concerned, Hanes (2007) explains that the cross-examination is also known as cross-fire, as both debaters are able to ask and answer questions.

The Lincoln-Douglas debate is defined by scholars as a competitive speaking activity presided by a judge, in which two speakers present their arguments supporting or rejecting a certain resolution (see Halvorson and Koshy, 2013). Speakers usually take turns from one round to another, either in favor of the resolution (the “affirmative”) or against it (the “negative”) (see Djuranovic, 2003).

### 3. Research methodology

When confronting opposing perspectives on a certain subject matter, in particular for the enhancement of EFL or ESP speaking skills in authentic contexts, the debate method can be extremely efficient. Krieger (2005, p. 25) asserts that debates engage learners in a wide array of “cognitive and linguistic” activities, and “is also highly effective for developing argumentation skills for persuasive speech and writing”. Furthermore, argumentative skills are ensured, and witty, challenging entertainment is furnished to the audience.

As described by *Encyclopaedia Britannica* online, formal debates – chaired by a neutral moderator – usually observe a set of well-established procedures, initiated by the statement of the debate topic as a positive resolution. According to the same aforementioned source, two teams – each made up of two members – have to present their arguments, supporting or rejecting the respective resolution. First, both teams are granted equal time intervals (ten-fifteen minutes) in order to set forth their perspectives; the affirmative party initiates the argument and, as a rule, the negative one initiates the rebuttal, and the order of debaters take turns by team. Then, they receive a shorter time interval in order to reject the opposing side’s arguments. During the entire process, although proof is constantly given in order to back up the speakers’ arguments, new claims cannot be raised (see *Encyclopaedia Britannica* online). Debates are thus extremely useful, as they can tackle real or simulated subject matters, where clashing perspectives are placed in the limelight and supported by arguments (see Littlewood, 1981, p. 57; Dale and Wolf, 2000)

Hypothesis: Debates can be successfully used in the ESP classroom in order to boost the learners’ language abilities, with a special focus on the speaking skills.

Subjects: In order to test this statement, two groups of undergraduate students of a similar language proficiency level are required, i.e., a control and an experiment group, majoring in Business Administration.

Methods: the observation and the experiment.

Experiment design: Before the teaching stage, the students in both groups should sit for an initial test, in order to ascertain their language proficiency level (which should be similar); moreover, the initial test results will be used in order to track the students’ progress. Then, for a four-week period, the two student groups will be taught the same language topics/ vocabulary items (for example, “Employment Contracts”, “Trade Unions”, “Strikes” and “Resolution of Labor Conflicts”); traditional teaching techniques should be employed with the control group, and the debate technique should be used with the experiment group.

In order to implement debates in the ESP classroom, learners should exhibit appropriate language proficiency levels, appropriate common knowledge about the debated subject matter, and distinct viewpoints that they should defend. Therefore, before implementing this technique in the ESP classroom, teachers should have in view that debates involve spoken production materialized in speech delivery, taking up certain positions on a given subject matter, the ability to defend one’s viewpoint and to argue it verbally.

A successful implementation of any teaching technique (and of the debate technique in particular) should take into account not only the development of the students’ speaking skills, but also their listening (involved often by the spotlight on comprehending the opposing party’s speech in order to prepare counter arguments), reading (skimming and/ or scanning various sources so as to design efficient and convincing arguments) and writing (taking notes, organizing speech parts, drafting coherent, consistent and convincing argumentative paragraphs and speeches, etc.) abilities (Nadrag, 2020b; Popescu, 2021). Moreover, other soft skills should be taken into account (such as creativity, teamwork, critical thinking, initiative, empathy, etc.) (Cinganotto, 2019). During the activities, the ESP teacher should constantly furnish feedback on pronunciation, word selection, syntactic structure and pertinency of the information, logic framework and coherence (see Baca, 2019).

Consequently, the debate technique furnishes the occasion to exercise and improve a wide array of skills. At the end of the teaching stage, both groups should sit for a final test in order to check for the students’ progress.

#### **4. Expected findings**

It is expected that the experiment results validate the hypothesis, highlighting the efficiency of debates in the enhancement of the students’ language skills, especially the speaking ones. Being a technique focused on meaning design and generation, and on language practice, it can highly motivate students to acquire language items in authentic contexts, based on communication (Cinganotto, 2019). Moreover, this technique will boost the students’ speaking confidence and verbal interaction; it will contribute to the improvement of their pronunciation, word choice in terms of context, understanding, sentence structuring, organization of ideas, language coherence and fluency (Roy and Macchiette, 2005).

Oral communication skills – which play a key role in successful careers (see Combs and Bourne, 1994) – are thus enhanced by debates, as they furnish learners the opportunity to employ EFL/ ESP in a pertinent manner, involving arguing and reasoning in the target language (Alasmari and Salahuddin Ahmed, 2012). If regularly implemented and backed up by constant feedback, this student-centered technique focused upon cooperation can successfully activate learners and furnish them better comprehension of the main speaking items.

#### **5. Conclusions**

The speaking skill involves interactive and context-based processes, triggering – among many others – a vast range of linguistic and cultural elements. Therefore, interaction and authentic communication are of uppermost importance in the EFL/ ESP learning process, especially when it comes to the speaking skills. If applied appropriately, the debate technique can contribute to the enhancement of a wide array of both EFL/ ESP skills and soft abilities, as it provides lifelike communication contexts, where students are able to interact in a meaningful way, express and argue their viewpoints on different subject matters.

## 6. References

- Alasmari, A. and Ahmed, S. S. 2013. Using Debate in EFL Classes. *English Language Teaching*, 6 (1), pp. 147-152. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p147>
- Baca, E. 2019. Effective Error Correction and Language Improvement in Business Communication Teaching. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, XIX(2), pp. 227-230.
- Bell, J. 2020. *The Debating Book: everything you ever need to know about debating*. [e-book]. Kindle.
- *Cambridge Dictionary* (online), Debate, [online]. Available at <<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/debate>> [Accessed 20 November 2023].
- *Cambridge Dictionary* (online), Speaking, [online]. Available at <<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/speaking>> [Accessed 20 November 2023].
- Chaney, A. L., and Burk, T. L. 1998. *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Chang, K., and Cho, M. H. 2010. *Strategy of selecting topics for debate teaching in engineering education*. *Religion*, 30(50).
- Chomsky, N. A. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.21236/AD0616323>
- Cinganotto, L., 2019. *Debate as a teaching strategy for language learning*. *Lingue e Linguaggi*, Istituto Nazionale di Documentazione, Innovazione e Ricerca Educativa, [online]. Available at <[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336836038\\_DEBATE\\_AS\\_A\\_TEACHING\\_STRATEGY\\_FOR\\_LANGUAGE\\_LEARNING\\_Lingue\\_e\\_Linguaggi](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336836038_DEBATE_AS_A_TEACHING_STRATEGY_FOR_LANGUAGE_LEARNING_Lingue_e_Linguaggi)> [Accessed 15 November 2023].
- Combs, H. W. and Bourne, S. G. 1994. The Renaissance of Educational Debate: Results of a Five-Year Study of the Use of Debate in Business Education. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 5(1), pp. 57-67.
- Dale, P. and Wolf, J. C. 2000. *Speech Communication Made Simple*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: MiamiDade Community College.
- Djuranovic, M. 2003. *The ultimate Lincoln –Douglas Debate Handbook*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., [online]. Available at <<https://resources.finalsite.net/images/v1664567890/rvaschoolsnet/zcoiathf81oalv14bfuq/TheUltimateLincoln-DouglasDebateHandbook.pdf>> [Accessed 15 November 2023].
- Dunlap, C. Z. and Weisman, E. M. 2006. *Helping English Language Learners Succeed*. Shell Educational Practices.
- *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (online), Debate, [online]. Available at <<https://www.britannica.com/art/debate>> [Accessed 20 November 2023].
- Fallahi, C. R. and Haney, J. D. 2011. Using debate in helping students discuss controversial topics. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 4(10). <https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v4i10.1540>
- Folse, K. S. 2006. *The art of teaching speaking*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.144550>
- Halvorson, S. and Koshy, C. 2013. *Lincoln Douglas Debate*. National Speech & Debate Association, [online]. Available at <<https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/Lincoln-Douglas-Debate-Textbook.pdf>> [Accessed 20 November 2023].
- Hanes, T. R. 2007. *Debating Policies: The skills and theories of Cross-Examination and Public Forum debate*, [online] Available at <[https://www.academia.edu/6327837/%20Debating\\_Policies\\_%20The\\_%20skills\\_and\\_theories\\_of\\_Cross-Examination\\_and\\_Public\\_Forum\\_debate](https://www.academia.edu/6327837/%20Debating_Policies_%20The_%20skills_and_theories_of_Cross-Examination_and_Public_Forum_debate)> [Accessed 20 November 2023].
- Harmer, J. 2015. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Longman.
- Hymes, D. H. 1972. *On Communicative Competence*. In: J. B. Pride and J. Holmes, eds., *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 269-293, [Online], Available at <<https://www.homes.uni-bielefeld.de/sgramley/Hymes-2.pdf>> [Accessed 20 November 2023].
- De Silva, J. H. and Burns, A. 1999. *Focus on Grammar*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Khamkhien, A. 2010. Teaching English Speaking and English Speaking Tests in the Thai Context: A Reflection from Thai Perspective. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), pp. 184-190. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n1p184>
- Klippel, F. 2012. *Keep Talking: Communicative Fluency Activities for Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Krieger, D. 2005. Teaching debate to ESL students: A six-class unit. *The Internet TESL Journal*, XI(2).

- Martinez-Flor, A., Uso-Juan, E. and Alcon-Soler, E. 2006. Towards acquiring communicative competence through speaking. In: E. Uso-Juan and A. Martinez-Flor, eds. *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the Four Language Skills*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197778.3.139>
- Maruntelu, C. L. 2019. Methods and Means of Communication Used in Vocabulary Teaching. *Scientific Bulletin of Naval Academy*, XXI(1), pp. 231-237.
- McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. 2003. *Materials and Methods in ELT: a teacher's guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Littlewood, W. 1981. *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Morrow, K. 1981. *Introduction: principles of communicative methodology*. In: K. Johnson and K. Morrow, eds. *Communication in the classroom*. Essex: Longman Group Ltd., pp. 59-66.
- Nadrag, L. 2019. Business Communication. Director's Reports. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, XIX(1), pp. 480-486.
- Nadrag, L. 2020a. Traditional and Online Assessment Tools for Learning English. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, XX(2), pp. 412-4.
- Nadrag, L. 2020b. How to Teach English for Economics. Case Study: Cryptocurrency and Bitcoin Vocabulary. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, XIX(1), pp. 444-450.
- Nolasco, R. and Arthur, L. 1987. *Conversation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. Oxford University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., Valdez Pierce, L. 1996. *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners*. Addison-Wesley Company Inc.
- *Online Etymology Dictionary*, Debate, [online]. Available at <<https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=debate>> [Accessed 10 November 2023].
- *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries online*, Debate, [online]. Available at <[https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/debate\\_1?q=debate](https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/debate_1?q=debate)> [Accessed 10 November 2023].
- Paulston, C. B. 1976. *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures*. Canada: Brown & Company.
- Popescu A. 2021. Teaching Functional Language for Business Purposes. *Ovidius University Annals: Economic Sciences Series*, XXI(1), pp. 408-411.
- Roy, A., and Macchiette, B. 2005. Debating the issues: A tool for augmenting critical thinking skills of marketing students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 27(3), pp. 264-276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475305280533>
- Spratt, M., Pulverness, A. and Williams, M. 2005. *The TKT (Teaching Knowledge Test) Course*, Cambridge University Press.
- Thornbury, S. 2005. *How-to-Teach-Speaking*. Pearson Longman.
- Underwood, M. 1997. *Teaching Listening*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Vo, H. X., and Morris, R. L. 2006. Debate as a tool in teaching economics: Rationale, technique, and some evidence. *Journal of Education for Business*, 81(6), pp. 315-320. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.81.6.315-320>