

ORGANIZING DEBATES FOR DEVELOPING CRITICAL THINKING AND SPEAKING SKILLS OF STUDENTS IN TEACHING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ДЕБАТОВ ДЛЯ РАЗВИТИЯ КРИТИЧЕСКОГО МЫШЛЕНИЯ И РАЗГОВОРНЫХ НАВЫКОВ СТУДЕНТОВ ПРИ ОБУЧЕНИИ ИНОСТРАННОМУ ЯЗЫКУ

CHET TILINI O'QITISHDA TALABALARNING TANQIDIY FIKRLASH VA SO'ZLASHISH MALAKALARINI RIVOJLANTIRISH BO'YICHA DEBATLAR TASHKIL ETISH

Tuychiev Adkhamjon Tukhtaboevich¹¹Tuychiev Adkhamjon Tukhtaboevich

– English teacher of Namangan Engineering-Construction Institute Free researcher of Namangan State University

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada tanqidiy fikrlashning usullaridan biri, chet tillarini, shu jumladan ingliz tilini o'rgatishda Karl Popper debati muhokama qilinadi. Munozaralarni o'tkazish metodikasi va tartibi ham tavsiflangan va shuningdek muallif ingliz tili darslarida bunday pedagogik usuldan foydalanish muhimligini ta'kidlagan.

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается один из методов критического мышления, проведение дебатов Карла Поппера при обучении иностранным языкам, в том числе английскому. Также описана методика ведения дебатов, а также автор указал на важность использования такой педагогической методики на занятиях по английскому языку.

Abstract

The article discusses one of the methods of critical thinking, conducting the debate of Karl Popper in teaching foreign languages, including English. The methodology of conducting debates is also described, and also the author pointed out the importance of utilizing the following pedagogical methodology during English teaching classes.

Kalit so'zlar: Karl Popper munozarasi, vebinar, jamoa, onlayn konferensiya.

Ключевые слова: дебаты Карла Поппера, вебинар, команда, онлайн-конференция.

Key words: Karl Popper debates, webinar, team, online conference.

INTRODUCTION

As is known, using distance learning and information technology to perform and participate in online conferences has become critical during a pandemic. In this environment, various methods of conducting debates for the development of speaking skills, such as teaching foreign languages, especially English, can be used. To reflect the process of conducting debates in an IT setting and through webinars, we must first understand what a debate is, what forms of debates occur, and which can be used in university or school classrooms. Actually, a debate (has originally come from Greek that means *I read*) is a clearly defined and specially coordinated public exchange of thoughts between two teams. This means that two teams compete online to defend the strengths of the same task, with one team concentrating exclusively on the positive aspects and the other on the negative aspects, with both sides making comments and defending their points of view. A third person acts as a judge, overseeing the game in which both teams defend their positions in English.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

There are Karl Popper debates and parliamentary debates. Speakers defend their point of view, policy, and program of parties during parliamentary debates, which are held during elections. The debate of Karl Popper is popular among high school students. Three teams of members have been chosen, one of which is the Affirmative team. The Negative team is the second, and the third is the Judging team.

The beginner explains the rules and regulations of the Karl Popper debate format, as well as the roles of the speakers and the peculiarities of the speech topics. What are the debate's ground rules? Before the game begins, the players must agree to these rules. A subject is chosen at the outset, for example, a topic: Information technology and online platforms make it easier for people to do their jobs.

TILSHUNOSLIK

Karl Popper's debate rules are as follows and you should:

- start debates on time. This means that all debates and discussions, the exchange of thoughts should be started on time, not be late.
- speak clearly and, to the point, respecting the rules. You need to speak on the topic, not deviate from the topic, speak according to the rules, according to the set time, clearly and distinctly.
- not interrupt, listen up to the speech of another participant. This means that you need to listen to the speeches of others, not to interrupt and not to say that they are wrong and standing up for your innocence. You just need to listen first, and then in your speech, presenting strong arguments and statements, prove the correctness of your point of view.
- raise your hand. In case of any questions, you must raise your hand and get the floor to speak your mind or speak.
- show the tolerance, mutual respect, both sides have opposite points of view, but at the same time they respect the second team, judges and listeners. They treat each other with the words: "Hello, dear listeners, judges, and the dear second team of Negation!"
- be patient and tolerant means that everyone is patient with the opposite side, with its participants, with the judges and other listeners of the debate. They listen to three speakers until the end of the speech, ask questions about the rules of the game.
- observe of the rules when speaking. You need to speak clearly and distinctly and, in essence, adhere to the time.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

Now, let's discuss and focus on Karl Popper's program.

Karl Popper's debate program is similar to a combined kind of Lincoln-Douglas debates. This type of debate is designed to develop an activity in teams of three people, to develop a presentation on a topic, in each group of 3 people, a topic develops that highlights the positive or negative aspects of the chosen topic. This type of debate is similar to a parliamentary or Senate game of the Oliy Majlis.

This activity is focused on critical thinking, reasoning skills, and an understanding of the subject's nuances. The task creates a type of plan in which students present their point of view, strategy, or the so-called scenario. Students learn to address problems, examine them from various perspectives, and propose potential solutions using this method.

The aim of Karl Popper Debate Program is to engage students in problem-solving discussions rather than just team discussions. A debate is held between two teams.

The first team has three members in the Affirmative team:

- A1 is the first speaker of the affirmative team,
- A2 is the second speaker of the approval team,
- A3 is the third speaker of the affirmative team.

The second team is a negative team, in which the participants are:

- N1 is the first speaker of the negative team,
- N2 is the second speaker of the negative team,
- N3 is the third speaker of the negative team.

During the game, each team takes no more than 8 minutes, and no more than 2 minutes to prepare for performances. The timekeeper warns the speakers 2, 1 and 0.5 minutes before the end of the speaking time using gestures, facial expressions or hands of the speakers from his sides and gives a signal about the end of the speaking time. Training and local (city, regional) games can be held according to the reduced regulations [1,2].

Speakers and their duties

Debate is a team game in which two or more people compete against each other. Each individual is kept to a high standard of success.

A1 - presentation and responsibilities of the first speaker of the affirmative team:

- respectfully greets the opposite side, listeners and judges, participants in the debate, introduces the affirmative team;
- presents and reads the statement, justifies its relevance;
- gives a definition to the terms included in the topic, based on an axiom;

- represents the point of view of the affirmative team;
- substantiates aspects of the consideration of this topic;
- presents the arguments of the affirmative party, which will be proved by the team during the game in accordance with the aspects stated by the team;
- goes on to prove the arguments put forward;
- ends with a clear statement of the general line of the affirmative team;
- asks cross-cutting questions to N2 (the second speaker of the negative team) [5,6,7].

N1 - presentation and duties of the second speaker of the negation team.

- greets everyone respectfully, represents the negation team;
- denies the topic (denies the thesis declared by the affirmative party), formulates the thesis of denial, refuting the thesis and point of view of the first team;
- accepts the definitions provided by the approver;
- represents the position of the negation party;
- accepts aspects of the affirmative party or represents other aspects that negate aspects of the affirmative team;
- refutes the arguments of the affirmative party put forward by A1;
- ends with a clear statement of the general line of the negation team;
- presents – asks cross-cutting questions to A2 (the second speaker of the approving team)

[3].

A2 is the second player or member of the approval team.

- restores the point of view of the asserting party with the help of hypotheses, examples, and proofs, or can use axioms;
- provides new evidence (new evidence is welcome);
- repeats important aspects (criteria) of previous evidence;
- develops the approving position in detail and develops the approving case in detail;
- refutes the denying case;
- no new arguments are given;
- ends with a clear statement of the general line of the affirmative team;
- answers cross-sectional questions of N1 [4].

N2 is the second player or member of the negation team.

- restores the denying position, using hypotheses, examples, and proofs, axioms;
- develops a denying position in detail, substantiating a denying case, a denying point of view;
- continues to refute the asserting position, their point of view, their case;
- provides new evidence;
- does not provide new arguments;
- ends with a clear statement of the general line of the negation team;
- answers cross-sectional questions of A1 [5].

A3 is the third member of the affirmative team.

- once again accentuates the key points of the debate (for the judge, indicates the most important questions);
- follows the structure of the approving case;
- returns to the criteria put forward by A1 and explains how they confirm the position of the affirmative team;
- identifies vulnerabilities in a denying case, shows the weaknesses of their point of view;
- does not provide new arguments;
- completes the line of the statement clearly and distinctly, even if there is little evidence in this speech;
- asks questions N1.

N3 is the third speaker of the negative team.

- once again emphasizes the key points (for the judge, indicates the most important aspects);
- follows the structure of the denying case;

TILSHUNOSLIK

- returns to the criteria put forward by N1 and explains how they confirm the position of denial, the point of view of this team;
- identifies vulnerabilities and weak spots in the approving case, in their point of view, reveals weak spots;
- focuses in this speech on comparing denying arguments with affirmative ones and explains why denial arguments are more convincing;
- completes the line of denial (there may be less evidence in this speech than in others);
- does not provide new arguments;
- asks questions A1.

In Karl Popper's debates, we distinguish **three types of speeches**:

Constructive speech: A1, N1.

Arguments are discussed and advanced in these speeches. The affirmative party presents an initial evaluation of the situation, which will decide the structure the entire round. The negative Party opposes the affirmative party and makes their case. In these two speeches, you must present all of your points.

Refuting (developing) speech: A2, N2.

After the "assault" of critics, you refute claims and restore the argument structure in these speeches. Details are crucial here; it's vital to respond to all of the opponents' claims and comment on how effectively they confirm or refute the subject. In these speeches, no new claims are permitted. Participants must use proof and logic to strengthen current claims.

Closing (summing up) speech: A3, N3.

The key inconsistencies of positions should be highlighted in these speeches. The controversy is summarized in these speeches. To do this, A3 and N3 must pretend to be asking their friends about how the debate went, their strengths, and why they would win. This speech does not include any new claims [6].

CONCLUSION

Generally, applying this technique, it is feasible to conduct debates on the top indicated or chosen topics in English to improve conversational discourse between students to increase speaking abilities in the field, more productive teaching of the English language, use the vital words in expressing their thoughts, their perspective, in shielding their position and bases on further developed articulations and expressions in the English language.

Conducting debates in English not only enhances the level and technique of debating, but it also improves and develops communication skills, increases and develops students' vocabulary, self-confidence, eliminates the fear of incorrect pronunciation, and encourages students to work on themselves and expand their thesaurus vocabulary.

The use of information and remote technology, as well as their behavior online, is another important aspect of debating in the context of a webinar or online conferences, which becomes especially significant during a pandemic.

It should be noted that the use of debate in the classroom contributes to a significant improvement in students' intellectual and communication skills, based on logical thinking and debate technique, a person's ability to control his emotions, focus on himself, on his information, and be able to present it to others, to feel full and confident in their knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. Agnes Bato, Aija Bildjuga. DISPUTE DISCUSS DEVELOP. How we started debating. Lesson Plans, debate transcripts and other tools. // - Szeged city, Hungary. - 2017. Pp. 30-31.
2. David Miller. Critical Rationalism: A Restatement and Defense. // Published by the University of Chicago Press. - 1994. P.170.
3. Deryabo S.D. Grossmeister obsheniya/Гроссмейстер общения // - Moscow, - 1998. P. 48.
4. Karl Popper. Conjectures and Refutations, 4th edition: Routledge Kegan Paul. London. -1972.
5. Lei Sun. Intellectual game of debates. // forms of organization and peculiarities of conducting. - China. Pp. 58-60.
6. Zaleski M. Using Debate in Second Language Teaching // International Debate Education Association. 2004. Vol. 1. Issue 2. Pp. 34-35.