

OBSERVATION FIELD NOTES

Institution : STKIP PGRI Sidoarjo

Class : English Education Study Program Batch 2018 A

Time : 08.00 a.m. – 09.40 a.m.

Duration : 100 Minutes

Day/Date : Tuesday, 26th of November 2019 (First Meeting)

Observer : Naufal Fachrur Rozi

Descriptive Observation Field Note

1. As an active observer, the researcher was initiating the first meeting by informing the rules of classroom debate.
2. Therefore, in a matter of deciding the affirmative side of the house and the opposition side of the house, the researcher was continuing the step by displaying the matchups (i.e. debaters' organization and roles within the classroom debate). In the first meeting, there were three match-ups that were conducted.
3. Furthermore, for the next step, the researcher published the motion for each matchup after the matchups were displayed. The motion for the first meeting was contained of two main motions, namely (1) *This House Regrets the Idea of Class Rank* for the first match-up; (2) *This House Would Ban Homework* for the second matchup; and (3) *This House Would Ban Homework* for the third matchup.
4. After publishing the motion for each matchup, the researcher was continuing the step by setting up the case building time or discussion time with a maximum time ten minutes.

5. Then, the essential part after finishing all those previous steps was the act of starting the classroom debate that is being organized based on debater's role.
6. Moreover, after the classroom debate strategy was conducted, the further step for the researcher was adjudicating the classroom debate through debating ballot.
7. Lastly, for the final step, the researcher conducted a communal evaluation to wrap the entire process of implementing classroom debate strategy in the first meeting.

Reflective Observation Field Note

1. Due to the fact that it was the first meeting, majorly, most of the research subjects were indicating shyness, hesitating, doubtful and trivia. It was being captured by most of them were laughing at their own arguments or other's arguments.
2. There was a lack of participants for the third match-up of the first meeting. There was an incomplete requirement for the quantity of debater that must be fulfilled for a matchup. The third match-up was contained of two students solely.
3. The content of their argument (i.e. manifestation of their critical thinking skill) was quite unsatisfying. In a major number, there were no evidence-based arguments.
4. There were no POIs from any debater in the first meeting.
5. In a quite low percentage, there was solely two research subjects that were able to perform the act of rebuttal.
6. On the bright side, there were no research subjects during every matchup that were misinterpreting the motion.

OBSERVATION FIELD NOTE

Institution : STKIP PGRI Sidoarjo

Class : English Education Study Program Batch 2018 A

Time : 08.00 a.m. – 09.40 a.m.

Duration : 100 Minutes

Day/Date : Tuesday, 3rd of December 2019 (Second Meeting)

Observer : Naufal Fachrur Rozi

Descriptive Observation Field Note

1. As an observer, the researcher was initiating the second meeting by informing the rules of classroom debate.
2. Therefore, in a matter of deciding the affirmative side of the house and the opposition side of the house, the researcher was continuing the step by displaying the matchups (i.e. debaters' organization and roles within the classroom debate). In the second meeting, there were three match-ups that were conducted.
3. Furthermore, for the next step, the researcher published the motion for each matchup after the matchups were displayed. The motion for the first meeting was contained of two main motions, namely (1) *This House Would Transform All Traditional Learning Process into E-Learning* for the first match-up; (2) *As Senior High School Teacher, This House Would Ban Mobile Phone during the Classroom* for the second matchup; and (3) *This House Regrets the Idea of Full-Day School in Indonesia* for the third matchup.
4. After publishing the motion for each matchup, the researcher was continuing the step by setting up the case building time or discussion time with a maximum time ten minutes.

5. Then, the essential part after finishing all those previous steps was the act of starting the classroom debate that is being organized based on debater's role.
6. Moreover, after the classroom debate strategy was conducted, the further step for the researcher was adjudicating the classroom debate through debating ballot.
7. Lastly, for the final step, the researcher conducted a communal evaluation to wrap the entire process of implementing classroom debate strategy in the second meeting.

Reflective Observation Field Note

1. In a strong definition, the researcher assumed that the second meeting was the peak of the succession of the implementation of classroom debate strategy.
2. Opposite to the first meeting, the second meeting of the implementation of classroom debate strategy had no issue in a matter of the quantity of debater in every match-up (i.e. the first match-up until the last match-up)
3. The nuance of the implementation of classroom debate strategy in the second meeting was quite satisfying. Most of research subjects were indicating excitement. There were tremendous appreciations, such as verbal support and claps.
4. The content of the arguments that most of the research subjects brought was insanely amazing. It was like a highly rocketing move from the previous meeting. Importantly, most of the arguments were logic, rational, and evidence-based.
5. Unfortunately, again, there were no POIs from every research subject.
6. Similar to the first meeting, there were no debaters that were indicating misunderstanding in giving arguments for their stances. Every debater delivered their arguments in a well-organized pattern.

OBSERVATION FIELD NOTE

Institution : STKIP PGRI Sidoarjo

Class : English Education Study Program Batch 2018 A

Time : 08.00 a.m. – 09.40 a.m.

Duration : 100 Minutes

Day/Date : Tuesday, 10th of December 2019 (Third Meeting)

Observer : Naufal Fachrur Rozi

Descriptive Observation Field Note

1. As an observer, the researcher was initiating the third meeting by informing the rules of classroom debate.
2. Therefore, in a matter of deciding the affirmative side of the house and the opposition side of the house, the researcher was continuing the step by displaying the matchups (i.e. debaters' organization and roles within the classroom debate). In the third meeting, there were three match-ups that were conducted.
3. Furthermore, for the next step, the researcher published the motion for each matchup after the matchups were displayed. The motion for the first meeting was contained of two main motions, namely (1) *This House Believes that EFL Teacher should Prioritize Teaching Speaking more than Other English Proficiencies (e.g. Writing, Reading, Listening)* for the first match-up; (2) *As Teacher, This House Would Privatize Students' Score* for the second matchup; and (3) *This House Believes that Grammar is Not Important in Speaking Practices* for the third matchup.
4. After publishing the motion for each matchup, the researcher was continuing the step by setting up the case building time or discussion time with a maximum time ten minutes.

5. Then, the essential part after finishing all those previous steps was the act of starting the classroom debate that is being organized based on debater's role.
6. Moreover, after the classroom debate strategy was conducted, the further step for the researcher was adjudicating the classroom debate through debating ballot.
7. Lastly, for the final step, the researcher conducted a communal evaluation to wrap the entire process of implementing classroom debate strategy in the third meeting.

Reflective Observation Field Note

1. The third meeting of the classroom debate strategy can be classified as good as the second meeting, but the peak of the research subjects' performance was still belong to the second meeting.
2. Similar to the second meeting, the third meeting of the implementation of classroom debate strategy had no issue in a matter of the quantity of debater in every match-up (i.e. the first match-up until the last match-up)
3. The nuance of the implementation of classroom debate strategy in the third meeting was satisfying enough. Similar to the second meeting, most of research subjects were still indicating excitement. Luckily, there were tremendous appreciations, such as verbal support and claps.
4. The content of the arguments that most of the research subjects brought was quite good. It was similar as the previous meeting. Importantly, most of the arguments were logic, rational, and evidence-based.
5. Unfortunately, similar to the first meeting and the second meeting, there were no POIs from every research subject.
6. The thing that made the third meeting was unable to beat the peak of the second meeting was the fact that there was one team (i.e. affirmative team from the first match-up) that practiced the tendency of misunderstanding in giving arguments for their stances. The manifestation of the misunderstanding was captured through the invalid content for their

stances because what they have done in their arguments were supposed to be the argument for the opposition team. That one team became the reason of the less-satisfying result of the third meeting of implementation of the classroom debate strategy.