

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE STUDIES  
(GRADUATE PROGRAM)

THE NATURE OF TURN TAKING PATTERNS IN GROUP  
DISCUSSION: 10+2 STUDENTS OF CRUISE PRIVATE  
SCHOOL IN FOCUS

YOHANNES BERHANEMESKEL

JULY, 2008

THE NATURE OF TURN TAKING PATTERNS IN GROUP  
DISCUSSION: 10+2 STUDENTS OF CRUISE PRIVATE  
SCHOOL IN FOCUS

A THESIS PRESENTED TO  
THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERISTY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN THE  
TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE  
(TEFL)

BY

YOHANNES BERHANEMSKEL

JULY, 2008  
ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

THE NATURE OF TURN TAKING PATTERNS IN GROUP  
DISCUSSION: 10+2 STUDENTS OF CRUISE PRIVATE  
SCHOOL IN FOCUS

BY: YOHANNES BERHANEMESKEL

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

---

ADVISOR

---

SIGNATURE

---

EXAMINER

---

SIGNATURE

---

EXAMINER

---

SIGNATURE

## **Declaration**

I confirm that this thesis is my original work.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Submission: \_\_\_\_\_

This thesis has been submitted for examination as a university advisor.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Submission: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Acknowledgements**

I am very much grateful to my advisor, (Ass. Prof) Amanuel Gebru, who gave me valuable comments and suggestions with out any reservation. I would also like to thank Dr. Seime Kebede for his suggestion, to study in this topic.

I am also indebted to Ato Seifu Gossaye, Excutive Director of Cruise Private School, for being there every time I needed him and for allowing me to make the video recording in his school.

My special thanks are due to my mother and father – wish you were here mom.

And above all PRAISE IS TO YOU, LORD.

## **Abstract**

This study was carried out to describe the nature of turn taking patterns among Grade 12 students of Cruise Private School in their group discussions to see the level of students participation and to explore the involvement of the teacher and group leaders in giving and taking turns. For the study, 18 students of grade 12 students of one section were selected. The students were grouped in to three with six members in each. The data was gathered by video recording the discussions and was analyzed using Allwright's (1980) model.

The overall result showed that the majority of the turns were taken by the students, i.e. (124 or 65.26%) out of the total turns of 190. From these, the great majority of the turns were taken trough self-initiated moves. On the other hand the teacher and the group leaders together took 66 turns or 34.74% out of the overall turns of 190.

The findings further indicated that, out of the overall total of 93 turns, the majority was made by the students, which is 56 or 60.23%. The teacher and the group leaders made a total of 18 or 19.35% and 19 or 20.43% respectively.

Finally, female Vs male students level of participation indicated that, from the total of 169 turns, the great majority of the turns were taken by male students (116 or 68.64%) and female students took the lesser turns (53 or 31.36%).

## Table of Contents

	Pages
Acknowledgements .....	i
Abstract .....	ii
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3 Objective of the Study .....	4
1.4 Scope of the study .....	4
1.5 Significance of the study .....	5
<b>2 Review of Related Literature</b> .....	7
2.1 Discourse in Classroom Interaction .....	7
2.2 Interaction and Language Development in Second Language Classroom .....	11
2.3 Conversation Analysis.....	14
2.4 Definition of Turn .....	17
2.5 Turn Taking in Conversation .....	18
2.6 Turn Taking in Second Language Classroom .....	22
2.7 Gender and Classroom Talk .....	28
<b>3 The Design of the Study</b> .....	30
3.1 Introduction .....	30
3.2 Subjects of the Study .....	30
3.3 Instrument of the study .....	31
3.4 Model for Analyzing the Study .....	32
<b>4 Results and Discussion</b> .....	36
4.1 Introduction .....	36
4.2 Distribution of Turn Getting Categories among the Participants in Each Group.....	36
4.3 Distribution of Turn Getting Categories among all Participants.....	43

4.4 Distribution of Turn Giving Categories among the Participants in Each Group .....	44
4.5 Distribution of Turn Giving Categories among all Participants.....	47
4.6 The Frequency of Turn Getting Distribution between male and Female Students .....	48
4.7 Discussion .....	49
4.7.1 Self-initiated Turn Getting .....	49
4.7.2 Responding to Personal Solicits .....	50
4.7.3 Giving Turns .....	51
4.7.4 The Teacher’s Response to the Four Questions.....	52
<b>5 Summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>53</b>
Bibliography .....	57
Appendices .....	60
Appendix 1 Transcription of Group1’s Discussion .....	61
Appendix 2 Transcription of Group2’s Discussion .....	69
Appendix 3 Transcription of Group3’s Discussion .....	75

## **List of Tables**

Table 1 Turn getting Distribution in Group 1 .....	37
Table 2 Frequency and Percentage of Turn Getting Categories in Group 1 .....	38
Table 3 Turn Getting Distribution in Group 2 .....	39
Table 4 Frequency and Percentage of Turn Getting Categories in Group 2 .....	40
Table 5 Turn Getting Distribution in Group 3 .....	41
Table 6 Frequency and Percentage of Turn Getting Categories in Group 3 .....	42
Table 7 Overall Turn Getting Distributions in Frequency and Percentage .....	43
Table 8 Turn giving categories in Group 1 .....	45
Table 9 Turn giving distribution in Group 2 .....	45
Table 10 Turn Giving Distribution in Group 3 .....	46
Table 11 Overall Turn Giving Distributions in Frequency and Percentage .....	47
Table 12 The Frequency of Turn Getting Distribution between Male and Female Students .....	48

# **Chapter One: Introduction**

## **1.1 Background**

Whether it is in a teacher fronted or student centered class, turn taking is some how put into practice. Perhaps, the difference may lie in the amount of turn that is given and taken, and the kind of turn that is made. For example, in the teacher oriented interaction, as Kramsch (1987:22) says, the teacher selects the next speaker and automatically selects him or her self for the succeeding turn. There is not much motivation for students to listen to one another, and the only motivation to listen to the teacher is the fear of being caught short on an answer (Ibid). Thus, we might say that the turn is usually distributed from the teacher to the student and back to the teacher. However, in student centered class, there is a possibility that there could be a student – student turn in addition.

Van Lier (1988:94) suggests that interaction in the classroom, in particular, is the matter of who speaks and when that is governed by regularities of some kind, whether we call them rules, regulations, routines, or conversation. He also adds that this randomness is probably characteristics of all interaction any where but at times there appear to be more constraints at other times.

This could mean that the way interaction appears could affect students' participation. As scholars suggest, interaction in the classroom promotes the learners' ability to use the second or foreign language to express their ideas as it provides the students with the opportunities to interact with each other (Allwright, 1984; Ellis, 1988; van Lier,1988).

There are of course schools and teachers that try to make the shift from the traditional method of teacher dominated classes to student – center approach. One of the schools which share with this idea seems to be Cruise Private School. The school was established in 1986 E.C. in Addis Ababa. The school believes that the more students are given a chance to interact the better they become in their communication skill. It also believes that this can be achieved if it is implemented starting form kindergarten (KG) up to grade eight by allocating extra periods for English Communication Classes in addition to the regular English courses.

Therefore, taking a close look at the pattern of the students turn taking in the classroom could be very important to investigate about the level of students' participation.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

As it has been indicated in the background, the need to shift from the traditional method to student centered or communicative approach is perhaps to make the students use English language. In other words, it is to make the students interact or participate because it is the springboard for learning to take place. Swann and Graddol (1994:152) citing Barenes et al. 1971: 127) indicate that 'It is as talkers, questioners, arguers, gossips, and chatterboxes, that our pupils do so much of their important learning'.

To give additional contribution to see students' participation, investigating the pattern of turn taking could be an important aspect though it may not as such simple. Kramsch (1987:22) suggests that teaching students how to take turns, as easy as it might seem requires a number of skills that are not automatically transferred from the mother

tongue. Therefore, this can be one problematic area that needs to be studied. In the Ethiopian context, for example, Amanuel (1996) investigated gender differences in verbal participation in discussion groups as one aspect. The statistical analysis of interactional turns showed that there were no gender differences. Eba's (2006) quantitative findings also indicated that the sex of the teacher was one factor that made differences in paying attention to male and female students' academic and non-academic moves.

On the other hand, studies conducted in the pattern of turn taking are made by Tadesse (1997) and Girma (1999) with particular focus on how turns are distributed between the teacher and the students and among their groups, such as, turn getting categories and turn giving categories (which will be explained in Chapter 3). Both studies, however, did not aim to see the amount of turns taken by female or male students. Moreover, they also did not attempt to video recorded the actual group discussion. Rather, it was arranged in such a way that one group discusses with the teacher. And if done this way, it may appear that it was not a group discussion but a teacher fronted class in a relatively very small number of students. Thus, the present study aimed at filling the gap that has been observed in the two studies. Therefore, this research tried to answer the following questions:

- Do students have the skill of turn taking?
- What is the involvement of the teacher like in taking and distributing turns to the students?
- What is the involvement of the students like in taking and giving turns in group discussion?
- Do students take turns though self-initiation?

- Do male or female students take more of the turns that has been allocated by the teacher and the group members?

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The study will investigate the nature of turn taking among Grade 12 students in their group discussion. To be more specific, the study will aim at finding out the level of students' participation. For this, the study will attempt to:

- I. See the level of involvement by the teacher and by the students in taking and giving turns in group discussions
- II. Find out if students get turns on their own initiation
- III. Find out if other participants (other than the teacher and group leaders) give turns to each other
- IV. Examine the overall turn distribution among the students, group leaders and the teacher in group discussion.

### **1.4 Scope of the study**

The study will be confined only to grade 12 students of Cruise Private School in Addis Ababa. More specifically, it will focus only on one section of the grade level. This is because incorporating more than one section will not be manageable to analyze the data. Moreover, the study requires willingness of the school administration and the subject teacher to collect the data. Additionally, the study will focus on only verbal acts due to time constraints and to avoid complication.

## **1.5 Significance of the Study**

Allwright (1980: 168) noted that turn taking studies are still at the embryonic stage with respect to classroom interaction. Even though studies in other countries have been conducted after 1980, the point seems different in the Ethiopian context since there has not been enough study. Therefore, it is hoped that the study will have the following significances;

### **I. Methodological**

This study tries to show the school and the subject teacher to what extent turn taking relates with classroom organization and teacher's style of teaching. Moreover, it contributes to the present EFL teaching methodology by showing how a student-centered class is different from a teacher fronted class.

### **II. Pedagogical**

It shows the teacher that how turns are distributed with those students or group leaders who have the skill of turn taking and with those who do not; and what should be done if there are any who need to learn the skill of turn taking.

### **III. Theoretical**

It strengthens those theories which focus on classroom interaction with special focus on student centered approaches and helps to modify those which focus on teacher fronted methods.

#### IV. Curricular

It may inform EFL syllabus designers and material developers about the kinds of topics they should select for group discussion because if the students find the topic difficult or remote from their experience, they might not be able to take part in the discussion.

## Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature

### 2.1 Discourse in Classroom Interaction

Clear as it may seem, discourse in the outside world and in the classroom are different even though they may have their own similarities. But mostly scholars argue that there is a certain pattern and role that teachers and students follow and play. McHoul (1978:189) discusses the following features in classroom talk by contrast with every day conversation:

- I. The potential for gap and power is maximized
- II. The potential for overlap is minimized in that:
  - The possibility of the teacher (or a student) 'opening up' the talk to a self-selecting student first starter is not accounted for;
  - The possibility of the student using a 'current speaker selects next' technique to select another is not accounted for;
- III. The permutability of turn-taking is minimized.

On the other hand, van Lier (1988:9-10) points out that:

*Some instances of classroom interaction occur because they have been planned to occur that way, others because circumstances at the moment demand action or reaction. Often, the teacher's actions are a result of prior planning, and the learners may be aware or unaware of the nature of the plan. Planned discourse can be very*

*different from unplanned discourse and discourse that is planned by one but not the other participant(s) results in asymmetry.*

As it can be noted from van Lier's view, most of the time what goes on in the classroom appear to be the way it is planned. However, it also tells us that it could also be spontaneous, with out any prior planning, perhaps; this characteristics of classroom discourse may make it a bit similar to natural conversation, out side the classroom. Naturally, conversation out side the classroom usually occurs because a certain circumstance requires 'action' or 'reaction'. Thus, it may be possible to say that natural conversation takes place with out prior planning.

Perhaps, one problem worth considering in classroom discourse could be what van Lier has said in his final statement of the above quotation, "... discourse that is planned by one but not the other participant(s) results in asymmetry." In classroom interaction, the teacher may expect a certain patter due to a planned discourse and if the students do not meet the expectation of the teacher or even do not know the routines, it might be possible that the discourse could be distorted.

On the other hand, Chaudron (1998:44) says, "discourse analysis has contributed to a growth in awareness of the internal formal structure and functional purpose of the verbal classroom interaction." Accordingly, Chaudron (1998:45) presents analytical units that can be employed in L2 discourse analysis as follows:

#### STRUCTURAL UNITS

*Utterances:* a string of speech by one speaker under a single intonation contour, and preceded and followed by another speaker's speech, or a pause of more than x seconds.

*Turn:* any speaker's sequence of utterances bounded by another speaker's speech.

*T-unit:* any syntactic main clause and its associated subordinate clauses.

*Communication unit:* an independent grammatical predication: the same as T-units, except that in oral language, elliptical answers to questions also constitute complete predications.

*Fragment:* any utterance which does not constitute a completed proposition (i.e. with explicit subject and verb)

## FUNCTIONAL UNITS

*Repetition:* an exact repeating of previous string of speech (either partial or full, and either a self - or - other - repetition)

*Expansion:* a partial or full repetition which modifies some portion of a previous string of speech by adding syntactic or semantic information

*Clarification request:* a request for further information from interlocutor about a previous utterance

*Comprehension check:* the speaker's query of the interlocutor(s) as to whether or not they have understood the previous speaker utterance(s)

*Repair:* an attempt by a speaker to alter or rectify a previous utterance which was in some way lacking in a clarity or correctness (either self - or - other - directed),

*Model:* a type of prompt by a speaker (usually a teacher) intended to elicit an exact imitation or to serve as an exemplary response to an elicitation.

Similarly, Allwright and Bailey (1991:61) say that the focus on stretches of oral discourse in classroom interaction leads us naturally to units of

analysis which are different from the concept of sentence, clause, or phrase: instead, discourse analysts, who are interested in the way of talk is structured, have investigated concepts such as utterances, repair strategies, topic nomination, turns, etc.

Discourse in classroom interaction, as van Lier (1988:122) is, “an analysis of the process of interaction by means of a close examination of audiovisual records of interaction.” This description, together with Chaudron’s unit analysis seems to make a reasonable sense. This is because, to take a closer look at the analytical units, it might be important to audiotape or videotape the interactions. Allwright and Bailey (1991:61) point out, “discourse analysts typically use transcripts and audio taped or videotaped interactions as their data base.” Some analysts may of course combine transcripts and videotapes so as to document the non verbal behavior of communication.

Transcripts defined as “written records of interaction in which the researcher copies down verbatim, the utterances of the participants”, may use standard orthography or detailed phonetic representations of speech, depending on the research goal (Allwright and Bailey, 1991:62).

Allwright and Bailey further indicate that producing a ‘high quality transcription’ is a tiresome work, even where ‘standard orthography’ is used. They say that transcribing native speakers’ one hour classroom interaction takes about five hours which in their and co-researchers experience, an hour of language classroom data could take up to twenty hours to transcribe accurately (Ibid). What is even worse is that, as they reported, it takes even longer to transcribe the speech of pairs or small groups of non-native speakers interacting in their second language.

However, even though transcribing could be a time consuming and complex task, analysts use it so that they can closely examine the nature of classroom discourse without missing a valuable data that can be helpful during the analysis. Supporting this claim, Allwright and Bailey (1991) say:

*Verbatim transcripts, which display all the hesitations, false starts, pauses and overlaps of natural speech, are extremely valuable records of interaction. Transcripts show us, in ways that coded data and frequency counts often mask, how classroom researchers prefer to conduct discourse analyses with detailed transcripts, rather than using other data collection procedures which may be easier to do, but which also run the risk of obscuring important information.*

(1991:62)

Of course, the above two issues which are data collection through transcription of recording and data analysis through discourse analysis bring together two important aspects – theory and practice. It must be noted that though the issues seem two different things, we should realize that both are very important if we want to know what really goes on during classroom interaction.

## **2.2 Interaction and Language Development in Second Language Classroom**

Second language development can be viewed from two aspects. One is, the formal classroom where there will be a model teacher and the other, the outside world where there will not be formal instruction. Most often, it is argued that formal instruction or the classroom can not be relied on to provide ample opportunity for successful L2 development. However, it

is possible to consider the formal classroom as supplemental, complementary, facilitating and consolidating. In fact, some argue that, as van Lier (1988:20) states, “if the classroom provides (i.e. mirrors) the conditions that make language development possible in the outside world, it can be successful.” Therefore, it can be said that the kind of interaction that takes place in L2 classroom, plays a great role in the development of second language.

Malamah – Thomas (1996:146g) defines interaction as, “a process in which people/things have a reciprocal effect upon each other through their actions: as opposed to transaction, the interpersonal aspects of the communication event.” According to this definition, interaction is not simply a matter of action and reaction between the teacher and the students. It is more than an action followed by a reaction, rather it is acting reciprocally, acting upon each other, in other words, the students reaction become in itself an action, evoking a reaction in the teacher, which influences his subsequent action.

It is also possible to say that for an interaction to take place in the classroom the lesson must not be dominated by the teacher or it should not be a one – way channel. As Rivers (1987:9) says, “Interaction can be two – way, three – way or four – way, but never one way”. Therefore, if we talk about language development through interaction, the teacher and the students should get involved in it jointly. In other words, interaction has to be handled by every participant, not just by the teacher; because interaction is not something that one do to people but something people do together (Allwright and Bailey, 1991:19).

In order for a successful interaction to take place in the classroom, Allwright and Bailey (1991:19) suggest that everybody has to manage at least five different things:

- I. who gets to speak? (participants' turn distribution)
- II. what do they talk about? (topic)
- III. what does each participant do with the various opportunities to speak? (task)
- IV. what sort of atmosphere is created? (tone)
- V. what accent, dialect, or language is used? (code)

Perhaps, one important thing we have to consider in addition to the above five points of management of interaction, is that the management of learning which means what the students have to do with all the management of interaction so that they can learn the language which is basically what we want from our students. This is because what ever we do in the classroom is for learning to take place. We manage interaction in the classroom for the sake of giving the students the best possible opportunities for learning the language. As Allwright and Bailey (1991:21) say, "managing interaction and managing learning come together".

Van Lier (1988:92-93) states that "The reason for focusing on participation is the assumption that it is in some way directly related to learning, or at least to opportunities for learning". Moreover, participation presupposes attention, and it is of course a basic tenet of the psychology of learning that attention is a prerequisite for learning (Ibid). Similarly, Rivers (1987:4) says that interaction allows the students to increase their language accumulation through listening or reading linguistic materials or even through the output of other students' discussion and problem solving tasks.

Allwright (1984) and Breen (1985) as cited in Chaudron (1998:10) argue that:

*Interaction is viewed as significant because it is argued that (1) only through interaction can the learner decompose the TL structures and derive meaning from classroom events, (2) interaction gives learners the opportunities to incorporate TL structures into their own speech ..., and (3) the meaningfulness for learners of classroom events of any kind, whether thought of as interactive or not, will depend on the extent to which communication has been jointly constructed between the teacher and learners.*

According to the this view, interaction helps the students to develop their language through what goes on in the classroom activity and of course this happens when there is a mutual understanding between the teacher and the learners in the type of interaction that takes place in the classroom.

### **2.3 Conversation Analysis**

In simple terms, as Yule (1996:143) describes it, “English conversation is an activity where for the most part, two or more people take turns at speaking”. Of course, the name also indicates that it can happen in spoken form and since speakers have to take turns, more than one person must get involved. Conversation should not be seen as the product of two ‘speaker-hearers’ who attempt to exchange information or convey messages to each other. Rather, as Hutchby and Wooffitt (2002:1) say, participants in conversation are seen as mutually orienting to and collaborating in order to achieve, orderly and meaningful communication.

Hence, the main purpose of conversation analysis is, to expose the method, organized reasoning procedures which inform the production of

naturally occurring conversation (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2002:1). This view indicates that the way conversational speech is planned is revealed through the organized procedures, tactics and resources which are interwoven to the context in which they are produced and which are available to the participants by being a member of a natural language community.

According to Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991:70) citing Gaskill (1980) and Hatch (1978) say that conversation analysis (CA) is one sub-area of discourse analysis (DA). And Hutchby and Wooffitt (2002:13) define CA as “the study of talk; more particularly, it is the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situation of human interaction: talk –in – interaction”.

Moreover, CA deals with real data of verbal communication and from such studies that one can identify a number of significant features of conversation that may be needed for teaching conversational skills (Cunningsworth, 1995). Overall, then, CA is the study of “recorded, naturally occurring talk – in – interaction” to use (Hutchby and wooffitt, 2002:14)’s words.

From the above view, we might say that, CA goes more beyond just a talk; it is about talk – in – interaction. CA strives for uncovering not just the exterior organization of talk but how the participants display for one another their understanding of what is going on.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (2002:4-5) discussed that CA has two important values for two disciplines – sociology and linguistics. Sociologically, CA’s distinctive contribution shows that analytic access can be gained to the situated ‘achievement of inter-subjectivity’ by focusing on the sequential organization of talk: in other words, on the management of turn taking.

In the field of linguistics, Hutchby and Wooffitt, citing different scholars mention that, CA is relevant for the following three main areas:

*(i) the ethnography of communication, which has aimed to analyze the patterns of language in use and the ways in which these relate to social and cultural patterns (Gumperz and Hymes 1972); (ii) pragmatics, with its interest in how meaning is communicatively established (Levinson 1983); and (iii) discourse analysis, with its concern for the structural and sequential properties of spoken language (Brown and Yule, 1982; Sinclair and Coulthard 1975).*

(2002:5)

According to the above view, CA does not concern itself in disorganized and faulty appearance of linguistic competence. This is one reason why CA analysts particularly concern themselves with the use of language to negotiate role-relationships, peer-solidarity, and the exchange of turns in conversation, the saving of face of both speaker and hearer (Brown and Yule, 1983:3). Thus, CA emphasizes that analysis should be based entirely on closely transcribed examples of actual talk recorded in naturally occurring settings, extracts from which are made available as part of published research (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2002:73). As they have further indicated that the transcription of data is important for two reasons: one is that it is the first important step to make the analysis of the recorded interaction in a way that CA requires. The second is that the practice of transcription and production of a transcript represents a distinctive stage in the process of data analysis itself.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (2002:73) also tell us that for CA, transcripts are not thought of as 'the data'. The data consists of tape recordings – audio

or video tapes - of naturally occurring interactions. Thus, it is important to consider that CA is not just transcribing and throwing away the tape thinking that the transcription alone is enough. Rather, we must consider that the transcription is there because we need it as a reasonable tool of reference.

As McCarthy and Carter (1994:136) say, systems of turn taking have been extensively investigated within the domain of study termed conversation analysis. Therefore, taking a look at turn taking in conversation will be important but before that defining turn taking becomes the first step.

## **2.4 Definition of Turn**

While an interaction is going on, it may not be difficult to identify a turn as we can simply point at a person currently holding the floor and speaking. Further more, as Van Lier (1988: 100) indicates, we might tend to say that a turn occurs whenever one person speaks, for as long as he or she speaks and until another person speaks.

But the problem here is that on the course of the interaction someone else may jump in and hence may overlap as consequence of which we may have problems in indicating whether to accept the latter as a new and separate turn or not.

Not only that, we may encounter false starts, half-finished or cut-off turns, and so on in which the borderlines are likely to be blurred and make it difficult to separate or demarcate the turns (Nunan, 1985, Van Lier,1988). Such problems can be easily observed predominantly in

natural or informal conversations where turns are not pre-allocated; they are locally managed.

Defining a turn in a more specific and precise way is very difficult since a turn cannot be understood as a static unit. In relation to this, Goodwin (1977) writes the following:

*A definition of turn as a static unit with fixed boundaries does not accurately describe its structure. Rather, the turn has to be conceptualized as a time bound process... It ... does not seem possible to first define the turn and then work out how it is to be exchanged. Rather, intrinsic structure elements of the unit being exchanged, its boundaries, seem implicated in the process of exchange itself.*

(as cited in Van Lier, 1988: 102-103)

According to the above view, the turn should be understood and conceptualized as a time bound process. It is the time that matters and determines the structure of the turn. Thus, in an attempt to define the turn, the question 'what is turn' may not be answered. What can be answered rather is 'when is a turn' since this takes us to a description of what a turn will 'turn out to be' (Van Lier, 1988).

## **2.5 Turn taking in Conversation**

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) work was the first on the issue of turn taking and has served as a foundational study for many researchers interested in turn taking and conversation analysis. In their study, the authors outline a model for describing how speakers manage turn taking in 'mundane conversation'; the term 'mundane' used in its technical sense to describe a particular form of talk in which what people say, how

they say it and the length of the turn in which they say it – in other words, turn form, turn content and turn length – are free to vary (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2002).

Hutchby and Wooffitt (2002:47), citing Sacks et. al (1974) note three basic facts about conversation:

- I. turn taking occurs
- II. one speaker tends to talk at a time and
- III. turns are taken with as little gap or overlap between them as possible.

Of course we might argue that there could be more than one person talking at the same time and that there could be more than little overlap during a conversation.

As van Lier (1988:97) says, in general conversation turn taking is governed by ‘competition’ and ‘initiative’; participants look for opportunities to take the floor and try to maintain it even if there is another person who wants to hold the floor as the current speaker does. And because of this, as long as the current speaker holds the floor and does not want to let go of the opportunity, obviously, the chance of the hearer’s turn will be minimized. In such cases, the hearers look for possible end points as a chance to get their turn, even if they know that the present turn may take a longer time (Ibid).

Hatch (1992:53) says, “Conversations are supposed to be symmetrical, that is each party should receive a fair share of turns at talk”. Accordingly, we might say that participants in conversation have to work on it through co-operation to produce orderly exchange of turns.

Any conversation, as Sacks et. al (1974:700-701) point out, has the following facts which can serve as a model:

- Speaker – change recurs; or at least occurs.
- Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time.
- Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief.
- Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap are common. Together with transitions characterized by slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions.
- Turn order is not fixed, but varies.
- Turn size is not fixed, but varies.
- Length of conversation is not specified in advance.
- What parties say is not specified in advance.
- Relative distribution of turns is not specified in advance.
- Number of parties can vary
- Talk can be continuous or discontinuous.
- Turn allocation techniques are obviously used. A current speaker may select a next speaker (as when he addresses a question to another party); or parties may self-select in stating to talk.
- Various turn-construction units are employed; e.g., turns can be projectedly ‘one word long’, or they can be sentential in length.
- Repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn taking errors and violations; e.g. if two parties find themselves talking at the same time, one of them will stop prematurely thus repairing the trouble.

The above turn taking model has two components: a ‘turn construction’ component and a ‘turn distribution’ component (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2002:48). The turn taking construction refers to two key features:

- I. turn constructions have the property of ‘projectability’. That is, it is possible for participants to project, in the course of a

turn construction units, what sort of unit it is and at what point it is likely to end.

- II. turn construction units bring into play ‘transition-relevance places’ at their boundaries. In other words, at the end of each unit there is the possibility for legitimate transition between speakers.

(Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2002)

On the other hand, ‘the turn distribution’ or ‘allocation’ components (Fasold, 1990; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2002) seem to be interested in two of the following rules:

- I. (a) If the current speaker has identified, or selected, a particular next speaker, then the speaker should take a turn at that place.  
  
(b) If no such selection has been made, then any next speaker may (but need not) self-select at that point. If selection occurs, then first speaker has the right to the turn.  
  
(c) If no next speaker has been selected, the alternatively the current speaker may, but need not, continue talking with another turn-constructional unit, unless another speaker has self-selected, in which case that speaker gains the right to the turn.
- II. Whichever option has operated, then rules 1a – c come into play again for the next transition-relevance place.

In a way of summary, the above rules come at each transition-relevance place: (i) The current speaker may select the next speaker by addressing the participant, naming him/her; (ii) If that does not happen, any

participant may 'self-select' as next speaker; and (iii) If not, the current speaker may continue.

Generally speaking, any conversation is somehow governed by certain procedures. The procedures as van Lier (1988:96), says may be predetermined in form of strict rules, or they may evolve as norms or routines in the interaction itself. As he says, the procedures basically address the following issues:

- I. the 'proper' size or length of a turn;
- II. identification of the end of a turn;
- III. the sequence of turns, or 'who's next'.

Therefore, for a 'proper' interaction to take place, participants must realize that they have to maintain the above rules so that their conversation could go smoothly.

## **2.6 Turn Taking in Second Language Classroom**

Students in the second language classroom usually find it very difficult to practice the skill of turn taking (Kramsch, 1987; van Lier, 1988; Hedge, 2000). For example, Smith (1986) reported that, university students of advanced speaking skill, had a great deal of difficulty functioning well to interact in small groups using the language (as cited in Tarone and Yule, 1989:93). Hedge (2000:268), similarly, says that, students usually say that they find it very difficult to find their next turn to step in to a conversation. They may have problems like; watching for indications that the current speaker is coming to a close: giving signals of a desire to come in: formulating a turn which fits the flow of the conversation and which picks up on what has already been said: and finding the language to express it. Sacks et. al (1974:698) under the

footage note say that teaching the skill of turn taking for students under five years old is the hardest thing to do.

The above view tells us that the skill of turn taking is something very difficult to teach our students what ever their level is. As it has been noted, starting form children to university students, they find it difficult to practice the skill of turn taking.

Some researchers like Gremmo, Holec and Riley, (1977) say that in the second language classroom, the teacher has the power over the interactions that occur in the class. The teacher is the one who usually initiates participation, decides for how long it should last or to end the interaction, etc. (as cited in Ellis, 1994:581). Kramsch (1987:21-22) points out that “in teacher fronted interaction, the teacher selects the next speaker and automatically selects him or herself for the succeeding turn”.

Obviously, the above view endangers the second language classroom because, as van Lier (1988) argues, self-initiation can be seen as a readiness to learn the target language. And if the teacher is the one who controls the classroom, then the students have very little chance to make use of the target language which in return make affect learning the target language.

Based on the rules set for the construction of turns in natural conversation, a simple set of rules for the management of turn taking in the classroom interaction can be suggested. Accordingly, McHoul (1978:188), proposes the following rules:

- I. For any teacher’s turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-construction unit:

- a. If the teacher's turn is constructed so as to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then the selected student has both the right and obligation to speak.
  - b. If the turn is not so constructed, then the teacher must continue.
- II. For any selected student's turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-construction unit:
- a. If the selected student's turn involves the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then it is the teacher who has the right and obligation to speak.
  - b. If the turn is not so constructed, the teacher may self-select as next speaker.
  - c. If not, the student may continue, but need not, unless the teacher self-selects.
- III. For any teacher's turn, if the teacher has continued to speak, then the other rule recycles and continues to operate only when transfer to a student is affected.
- IV. For any student's turn, if neither of the first two rules has operated, and the current speaker (the student) continues to speak allowed by C in 2, the rules recycle and are in effect at the next transition-relevance place and continue to apply recursively until transfer to the teacher is effected.

These rules show that how the turns are constructed in the second language classroom and how the teacher and the students have to work on the turns that occur during classroom interaction.

As van Lier (1988:105) discusses, in some cases, particularly in more formal settings, including many L2 classrooms, rules of turn distribution emerge or are instituted, so that the matter of who speaks when (as well as perhaps, about what) is predetermined. On such occasions transition

ceases to be problematic, and consequently ceases to be governed by negotiation, competition, or personal initiative. Thus it can be said that the participants are no longer concerned with resolving transition and distribution problems, but rather with observing rules. So far as the L2 classroom is concerned, as van Lier (1988:105-106) says, this state of affairs can lead to at least three possible consequences which can be empirically investigated:

- I. The ways in which classroom activities are conducted are determined by the forces (usually the teacher, but also tactic norms of classroom conduct) that govern allocation of turns. That is, control over proceeding, including topics and types of activities, co-occurs and coincides with control over turn taking. This being the case, a study of turn taking is vital to a study of discourse topic, instructional 'logic', sequential structuring, etc.
- II. In a situation of rigid turn control learners will not be able to explore the ways in which speaker change is effected through turn taking in the target language, which means that they will not be practicing vital skills involved in interacting in the target language. Even if underlying turn taking rules are universal, which is by no means clear ... the ways in which they are realized socially, contextually, linguistically and behaviorally are manifestly very different in different languages and cultures.
- III. As Sacks et al. points out, the conversation turn taking organization provides 'an intrinsic motivation for listening'. They continue:

*In its turn allocational techniques, the turn taking system for conversation builds in an intrinsic motivation for listening to all utterances in a conversation, independent of other possible motivations, such as interest and politeness. In the variety of techniques for arriving at a next speaker,*

*and in their ordered character, it obliges any willing or potentially intending speaker to listen to, and analyze, each utterance across its delivery.*

(Sacks et al. 1974, p.43)

For two reasons, the three points can be an important observation as far as the L2 classroom is concerned. Firstly, an assumption can be made that if the learners are keen about the language they hear around them, there can be an opportunity that language learning can greatly improve. Moreover, attention and comprehension are essential if language exposure is to be transformed in to usable input. Secondly, conversational turn taking forces the students to be actively involved, and to plan and structure their contributions in contextually appropriate and acceptable ways.

However, the nature of turn allocation in the classroom seems to be very much restricted which mainly is done and dominated by the teacher. In relation to this, Ellis (1992:38) points out that:

*... in classroom discourse there is frequently a rigid allocation of turns, who speaks to whom at what time, about what topics is subject to strict control with the result that competition and individual learner initiative are discouraged.*

As it has been discussed earlier, turn taking in conversation forces the students to participate in the interaction. But in a teacher fronted class, since the allocation of turns is rigid, the students will not have the chance of getting actively involved in the interaction and will miss the chance of learning the target language through interaction. However, the current communicative approach advocates that students should learn to use the language instead of learning about the learning. Moreover, it

favors that students get in to groups or in pair so that that they can have the opportunity to communicate with each other and also gives a chance for all students at all level. Referring to this point, Brumfit (1984:77) says that some students are intelligent while others are gifted in learning language. And that some are extrovert and some are shy. In small groups, all these types of learners can have an opportunity to interact using the target language.

But it must be noted that the students need to have the skill of turn taking in order to let the conversation go smoothly and appropriately among the students and the teacher. In relation to the skill of turn taking, Richards (1990:67-68) points out three strategies:

- I. Strategies for taking a turn. These involve ways of entering into a conversation or taking over the role of speaker, and include:
  - Using interjection to signal a request for a turn such as ‘Mm-hmm’, ‘Yeah’, and rising intonation
  - Using facial or other gestures to indicate a wish to take a turn.
  - Accept a turn offered by another speaker by responding to a question or by providing the second part of an adjacency pair.
  - Completing or adding to something said by the speaker.
  
- II. Strategies for holding a turn. These involve indicating that one has more to say, for example, through intonation or by using expressions to suggest continuity, such as ‘first’, ‘another thing’, ‘then’.
  
- III. Strategies for relinquishing the turn. These are devices used to bring the other person(s) into the conversation, and include:
  - Using adjacency pairs
  - Using phonological signals

- Pausing to provide an opportunity for someone to take up the turn.

If the students develop the above skills of turn taking, during their small group discussion, it might be possible to say that they have a great deal of opportunities to make use of the target language.

## **2.7 Gender and Classroom talk**

Many have been said about the issue of gender in classroom talk. Most often it has been argued that girls have a lesser chance than boys during interaction in the classroom (Sunderland, 1992; Swann and Graddol, 1994; Williams and Burden, 1997).

Barnes (1976:30) as cited in Swann and Graddol, (1994:152) indicates the following in his analysis of the discussion of four eleven year old girls:

*During their eleven years of life they have learnt a great deal about using language for collaborative thinking, for encouraging one another, for coping with disagreement, and for rational persuasion. If these skills, which are not unusual in eleven year olds, do not appear in lessons, this is partly because of the communication patterns of classroom and school.*

However, recent studies of classroom interaction have indicated that there are also other sources of concern (Swann and Graddol, 1994:153). Talk in the classroom is not only unequally distributed between teacher and the students but also between the students themselves. In particular

recent studies of gender division in the classroom have demonstrated that girls contribute far less to classroom talk than boys (ibid).

Similarly, Sunderland (1994:97) tells us that in pair and group work, male students have been found to speak more frequently, and take longer turns than female students, who provide more feedback. She has further indicated that those female students were providing a good supportive environment for the males' language practice, but getting little conversational encouragement themselves.

Williams and Burden (1997:131) point out that there is some evidence that 'learned helplessness' is more predominant in girls and 'self worth' concern in boys. On the other hand, Swann and Graddol (1994:153) say that this gender inequality in talk is not a feature unique to schools. They also point out that, mixed sex talk amongst adults is dominated by men by talking more and controlling topics, interrupting the women than they are interrupted by women. Then it will not be a surprise if this dominance occurs in the classroom.

Thus, it must be of a big concern to educationalists since distribution of talk is one of those aspects of classroom life supposedly mediated, if not controlled by the teacher.

## **Chapter Three: The Design of the Study**

### **3.1 Introduction**

As it has been stated in Chapter One, the main objective of the study was to describe the pattern of turn taking among one of the sections of Grade 8 students on Cruise Private School. In other words it attempted to describe the nature of turn taking to see the level of the students' participation. Thus, the study attempted to:

- I. See the level of involvement by the teacher and by the students in taking and giving turns in group discussions.
- II. Find out if students get turns on their own initiation.
- III. Find out if other participants (other than the teacher and group leaders) give turns to each other.
- IV. Examine the overall turn distribution among the students, group leaders and the teacher in group discussion.

### **3.2 Subjects of the Study**

The subjects of the study were 18 students from one section of Grade 12 students of Cruise Private School in Addis Ababa. The sampling method employed was purposive sampling. This was because the study required the willingness of the teacher and the school administration to make video recording. The research also took only one section because making the transcription of the recordings and analyzing it would take considerable time and would be unmanageable.

### **3.3 Instrument of Data Collection**

The study focused on investigating the nature of turn taking patterns of the students and the teacher, and this basically makes it descriptive. To collect the data, on the first day of the recording, two video recorders were used to record two groups at the same time and only one video recorder on the second day of the recording. The plan was originally to make three separate video recordings with the intention of a single group in focus discussing in three different topics. However since the students were grade 12 students and they were to take a national examination, it was only possible to meet the students only for two days. Thus, instead of making three different recordings on three different topics, two topics were selected and on the first day two groups were recorded on the same topic and the third group only using the second topic, and were recorded alone. On average, each group was video recorded for 17.33 minutes. So the video taping was made for 57 minutes as a whole.

Though the researcher is aware that non verbal behaviors accompany the verbal behavior and that they are very important aspects of communication, due to time constraints and to avoid complications the researcher limits his study to verbal acts.

The class was divided into three groups, each group containing six members including the group leaders. Each group had three male and three female students. The students were recorded while they were discussing the following topics:

- I. Teenagers – students at your age level – should get a part time job to generate income. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?
- II. Do you think ‘Brain Drain’ has disadvantage or advantage for one’s country?

### 3.4 Model for Analyzing the Recorded Data

In order to achieve the objective of the study, the video recorded data was transcribed with a focus on the turns. To do this the researcher found only two models developed by Allwright (1980) and van Lier (1988) with focus on classroom interaction. Of course Sacks et al (1974) have developed the first model for analyzing turn taking in conversation. But their model was developed for natural conversation and can not be used for second language classroom interaction.

Van Lier (1988: 109-110) tries to classify turn taking with primary distinctions of the following:

- I. Prospective: the way the turn is linked to the subsequent turn(s).
- II. Retrospective: the way the turn is linked to the preceding turn(s).
- III. Concurrent: a turn that is taken during a current turn which is related to that turn in a servicing sense.
- IV. Neutral: a turn which is indeterminate as to a), b) or c), and which is not implicative of prospective or retrospective relations to its surrounding turns.

Van Lier then further classifies the above categories in detail to explain the more specific distinctions on sequence from up to bottom.

#### **I. Prospective**

- a. allocating: nominate, signal or gaze – specific solicit
- b. soliciting: verbal (general solicit) or behavioral
- c. ending: end, give up or give way

#### **II. Retrospective**

- a. allocated: pre-allocated or locally allocated
- b. unallocated: response to solicit or self-select **(WTA)\***, floor seeking **(WTNA)\***, negative feedback or stolen

- c. OK – pass

### **III. Concurrent**

- a. listening response
- b. Intra-turn repair/repair-initiation

### **IV. Neutral**

- a. rehearsal
- b. private

**\*WTA** = When Turn – Available

**\*WTNA** = When Turn Not Available

Van Lier's model is not used because it contains categories that are not considered in this study. These categories are concurrent and neutral, for example, listening response and intra-turn repair are not considered as turn rather as turn lubricators (Orestrom 1983) as cited in van Lier (1988:116). Moreover, category 4, rehearsal and private are very difficult to code for they are delivered in a soft voice as van Lier himself discussed it. He further indicates that they are not the official business of the classroom at the moment (van Lier, 1988: 121).

The other model that was found relevant for this study is the one developed by Allwright (1980). Allwright classifies turn taking in to two categories: turn getting and turn giving. He then, further classifies the two in to other sub-categories:

#### **a. Turn getting**

- i. **Accept:** respond to a personal solicit
- ii. **Steal:** respond to a personal solicit made to another person
- iii. **Take:** respond to a general solicit (e.g. a question addressed to the whole class)

- iv. **Take:** take an unsolicited turn, when a turn is available – ‘discourse maintenance.’
- v. **Make:** make an unsolicited turn, during the current speaker’s turn, with out intent to gain the floor (e.g. comments that indicate one is paying attention).
- vi. **Make:** start a turn, during that of the current speaker’s, with intent to gain the floor (i.e. interrupt, make a takeover bid).
- vii. **Make:** take a wholly private turn, at any point in the discourse (e.g. a private rehearsal, for pronunciation practice, of a word spoken by the teacher)\*.
- 0. **Miss:** fail to respond to a personal solicit within whatever time is allowed by the interlocutor(s).

**b. Turn giving**

*Symbol*

- : fade out and/or give way to an interruption.
- O** : make a turn available without making either a personal or general solicit (e.g. by simply concluding one’s utterance with the appropriate terminal intonation markers).
- P** : make a personal solicit (i.e. nominate the next speaker)
- G** : make a general solicit.

\* #7 is not used for the study for the same reason given for van Lier’s model.

In addition to the above method of data collection, the teacher was also asked the following four questions to find out if the students:

- I. have the skill of turn taking?
- II. take turns through self-initiation?
- III. respond to turns that is allocated to them?
- IV. give turns to others?

Basically, it was the video recorded discussion that was used as a main source. The above four questions were used to check, how much the collected data and the teacher's view match. As it has been mentioned in the literature section, a study of turn taking is conducted through the transcription of the video or audio recorded data (van Lier, 1988, Allwright and Bailey, 1991 and, Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2002).

## **Chapter Four: Results and Discussion**

### **4.1 Introduction**

The study as it has been mentioned earlier, focused on investigating the nature of turn taking patterns in students' group discussion. Therefore , unlike the other two researches conducted in turn taking by Tadesse Habte and Girma Wosennie, this study focused on what actually happened in students group discussion among themselves rather than what they do in, as a form of feedback session with their teacher. This was done because if it is in their way it might be difficult to call it a group discussion, rather it would be more like a teacher fronted class with a small number out of the total of the large number.

Having said this, the following results present a group focused discussion of the students.

### **4.2 Distribution of Turn Getting Categories among the Participants in Each Group**

The following statistics are presented in this section after the groups were video recorded and later the video recording was transcribed for easier identification of the turns.

Table 1. Turn getting Distribution  
Group 1

Turn getting categories	Participants							
	T	GM	M1	M2	F1	F2	F3	Totals
1 - accept	1	3	3			2	3	12
2 - steal		1	2			1		4
3 - take				2				2
4 - take	9	5	6	2		4	3	29
5 - make				1		2	1	4
6 - make			1		1	6	1	9
0 - miss					2	1	3	5
Totals	10	9	12	5	3	16	10	65

In terms of the categories of the analysis the main finding is the preponderance of 4's – take an unsolicited turn when turn is available. This shows that most of the turns were made through self initiation. As it can also be seen in the table, and as one might expect, the teacher has tried to maintain the discourse when ever available, so that the conversation can continue as expected. Another one that can be noticed is that, most of the interruptions were made by female students. This of course happened when F2 and F3 tried to convince one another – F2 getting a support from the group leader. Additional participant worth looking at is F1. Out of the total turns of 65, F1 took only three and even from the three turn getting categories, she missed two of them. This shows that she was the least participant among the group.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of Turn Getting Categories  
Group 1.

Turn getting Categories	Participants						Totals	
	T		GM		Others			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1- accept	1	1.54%	3	4.62%	8	12.31%	12	18.46%
2 – steal			1	1.54%	3	4.62%	4	6.15%
3 – take					2	3.08%	2	3.08%
4 – take	9	13.85%	5	7.69%	15	23.08%	29	44.62%
5 – make					4	6.15%	4	6.15%
6 – make					9	13.85%	9	13.85%
0 – miss					5	7.69%	5	7.69%
Totals	10	15.38%	9	13.85%	46	70.77%	65	100%

The data show that out of the total turns of 65, the teacher took (10 or 15.38%) and the group leader took (9 or 13.85%); together which makes it (19 or 29.23%). The majority of the turns were taken by responding to 4's that is – take a turn in the absence of a solicit (14 or 21.54%). The teacher took one additional turn only by accepting (1 or 1.54%). Other than these two turns the teacher did not get other turns. However, the group leader got two other turns other than the 4's. He took (3 or 4.62 %) turns by accepting and additionally by stealing one turn (1 or 1.54).

The results also showed that out of the total of 65 turns, the students got the majority of the turns (46 or 70.77%) than the teacher and the group leader. From these turns, the got the turns by self-initiation, i.e., by 4's Take (15 or 23.08%), 6's make (9 or 13.85%), by stealing (3 or 4.62) and by 3's take – that is self select to a general solicit (2 or 3.08%). The

students also took turns by accepting to respond to specific solicits (8 or 12.31) and 5's make (4 or 6.15%) with out the intent to gain the floor. And finally, they missed turns that were allocated to them (5 or 7.69%).

Table 3. Turn Getting Distribution

Group 2.

Turn getting categories	Participants							Totals
	T	Gm	M1	M2	F1	F2	F3	
1- accept		1	1					2
2 - steal								
3 - take		2	2	2	1	2	1	10
4 - take	8	10	5	1	2		2	28
5 - make	2	3	4	1				10
6 - make		3	3	1				7
0 - miss								
Totals	10	19	15	5	3	2	3	57

Similar to group 1, group 2 has also taken the majority of the turns by responding to 4's - take, which is 28 out of the total turns of 57. In this group the distribution of the turn getting categories were probably affected by dominance of the group leader. And probably, rather than letting a discussion go on, he focused on producing a written report. Because of these reasons, the students might have got less opportunity to participate in the discussion except one male student who was trying to gain the floor which was dominated by the group leader. From the transcription, it might be possible to see the rest of the students tried to take turns when the teacher appeared in the discussion and gave turns

by making general solicits. And additionally, when F3 tried to take a turn when it was available (4's take), the group leader interrupts and tried pass on his own view.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Turn Getting Categories

Group 2

Turn getting categories	Participants						Totals	
	T		GM		Others			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1- accept			1	1.75%	1	1.75%	2	3.51%
2 – steal								
3 – take			2	3.51%	8	14.04%	10	17.54%
4 – take	8	14.04%	10	17.54%	10	17.54%	28	49.12%
5 – make	2	3.51%	3	5.26%	5	8.77%	10	17.54%
6 – make			3	5.26%	4	7.02%	7	12.28%
0 – miss								
Totals	10	17.54%	19	33.33%	28	49.12%	57	100%

Out of the total turns of 57, more of it was taken by the teacher and the group leader (29 or 50.87%). From these turns, the majority was for 4's – take (18 or 31.58%). They also took turns with out the intent to take the floor – 5's make (5 or 8.77%). Other than the two turn the teacher did not take additional turns. However, the group leader took other turns by accepting (1 or 1.75%), 3's take- self select (2 or 3.51%), and by 6's make (3 or 5.26%).

On the other hand, the other participants took relatively the lesser turn. Out of the total of 57 turns, they took (28 or 49.12%). From these turns most of them taken by self-initiation, i.e., 4's take (10 or 17.54%), 3's take (8 or 14.04%) and 6's make (4 or 7.02%). They also took a turn without the intent to take the floor – 5's make (5 or 8.77%). However none of the participants steal or miss a turn.

Table 5. Turn Getting Distribution

Group 3.

Turn getting categories	Participants							Totals
	T	GM	M1	M2	F1	F2	F3	
1- accept		2		1	1	2	3	9
2 – steal			2	2				4
3 – take				1		1		2
4 – take	4	8	7	7			2	28
5 – make		1	3	2				6
6 – make		3	3	3			5	14
0 - miss				3		2		5
Totals	4	14	15	19	1	5	10	68

Again like the other two groups, group three also took the majority of the turns by 4's take which is out of the total of 68 turns, it makes 28. However, it might be worth mentioning that only F3 took 2 turns among females. The rest was taken by male students (including the group leader) and the teacher. It appears that – as can be seen from the transcript – F2 has tried to take her turns but seems that she got lost

out of ideas that could bring her in the discussion. Probably, the nature of the topic has limited her from further participating in the discussion. And F1 seemed to wait only for her turn, that is, by specific solicit to accept her turn.

Table 6. Frequency and Percentage of Turn Getting Categories

Group 3.

Turn getting categories	Participants						Totals	
	T		GM		Others			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1- accept			2	2.94%	7	10.29%	9	13.24%
2 – steal					4	5.88%	4	5.88%
3 – take					2	2.94%	2	2.94%
4 – take	4	5.88%	8	11.76%	16	23.53%	28	41.18%
5 – make			1	1.47%	5	7.35%	6	8.82%
6 – make			3	4.41%	11	16.88%	14	20.59%
0 – miss					5	7.35%	5	7.35%
Totals	4	5.88%	14	28.59%	50	73.53%	68	100%

In this group, the teacher and the group leader took (18 or 74.47%) turns out of the total of 68 turns. The teacher took 4's – take (4 or 5.88%) only. On the other hand, the group leader took turns through self-initiation by 4's – take (8 or 11.76%), and 6's – make (3 or 4.41%). Additionally, he took a turn by accepting (2 or 2.94%) and another turn, with out the intent to take the floor, 5's – make (1 or 1.47%). Neither the teacher nor the group leader took turns by stealing or missing.

The other participants took the majority of the turns (50 or 73.53%) out of the total of 68 turns. From these turns, the majority was taken by 4's - take (16 or 23.53%) which is of course classified as self-initiation turn. They also took other self-initiated moves by 6's - make (11 or 16.88%), steal (4 or 5.88%) and 3's - take (2 or 2.94%). They took other turns by accepting a solicited turn (7 or 10.29%) and by missing a solicited turn (5 or 7.33%). And finally they took turns with out the intent to gain the floor, 5's - make (5 or 7.35%).

### 4.3 Distribution of Turn Getting Categories among all participants

In this section, the overall distribution of all the turn getting categories among all the participants is presented. The data is presented in such a way by adding all the turns taken by the teacher, the group leaders and other participants including male and female students.

Table 7. Overall Turn Getting Distributions in Frequency and Percentage

Turn getting categories	Participants						Totals	
	T		Group leaders		Others			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1- accept	1	0.53%	6	3.16%	16	8.42%	23	12.11%
2 - steal			1	0.53%	7	3.68%	8	4.21%
3 - take			2	1.05%	12	6.32%	14	7.37%
4 - take	21	11.05%	23	12.11%	41	21.58%	85	44.74%
5 - make	2	1.05%	4	2.11%	14	7.37%	20	10.53%
6 - make			6	3.16%	24	12.63%	30	15.79%
0 - miss					10	5.26%	10	5.26%
Totals	24	12.63%	42	22.11%	124	65.26%	190	100%

The overall result showed that the majority of the turns were taken by the students, i.e. (124 or 65.26%) out of the total turns of 190. From these, the great majority of the turns were taken through self-initiated moves; 4's – take (41 or 21.58%), 6's – make (24 or 12.63%), 3's – take (12 or 6.32%) and 2's – steal (7 or 3.68%). They also took turns by responding to personal solicits, that is, by accepting (16 or 8.42%) and missing (10 or 5.26%). The other turn they took was without the intent to take the floor, 5's – make (14 or 7.37%).

On the other hand the teacher and the group leaders together took 66 turns or 34.74% out of the overall turns of 190. From these turns, they took the majority of the turns by taking 4's – take (44 or 23.16%). They took (7 or 3.69%) turns by accepting out of which the teachers turns was only (1 or 0.53%). They also took turns without the intent to gain the floor, 5's – make (6 or 3.16%). The rest of the turns were taken by the group leaders only. The group leaders took (6 or 3.16%) turns by 6's make (2 or 1.05%) by 3's – take, (1 or 0.53) by stealing.

#### **4.4 Distribution of Turn Giving Categories among Participants in Each Group**

This section presents the data for turn giving categories of each group. The order of the groups will be the same as it was for turn getting categories.

Table 8. Turn giving categories

Group 1.

Turn giving categories	Participants							Totals
	T	GM	M1	M2	F1	F2	F3	
-			2	1		3	2	8
O	1	3	1			2	1	8
P	4	3	4	1	1	6	3	22
G	2							2
Totals	7	6	7	2	1	11	6	40

From the total turn giving distribution of 40, the majority of it was by making personal solicits which is 22. It appears that none of the students were making general solicit. Only the teacher made 2 general solicits. The rest of the turns were made by fading out i.e. 8 and by concluding or using intonation markers i.e. 8.

Table 9. Turn giving distribution

Group 2.

Turn giving categories	Participants							Totals
	T	GM	M1	M2	F1	F2	F3	
-		4	2					6
O	1	1	3	1				6
P		1	1					2
G	6							6
Totals	7	6	6	1				20

It was explained in the turn getting categories that group2's turn distribution was dominated by the group leader that the participants did not get enough of their share to take turns even though they had the initiation. For the same reason, in turn giving also, they could not have the chance except for M1 who was now and then trying to break the domination.

Out of the total of 20 turns, 2 turns were made through personal solicit. The rest of the turns had equal share which is 6 for each categories. Like group one, this group also had a general solicit made only by the teacher which is 6. NO group member made a general solicit.

Table 10. Turn Giving Distribution

Group3.

Turn giving categories	Participants							Totals
	T	GM	M1	M2	F1	F2	F3	
-	2		1	3	1	2	1	10
O		2	1	2			1	6
P		5	6	3			1	15
G	2							2
Totals	4	7	8	8	1	2	3	33

From the total turn giving distribution of 33, the majority was made by personal solicit, i.e. 15. All the personal solicits were made by the students only. Turns that were made through general solicit were made only by the teacher which is 2. The rest of the turns were made through fade out – 10 and through concluding or intonation marker – 6.

#### 4.5 Distribution of Turn giving Categories among all participants

For the purpose of looking at the involvement of the teacher and the group leaders in general, and the other students in making a turn available, this section presents the overall distribution of turn giving categories among all participants.

Table 10. Overall Turn Giving Distributions in Frequency and Percentage

Turn giving categories	Participants						Totals	
	T		Group leaders		Others			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
-	2	2.15%	4	4.30%	18	19.35%	24	25.81%
O	2	2.15%	6	6.45%	12	12.90%	20	21.50%
P	4	4.30%	9	9.68%	26	27.96%	39	41.94%
G	10	10.75%					10	10.75%
Totals	18	19.35%	19	20.43%	56	60.23%	93	100%

This finding shows that out of the overall total of 93 turns, the majority was made by the students, which is 56 or 60.23%. The students made the majority of the turns by personal solicit (26 or 27.96%). They also made turns available by fading out (18 or 19.35%) and by concluding or intonation markers (12 or 12.90%). The students did not attempt to make a turn through general solicit.

On the other hand, the teacher and the group leaders took a total of 18 or 19.35% and 19 or 20.43% respectively. The teacher alone made 10 or 10.75% general solicits. And together they made personal solicits (13 or

13.98%). They also made a turn available by fading out (6 or 6.45%) and by concluding or intonation marker (8 or 8.60%).

#### **4.6 The Frequency of Turn Getting Distribution between Male and Female Students**

The following data presents a comparison between male and female students to see the level of their participation; in other words, to see if male or female students took more of the turns.

Turn getting categories	Participants				Totals	
	Male		Female			
1 – accept	14	8.28%	11	6.50%	25	14.79%
2 – steal	7	4.14%	1	0.59%	8	4.73%
3 – take	9	5.33%	5	2.96%	14	8.28%
4 – take	51	30.18%	13	7.69%	64	37.87%
5 – make	15	8.88%	3	1.78%	18	10.65%
6 – make	17	10.06%	13	7.69%	30	17.75%
0 - miss	3	1.78%	7	4.14%	10	5.92%
Totals	116	68.64%	53	31.36%	169	100%

From the total of 169 turns, the great majority of the turns were taken by male students (116 or 68.64%) and female students took the lesser turns (53 or 31.36%). From the total of 116 turns that male students took, the majority was taken through self initiation; 4's – take (51 or 30.18%), 6's – make (17 or 10.06%), 3's – take (9 or 5.33%) and steal (7 or 4.14%). They also took turns by responding to a personal solicit; accept (14 or 8.28%) and miss (3 or 1.78%). And finally, they took a turn with out the intent to gain the floor, 5's make (15 or 8.88%).

On the other hand, even though female students took the lesser turn, like male students, they took their majority of turns through self-initiation; 4's – take (13 or 7.69%), 6's – make (13 or 7.69%), 3's – take (5 or 2.96%) and steal (1 or 0.59%). The other turn they took was through accept (11 or 6.50%) and miss (7 or 4.14%). They also took a turn without the intent to gain the floor, 5's – make (3 or 1.78%)

## **4.7 Discussion**

### **4.7.1 Self-initiated Turn Getting**

As it has been mentioned in the result section, most of the turns that the students got were through self-initiated moves. The majority of the turns they got were 4's take. This category is identified as taking unsolicited turn when a turn is available so that the silence could be broken and the conversation could continue. To do this, the students had to select themselves to take the available turn. This shows that they have the willingness to participate in classroom conversation which can be said the first step for learning a language. Of course some of these turns were made to maintain the discourse by making a personal solicitation so that the other participant could say his or her part. But the great majority of it was to gain the floor and say one's part.

The other self-initiated turn they got next to 4's – take is 6's – make which can be identified as start a turn, during that of the current speaker's, with the intent to gain the floor. This was mostly done through interruption. Even though this might not be a good habit if done too much, still it can be classified as a self-initiated turn. This is because the students have to have the willingness to take a turn. The reason was that they wanted to say their share when they were left out of the conversation or because they did not agree with what the student who

gained the floor was saying. Unlike the students, the teacher never intended to gain the floor through interruption. This shows that, his intentions were for the students to take part in the conversation. Even when he was taking turns, it was only when a turn was available. This of course gives the students confidence because they will not feel that they are dominated by the teacher.

Next to the above two categories, is 3's – take which can be identified as respond to a general solicit. This allocation is done in such a way without nominating a particular student. Therefore, the students have to select themselves through self-initiation. That means there are volunteer students to take turns to address a question asked to the whole group.

The last category for self-initiated turn was steal. This category can be identified as respond to a personal solicit made to another person. Among the self-initiated turns, this category takes the least share. The students took turns by stealing to say their share when they are left out or to support one another when there is a pressure on a particular student.

Statistically, the figure shows that out of the overall total of 190 turns, the students took (including the group leaders) 116 or 61.05% were made through self-initiation. Thus, it can be said that the students have the readiness to learn the language by participating through self-initiation.

#### **4.7.2 Responding to Personal Solicit**

The students also took turns by responding to personal solicit either by accepting or missing a turn. But the greater share was by accepting a

turn that was allocated to them (i.e. 22 or 11.58). They have on the other hand missed 10 or 5.26% turns. Students missed turns specially, when they were lost of ideas and were in short of ideas. But this could be an exception for two female students in group 1 and group 3 – F1 in both groups. These two students were different from the others because they did not have the initiation to take turns on their own. F1 of group 3 only waited for her turn until it was allocated to her. And F1 of group 1 was avoiding the turns because she did not want to take part in the conversation.

#### **4.7.3 Giving Turns**

The majority of the turns that all the students gave for each other was through personal solicit (i.e. 35 or 37.63%). The students were making personal solicit when they were talking one on one or when they are simply giving the turn to other participants. Except in group one, the majority of the turns that were made was by other students excluding the group leaders (i.e. 26 or 27.96%). This shows that the students have also taken the responsibility of distributing a turn among themselves by nominating the next speaker. The teacher made a personal solicit in his conversation with group 1 when he tried to find out what their views were. But it appears that none of the students made a general solicit. All of these turns giving categories were made only by the teacher.

The participants additionally made a turn available by fading out when they do not have anything left to say. Most of the times, these turns were taken by 4's take i.e. taking a turn when a turn is available. They also made a turn available by concluding or using intonation markers that indicated that they had finished their turns. Just like fading out, these turns were taken mostly by 4's take.

#### **4.7.4 The Teacher's Response to the Four Questions**

For the first question, that is, if the students had the skill of turn taking, the teacher responded that there was not a training given for the students and because of this he added that they may not have the skill. In fact, the teacher appeared to be unfamiliar with the topic when addressed for the first time. This shows that, teacher training institutes may not give the training. To add to the point, the researcher's experience as an undergraduate student showed that turn taking is a topic that was unheard of.

When asked if the students have the initiation to participate on their own, he responded that, most of the students volunteer to participate in a discussion. For the third question also, he responded that most of the students accept a turn when it is allocated to them. He added that, this might be a problem when the students do not know the answer or when they do not have anything to say.

And finally, for the last question, that is, if the students give turns to others, he responded that most of the time, if it was not a group discussion, the students did not give turns to others; however, he mentioned that this could probably be different when it was a group discussion.

Therefore, when the teacher's response was compared with the video recorded data, it was possible to say that both indicated the same result.

## **Chapter Five: Summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation**

This study was carried out to describe the nature of turn taking patterns among Grade 12 students of Cruise Private School in their group discussions to see the level of students participation and to see the involvement of the teacher and group leaders in giving and taking turns. For the study, one section of grade 12 students with 18 students was selected. The students were grouped in to three with six members in each. The data was gathered by video recording the discussions and was analyzed using Allwright's (1980) model.

The overall result showed that the majority of the turns were taken by the students, i.e. (124 or 65.26%) out of the total turns of 190. From these, the great majority of the turns were taken trough self-initiated moves; 4's – take (41 or 21.58%), 6's – make (24 or 12.63%), 3's – take (12 or 6.32%) and 2's – steal (7 or 3.68%). They also took turns by responding to personal solicits, that is, by accepting (16 or 8.42%) and missing (10 or 5.26%). The other turn they took was with out the intent to take the floor, 5's – make (14 or 7.37%).

On the other hand the teacher and the group leaders together took 66 turns or 34.74% out of the overall turns of 190. From these turns, they took the majority of the turns by taking 4's – take (44 or 23.16%). They took (7 or 3.69%) turns by accepting out of which the teachers turns was only (1 or 0.53%). They also took turns with out the intent to gain the floor, 5's – make (6 or 3.16%). The rest of the turns were taken by the group leaders only. The group leaders took (6 or 3.16%) turns by 6's make (2 or 1.05%) by 3's – take, (1 or 0.53) by stealing.

The findings further indicated that, out of the overall total of 93 turns, the majority was made by the students, which is 56 or 60.23%. The students made the majority of the turns by personal solicit (26 or 27.96%). They also made turns available by fading out (18 or 19.35%) and by concluding or intonation markers (12 or 12.90%). The students did not attempt to make a turn through general solicit.

On the other hand, the teacher and the group leaders made a total of 18 or 19.35% and 19 or 20.43% respectively. The teacher alone made 10 or 10.75% general solicits. And together they made personal solicits (13 or 13.98%). They also made a turn available by fading out (6 or 6.45%) and by concluding or intonation marker (8 or 8.60%).

And female Vs male students level of participation indicated that, from the total of 169 turns, the great majority of the turns were taken by male students (116 or 68.64%) and female students took the lesser turns (53 or 31.36%). From the total of 116 turns that male students took, the majority was taken through self initiation; 4's – take (51 or 30.18%), 6's – make (17 or 10.06%), 3's – take (9 or 5.33%) and steal (7 or 4.14%). They also took turns by responding to a personal solicit; accept (14 or 8.28%) and miss (3 or 1.78%). And finally, they took a turn with out the intent to gain the floor, 5's make (15 or 8.88%).

On the other hand, even though female students took the lesser turn, like male students, they took their majority of turns through self-initiation; 4's – take (13 or 7.69%), 6's – make (13 or 7.69%), 3's – take (5 or 2.96%) and steal (1 or 0.59%). The other turn they took was through accept (11 or 6.50%) and miss (7 or 4.14%). They also took a turn with out the intent to gain the floor, 5's – make (3 or 1.78%).

Based on the findings, it was possible to conclude that the students took most of the turns through self-initiation which of course can be considered as the first step that learning could take place. It is also possible to say that the role the teacher or group leaders play in group discussion can affect the other participants. And finally, it is worth mentioning that female students took the lesser turns than male students. Specially, group 2's female participation was highly affected because of the domination of the group leader. Probably, results might have been different if he had the skills of turn taking and distributing them.

Based on the results of the study, it would be very necessary to recommend the following points:

- I. Female students must be encouraged to build their confidence so that they can take equal parts as male students do during taking turns.
- II. Group leaders must always be aware the responsibility they have in group discussion because the way they distribute the turns among each other could affect the entire participation level of the group members. And if the teacher is aware that a particular group leader dominates the whole discussion, it would be wise to change that group leader by some other leader whom he or she thinks can do better.
- III. Students must also need to learn more of the skill of turn taking because if students over do interruptions and stealing turns, other participants may feel that they are left out of the conversation and may stop engaging in the participation. They must also be trained that they should not miss turns just because they do not want to say their share in the participation. In addition to this, teacher training institutes must also consider in training the teacher the

skill of turn taking. Because this is one way that the students can learn the skill of turn taking from their teacher.

## Bibliography

- Allwright, D. 1988. Observation in the Language Classroom. New York: Longman.
- Allwright, D. and Bailey, K. 1991. Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allwright, R. L. 1980. "Turns, Topics and Tasks: Pattern of Participation in Language Teaching and Learning". In Larsen-freeman, D. (ed). Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research. Rowely, MA: Newbury House.
- Allwright, R. L. 1984. "The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning". Applied Linguistics. 5/2, 156 -171.
- Amanuel Gebru. 1996. "Gender Differences in Participation in Discussion Groups in Freshman English Classes at A.A.U". Addis Ababa: A.A.U.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. 1983. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brumfit, C. 1984. Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudron, C. 1998. Second language Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningsworth, A. 1995. Choosing Your Course Book. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eba Mijena. 2006. "An Investigation of Current EFL Mixed – Sex Classroom Practice in Teacher – Pupil Interaction in Relation to Gender Equity: A case of Bole Senior Secondary School Grade 10 EFL Classes". Addis Ababa: A.A.U.
- Ellis, R. 1988. Classroom Second Language Development. New York: Prentice Hall International.

- Ellis, R. 1992. Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1994. The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fasold, C. 1990. Sociolinguistics of Language. (Vol. 2). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Girma Wossenie. 1999. "An Investigation of the Pattern of Turn Taking in Group Discussion in Grade 11 EFL Class at Kokebe Tsibah Senior Secondary School". Addis Ababa: A.A.U.
- Hatch, E. 1992. Discourse and Language Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hedge, T. 2000. Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. 2002. Conversation Analysis. Great Britain: Polity Press and Blackwell.
- Kramsch, J. 1987. "Interactive Discourse in Small and Large Groups". In Rivers, W. (ed). Interactive Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M. 1991. An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research. New York: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Malamah-Thomas, A. 1996. Classroom Interaction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy, M. and Carter, R. 1994. Language as Discourse. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- McHoul, A. W. "The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in the Classroom". Language in Society. 7: 183 – 213.
- Nunan, D. 1985. Understanding Language Classrooms: A Guide for Teacher – initiated Action. UK: Prentice Hall.
- Richards, J. C. 1990. The Language Teaching Matrix. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rivers, W. 1987. Interactive Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. E. et al. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation." Language. 50/4: 696 – 735.
- Sunderland, J. 1992. "Gender in EFL Classroom". ELT Journal. 46/1. In Hedge, T. et. al. (ed). 1996. Power, Pedagogy and Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swann, J. and Graddol, D. 1994. "Gender Inequalities in Classroom Talk". In Graddol, D. et.al. (ed). Researching Language and Literacy in Social Context. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Tadesse Habte. 1997. "The Nature of Turn Taking among Freshman Sudents in an EFL Class in their Group Discussion at A.A.U". Addis Ababa: A.A.U.
- Tarone, E. and Yule,G. 1989. Focus on the Language Learner. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Lier, L. 1988. The Classroom and the Language Learner. London: Longman.
- Williams, M. and Burden, R. L. 1997. Psychology for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. 1996. The Study of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## **Appendices**

T: the teacher

GM: male group leader

M1, M2: male subsequent participants in the group

F1, F2, F3: female subsequent participants in the group.

Ss: all students in the same group

...: indication of pause

-: indication of unfinished word

/ /: transcription for Amharic word

[ ]: indication of turn getting and giving categories

## **Appendix 1. Transcription of Group 1's Discussion**

GM: [4's take]

Ok M2. [P]

M1: [accept]

In this situation ...

M2: [5's accept]

In our country ...

M1: [accept]

This depends on the ... person because ... uhm [-]

F2: [4's take]

If he has money ... if you have money, we shouldn't work at this level. Ok F1. [P]

F1: [miss]

Wait.

M1: [4's take]

Yes, if he had money and a family ... he can only study as long ... but his condition not good ... not good ... he must be working. [0]

F2: [4's take]

No, no, ... not having a money is not ... like ... we could learn with out having money ... government schools, since they are ... we don't pay for them ... we could just ... we learn. That's not that much of essential ... having money ... we can learn. [0]

M1: [4's take]

Only in one thing ... we can be successful. If ...

F1: [6's make]

Government point? [P]

M1: [accept]

No!

M2: [4's take]

But if he works ...[-]

GM: [4's take]

F2. [P]

F2: [miss]

That's my point /b ka/ ... F3 [P]

F3: [miss]

Wait.

M1: [4's take]

In my opinion, he must do one thing only. Either he must study or ... must work. Ok tell me your idea. [P]

GM: [accept]

Ok, my idea? ... I would like to relate with F2's idea. In our teenagers ... we must learn ... only learn; and after that ... after we success in our learning process, we can do any thing we want. [0]

M1: [4's take]

But ... the person haven't any income ... so, he must work and at the same time must learn. M2, tell me your idea, please. [P]

GM: [steal]

F3, tell me your idea. [P]

F3: [miss]

Me?

M2: [4's take]

Yes, you. [p]

F3: [accept]

We're living in a developing country ... /s l z h] we should have to strive to work /mal t/ ... majority of the society lacks money ... but they should have to work. And to earn money ... but they should have to work ... to earn money and study ... right? I mean, it's the condition ... we're living in a developing country. The point is that shortage of money /all /. [0]

M1: [4's take]

What about you? [P]

F1: [miss]

wait, wait.

M1: [4's take]

Ok, F2 [P]

F2: [accept]

I disagree with F3 ... 'cause ... doing two things at the same time is so difficult ... like ... working and learning ... 'cause it would just divide your mind ... uhmm ... at this moment ... we're just ... we can't even take it seriously ... only learning /mal t n w/ than working ... even learning is hard for us ... but don't just go and add some work and it's gonna be so tough for us. So, we should have one thing and work it as much as possible. That's what I have. [0]

F3: [4's take]

First of all you'd have to convince yourself that I should have to do ... both of them at the same time. I mean, if there is a problem ... you just ... like ... you're aiming just to go to university and graduate ...right? [P]

F2: [5's make]

Yeah.

F3: [4's take]

So if you think those things ... you are going to do your work ... at the same time ... both of them at same time. But ...

F2: [6's make]

What kind of work? [P]

F3: [accept]

As a waitress ... /m nam n/ [-]

F2: [4's take]

So, I'm ... gonna learn here and ... go out and ... work? [P]

F3: [accept]

Yes, this is the only solution you've got ...

F2: [6's make]

Uhh ... I don't think ... [-]

GM: [4's take]

But ... we've got two choices. Governmental and private school.

F3: [5's make]

Yeah.

GM: [4's take]

If we don't have the money, we can go and learn in government school. We have the money, we can go and learn ... in private school.

[0]

F3: [4's take]

But another ... we need materials. If your family is just like ... poor ... they can't support you buy, you should have to work ... right? The only problem is you haven't just ... [-]

F2: [6's make]

This moment ... you shouldn't just ... you shouldn't learn.

F3: [6's make]

Why? [P]

F2: [accept]

If you don't have any money ... you should work and ... stop learning

...

M1: [6's make]

We can work and ...

F2: [6's make]

But, you wouldn't be successful in learning. [P]

M1: [steal]

For example, there is no preparatory class ... so ... how can ...[-]

T: [4's take]

Any one? Teenagers must work. Any one agreeing with this statement? ... Uhhh ... is there any one, who disagree? [G]

M2: [3's take]

She (referring to F2) does not agree.

T: [4's take]

And the rest of you? ... Ok why ... what's your reason ... there are a number of reasons ... in order to support ... your financial problem? [G]

M2: [3's take]

If the family doesn't have any money ... while he is learning ... they can support themselves.

T: [4's take]

Nice! And you? Why are you against it? Why do you say we can't do? [P]

GM: [accept]

We can't do two or ...four things ... or ... different things in once. [0]

T: [4's take]

Ok, we can't do? Simultaneously? [P]

GM: [accept]

Yes!

T: [4's take]

Why? [P]

F2: [steal]

'cause ... it's going to be divided ... like ... we can't even concentrate in one thing ... we should be ... to be successful ... we should be concentrated in one thing and (inaudible). [-]

T: [4's take]

But there are living legends ...

F2: [5's make]

Yeah, there are.

T: [4's take]

Who do ... four, five things.

F2: [6's make]

Yeah, there are ... we're just ... not ... uhh ...[-]

T: [4's take]

You are not efficient? Then individual difference or age difference? [P]

M1: [steal]

Maturity

F2: [4's take]

Yeah, maturity.

T: [4's take]

Maturity? ... Good. People at the same age of you ... things they can do  
... three ...four, five things ...

F2: [6's make]

Here? [P]

T: [accept]

Yeah ... Ok go no now. [0]

GM: [4's take]

I don't agree with him (the teacher).

The conversation ends

---

## **Appendix 2: Transcription of Group 2's Discussion**

M1: [4's take]

Let's start from experience. [P]

GM: [accept]

They can accumulate higher experience at a working level age ... we are agreeing on the point that working ... as ... as ... some job experience ... making them ... uh ... generating money ... [-]

M2: [4's take]

They can support their family. [0]

GM: [5's make]

They can support their family.

M1: [4's take]

They ... make them ... to have a better experience in their lives. [-]

GM: [4's take]

With the money they gain, they can either save it or they can either help their family.

M1: [5's make]

Yeah, they gonna (inaudible). [-]

GM: [4's take]

With the money they save, they can help themselves ... they can help themselves by ... by spending the money on different things ... items. [-]

M1: [4's take]

They don't need ... they ... from their family. [0]

GM: [4's take]

They need. [P]

M1: [accept]

No, if they work ... [-]

GM: [4's take]

Because, if they work hard ... with the money they got, they can accumulate.

M2: [5's make]

Yes.

GM: [4's take]

More money ... by the money they ... they have ... they will accumulate or gain ... they can put it in to ... they can put it on better food and also with the help of their parents ... the parent money ... they can pay for higher education ... [-]

M1: [4's take]

They can save money also ... for the future.

GM: [5's make]

They can save money for the future ... their future life which is ahead of them. [0]

T: [4's take]

What's going on here? ... How many of you support? [G]

GM: [3's take]

Unanimous ...unanimous.

T: [4's take]

No one supports the idea? Every body says we shouldn't? [G]

Ss: [3's take]

No, no.

F1: [4's take]

We're supporting.

T: [4's take]

Every body is in favor of the idea? [G]

M2: [3's take]

Yes.

T: [4's take]

In favor? ... So, why don't you work? If you say teenagers must work, why don't you ... yourselves go out and work? [G]

F2: [3's take]

We don't have the time.

T: [5's make]

You don't have the time? [G]

F1, F3: [3's take]

We don't have time.

T: [5's take]

You don't have time? [G]

M1: [3's take]

Yeah.

GM: [4's take]

We can balance it.

T: [4's take]

The whole time ... (inaudible )

M2: [6's make]

We are spending it on learning.

T: [4's take]

You go out at 10:00 ... and then go home ... at least one hour ...

GM: [6's make]

I mean it not some thing bad ...

M1: [6's make]

In our country ... we don't get time. [0]

T: [4's take]

At 11:00, there is a job, you have (inaudible) ... but there is no conducive environment, (inaudible) ... part time job ... one hour, two hours.

M1: [5's make]

Yeah.

GM: [6's make]

There is conducive environment next time we get it carry on. [0]

T: [4's take]

So this means ... in order to develop ... get to know some other activity ... the country condition with ultimate reality ... do that ... you should add ... ok go on. [0]

GM: [4's take]

By the conducive time we ... that is negotiable ... we can properly balance our necessity in learning ... with the job that we are working. So, with above reasons ... teenagers can work with their time ... and can ... and they can accumulate education, experience at their working level ... age ... uhm ... by the money they ... by the ... by the ... ok ... uh ... with the parents help ... they can pay for higher education. So, as a conclusion, we decided working at a teenager level ... uh ... it's not that much hard ... nonetheless ... that means ... uh ... we can ... by working ... we can achieve many things ... uh ... we can achieve experience ...

M1: [6's make]

It goes with the condition of the country.

GM: [5's make]

Yes

F3: [4's make]

In a developing country ...

GM: [6's make]

We can achieve self confidence ... self restrain ... self esteem ... we can accumulate experience ... at working level ... so, by working at this level ... one can achieve ...uh ... one can achieve ... future ...[-]

M1: [4's take]

It is difficult in a developing country.

GM: [4's take]

It is difficult ...

M1: [5's make]

Yeah

GM: [4's take]

But, more or less at future level ... it won't be that much hard.

M1: [5's make]

Yeah.

GM: [4's take]

Because ... we are experienced at a teenage level. So, after higher ambition ... after graduation from university either college, we can work ... so , it won't be that much hard ... uh ... so, we can implement ... this job ... we can ... it won't be much hard ... by accumulating higher experience ... and also with the backing up of our knowledge ... one can get a higher level ... or ... we accumulate much money.

The conversation ends

---

### **Appendix 3: Transcription of Group 3's Discussion**

GM: [4's take]

Ok, let's start from M2. What is your idea? [P]

M2: [Miss]

Wait

GM: [4's take]

Ok, F2 [P]

F2: [miss]

Just wait.

M2: [4's take]

Ok you F1 [P]

M1: [steal]

F2, start, start [P]

M2: [steal]

Yeah, F2 [P]

F2: [accept]

Umm ... I don't think there is advantage but from them ... So, about disadvantage ... Uh ... the disadvantage is ... we need to work in our country ... the income must ... uh ... in our country ... no body should get outta our country. [-]

M1: [4's take]

Uhh ... [-]

M2: [4's take]

Please, uhh ...[-]

M1: Brain drain have ... many, many disadvantage rather than advantage ... because of intellectuals are used ... uh ... that country's resource than ... they are not working in their country ... and they leave in other countries ... so, it has many disadvantage ... In other case ... they migrate to other countries and support their family ... but ... this is more disadvantage for their country. So, the disadvantage of brain drain is more than the advantage. [0]

GM: [4's take]

Ok, M2 [P]

M2: [miss]

M1: [4's take]

Ok, M2 [P]

M2: [miss]

Wait, wait.

GM: [4's take]

Ok, F3 [P]

M1: [steal]

F3 [P]

F3: [accept]

Umm ... It has got disadvantage and advantage. ... Advantage, individually to have a better life ... when we go to developed countries ...

M1: [5's make]

Ok

F3: [accept]

But at a country level ... the disadvantage is higher. Because most of the intellectuals ... I mean when the learned ones go, it would not ... we don't have any developing land ... the country ... [-]

GM: [4's take]

M2 ok [P]

M2: [accept]

Yes, uh ... brain drain ... have disadvantage ... and advantage. The disadvantage is very ... more than the advantage. The advantage is like F3 says for the man who goes out for his family only ... and ... currency for our country ... but if he works in our country ... he will have fixed our budget allotment ... more than you think ... that is why intellectuals ... [-]

M1: [4's take]

Ok, a chance to give for F1 [P]

M2: [steal]

F1 [P]

F1: [accept]

I don't think brain drain has disadvantage ... uh ... because intellectuals are learning here with the country's resource ... the resource ... umm ... are coming from the country ... after learning ... they go to other country and work ... it affects the country. [-]

T: [4's take]

Uhm ... the topic is about how to be calm? [G]

F2: [3's take]

No.

T: [4's take]

Could it? [G]

M2: [3's take]

No, we are explaining the (inaudible) ... [-]

T: [4's take]

It is about whether you support [-]

M2: [5's make]

Yeah

T: [4's take]

Let me guide you ... think about ... especially the development of the country ... and the things associated with the language ... and when a man (inaudible) ... with education ... they learn other language ... (gives longer speech) [-]

M1: [4's take]

Umm... teacher said that ... it affects the language and the culture. I'm not accept this idea, because the society ... they are not accept the language or the culture ... F2 [P]

F2: [accept]

We don't think this can be ... [-]

M1: [4's take]

Make a conclusion ... [P]

GM: [accept]

Ok ... in my opinion ... if the learned ones go to other countries ... there is a big disadvantage to our country ... because ... those of the learned people used our resources to learn here ... means ... as we know ... our learning standard is better than others ... so, if they go to other countries and use their potentials to those countries by means of migration or DV. It is my idea. [0]

F3: [4's take]

Our learned ones are better than the ...

GM: [6's make]

The others.

F3: [4's take]

This is the conclusion? [P]

GM: [accept]

In our si-

F3: [6's make]

How it is very difficult to conclude! [0]

GM: [4's take]

Yeah, ...

M2: [6's make]

If you go ... if you go to other country ... would be very excellent ...

F3: [6's make]

But what we get, the people ... but standardically, the country's ... I mean ... the foreigners ... their education standard is very easy ...

M2: [6's make]

We have ...

GM: [6's make]

Yeah but ...

F3: [6's make]

Therefore, the disadvantage is for them. [0]

GM: [4's take]

How? [P]

F3: [accept]

Because you know, ours is very difficult.

GM: [5's make]

Yeah, we know.

M2: [4's take]

If you go there ...

GM: [6's make]

So our potential is ... so better. [0]

M2: [5's make]

Than them.

M1: [4's take]

Than the fo-

F3: [6's make]

But it is important for ...

M1: [6's make]

Because our education ...

F3: [6's make]

Job opportunity.

M1: [6's make]

Noo ...

M2: [4's take]

So ... if you go there ... you will have opportunity and you will be very successful. [0]

GM: [4's take]

The land ... uh... because our (inaudible) positive.

M2: [4's take]

Yeah ... let's continue with brain drain ... like ...

M1: [6's make]

Because there is no other choice with out education. So, because of that ...

M2: [6's make]

So brain drain is very disadvantage for the developing country.

M1: [5's make]

Yeah.

M2: [4's take]

But it is good for the developed country, they can update the successful person from the developing country. [0]

M1: [5's make]

Of course

M2: [4's take]

What do you think, F2? [P]

F2: [miss]

About this idea? ...[-]

The conversation ends

---