IJLECR
International Journal of Language Education and Culture Review

ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS TURN-TAKING IN GROUP WORK DISCUSSION

Flora[*], Emzir[**]
FKIP Universitas Lampung, Indonesia[*]
Language Teaching Study Program of Graduate Program of Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia[**]
nainggolan.flora@yahoo.com[*]
emzir@gmail.com[**]

ABSTRACT

This content analysis that belongs to qualitative research aims at finding indebth understanding about turn-taking produced by S1 students of FKIP- Lampung University during group work discussion. The data were students utterances during group work discussion. All the data were recorded, transcribed, and were analyzed based on the context in order to find out the students' turn-taking. The result shows that students made turn-taking during the group work discussion and it can be classified into two catagories, namely: 1) by choosing himself, and 2) by choosing others. The speaker chose himself by having four reasons while the speaker chose others by having three reasons. All the turn-takings are made by students in order to finish the task given by the lecturer.

Keywords*: group work discussion, turn-taking, and students' utterances.*

Studies on conversation analysis focused more *turn-taking,* (*adjacency pairs, overall organization, organization and structuring of conversation (*Levinson, 1985; Mey, 1996; Eggins and Slade, 2001). Normally, the people involved in a conversation has role as a speaker or as a listener. Duncan 1974 in Coulthard (1977: 92) stated that it is difficult to analyze a conversation since the speakers's utterances, sometimes, more than one sentence. For example:

A: *How are you feeling?*
B: *Fine thanks.*
B: *And you?*

Based on the data above, it is not clear whether B's utterances is counted one turn-taking or not. Because of this, another expert (Shiffrin, 1994: 106-108)) did research on conversation analysis, especially on turn-taking. He found that someone takes turn to speak for other, as the following example.

Henry   : *Y'want a piece of candy?*
Irene   : *No*
Zelda   : *She's on a diet.*

By saying "*She's on a diet",* the speaker (Zelda) wanted to give reason why Irene did not want to have the candy offered by Henry. Shiffrin did not give further explanation why the speaker (Zelda) speaks for Irene (speak for other). Therefore, multi interpretations can be happened since the real meaning of utterances can only be interpreted correctly by analyzing the context.

Levinson (1985: 318-319) stated that in conversation analysis, the researchers should not only consider the frequency of turn-taking, adjacency pair, and overall

organization. In conversation analysis, accoring to Wray and Bloomer (1998: 54-55), the most important thing is how the speaker produces the utterances based on the context of the conversation. In relation to this, Eggins and Slade (2001: 21), stated that the people involved in interaction of oral conversation take turn to speak by considering the context. Therefore, turn-taking might be happened into ways; how the speaker choose himselt or choose others. In line with this, another expert, Littlejohn and Foss (2008: 147) stated that conversation is an interaction among the people who are involved in a conversation where the turn-taking and the purpose of the conversation.

All the staments given by those experts need to be analyzed deeper since conversation can be happened in different settings and different speakers. Setting and speakers who are involved in a conversation will produce different linguistic choices and different reasons for taking turn. Therefore, this study aims at finding indebth understanding about turn-taking produced by S1 students of FKIP-Lampung University during group work discussion.

METHOD

This study aims at finding indebth understanding about turn-taking produced by S1 students of FKIP- Lampung University during group work discussion. This is a content analysis that belongs to qualitative research. The data were gathered through a 15-20 minute video recording, interview and questionnaire. Krippendrof (1991: 19) stated that content analysis must be justified based on the real context of the data. All students utterances were recorded using video recording. The recorded data were then transcribed and were analyzed based on the context to see the students turn-taking; how the speaker chose him self and how the speaker chose others. To have more valid data, interview was also conducted.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result of the analysis shows that during the group work discussion, the students made turn-taking that can be classified into two catagories, namely: 1) by choosing himself, and 2) by choosing others. The speaker chose himself by having four reasons; (1) as a leader of the group, (2) there is a silence, (3) interuption, and (4) changing the topic. Meanwhile, the speaker chose others by having three reasons; (1) the speaker is not ready yet, (2) asking for opinion, and (3) changing the topic. Each of them will be elaborated below.

1. Turn –Taking by Choosing Himself

During the group work discussion, the student chose himself by having four reasons. They are: 1) as a leader of the group, 2) there is a silence, 3) interuption, and 4) changing the topic. The followings are the explanations of each.

1) As a Leader of the Group

Based on the interview, the students involved in the groups had already made a commitment to choose one as a leader. The leader usually has a role to start the discussion. Knowing his/her position as a leader, s/he chose himself to speak.

(1)
Da   : *In this discussion we have to choose five people, and start from Rima. Who you…you choose?*
(2)
Su   : *Good morning guys. You can see here that there are ten persons that we have to save them from the war situation, what do you think Yuni, what about you?*

2) Silence
The analysis of the data shows that the speaker chose himself to speak because he noticed there is no one to speak (there is silence).
(3)
Ang   : I choose Mr. Sapri.
Da   : Why? He dropped out from the college. Someting not good.
All   : ....(silent)
Si   : But..but no problem I think. He...he has other..he is very handy. You can see in here..in this paper.
(4)
Ni   : Yes, and another. Another person?
All   : …….. (Silent).

Ni   : Why don't we choose Mr. Rettob? He is very….he has four children which his responsibility.

The speaker chose himself to speak in order to continue the discussion. The silence happened because the members in the group still were confused what to say. On extract (3), for example, when the speaker (Ang) chose Mr. Sapri, other member in the group (Da) did not agree with that because some one who dropped out from the college, according to (Da), is not good. The members, including the speaker (Ang) did not give any response to (Da). Finally "Ni" chose himself to speak to continue the conversation.

On extract (4), silence also happened because all the members sill got confused to choose one of the ten persons provided on the task given by the lecturer. Another thing that can be analyzed on extract (4) is about the construction of the sentence. The speaker (Bu) said, "*Yes, the next..the next person to..to be choose...chosen?",* contextually, this sentence belongs to imperative. Roth (2013: 147) stated that imperative is constructed using invinitive, for example: "Bring me that book!" The sentence construction on extract (4) is not in line with the statement given by Roth. Following the sentence construction of imperative defined by Roth, the sentence should be "Choose another person!". Furthermore, Leech (1983:107-110) stated that indirect speech act is more polite than that of direct speech act : (1) *Answer the phone*, (2) *I want you to answer the phone,* (3) *Will you answer the phone?*, (4) *Can you answer the phone?* and (5) *Could you possibly answer the phone).*

The data of this study show that the formula of sentences given by Leech do not occur. For example on extract (4) ; *"Yes, the next..the next person to..to be choose...chosen?"*. Following Leech's statement, this imperative should be : (1) Choose one person, (2) I want you to choose one person, (3) Will you choose one person?, (4) Can you choose one person? and (5) Could you possibly choose one person).

The data of this study show that the construction of the sentences given by Leech were not used by the students for two reasons; 1) they haven't studied the rules, and 2) they focus more on the message. Even though these constructions were not used, the conversation can run well. In short, the students do not pay attention too much on the construction of the sentence. The most important thing is how they can understand each otherand they can finish the task given by the lecturer well.

Even though the construction of sentences on (extract 4) is not as it is stated by Roth, the meaning of the sentence also functions as imperative, that is to ask the members of the group to choose one of the persons provided on the task sheet given by the lecturer. In short, to understand the meaning of the sentence, it is not enough only to see the construction of the statement linguistically but also pragmatically. In other words, context made the peole can interpret the meaning of the sentence well.

3) Interruption

The speaker chose himself to speak because he wanted to interupt other speaker. Interruption in this study means the speaker chose himsel to speak while other speaker has not finininshed experessing his idea. The result of the data analysis shows that interrupton can be classified into two classifications, namely: 1) stating disagreement, and 2) giving help. Each of these two classifications will be discussed.

a) Stating Disagreement

The speaker chose himself to speak by interupting the other speaker. Interruption is done to show disagreement with the idea given by other speaker. Below is the example.

(5)
Ra   : *Dr. Fuad more have many knowledge about health. I think he will share his* ....
Af   **: *But he's too old. He can die every time before transferring his knowledge.***

(6)
Yu   : *Why don't we choose Mr. Rettob? he is very....he has four children which his responsibility. So..he..has to take..take care...hmm........*
Su   : *I think Mr. Rettob..emmm...I think......not good. That's too old...too old...fifty one.*

On extract (5), the speaker (Af) did interruption because he monitored that (Ra) wanted to choose Dr. Fuad. He gave argumentation for not choosing Dr. Fuad. The interruption made by Su (extract 6) also to show disagreement. He (Su) did interruption because he knows that (Yu) wanted to give further arguments to choose Mr. Rettob. To show their disagreement, (Af) and (Su) did not say in direct speech act but in indirect speech act. This is what (Brown and Yule,1983: 31); Mey (1996: 99); Wijana dan Rohmadi (2010: 227) called implicature. Grice quoted by Yule

(1987: 110) stated that in conversation, the speakers need to think the cooperative principles. To put it differently, during the conversation, it should be given the turn for the speakers involved in the conversation so that communication can run well. The result on extract (5) and (6) show that they break the principle of cooperative principle. This result also support Azis's finding (2012) that not all maxims given by Grice are apporipriate in all settings. This situation happens because all the members in the group discussion spoke spontaneously and they focus on finishing the task given by the lecturer. Each member tried to give argumentation in order to have a good result of discussion.

b) Giving Help

(7)

Ire : *But I don't like him because he is homosexual and...uhmm...He is ofcourse...umh..*

Ni **: dangerous...haa...haa.**

Ire : yes...yes..

(8)

Ri : *Because…ehmmm….. you know that he is a doctor, and in war situation, we need umm...we need doctors to umm..…*

Da ***: take care the victim.***

Ri : *Yes, to take care the victims of the war and I think it is a good choice for the war situation.*

So : Mmm… Iya.

On extract (7) and (8) the speakers (Ni) and (Da) interupted (Ire) and (Ri) because they noticed that the speakers (Ire) and (Ri) had problem to complete their sentences. Their interlocutors (Ni) and (Da) interrupted them in order to give a help. The interlocutors (Ni) and (Da) could give a help correctly because of the context. Schiffrin (1994: 366) stated that context is as knowledge which is called *constitutive rules*; the knowledge needed by the speakers in order to understand the utterances. An interesting finding of this study is about code-switching. Eventhough students have problem in expressing their ideas in English, they never switch it into their own language, Indonesian language. They prefer to leave their sentences incompletely, hoping their interlocutors can help them. Based on the interview, they did so because they think that they should speak in English since the class is in Speaking class so they have to use English during the learning activity.

4) Changing the Topic

In daily conversation, it is usually found that people change the topic of conversation. It also happned during the group work discussion. The topic of the discussion given by the lecurer is choosing five out of ten persons provided on the task. Then, automatically there was changing of the topic. In turn-taking, students chose himself to speak because s/he wanted to change the topic of conversation. S/he did so for some reasons, namely: a) there is already agreement for one topic, and b) there is no agreement for the topic.

a) There is already agreement for one topic

(9)

Da   : Ok, it is Mr. Rettob

Ang   : I think it is good.

Da   : And the... the last I choose Dr. Lee.

(10)

An   : I think we should save Mrs. Lee.

Yu   : Mrs. Lee? Why?

An   : She is enough young 38, a counselor in mental clinic, good health, active in community. She is a counselor in mental clinic, I think it is important to help the victim of the war because of course the victim have trauma. I think Mrs. Lee is helpful for our government to recovery the mental of the victim

Yu   : Iya, I agree with you and she is active in community. I think that useful in war situation, if we have another members of organization we can call them to help in the war situation, and I think that is useful.

Angg   : Iya. Good.. Hmmm...the other..the other person is Dr. Fuad. He is a doctor and we need him to...to help..help war victims

On extract (9) the speaker chose himself by changing the topic because he knows that all the members in the group already agree with the topic being discussed, that is to choose Mr. Rettob. The same thing also happend to the speaker (Angg) on extract (10).

b) There is no agreement for the topic

Based on data analysis, some of the students tried to defend his idea by giving some argumentations, and consequently the discussion got stuck. To avoid this situation, other speaker chose himself to speak by changing the topic.

(11)

Da   : And the...... the last I choose Dr. Lee.

Nu   : Dr. Lee? Why?

Da   : Because umm…he is still young and he has Ph.D title and he is university professor and especially active organization.

Nu   : He has no religion.

Da   : I think it is no problem umm…to choose him because he can help us with his previous learning activity. So..umm..religious is about individual problem. Umm….I think no problem if he has no religion. Then he has good health and he is still young.

Nu   : But ..but it's not good.

Da   : You see...he is a doctor...can..can help people in war situation...like this.

Nu   : No religion...is atheist...ego...

Ri   : I think the next person umm..must be survived in war situation is Mrs. Lee.

By monitoring the situation, the speaker (Ri) concluded that it is difficult to make decision. Knowing this situation, the speaker (Ri) chose himself to speak by moving to other topic. In short, the speaker chose him self to speak in order to make the communication more effective.

(12)

H : *I choose Dr. Fuad. Because he is a civil, I think he can save all person and he is a doctor. So, I think he will contribute in this war situation. That's my opinion*

Ar : *I absolutelly agree with Hamdan because we need doctor in a war situation and without him too. So,I think Dr. Fuad should survive first in this situation.*

M : *Ok, I agree with Hamdan that Dr. Fuad give many advantages in war situation, but don't forget if he has heart attact and 66 years old. How if the heart attack comes again?*

B : *So, you are dissagree?*

M : *No, I agree but I just think if how if his heart attack come in war situation?*

B : *Ok, but I think that in a doctor need much time to get the knowledge. I think it's good if I survive him*

H : Ok, I know what you mean. But if you dissagree, who will you save?

M : *I will choose Mrs. Tan, because of she is a eletronic engineer and in war situation some electronic devices will be broken, so we need electronic engineer.*

On extract (12) actually the interlocutor (M) did not agree with her interlocutor's idea who choose Dr. Fuad. The interlocutor (M) did not want to say directly that she did not agree and it makes (B) confused and keeps asking directly whether (M) agrees or not. By monitoring this situation (H) assumed that (M) actually did not agree to choose Dr. Fuad and finally he (H) chose himself to speak by saying , "*Ok, I know what you mean. But if you dissagree, who will you save?* And (M) said, "*I will choose Mrs. Tan*". The speaker (H) can understand (M) because both of them (M) and (H) come from the same tribe that is Javanese while (B) is from Sumatera. From these data it can be concluded that knowing the speakers' culture makes people can understand each other easily.

2. Choosing other

Choosing other in this study means giving turn to speak for other people who are involved in the conversation. Based on data analysis, it can be classified into two catagories; 1) the speaker is not ready yet, 2) asking for opinion, and 3) changing the topic.

1) The speaker is not ready yet

During the group work discussion, each member in the group has a symmetrical role in finishing the task. Based on the interview, the speaker chose other to speak because he is not ready yet to express his idea. In other words, he still got confused what to say about the topic being discussed. In this situation, the speaker chose other to speak in order to avoid the silence.

(13)

Af : Kharis?

Kh   : I will choose Mary Jung.

2) Asking Opinion

In this group work discussion, the speaker gave turn for other people to speak in order to ask his/her opinion.

(13)

Su   : What do you think Nidya?
Ni   : What?
Yu   : About Mrs. Tan.
Ni   : I agree with Yuni.

The speaker needs other's opinion about the topic being discussed. In short, she chose other to give his opinion so that the decision can be met. By having the decision, they can move to other topic. Besides, the speaker also wants all the members in group to participate in the discussion.

3) Changing the Topic.

Similar to the turn-taking (choosing himself), turn-taking (choosing others) is also divided into two classifications, namely: **1)** There is already agreement for choosing the topic, and 2) There is no agreement for choosing the topic.

a) There is already agreement for Choosing the Topic

The speaker chose other to speak after all the members agree with one of the topics provided on the task given by the lecturer.

(14)

Lu   : I think I will save Mrs Lee. The point is she is a master of phsychology and the effect of war is in mental and we need phsycholog to grow their spirit.
Ar   : Iya, because that is the important effect, mental.
M   : Ok, so next Barry?
B   : I will save Kasim Ismail because he is active in civil right. So I think he can make a link to get help after the war situation.

b) There is no agreement for choosing the topic

(15)

Nid   : *Why you choose Mr. Sapri?*
Yu   : *Because he is young and starting last year of medical school, you know. In the war …that is maybe ya…useful for the situation in war, even though he is suspected homosexual tha is not mean he is homosexual. He is in good health, very handy, and enjoy sport. I think that very useful in war situation because I think if he enjoy in sport the will aaa….he has good healthy.*
An   : *Even though he is homosexual?*

Yu   : *Iya, but he is just suspected not mean that he is real homosexual.*
An   : But...but almost...later..... real..real *homosexual.*
Yu   : How do you know?
An   : Iya...usually like that.
Su   : So, who is your choice Nidya?
Nid   : I choose Mrs. Lee.

On extract (15) both the speakers (An) and (Yu) gave repeated argumentations. They did so because their intentions have not been met yet. Knowing this situation, the speaker (Su) asked other (Nid) to give her opinion by choosing other topic. This study is in line with De Beaugrande's statement (1981: 113-137) who stated the the speaker usually repeats his statement using various kinds of sentences because his intentation has not been met yet.

CONCLUSION

During group work discussion, the students speak spontaneosly and focus more in finishing the task given by the lecturer. They take turn to speak by choosing himself and by choosing others. This type of turn-taking happens based on the situation during the group work discussion. Most of students' utterances are in the form of indirect speech act. Indirect speech act can be understood clearly because all the members have the same background knowledge about the topic.

SUGGESTION

Based on the transcription of students' utterances during group work discussion, there are some ungrammatical sentences. Therefore, those who use group work in teaching speaking subject, it will be better if the lecturers notify the ungrammatical sentences and discuss them. This is done since all the students will be English teachers. In addition, this study has not discussed deeper about other area of turn-taking. For example, how do two (more) speakers who begin to speak at the same time and who will be let first to speak and why.

REFERENCES

Azis, *Bentuk Tindak Tutur Berbahasa Indonesia di Kelas. Penelitian Etnografi Komunikasi pada Mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Fakultas Bahasa dan Sastra, Universitas Makasar*, Sinopsis Disertasi. Jakarta: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Jakarta, 2012.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Coulthard, Malcolm. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Harlow: Longman Group Ltd,1977.

De Beaugrande, Robert Alain and Dressler Wolfgang Ulrich. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London : Longman,1981.

Eggins, Suzanne and Diana Slade. *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Continuum, 2001.

Krippendorff, Klaus. *Analisis Isi: Pengantar Teori dan Metodologi*, terjemahan Farid Wajidi. Jakarta: Rajawali Press, 1991.

Levinson, Stephen C. *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Littlejhon, W. Stephen, and A. Foss Karen. *Theories of Human Communication*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 2008.

Mey, Jacob L. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1994.

Roth, Moshe. "Directives in English and Hebrew: The Issue of Politeness and Problems for Learners"*, 2ⁿᵈ Annual International Conference Proceedings: Language, Literature & Linguistics (L3)*. Singapore: Global Science &Technology Forum (GSTF), 2013: 147-151.

Schiffrin, Deborah. *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Yule, George. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Wijana, I Dewa Putu dan Muhammad Rohmadi. *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik:Kajian Teori dan Analisis*. Surakarta: Yumma Pustaka, 2010.

Wray, Alison. Kate Trott and Aileen Bloomer. *Projects in Linguistics: A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. London: Arnold Publisher,1998.