

T.C.
ÇANAKKALE ONSEKİZ MART UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

DISCUSSION TECHNIQUE IN ENGLISH CONVERSATION CLASSES

MA THESIS

Submitted By
Mehtap SAVAŞ YÜCE

145679

Supervisor
Assoc.Prof.Dr.Dinçay KÖKSAL

Çanakkale 2004

145679

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne
Mehmet SAVAS... YÜKSEK... ÜYE... "Discussion Technique" adlı
Çalışma, jürimiz tarafından Yabancı Diller...
..... Anabilim/Anasanaat Dalında
DOKTORA / SANATTA YETERLİK / YÜKSEK
LİSANS TEZİ olarak kabul edilmiştir.

(İmza)
Başkan Doç. Dr. Ömer KOKTAÇ (Danışman)
Akademik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı

(İmza)
Üye Yrd. Doç. Dr. İ. Hakkı MİRİCİ
Akademik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı (Danışman)

(İmza)
Üye Yrd. Doç. Dr. Binay GENÇİLER
Akademik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı

(İmza)
Üye Yrd. Doç. Dr. Levent TOKOĞLU
Akademik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı (Danışman)

(İmza)
Üye Yrd. Doç. Dr. İ. Hakkı ERGEN
Akademik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı tartışma tekniğinin öğrencilerin iletişimsel performansı üzerindeki etkisini belirlemektir. Bu çalışma aynı zamanda öğrencilerin akıcılık, motivasyon ve derse katılımı konusunda bir ilerleme kaydedip kaydetmediğini belirlemeyi hedeflemiştir.

Bu açıdan Hava Harp Okulu'nda okuyan yabancı dil öğrencilerine dil seviyelerini belirlemek amacıyla öntest verilerek veri toplanmıştır. Akademik yılın başında uygulanan öntest San Antonio Lackland Hava Üssü'nde bulunan Hava Lisan Okulu'nda geliştirilmiştir. Bu test aynı zamanda Hava Harp Okulu'nda da öğrencilerin dil seviyelerini belirlemek için kullanılmaktadır.

Tanımlayıcı istatistikler göstermiştir ki, öntest (pretest) de deney grubunun notları başarı açısından 1. ve 2nci kontrol gruplarından sonra gelmektedir. Ancak 3ncü kontrol grubu, deney grubu ve diğer kontrol gruplarından daha az başarı göstermişlerdir. Daha sonra birden fazla kıyaslamalarla (multiple comparisons), öntest (pretest) ve sontestleri (posttest) uygulayan öğretmenler not verme açısından birbirleriyle karşılaştırıldılar ve sonuç olarak aralarında fark bulunmadığı, not verme açısında güvenilirlik olduğu kaydedildi. Bu da şunu göstermiştir ki öğretmenlerin birbirlerinden bağımsız olarak verdikleri notlar birbirlerine çok yakındır.

Bahar döneminde deney ve kontrol gruplarına tartışma tekniğinin deney grubundaki etkisini belirlemek amacıyla bir sontest uygulanmıştır. Oneway ANNOVA testi kontrol grubunun sontestten en yüksek notunun (M= 75,40) olduğu, hemen arkasından da deney grubunun (M=70,33) geldiğini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu iki grup kıyaslandığında, iki grubun aldıkları not açısından belirli bir farklılık yoktur. Ayrıca deney grubunun aynı seviyedeki diğer üç grup içinden en düşük notları alan öğrencilerden oluşturuldukları göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, bu elde edilen sonucun deney grubu açısından kayda değer bir başarı olduğu

görülmektedir. Bu sonuç aynı zamanda tartışma tekniğinin deney grubu üzerinde etkili olduğunu da kanıtlamıştır.

Son olarak, t-testi (t-test) sonucu öğrencilerin sınıfta güz döneminden bu yana büyük bir ilerleme kaydettiklerini göstermiştir. Tartışma tekniğinin Hava Harp Okulu'nda işe yaradığı görülmüştür. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin ilgisini çekecek tartışma konuları bulmak, onlara tartışmaları için bir amaç vermek ve çok iyi bir planlama yapmak gibi bazı etmenleri de göz önünde bulundurduğumuzda, tartışma tekniğinin öğrencilere hem dilde akıcılığı geliştirmelerini hem de iletişimsel becerilerini geliştirmelerine imkan sağlayacaktır.



ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of discussion technique on students' communicative performance. The study also aimed to determine if there was any improvement on students' fluency, motivation and participation.

To these ends, in the study data were collected from Turkish military EFL students who were administered a pretest in order to determine their oral language performance level. At the beginning of Academic Year, the pretest which was developed by the researcher based on the test prepared by the Defence Language Institute (DLI), Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio. This test is also used by Turkish Air Force Academy to determine oral language performance of the students at TAFA:

Descriptive statistics showed that in pretest the scores of experiment group followed those of control group 1 and then control group 2 in terms of their success. Yet control group 3 showed less performance than the experiment group as well as control group 1 and 2. Using multiple comparisons, instructors who administered the pre and posttests were compared within each other in terms of scoring; and no significant difference was recorded in terms of scoring reliability. This showed that scoring granted by the instructors was very close.

At the end of the Spring Term, the experiment group and control groups were administered a posttest to determine the impact of discussion technique on the experiment group. Oneway ANNOVA test revealed that control group 1 ($M=75,40$) had the highest score in the posttest, immediately followed the experiment group ($M=70,33$). When these two groups are compared, the difference in scores of these groups is not significant. Furthermore, when we consider the fact that experiment group was conducted from the students who got the lowest score among the four pre-intermediate level groups, this confirms considerable improvement in the experiment

group. It also proves that discussion technique was effective on this group.

Finally, t-test reveals that the students have showed a great deal of improvement in the posttest since the Winter Term. It is concluded that discussion will work with the students at TAFA. Moreover, considering some factors such as choosing an interesting topic which will draw students' interest, giving students purpose for debate, and careful planning, the discussion technique will provide students with opportunity to practise fluency as well as communicative skill.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people whose contribution to the preparation of this thesis I need to acknowledge.

I would like to acknowledge my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dinçay KÖKSAL for his guidance for the study. His understanding and readiness to help me gave me strength and effort to finish the study.

I also owe thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı ERTEN for his professional assistance and friendly attitude whenever I needed.

I must thank my colleagues in English Teaching Department at Turkish Air Force Academy for their sincere contributions.

I would like to thank Zeliha KATIRCI for her assistance with the SPSS programme at the analysis stage of the study.

My sincere thanks are due to Işın ERGÜDER for his precious contribution. I am grateful to him for his encouraging motivation, positive energy, and his valuable contribution in applying pre and post-tests, his professional and constructive comments with the study.

I would like to express my love to Emrah YÜCE, my husband and my best friend, for his unfailing support, patience, trust, and valuable contribution to the study.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest respect, love and thanks to my parents for their support and trust.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	
ÖZET	i
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY.....	1
1.2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	3
1.3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	4
1.4. ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY	5
1.5. LIMITATIONS	5
1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	6
CHAPTER TWO.....	7
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.0. INTRODUCTION.....	7
2.1. GENERAL THEORY OF HOW PEOPLE LEARN.....	7
2.2. HOW COGNITIVISTS ACCOUNT FOR SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING.....	9
2.3. LEARNING STRATEGIES.....	10
2.4. FLUENCY DEVELOPMENT IN SLA	11
2.5. A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST MODEL: LONG’S INTERACTION HYPOTHESIS.....	11
2.6. COMMUNICATION TASKS	13

2.7. AIM FOR A DISCUSSION	14
2.8. SIGNIFICANCE OF DISCUSSION.....	14
2.9. SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR ESL TEACHERS	17
2.10. APPROACHES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF DISCUSSION SKILL .	21
2.10.1. PRE-DISCUSSION.....	22
2.10.1.1. FORMING THE GROUPS.....	22
2.10.1.2. IDENTIFYING AND ORGANIZING THE TOPICS	23
2.10.2. DISCUSSION	23
2.10.2.1. OBSERVER-RING	23
2.10.2.2. SHADOWING	24
2.10.2.3. USING VIDEOS AND AUDIO RECORDERS	24
2.10.3. POST-DISCUSSION	25
2.11. WHY GROUP WORK.....	25
2.12. CHAPTER SUMMARY	27
CHAPTER THREE	28
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY.....	28
3.0. INTRODUCTION.....	28
3.1. OBJECTIVES	28
3.2. ASSUMPTIONS	29
3.3. SUBJECTS.....	30
3.4. SETTING	31
3.5. INSTRUMENTS	31
3.5.1. WHY A DISCUSSION TECHNIQUE WAS CHOSEN	31
3.5.2. PRE AND POSTTESTS	32
3.6. METHOD AND PROCEDURES	33
3.6.1. DISCUSSION	33
3.6.1.1. SETTING	33
3.6.1.2. PLANNING AND ORGANIZING DISCUSSION.....	34
3.6.1.3. PROCEDURE	37
3.6.1.4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	38
3.6.2. PRE AND POSTTESTS	38

3.6.2.1. SETTING	38
3.6.2.2. PROCEDURE	38
3.6.2.3. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	39
3.7. CHAPTER SUMMARY	40
CHAPTER FOUR	41
EVALUATION OF THE STUDY	41
4.0. INTRODUCTION.....	41
4.1. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	41
4.1.1. DISCUSSION TECHNIQUE.....	41
4.1.2. PRETEST	43
4.1.3. POSTTEST.....	44
4.1.4. COMPARISONS OF TWO TESTS.....	47
4.2. IMPLICATIONS.....	51
4.3. CHAPTER SUMMARY	52
CHAPTER FIVE.....	53
CONCLUSION.....	53
5.0. INTRODUCTION.....	53
5.1. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	53
5.2. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	55
REFERENCES.....	57
APPENDICES.....	61

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table 1</u> : Discussion topics.....	35
<u>Table 2</u> : Oneway ANNOVA Test : Inter-rater reliability between instructors.....	43
<u>Table 3</u> : Dependent variable: multiple comparisons in pretest.....	44
<u>Table 4</u> : Oneway ANNOVA Test : Inter-rater reliability between instructors.....	45
<u>Table 5</u> : Dependant variable : the multiple comparisons in posttest.....	45
<u>Table 6</u> : Oneway ANNOVA Test : Inter-rater reliability between instructors of experiment and control groups.....	46
<u>Table 7</u> : Dependent variable: multiple comparisons of groups in posttest.....	47
<u>Table 8</u> : T-test: Paired Samples Statistics of Instructor 1.....	48
<u>Table 9</u> : T-test: Paired Samples Statistics of Instructor 2.....	48
<u>Table 10</u> : T-test: Paired Samples Statistics of Instructor 3.....	48

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure 1</u> : Observation and evaluation sheet.....	23
<u>Figure 2</u> : One-to one peer-evaluation sheet.....	24
<u>Figure 3</u> : Lesson plan.....	36
<u>Figure 4</u> : Pretest topics.....	39
<u>Figure 5</u> : Posttest topics.....	39
<u>Figure 6</u> : Evaluation Criterion.....	40



CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter firstly presents a brief description of the background to the study. It then states the purpose of the study and the general and specific research questions are addressed in the study. Next it gives a brief description of the significance of the study, its assumptions and the limitations. The chapter finally ends with the organization of the thesis.

1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In all classes of Turkish Air Force Academy (hereafter, TAFA) students study ALC (American Language Course) books. The first grade students (freshmen) follow the books from 13 to 17 (five books) in Winter Term and 18 to 22 (five books) in Spring Term. Each set of book has activities which aim to develop four skills “Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing”. There are 12 hours of English course a week for the freshmen, two hours of which are studied in the language laboratories. Lessons take 40 minutes. And a book is to be finished in three weeks. In each book of ALC has four units and a revision unit. Speaking activities are not included in every unit. Among these four skills, speaking is the least practised skill in the classroom , most probably because it requires time-consuming activities.

Students are sometimes required to repeat example dialogues in the units and then to write a similar dialogue. They practise the dialogues with their pairs afterwards. They could also be asked to discuss the problems presented in some units and to find solutions to them. Speaking activities such as problem solving and role playing need a lot of preparation and do not allow all the students to practise on the same day. Considering the classroom size from 20 to 24 at most, the number of

students is not many. Nevertheless, considering the time arranged for each unit to finish, time consuming exercises are not eligible for the schedule.

However, from the perspective of the objectives in foreign language teaching and the objectives at TAFE, what is important is to teach the students to speak the target language accurately, fluently, and intelligibly. Teaching speaking is crucial at every stage of foreign language teaching. The students should be participants rather than passive receivers. Moreover, acquiring the ability to speak English is a necessity for TAFE because Turkish Military Force needs highly qualified personnel to represent their country in the meetings, symposiums, combined headquarters abroad and the personnel who have enough knowledge of English to represent their country.

There is another issue to point out. How much of this study can be applied to TAFE? Is it eligible for the students at military school? These are also the research questions in the study. Students are educated and trained in the military way. They are also expected to behave in terms of military customs in the classrooms. They are expected to sit still; and only to speak when they are asked questions. Classroom setting is the same in all classrooms and students are not allowed to walk around in the classroom. This would not be a good picture for a language classroom. There is a general fact that a foreign language can be best learned in a natural environment. The more opportunities we create for natural environment, the better the students will learn. Problem solving, discussing the real life problems, issues and finding solutions to these sound natural as these are the daily activities we do in our daily lives. Moreover, discussion techniques need careful organization and careful presentation of thoughts and critical thinking. These are also the qualifications required for military personnel to have.

1.2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The aim of the study is to determine the impact of discussion technique on students' motivation and oral communication performance at TAFA. The main aim of the discussion is fluency practice, as it is assumed that the participants already know enough English to produce necessary structures and vocabulary. Moreover, students will learn how to participate in a discussion and to think critically, logically and; consequently, to improve debating skills.

To these ends, students were handed out discussion topics on slips and asked to prepare supporting ideas. The students were first divided into two groups at random randomly (not according to their real opinions), so that many would find themselves in a setting in which they have to argue in favour of something they are against, or vice versa. The number of groups was corresponding.

Moreover, students were also administered a pre-test to see their proficiency level and a post-test to determine the progress in language practice. The data collected were then analyzed to find answers to the following research questions.

Research questions of the study are:

- 1) Does "discussion technique" work at TAFA?
- 2) Is there a change in the level of speaking skill of the students who participated in the classroom discussion?
- 3) What is the relationship between language practice and efficiency in language?
- 4) Is there a relationship between the language use frequency and students' motivation, participation, willingness, or self-confidence?

This motivation could be provided by organizing discussions on specific subjects which draw students' attention. Discussions are useful to explore material, to share new examples from diverse backgrounds, to examine and defend ideas. If they are given opportunity to state, share and defend their own ideas, they will be involved in the classroom activity and use the target language as much as possible.

1.3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Speaking is the oral communication of thoughts and feelings. Speech activities encourage students' social competence as well as their understanding and facility with language. Many researchers have shown that oral language is a powerful learning tool. It shapes, modifies, extends and organizes thought. Oral language, in this sense, is a foundation of all language development and, therefore, the foundation of all learning. It provides a base for the other language strands. Through speaking and listening, students learn concepts, develop vocabulary and perceive the structure of the English language, which are essential components of leaning.

Students who have a strong oral language base have an academic advantage. School achievement depends on students' ability to display knowledge in a clear and acceptable form in speaking as well as writing. To speak fluently and confidently in a variety of situations is a central human need and an important goal of education.

In the light of the important points of spoken language stated above, this study will be beneficial to both the teachers of English, and the students at TAFA and will also contribute to the development or enrichment of new curriculum. Teachers of English will experience how to use discussion techniques in the classroom, how to get students involved in the lesson, how to plan and organize a classroom discussion. Teachers will also learn that with a good organization, a good ending language is perfectly practised. Through a discussion, teachers will realize that it is easy to get information on what language is actively known, and what is not, what is used rightly and what needs correction and practice.

Students will have a chance to practise and improve fluency. Through discussions they will see what they lack in vocabulary, structures, grammar and pronunciation. In this way, they will correct their pronunciation, the amount of vocabulary will increase and/or they will practise the vocabulary they already know. It will also give a chance to search on internet, think on the issues in the world and to arrange their thoughts , as well as to decide how to support their ideas (how to debate). Their hesitation to speak will diminish, so this will lead to self-confidence...

This study will also be helpful for the ELT procedure at TAFE. Students' performance in discussion activities will give an idea of organizing discussion groups regularly every week. The increase in motivation and interest in the lesson will give a clue in the importance and the efficiency of speaking skill. When the students graduate, they will have almost no problem in communicating in English. This will also be helpful for their improvement in other skills.

1.4. ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted under the assumptions that classroom discussions would be more informative, practical, and easy to apply, and provide feedback, more interesting and motivating than the other activities. The amount of vocabulary would increase as they would need to search for some objective words to discuss the ideas, they would realize their errors in pronunciation and they would correct them. Furthermore, they would realize how important it was to practise speaking skills to improve other skills as well.

Students' participation in discussion session will improve their fluency as well as their motivation and enthusiasm. Students will be more efficient in language practice than they have been before. A new viewpoint would be presented and applied at TAFE. This would open a new door to new ideas to apply at school and would help students improve their language fluency.

1.5. LIMITATIONS

The limitations of the study are:

- 1) We do not have much time to observe the discussions. The study takes place in a short time (40 minutes a week).
- 2) Students may display a lack of interest in developing suggested discussion topics.
- 3) The classroom is randomly divided into two groups. Some students may resent being asked to argue against the discussion topic they are assigned when they feel very strongly for it.

- 4) Boys are in majority in ELT classes, so the data collected in the research will mostly represent the boys.
- 5) In forty-minute period holding a discussion may be difficult and if we want all our students to speak, it may be impossible.
- 6) The discussion may be dominated by a few fluent speakers.
- 7) The presence of cameras and recorders can be distracting.
- 8) Students concern about the language credit to pass the class may cause frustration of not being able to communicate effectively in the foreign language.

1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

There are five chapters in this study. Chapter One makes an introduction to the study and presents the background to the study. It also explains the purpose of the study and gives the limitations. Chapter One ends with a description of the organization of the thesis.

Chapter Two presents a review of literature on “discussion” technique in language teaching. Approaches to the development of discussion are introduced. It also describes the implementation of classroom discussion.

Chapter Three describes the study. It presents assumptions, subjects, setting, instruments, method and procedures of the study and analyses of the data.

Chapter Four is the evaluation of the study. It discusses the results in the light of the data and presents the implications.

Finally, in Chapter Five a brief summary of the study is given. Then, it presents some implications for learners and teachers with some very useful suggestions and limitations for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter starts with reviewing different ideas about the second language acquisition. Then, it describes the development of fluency from the cognitive point of view. Furthermore, learning strategies and fluency development in SLA (second language acquisition) are presented. A social constructivist model is introduced. This chapter also presents communication tasks. Then, it tries to explain the aim and significance of discussion. This chapter will also provide some suggestions for ESL teachers and a good introduction to the main points in discussion technique and discussion teaching. Finally, the important points of group work will be discussed.

2.1. GENERAL THEORY OF HOW PEOPLE LEARN

Krashen (1980:168) regarded the Input Hypothesis as “the single most important concept in second language acquisition today”, in that it attempts to answer the critical question of how we acquire language. Krashen (1980:168) claims that if input is understood and there is enough of it, the necessary grammar is automatically provided. Speaking is a result of acquisition and not its cause. The ability to communicate in a second language cannot be taught directly but “emerges” on its own as a result of building competence via comprehensible input. In other words, speaking cannot be taught directly or very early in the language-classroom. Speech will “emerge” once the acquirer has built up enough comprehensible input. However, Brown (2000:281) argues against Krashen’s claims. He points out that the notion that speech will “emerge” in a context of comprehensible input sounds promising, and for some learners (bright, highly motivated, outgoing learners), speech will indeed emerge. He also says that :

But we are left with no significant information from Krashen's theories on what to do about the other half (or more) of our language students for whom speech does not "emerge" and for whom the "silent period" might last forever...

Moreover, Krashen (1985) has argued that speaking is necessary for acquiring a second language. In his view, the only role that the speaker's output plays is to provide a further source of comprehensible input. Other researchers would argue that *understanding* new form is not enough; the learner must be given the opportunity to produce the new forms. Swain (1985) has argued for the importance of "comprehensible output". Swain points out that much incoming second language input is comprehensible, without any need for a full grammatical analysis. If we do not need to pay attention to the grammar in order to understand message, why should we be compelled to learn it? On the other hand, when we try to say something in our chosen second language, we are forced to make grammatical choices and hypotheses, in order to put our utterances together. The act of speaking forces us to try out our ideas about how the target grammar actually works, and of course gives us the chance of getting some feedback from interlocutors who may fail to understand our efforts. Swain and Lapkin (1995) also offered convincing evidence for their Output Hypothesis in their study. They claimed that Output Hypothesis was at least as significant as input, if not more so, in explaining learner success. In a review of the Output Hypothesis, de Bot (1996:529) states "output serves an important role in second language acquisition ... because it generates highly specific input the cognitive system needs to build up a coherent set of knowledge."

Mitchell and Myles (1998:15) state in their study that Krashen was unusual in not seeing any central role for language production in his theory of second language acquisition. Most other theoretical viewpoints support in some form the common-sense view that speaking a language is helpful for learning, though they offer a wide variety of explanations as to why this should be the case. Mitchell and Myles (1998) gives example from the behaviourist learning theory as they saw regular (oral) practice as helpful in forming correct language "habits."

Krashen's Input Hypothesis which claims that "human acquire language in only one way - by understanding messages, or by receiving 'comprehensible input'... We move from *i*, our current level, to *i + 1*, the next level along the natural order, by understanding input containing *i + 1*" (Krashen 1985:2), has been criticized by Brown (2000:280). Brown reports Krashen's claim about his Input Hypothesis "comprehensible input is the only causative variable in second language acquisition, in other words, success in a foreign language can be attributed to input alone."

Brown is against Krashen's hypothesis:

... reading, listening to a conversation, or watching a movie — in any language. This is your input. But your intake is what you take with you over a period of time and can later remember. Krashen (1983) did suggest that input gets converted to intake through a learner's process of linking forms to meaning and noticing "gaps" between the learner's current internalized rule system and the new input. Others have noted, however, that these processes "are not clearly operationalized or consistently proposed (Brown 2000:280).

2.2. HOW COGNITIVISTS ACCOUNT FOR SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

Cognitive psycholinguists have investigated the development of fluency in learners and how learners improve access to their linguistic system with time and practice. They believe that language is inseparable from other aspects of cognition. Cognitive psychology illustrated a model to the question of how the learner's speech becomes more fluent. In Anderson's ACT model (Adaptive Control of Thought), which is not dissimilar to McLaughlin's, it is claimed that practice leading to automatization also plays a central role. It enables *declarative knowledge* (i.e. knowledge *that*) to become *procedural knowledge* (i.e. knowledge *how*). (Mitchell & Myles 1998:87).

To illustrate this shift from declarative to procedural knowledge in the context of second language learning, Mitchell and Myles (1998) quoted what Anderson, himself, speculated :

When we learn a foreign language in classroom situation, we are aware of the rules of the language, especially just after a lesson that spells them out. One might argue that our knowledge of the language at that time is declarative. We speak the learned language by using general rule-following procedures applied to the rules we have learned, rather than speaking directly, as we do in our native language. Not surprisingly, applying this knowledge is a much slower and painful process than applying the procedurally encoded knowledge of our own language. Eventually, if we are lucky, we can come to know a foreign language as well as we know our native language. At that point, we often forget the rules of the foreign language. It is as if the class-taught declarative knowledge had been transformed into a procedural form.

Here Anderson claims that the learner's speech might become more fluent as more knowledge becomes proceduralized, and might, therefore, be accessed more quickly and efficiently. Anderson's model has been applied to two strands: to the application of learning strategies to the second language learning problem, and to the development of second language fluency (Mitchell and Myles 1998:89).

2.3. LEARNING STRATEGIES

Learning strategies procedures are undertaken by the learner in order to make their own language learning as effective as possible. They may include (O'Malley and Chamot 1990:43)....

- * focusing on selected aspects of new information,
- * analyzing and monitoring information during acquisition,
- * organizing or elaborating on new information during the encoding process,
- * evaluating the learning when it is completed, or assuring oneself that the learning will be successful as a way to allay anxiety.

However, Mitchell and Myles (1998:90) state a problem raised by O'Malley and Chamot. The problem stated is that teaching strategies will involve a considerable investment of time and effort in order to be effective (before the skills taught can become proceduralized); therefore, long-term studies are required to realize the effects of strategy teaching. Mitchell and Myles also claim that the

research O'Malley and Chamot did suggests some positive effects of strategy teaching on vocabulary development, listening comprehension, and oral production.

2.4. FLUENCY DEVELOPMENT IN SLA

According to Mitchell and Myles (1998:92), Towel and Hawkins have incorporated aspects of the ACT model into their overall model of second language learning, in order to account for fluency development. Their model attempts to integrate how learners learn the second language system with how they learn to use the system.

The internally derived hypotheses about L2 structure (shaped by UG and the L1) are stored in different ways in the mind at different stages of the learning process. In a first stage, a hypothesis will be stored in the declarative long-term memory (controlled). When put to use, this kind of internally derived knowledge will give a rise to a production stored in the procedural long-term memory. The hypothesis may be then be revised and cause some reorganization of the declarative knowledge, which will then give rise to other revised productions. Eventually, after successful reorganizations, these productions will become autonomous and are stored as such in the "autonomous" part of the procedural memory (Mitchell and Myles 1998:93).

Mitchell and Myles (1998:93) state in their study that cognitive approaches have enlightened on what processes are involved in the speeding up of the acquisition process and this enabled many pedagogical implications to be drawn.

2.5. A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST MODEL: LONG'S INTERACTION HYPOTHESIS.

Krashen's Input Hypothesis and the cognitive models of Second Language Acquisition, both focuses, to a considerable extent, on the learner. The social

constructivist perspectives that are associated with more current approaches to both first and second language acquisition emphasize the dynamic nature of the interplay between learners and their peers; and their teachers and others with whom they interact. The interpersonal context in which a learner operates takes on great significance, and therefore, the interaction between learners and others is the focus of observation and explanation.

One of the most widely discussed social constructivist positions in the field emerged from the work of Michael Long. Long went on to propose an extension of Krashen's Input Hypothesis, which is called Interaction Hypothesis. According to the Long's interaction hypothesis (1983), learners acquire new forms when input is made comprehensible through negotiating for meaning, as in this example:

NS... : Do you wear them every day?

NNS: Huh?

NS... : Do you put them on everyday?

(Young and Doughty 1987:213)

Here, a native speaker (NS) asks a question which the non-native speaker (NNS) does not understand. This leads the NNS to negotiate for a focused communication task, in contrast, does result in some linguistic feature being made prominent, although not in a way that causes the task learner to pay more attention to form than to meaning.

Brown (2000:288) mentions the other side of the Long's interaction hypothesis:

It centres on the language classroom not just as a place where learners of varying abilities and styles and backgrounds mingle, but as a place where the contexts for interaction are carefully designed. It focuses materials and curriculum developers on creating the optimal environments and tasks for input and interaction such that the learner will be stimulated to create his or her own learner language in a socially constructed process. Further, it reminds us that the many variables at work in an interactive classroom should prime teachers to expect the unexpected and to anticipate the novel creations of learners engaged in the process of discovery.

In this sense, discussion classrooms provide the learners with interaction opportunities.

2.6. COMMUNICATION TASKS

Communication tasks have been defined as tasks that “involve the learner in comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form” (Nunan 1989:10). On the other hand, Brumfit (1984) claims that communication tasks are important for both “fluency” and “accuracy”. They aid fluency by enabling learners to activate their linguistic knowledge for use in natural and spontaneous language, such as when taking part in conversation. One way in which this is achieved is by developing *strategic competence*, defined by Canale (1983) as the verbal and non-verbal strategies used to compensate for breakdowns in communication and to enhance the effectiveness of communication. They contribute to accuracy (i.e. linguistic competence) by enabling learners to discover new linguistic forms during the course of communicating, and also by increasing their control over already –acquired forms. Furthermore, according to the *comprehensible output hypothesis* (Swain 1985), acquisition takes place when learners are “pushed” into producing output that is more grammatical, as in this example:

NNS : He pass his house.

NS : Sorry?

NNS : He passed, he passed, ah, his sign.

Here the NS negotiates for meaning-by means of a clarification request-when she fails to understand the non-native speaker’s initial utterance, causing the learner to reformulate the utterance.

Ellis (1982) presents some characteristics of communication tasks:

1. There must be a communicative purpose (i.e. not just a linguistic goal),
2. There must be a focus on message rather than on the linguistic code,
3. There must be some kind of “gap” (i.e. an information or opinion gap),
4. There must be opportunity for negotiation when performing the task,

5. The participants must choose the resources-verbal and non-verbal-requiring for performing the task (i.e. they are not supplied with the means for performing the task).

According to Ellis, individual tasks can be more or less “communicative”, depending on whether all or just some of these characteristics are present.

2.7. AIM FOR A DISCUSSION

There may be several aims for a discussion, but usually the aim is to provide an opportunity to practise speaking, with more attention to improving fluency than to getting accurate sentences.

To achieve the main aim, instructors must find ways of enabling as many students as possible to speak as much as possible. Sometimes an all class speaking activity is useful, but it takes up the whole lesson it actually offers very little speaking time to each individual student.

2.8. SIGNIFICANCE OF DISCUSSION

The most natural and effective way for learners to practise talking freely in English is by thinking out some problems or situation together through verbal interchange of ideas; or in simpler terms, to discuss. (Ur, 1981:2).

It is a fact that discussions allows students to organize their thoughts, carry out peer and self-observation and evaluation and analyse findings. Therefore, positive results are produced for both learners and teachers. Ur (1981:2) points out that some sort of dynamic, individual and meaningful oral practice should be included in English lessons from the beginning. Instead of constructing correct sentences, she draws attention to the necessity of students’ learning how to communicate first.

She (1981) also claims that full participation and high motivation of the participants are necessary for a discussion to work. In order to supply students' interest and motivation, she suggests that students should be given a reason to speak more than they need something to speak about.

In another research, Battle (2002) presents the significance of discussion method and its implications attempted by Professor John Powelson and based on a Graduate Teacher Program workshop.

Professor Powelson's aim, as stated in the article, is to encourage students to engage in and challenge the subject-matter. Before implementing his teaching through discussion method, Professor Powelson anticipated and resolved certain structural problems inherent in this way of teaching. These are:

- Classroom setting,
- Budgeting time.

Professor Powelson solved the first problem by asking students to arrange the desks in a circle before the start of each class and to return the desks to their original positions at the end of the period. It is known that such a seating arrangement promotes student-to-instructor as well as student-to-student interactions.

He resolved this time management issue by assigning the class an entire chapter or article for reading. The reading would then provide the context for those topics or issues discussed extensively during class.

As his experience with class discussion evolved, he started assigning the class general questions to prepare for forthcoming discussion periods. Professor Powelson has also established procedures to ensure that students, especially those in large classes, keep up with their reading assignments. In general, he notes that once students are expected to do the readings on a timely basis, they comply. If, however, a student is not prepared for discussion, "I will subtract points off (his or her) final grade." That could mean the difference, for example, between a B- and a C+ or a C- and a D+.

In his article, Ken also presents crucial points identified by Professor Powelson in instructors' attitudes towards brighter students and instructors' errors in discussion classrooms. At the outset of the class:

▪ **The instructor's attitudes towards the brighter students**

The instructor must make it clear that the insights and discourse of, perhaps, brighter students will be greatly appreciated, but such students will not be permitted to dominate the discussion periods; everyone must have an opportunity to contribute.

▪ **The instructor's response to students' errors**

The instructor should, first, acknowledge whatever worth an incorrect answer has. He or she should question the student in such a way that the latter will gain an awareness of the error in question.

Discussion method attempted by Powelson is considered successful. Despite some of the inhibitors mentioned before, it can be effectively attempted by bringing solutions to the problems. Therefore, the learning process for students in large and small classes can be significantly enhanced by teaching through discussion.

2.9. SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR ESL TEACHERS

Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974) provide ESL teachers some suggestions on how to handle the discussion class. Many people believe that discussion class is a frequently troublesome experience for ESL teachers and a number of problems peculiar to this type of class. However, Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974) present a key to resolution of these problems; “a discussion class is not primarily an intellectual exercise, but a language learning experience.” They also add that the key to a successful language-learning discussion is to design interesting topics and questions that are within both the intellectual and linguistic competence of the students.

On the other hand, Berwick (1975) supports that the most useful kind of discussion period is one in which the students speak most of the time, bringing into the discussion latent vocabulary and previously learned grammatical patterns, and generalizing into previously un-uttered patterns. In order to reach this stage, it is considered essential to recognize and remove socially based inhibitions to discussion.

One of the most important problems in a discussion class is the long and useless period of silence. According to Berwick (1975), this can be predicted if the teacher is unwilling to speak for most of the discussion period. It seems as if the students are too shy to speak or as if they fear speaking up individually in response to a question asked of the entire group. Berwick adds that after considering the physical and psychological arrangements of the classroom, hesitancy and shyness are to be completed. Berwick accounts for this situation with the status gap between student and teacher-that conversation is inhibited. He also says that “The social situation in which inferiors and superiors interact greatly determines what kind of communication they are going to have. For example, a teacher who notices his students to be reticent and shy in the classroom finds them to be talkative and much more open in a coffee shop or at a train station.”

Berwick concludes this status gap between student and teacher with the need for a hierarchy of questions, posited by Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974: 343-344).

Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974) mention the importance of two types of questions which are to precede the classroom discussion. First, "information retrieval" questions to confirm the background, and then "reaction articulation" questions, i.e., those eliciting a personal reaction or conceptual answer, to fuel the discussion." Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974) put forward some advantages of the informational retrieval questions.

Initiating discussions with information retrieval questions has the advantages of drawing quick and eager responses and of isolating those elements on which that phase of the discussion will be based.

They also add that these questions are designed to elicit either a delimited factual response or an impersonal narrative which may be given by a single student or initiated by one and continued by others at the teacher's direction.

Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974) give example. "Women's Liberation" is the common grounds. Information retrieval questions, then, can possibly be such as "Do you agree with women's liberation?", "How did women's liberation get started?"

As well as forwarding the discussion, these questions' most important function as Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974) stated in their study, is linguistic; by responding to an impersonal question to which the student probably knows the answer, the cultural and intellectual interference is minimized and so the focus becomes the un-modelled articulation in the target language of something cognitively known. These questions also develop the student's confidence to deal with the more abstract, more stimulating, and reaction articulation questions which should follow. On the other hand, "reaction articulation questions" as those questions demanding an intellectual-emotional reaction in the target language to a situation spontaneously confronted. Here are some examples: "On women's liberation, "Would you like your wife to be pursuing a full-time career?" or, "Is equality of sexes really possible?" are some examples of "reaction articulation questions.

Berwick also suggests a number of constraints which seem to be productive of extended discussion:

1. Students should have some familiarity with the discussion topic prior to the discussion. Ideally, they should be exposed to a variety of discussion stimulants, including new vocabulary in context which has been presented in the form of drills, reading and brief lecture.
2. The teacher's primary role at the beginning of any discussion period is to stimulate thinking about the topic in advance of the discussion. For instance, in their groups may later choose to evaluate. It is understood, of course, Students may be asked to write a short list of word-associations based on essential vocabulary for the current topic. This introduction to the discussion is brief and does not necessarily control the content of the group conversations. The content—logical or not, realistic or not—is largely up to the group.
3. A classroom with moveable desks and chairs is essential to forming small Discussion groups.
4. The affective importance of the group seems to increase in proportion to the number of groups in the classroom. The size of the room should permit at least two discussion groups.
5. The teacher remains essentially out of the discussions or at least participates only to the extent that his presence does not destroy the conversational quality of the group.

Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974) state their opinion about teachers' inference in the discussion by saying that:

The teacher must be primarily a catalytic agent and only rarely an active discourser. He must therefore be careful to correct the students, but not overcorrect, and to direct the discussion, but not over direct. Done well, the ESL discussion class can be an exceptionally interesting and productive mechanism for developing the student's confidence and improving his language proficiency.

Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974) clarify the teachers' role at the time of dealing with questions. According to Kaltinick and Kaltinick, teachers should "deal with" the questions directed at them, not "answer" them. They add that the teacher must immediately decide if the question is deflectable or none:

If it is deflectable, i.e., if there is a reasonable probability that another student can answer it and the teacher wishes it answered at that point, deflect it. If necessary repeat

the question and ask if anyone can answer it. If there is no volunteer call on one of your better students...The benefits of deflecting questions are that they increase student speaking time and cause students to pay closer attention to their peers' questions. Non-deflectable questions are those which only the teacher can answer, either because he has some special knowledge of the subject or because the question demands a personal experience or opinion...

Kaltinick and Kaltinick (1974)

6. The groups should be self-directing. If a teacher feels he must continually correct students' errors, he will most certainly succeed in destroying the cohesiveness and thereby the conversational quality of the group.
(Berwick, 1975:286-287)

According to Kaltinick and Kaltinick, however, except for students with virtually native English precision, the teacher must correct; indeed, the most basic function of the teacher *and* the discussion class is to correct the student's speech in a non-structured, spontaneous situation. Furthermore, they add that student reaction, as measured by both face-to-face conversations and anonymous questionnaires, overwhelmingly favours such correction. However, they state that it must be done with discretion, i.e., there must be enough of it so that the student is getting some linguistic benefit from the class. They carry on their argument and state that questions posed by the students should be a particular focus of the teacher's in making corrections. If done quickly and simply such corrections will not dampen the discussion, and will be of immense benefit to the student outside the ESL classroom. In addition to questions, pronunciation, intonation, vocabulary, idiom, verb tense, agreement, even volume, is all fair games for judicious correction. The instructor should focus on the outstanding problems of each student and not try to correct everything for everyone at once.

They conclude their support by saying that:

... The teacher should concentrate on the student's use of language—on helping him get out his thoughts in good English. Beyond this, the matter is largely one of correcting what is incorrect and praising what is praiseworthy.

2.10. APPROACHES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF DISCUSSION SKILL

Green, Christopher & Lam (1997) present the use of structured or guided discussion in their research. This approach provides a framework which involves the following steps:

- Learners receive content input just before the discussion itself,
- Learners are given roles to play,
- Learners follow pre-determined steps through to the end of the discussion,
- Language prompts or appropriate wordings are usually provided,
- Teachers provide feedback on the whole performance.

Although the guided approach provides some security for learners and may help prevent communication breakdown, Green, Christopher & Lam state the disadvantages of this approach. These are:

- There is little direct learner involvement in the discussion process,
- Learners do not choose the topic, or decide on specific lines to pursue,
- Learners are not engaged in observing and evaluating their peers or themselves.

As a result, there seems to be no reason for learners to participate actively in the discussion and learner cognitive engagement with the task, and motivation to develop the topic to any significant degree, are likely to be poor. In this approach the topic for discussion is imposed, defined and structured, so it may be called “objective”.

Another approach presented by Green, Christopher & Lam is learner-centred approach. In this approach, students need to be encouraged to become increasingly independent and self-directed in their learning. It is stated that self-evaluation raises students’ awareness of the links between learning objectives, processes, and outcomes, by requiring them to reflect directly on their own and others’

performances rather than relying on formal pre-structured modes of formal evaluation.

This approach presents the following advantages:

- It is subjective,
- It provides learners evaluation and feedback,
- With carefully chosen grouping, it may be used effectively with most levels of learners, and for any type of course.

To these ends, Green, Christopher & Lam (1997) present three stages in the implementation of a classroom discussion as pre-discussion, discussion, post-discussion.

2.10.1 PRE-DISCUSSION

In this stage variable discussion and associated partner groups are formed. Next, a topic for discussion is selected and divided into manageable areas of inquiry for the time available.

2.10.1.1. FORMING THE GROUPS

Groups should be as homogenous as possible in terms of both linguistic ability and personal type. If heterogeneous groups are formed, introvert personalities may well feel crushed by the more expressive participants, and lose the little confidence they possess, while the confident ones might feel that no satisfactory progress is being made, and so become bored and discouraged.

The next step is the formation of partner groups of observer-evaluators, so students will have opportunities to observe, describe, and evaluate the process as well as participating in discussions. In this way, discussion stages become learner-centred.

2.10.1.2. IDENTIFYING AND ORGANIZING THE TOPICS

Although there is not much research data on the effects of second language learners selecting topics for discussion, some researchers support that acquisition is enhanced when teachers allow students free choice of topic.

At the stage of topic selection, students are advised to identify and list sub-topics and to set objectives for their coverage.

2.10.2. DISCUSSION

The groups discuss the topic while partner groups of observer-evaluators monitor the process, using a variety of instruments to record data.

2.10.2.1. OBSERVER-RING

While a group conducts its discussion, the observer-evaluators sit with the discussion group and monitor the proceedings. Their findings are reported back in the post-discussion stage. For collection of storable data, observers need to complete observation and evaluation sheets (see Figure1).

Figure 1: Observation and evaluation sheet

Behaviour	Number of Contributions				
	Student A	Student B	Student C	Student D	Student E
1. Total number of ... contributions made					
2. Responding supportively					
3. Responding aggressively					
4. Introducing a new ... relevant point					
5. Digressing from the topic					

Green, Christopher & Lam (1997:139)

This kind of exercise can be a great motivator and the data collected might also provide evidence of a poorly constituted grouping in need of reorganization.

2.10.2.2. SHADOWING

A specified member of the partner group sits next to, or behind a discussion group participant. This technique may also be used for empathy building. Contributing and responding empathetically can be very useful in getting learners to understand how others think and express themselves.

An example of an observation exercise best carried out by one-on-one shadowing is given in Figure 2. The functions are given for guidance, and to raise observer awareness of what to focus on while observing intra group dynamics.

Figure 2 : One-to one peer-evaluation sheet

Functions	Language used	Pronunciation	Gestures
1. To prevent interruption and finish speaking	<i>Please.....I must finish.....</i>	Voice gets louder and faster	Holds up one hand
2. Helping somebody to begin speaking	<i>I wonder If Amy has an opinion about this.....?</i>	Stress Amy; voice rises towards end of question	Smiling; eyes wide open
3. Interrupting to disagree	<i>Sorry, but I can't agree.....</i>	Stress the negative	Eye contact made with speaker
4. Interrupting to obtain more information	<i>What do you mean by..?</i>	Stress on uncertain term, voice falls at end of question	Leans forward
5. Supporting the previous speaker	<i>I think Peter made a good point about....</i>	Stress good	Look at Peter

Green, Christopher & Lam (1997:140)

2.10.2.3. USING VIDEOS AND AUDIO RECORDERS

This means of collecting data is to exploit in practice. Video gives the best possible feedback because it provides a simultaneous display of contributions, sociolinguistic strategies, group dynamics, language use, and accuracy.

Another advantage of recording discussion session is that the video may be reviewed by individual students as a post discussion activity.

2.10.3. POST-DISCUSSION

In this phase,

- Learners may review and discuss the strength and weakness of the discussion with peers and the teacher,
- Learners may make recommendations for future modifications and improvements,
- Writing tasks may be carried out,
- Recorded linguistic data can be used for future application.

(Green, Christopher & Lam 1997:135-142)

2.11. WHY GROUP WORK

Instead of the teacher standing face-to-face with the students, acting as THE social control, forcing the students to recognize him as the leader and source of all knowledge, the student group itself becomes the medium of social control.

(Mouly 1968: 342.)

Long and Porter (1985) have provided evidence for the usefulness of what they termed “interlanguage talk” conversation between non-native speakers in which they negotiate meaning in groups. Such group work has been found to increase the communicative abilities of the group members and to motivate students to learn. It provides evidence that learners can benefit from talking, although Krashen would probably argue that this is because of “comprehensible input” they receive from their own speech and that of other group members.

Long and Porter (1985) argue in their study that for some years now, methodologists have recommended small-group work (including pair work) in the second language classroom. In doing so, as Long and Porter believe, they have used arguments which, for the most part, are *pedagogical*. While those arguments are compelling enough, group work has recently taken on increased *psycholinguistic* significance due to new research findings on two related topics: 1) the role of comprehensible input in second language acquisition (SLA) and 2) the negotiation work possible in conversation between non-native speakers, or *interlanguage talk*.

Thus, in addition to strong pedagogical arguments, there now exists a psycholinguistic rationale for group work in second language learning.

Long and Porter state at least five pedagogical arguments for the use of group work in second language (SL) learning. They concern the potential of group work for increasing the quantity of language practice opportunities, for improving the quality of student talk, for individualizing instruction, for creating a positive affective climate in the classroom, and for increasing student motivation.

Ur (1981) also mentioned the advantages and disadvantages of group work in her study. She states that group work increases participation and is very effective. Furthermore, Ur supports that group work also improves motivation since the physical focus of the discussion is close and directed towards the individual student. Ur also says that group work lends to game-like activities. Another advantage of group work she mentions is that group-work frees the teacher from her usual role of instructor-corrector controller, and allows her to wander freely round the class. Finally, there is peer-teaching. In the course of group discussions, students will learn from each other, whether consciously or unconsciously.

Ur (1981) also mentions the disadvantages of group work. However, by discipline, thoughtful and efficient organization, she suggests that any kind of disorder might be prevented.

2.12. CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter reviewed the literature regarding the theories of second language learning. One of the important points this chapter has highlighted is that there is not only one theory but there are many different theories that are quite different from each other.

Another important thing that this chapter highlighted is that fluency development and developing communicative skills are long procedures that are made up of various essential steps.

Having thus finished reviewing the literature, the next chapter will be about the description and the general objectives of the present study.

CHAPTER THREE

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

3.0. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, general objectives are summarized and assumptions are presented. Next, the chapter describes the subjects and the setting. Instruments, method and the procedures and finally the analysis of the study are described.

3.1. OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the research is to determine the impact of discussion technique on the students' oral performance at TAFA. It aims at investigating the relationship between the use of discussion technique and the improvement in communicative skill as well as fluency.

To these ends, a pretest and a posttest were administered to the students in two separate terms. In the beginning of Winter Term, 75 pre-intermediate level students from four separate classrooms were administered oral test conducted by three teachers of English. Participants were handed out the speaking topics during the oral test and given a few minutes to think over. Some questions were asked to comfort the students.

This pretest provided the researcher some information about students' performance in speech.

Through the end of the Spring Term, a posttest was administered to the same students in order to see fluency improvement and determine the difference or similarity between the scores of experiment group and the control groups. This time

speaking topics were much complicated than those in pretest... Students themselves chose the speaking topic in both tests.

In this study not only experiment group but also control groups followed the same procedure in English throughout the Winter Term. No additional exercise was given to any of these groups. However, in Spring Term, experiment group was asked to make some preparations for discussion session which was held only in their classroom for only 40 minutes a week. The classroom was arbitrarily divided into two groups and the groups were asked to come to the classroom with their questions in their minds or in written form to ask the opponent group members and with good examples to support their own group.

The data collected were analysed to find answers to the following questions :

- 1) Does discussion technique work at TAFA?
- 2) Is there a change in the level of speaking skill of the students who participated in the discussion session?
- 3) What is the relationship between language practice and efficiency in language?
- 4) Is there a relationship between the language use frequency and students' motivation, participation, willingness, or self-confidence?.

3.2. ASSUMPTIONS

By the end of the Spring Term experiment group is assumed to have shown success and improvement in terms of communicative competence. Moreover, using discussion technique is expected to raise more student participation, and more enjoyment of learning English.

3.3. SUBJECTS

In this study subjects are the students at Turkish Air force Academy and taking military education and training. 75 students participated in the study, 21 of them belong to experiment group and 20 belong to control group 1. There are 17 students in control group 2 and 12 students in control group 3. The number of subjects is not equal in experiment and control groups. Some students were eliminated from the study when they were assigned some unexpected military duties by the Regiment. There are only 4 female students in control group 1 but none in the others. These students live in the dormitory and are not allowed to go out except the weekends. Therefore, they nearly lack the opportunity to practice with the native speakers, or speakers of English outside the school.

Their age, background and experiences are more or less the same. Moreover, they mostly belong to the low socio-economic level and come from the government high schools. They were administered a placement test by the department of English before the lessons started and their language level was determined as pre-intermediate. However, they had low proficiency in English especially their competence in speaking and listening comprehension was rather bad. Furthermore, the students on pre-intermediate level were listed according to their scores in the placement test. The control group 1 got the highest scores in the placement test, then they were listed the first 20 students in the classroom list. These students constituted the classroom 1. The experiment group members showed the least performance among these four pre-intermediate level groups, so this group constituted the class 4 in the list.

The subjects had 12 hours of English lessons a week during an academic year. At the time of study, the researcher was the English teacher of the experiment group.

3.4. SETTING

The study was conducted at Turkish Air Force Academy during the 2002-2003 Academic Year. It was considered that it would be suitable to carry out the study at that place as the researcher was working as a full-time instructor there, which gave her a chance of knowing most of the students who would participate in the study.

Since the researcher was giving some of the courses herself, she explained her aim to the students who agreed on participating in the study. Further, some of the researcher's colleagues helped conducting and applying the pre and posttests.

3.5. INSTRUMENTS

Data collected for the study included pretest and posttest to determine students' communicative performance by three teachers of English at Turkish Air Force Academy. In order to improve their communicative performance, the class was attempted discussion in the Spring Term. The class was also asked to fill in the self-reports to determine their activities outside the classroom.

3.5.1. WHY A DISCUSSION TECHNIQUE WAS CHOSEN

To answer this question, two main points will be presented. First point is the general perspective from Turkish Air Force Academy where the study was conducted. The teaching process and the range of techniques used at TAFE are the same. The question / answer technique dominates the classrooms. Repetition, recalling and memorizing have important roles. Listening to scripts from the tape and answering questions in ALC laboratory books seem to be very little part of activities in almost every class. Writing and reading activities are mostly done activities especially for marking. Pair work and language games do not draw teachers' interest for the reason probably they take a lot of time to prepare and practise in the

classroom. The emphasis is on mainly grammar and vocabulary, partly on reading and writing. Instructors use target language as the little medium of communication and as the main medium of introducing the grammar and vocabulary and giving instructions. Yet, native language (Turkish) is used when it is felt necessary. Using authentic audio visual aids, encouraging good pronunciation, communicative games and problem solving, role playing, drama, using authentic texts, group work are not of vital importance.

The other point is students' daily lives at school. As mentioned before, this study was conducted at Turkish Air Force Academy. The students who took part in the study are cadets and their whole time passes at school. As soon as their lessons are over at Faculty, they march to the Regiment to train all day. Therefore, discussion technique was assumed to develop students socially and psychologically considering their position at school. To researcher, the best way to provide students their needs to express their feelings, share experiences and expectations with peers and teacher was discussion.

Another reason can be said that the classroom size and setting were suitable for the discussion technique. Moreover, using video and audio recording was thought to draw student's interest in the learning process. This technique also provides skills that students at Turkish Air Force Academy need to develop in terms of their career.

3.5.2. PRE AND POSTTESTS

At Turkish Air Force Academy, 75 students in pre-intermediate level were administered pretest in order to determine their speaking performance by a commission made up of three teachers of English at the beginning of the Winter Term. During this term all the activities in ALC (American Language Course) book series were carried out by both experiment and control groups. Students were not assigned any additional study.

In the Spring Term experiment group was attempted discussion technique. Discussion topics were chosen by the researcher. Through the end of the Spring Term, posttest was administered to the same students by the same instructors to determine their improvement in oral communication. The students' success in pre and posttests was recorded and analyzed.

3.6. METHOD AND PROCEDURES

In this section, the method and the procedures pursued in the study are described. It also describes the setting and analyses the data.

3.6.1. DISCUSSION

Discussions were conducted at Turkish Air Force Academy. Participants were members of experiment group and the instructor was also the researcher of the study. Twenty-one participants took place in discussion and these participants were made aware the aim of the study. Discussion sessions were carried out only once a week, decided to be on Fridays, and took only forty minutes in a class hour.

3.6.1.1. SETTING

Classroom where the discussions took place was large enough to include 21 students, but the desks took a lot of place and very heavy to move, Classroom door had a small window and sometimes the class was observed through this window by the management. The study was intended to start in February as soon as the Spring Term started, but the procedures at the stage of getting permission from the Dean of Faculty took time, so the first discussion topic was assigned to the students in April the 8th.

3.6.1.2. PLANNING AND ORGANIZING DISCUSSION

Discussions were planned in three stages. These are pre-discussion, discussion and post-discussion stages.

In pre-discussion stage, students were presented their discussion topics a week before. Thus they had a chance to construct their thoughts and investigate the subject on internet or in the library. The topics were determined by the researcher (see Table 1). Instructor set the goals and prepared the lesson plan (Figure 3). The groups were determined, so each group members knew if they were for or against the topic. Consequently, they attended the classroom prepared before.

Discussion stage is the stage where the students interact with each other, and determine their aims. The teacher was only an observer and a guide during the discussion. The discussion did not become teacher led one. To guide the students and draw their attention upon the main subject, questions were directed to the all students. The questions also came from the students, and they were encouraged to speak to each other. They tried to give reasons and provide evidence to support the idea they were assigned.

Finally, in post-discussion stage, students were addressed evaluation questions and in the following class they were handed out quiz papers to record what they support about the previous topic as a writing task. After being evaluated, the instructor handed out the quiz papers to the students. The papers were graded from 1 to 20 and included in the final exams with the evaluation of their performance in discussions.

Table 1 : Discussion topics

TOPIC	: GUN CONTROL
DATE	: APRIL 18TH, FRIDAY...
FOR :	
	- Gun control saves lives.
	- Criminals don't obey gun control or any other kind of laws
	- Most people need weapons for self-defence such as women and the old
	- Weapon ownership is necessary to reduce crimes
	- Civilian gun ownership can be powerful deterrent to crime
AGAINST :	
	- The family gun is more likely to kill you or someone you know than to kill in self-defence.
	- We live in a civilized society-we don't need guns
	- When one is attacked, passive behaviour is the safest approach..
	- The police do a fine job of protecting us

TOPIC	: DEATH PENALTY
DATE	: APRIL 25TH, FRIDAY
FOR	
	The Death Penalty prevents future murders.
AGAINST	
	The Death Penalty is applied unfairly and shouldn't be used.

TOPIC	: ORGAN DONATION
DATE	: MAY 2ND, FRIDAY
FOR	
	When you donate your organs, you give someone else the chance to live.
AGAINST	
	It is not allowed for a dead person to donate an organ in terms of religion.

TOPIC	: ABORTION
DATE	: MAY 9TH, 2003
FOR	
	It is equally as heinous intentionally to kill a human being in existence at fertilization, as to kill a larger pre-born child.
AGAINST	
	Women have many reasons for not wanting to be pregnant, and thus to seek an abortion.

TOPIC	: DISARMAMENT
DATE	: MAY 16TH, FRIDAY
FOR	
	Disarmament prevents and helps governments to investigate war crimes and crimes against humanity.
AGAINST	
	Disarmament is a barrier to governments' defence system.

TOPIC	: FEMALES IN THE ARMY
DATE	: MAY 23RD, 2003
FOR
	Females add a different view. Females are mentally and physically superior in the Army.
AGAINST
	It is not possible to participate in some activities as men.

TOPIC	: TRANSSEXUALISM
DATE	: MAY 30TH, 2003
FOR
	Changing sex roles affect the family unit Changing sex harms the morals in society.
AGAINST
	It is personal choice and does not give any harm to other people.

Figure 3 : Lesson plan

Topic1 : GUN CONTROL
Date : APRIL 18TH, FRIDAY

I. The Discussion Objectives

- have the students critically think about the topic
- arouse their curiosity
- have them make searches about the topic on Internet.etc.
- engage their mind, feelings and imagination
- have them find supporting ideas, examples to the side they will defend
- encourage them to state their opinions
- encourage them to use English communicatively
- make them feel involved in the learning process
- make them enjoy the learning process
- make them sure they completed a task successfully
- make them feel self-confidence

II. Questions for Discussion

Knowledge questions

- Do we have "gun control" in our country?
- What countries have "gun control" system or regulations?

Application questions

- How would you explain the guns' being effective means of self-defence?
- Why would someone want to buy guns except to sell them to criminals?

Evaluation questions

- What would you do if you were attacked several times when you go out?
- Would you carry a gun to feel secure?

Evaluation of the discussion.

- What are the important points you learned in this discussion?

Objective Vocabulary

Ban- Firearms- Advocate- Support- Shoot- Victim- Gun-Related Crimes- Gun Deaths-
 Illegal- Weapon- Safety- Bear Arms- Purchase- Flea Market.

Functions

If I were....., I wouldI wish X would / X did.....
 Simple Past to narrate an event occurred in the past

3.6.1.3. PROCEDURE

Some arrangements were done before discussions. Firstly, the classroom arrangement was planned. Students were asked to divide the classroom into two so that members of two groups would sit on their sides. The best classroom design is supported to sit in a half circle. However, the desks in the classroom were too big to fit them in that shape. The students arranged the desks before the start of each discussion class and turned them to their original positions at the end of the period.

Next, the board in the classroom was arranged before the class. Discussion topic on that day, example of supporting idea from for and against groups, and the date were written on the board. The instructor was responsible to bring and prepare the video recorder for the discussion....

The instructor also handed in the topic of the day a week before the discussion session and asked the students to prepare for forthcoming discussion. Therefore, they brought a couple of questions to ask the opposite group members.

Brighter students were not permitted to dominate the discussion periods; everyone had an opportunity to contribute. The instructor was a guide, observer during the discussions and sometimes asked questions to both groups to keep the discussion dynamic.

3.6.1.4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Performance of the students, their participation in the discussion and evaluation of the quiz papers were recorded and reflected in their final exam. Students' grades were not lowered as a result of their classroom discussion. the 8th.

3.6.2. PRE AND POSTTESTS

In both tests 75 students were included. The number of the students and the participants were the same in both tests. Furthermore, both the pretest and the posttest were applied by the same instructors, one of them is the researcher and the others have never taught the subjects.

3.6.2.1. SETTING

Both the pretest and the posttest were conducted at Turkish Air Force Academy in the same office. There were three tables for instructors and a chair and a coffee table for the students. Students were invited one by one to the instructors' office and allowed between 3 and 5 minutes to talk about the topic they wanted to speak.

Pretest was conducted at the weekend in October and the posttest was administered to the students in the evening in June.

3.6.2.2. PROCEDURE

The students were given the speaking topics (see Figure 4 and Figure 5) prepared by the test commission before they took the exam and they had a chance to think and organize their thoughts. Students were allowed to get into the examination room one by one and given a seat before the commission. Some questions such as whether they are tired or hungry, or whether they have a girlfriend or what they are planning to do for the weekend were asked to relax them.

The students were recorded during the posttest by a tape recorder at the time of oral examination. The recording of the posttest on two CDs is available.

Figure 4 : Pretest topics

1. MY FAMILY.
2. MY FAVOURITE SPORT.
3. MY FAVOURITE FREE TIME ACTIVITY.
4. MY HOMETOWN.
5. MY FAVOURITE JOB.

Figure 5 : Posttest topics

1. Do you think that the world will be a better or worse place to live 100 years from now?.
2. If you were the President of Turkey, what would change?.
3. What do you think is the best age to get married?
4. Is it important to be famous? Why?.
5. If you were born again, would you like to be female or male?

3.6.2.3. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Participants in the pretest and their grades are presented in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 illustrates the participants and grades in posttest. In these tables abbreviations (MS, ŞS, MB, and ME) represent the capital letters of the instructors of the participants. MS is the researcher and the instructor of the experiment group, ŞS is the instructor of control group 1, MB is the instructor of control group 2, and finally control group 3 is represented by instructor ME.

Evaluation criterion (see Figure 6) was determined and accepted by the instructors who applied the pre and posttests. The same evaluation criterion was used in both tests. Total point was 50 in both tests then they were turned to 100. Grades

given by three instructors for the same student compared on SPSS program to see the inter-rater reliability.

Posttest was recorded on tape recorder for an hour and available on two CDs.

Figure 6 : Evaluation Criterion

1. Point to the subject	10
2. Content “supporting the idea with good examples”	10
3. Selecting the appropriate and correct vocabulary	10
4. Fluency in speech	10
5. Pronunciation and Intonation	10
TOTAL	50 points

3.7. CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, general objectives and assumptions of the study were presented. Subjects were introduced and the setting where the study conducted was described. In this study, instruments were also introduced and method and procedures pursued in the study were described.

CHAPTER FOUR

EVALUATION OF THE STUDY

4.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the findings obtained from the statistical analysis of the data collected from participants. The findings will be presented in four parts. Firstly, the reflections from the students and the evaluation of the discussion session will be presented. Then, analysis of pretest and posttest are discussed. Next, the findings of the pre and posttest levels tests will be compared.

4.1. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The data collected for the study will be presented in four sections and then the findings will be discussed. Finally, some implications for the learners and instructors will be introduced.

4.1.1. DISCUSSION TECHNIQUE

RQ1 *Does the “discussion technique” work at TAFA?*

This study was conducted at Turkish Air Force Academy (TAFA), and the subjects were all males except for five females in control group1. There was no female participant in experiment group. Therefore, it may be concluded that this study refers to only males.

If we consider the setting which is required for discussion class, it is necessary to point out that certain physical conditions are to be required for the

discussion class to run smoothly. First, ideal number of students seems to run from six to twelve. Discussion classes are reported to function marginally with sixteen. Much beyond that, the time might be better spent in other days. Second, the students must be seated in a semi-circle, seated in rows; the class is doomed to sequential recitation, only rarely achieving anything resembling genuine discussion. Finally, time required for the discussion class should allow the instructor to complete post-discussion session. Reviewing the recorded data would be helpful for students to evaluate and criticize themselves later on, or summarizing the important points, reviewing the objective vocabulary, structures or grammar used in the discussion would be good post-discussion session takes time and absolutely necessary for feedback...

Considering the facts stated above, some necessary precautions should be taken. Although the number of students is not many in the classrooms, this number is excessive for discussion classroom. Every member of each group should take turn to speak. Classroom control would be easy for the instructor. The instructor would be able to observe each student and help every member participate in the discussion session. Furthermore, movable chairs would be better to reshape the classroom in order to prepare the setting for ideal classroom discussion...

Despite the lack of these requirements, discussion classroom was conducted and preceded at TAFA. Although post-discussion step was applied much beyond the expectation of the instructor, feedback was somewhat received from the written documents which were handed in by the participants after each classroom discussion. Furthermore, classroom was rearranged into two separate groups before the classroom discussion so that two opposite group participants could face each other. Moreover, instructor tried to give each student opportunity to participate in the discussion. Since the participants were military students, they were good at supporting their ideas with outstanding examples. This is also the necessary ability for military students in order to become successful in their career.

4.1.2. PRETEST

The data obtained by the pre and posttests were computed on SPSS, Statical Package for the Social Science. First, participants were given marks by three instructors (see Appendix 1) in order to determine their oral proficiency. Then, data collected from 75 participants were analyzed. (See Table 2).

Table 2: Oneway ANNOVA Test : Inter-rater reliability between instructors

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1.	75	50,40	9,92	1,15	48,12	52,68	26	77
2.	75	48,59	12,18	1,41	45,79	51,39	25	86
3.	75	48,33	9,85	1,14	46,07	50,60	31	80
Total	225	49,11	10,70	,71	47,70	50,51	25	86

The maximum score was appreciated by instructor (1) (Mean=50,40). Then follow the other instructors. The mean of the scores appreciated by instructor (2) (Mean=48,59) and instructor (3) (Mean=48,33) were closer to the mean of scores appreciated by instructor (1).

In order to see scoring reliability between the instructors, multiple comparisons were used (see Table 3).

Table 3: Dependent variable: multiple comparisons in pretest

(I) GRUP	(J) GRUP	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	1,81	1,75	,553	-2,28	5,91
	3	2,07	1,75	,464	-2,03	6,16
2	1	-1,81	1,75	,553	-5,91	2,28
	3	,25	1,75	,988	-3,84	4,35
3	1	-2,07	1,75	,464	-6,16	2,03
	2	-,25	1,75	,988	-4,35	3,84

In Table 3 multiple comparisons are used. Instructor (1) is compared with instructor (2) (Mean=1,81) and instructor (3) (Mean=2,07) in terms of their scoring reliability. When we look at the lower and upper bound, it is clear how much closer their scoring is. This is true also of various comparisons between each other.

When we look at the students' success in pretest (see Appendix 1), it can be concluded that control group 1 has scored the highest (Average=54), control group 2 comes next (Average=49), then follows experiment group (Average=48), and finally, control group 4 (Average=46). It may be concluded from the data that the students in experiment group and control groups showed more or less the same performance in pretest. Additionally, in control group 1 there are four female students who might have contributed to the classroom success in pretest. Moreover, control group 1 consists of more extrovert students and the most successful students in placement test which was conducted by the Head of English...

4.1.3. POSTTEST

The data obtained from the posttest followed the same steps in pretest. First, participants were graded by the same instructors and the inter-rater reliability was determined (see Table 4).

Table 4: Oneway ANNOVA Test : Inter-rater reliability between instructors

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	75	69,25	11,21	1,29	66,68	71,83	40	90
2	75	69,21	11,43	1,32	66,58	71,84	40	99
3	75	67,96	11,62	1,34	65,29	70,63	47	98
Total	225	68,81	11,38	,76	67,31	70,30	40	99

Table 4 illustrates that the highest score was again appreciated by instructor (1) (Mean=69,25). This time scoring recorded by instructor (2) is higher than that of instructor (3). The mean of scores in the table illustrates the presence of inter-rater reliability between the instructors.

Table 5 also shows the multiple comparisons in posttest.

Table 5 : Dependent variable: multiple comparisons in posttest

(I) CRUP... (J) GRUP	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1.....2	4,00E-02	1,86	1,000	-4,33	4,41
.....3	1,29	1,86	,767	-3,08	5,66
2.....1	-4,00E-02	1,86	1,000	-4,41	4,33
.....3	1,25	1,86	,780	-3,12	5,62
3.....1	-1,29	1,86	,767	-5,66	3,08
.....2	-1,25	1,86	,780	-5,62	3,12

In Table 5 multiple comparisons between instructors proves the inter-rater reliability. Scoring by these instructors is very close to each other. If we look at the students' performance in posttest (see Appendix 2), control group 1 showed the highest performance (Average=75). This time experiment group scored higher

(Average=70) than control group 2 (Average=65). Control group 3 was the least successful (Average=60). This is clearly illustrated below.

Table 6: Oneway ANNOVA Test : Inter-rater reliability between instructors of experiment and control groups

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	21	70,33	8,14	1,78	66,63	74,04	59	90
2	20	75,40	9,58	2,14	70,92	79,88	57	93
3	22	65,86	7,46	1,59	62,56	69,17	47	84
4	12	60,33	13,69	3,95	51,64	69,03	45	92
Total	75	68,77	10,57	1,22	66,34	71,21	45	93

In this table experiment group is represented by number 1. Number of students is presented in second box. Lower and upper bounds illustrate the interval confidence.

Having compared the scores of experiment group with the scores of control group 1 and next control group 2, differences are not significant but when we look at the comparison between experiment group and control group 3, the mean difference is significant (see Table 7). As stated above, the female students and the students' personalities in control group 1 may have contributed to these results. When the researcher observed the control group 1, it was recorded that the students, especially the girls, were more extrovert and more talkative than the other groups.....

Table 7 : Dependent variable: multiple comparisons of groups in posttest

(I)GRUP.....(J)GRUP	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
2.....1	5,07	2,94	,218	-2,02	12,16
3.....1	-4,47	2,87	,292	-11,39	2,45
4.....1	-10,00*	3,41	,013	-18,21	-1,79

The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

a. Dunnett t-tests treat one group as a control, and compare all other groups against it.

In comparison of experiment group (illustrated as GRUP J in the table) with control group 3 (illustrated as 4 in the table), the mean difference is significant at the -10,00 level. However, mean difference between experiment group [(J)GRUP1] and control group 1 [(I) GRUP 2] and control group 2 [(I) GRUP 3] are not significant.

4.1.4.COMPARISONS OF TWO TESTS

RQ2. *Is there a change in the level of speaking skill of the students who participated in the classroom discussion?*

Experimental group's average was 48 (see Appendix 1) in pretest which was administered in Winter Term. However, this score increased in posttest and became 70.33 (see Table 6) in Spring Term. When these scores are compared, the considerable increase cannot be denied. While the students were very stuck and hesitant to speak during the pretest, they were more confident and fluent in posttest. This was also reflected in their scores. Another issue to point out is that experiment group was conducted from the students who took the lowest grades among the four pre-intermediate level groups in placement test administered in Winter Term. Therefore, in pretest, experiment group became the third in the order of achievement. Nevertheless, this group became the second in the posttest and there was no

significant mean difference (Table 7) between the control group 1 and the experiment group. This also shows the undeniable change in the level of the speaking skill of the students participating in the discussion session.

Table 8 illustrates the mean differences between pre and posttests in their scores given of the instructor 1, and Table 9 gives the results and differences of instructor 2 and finally those of instructor 3 (see Table 10).

Table 8 : T-test: Paired Samples Statistics of Instructor 1.

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair ... PRETEST	50,40	75	9,92	1,15
1 POSTTEST	69,25	75	11,21	1,29

Table 9 : T-test: Paired Samples Statistics of Instructor 2

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair ... PRETEST	48,59	75	12,18	1,41
1 POSTTEST	69,21	75	11,43	1,32

Table 10 : T-test: Paired Samples Statistics of Instructor 3

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair ... PRETEST	48,33	75	9,85	1,14
1 POSTTEST	67,96	75	11,62	1,34

Instructors' scoring in pre and posttest are compared in the tables above. When we look at the results of pretest and posttest graded by instructor 1 in table 8, it can be concluded that the achievement increased from (Mean=50,40) to (Mean=69,25) and the same increase in grades is true for the results in Table 9 and 10. There is no significant difference between the pre and posttests.

RQ3 *What is the relationship between language practice and efficiency in language?*

The general conclusion from the limited research on interaction in the classroom as an explanation for acquisition (Hall & Verplactse, 2000; Mackey, 1999; Ohta, 1999, 2001) is that specific, well-designed tasks in experimental settings have a moderate effect on acquisition. It is tempting to take this finding as evidence that interaction in the classroom leads to acquisition and to tell language teachers to have more interaction in their classes. This actually has been done. "Good practice" mantras stress the benefits of interaction, and teachers seem to accept this. The real point is to what extent and how the words of experts reflect what goes on in normal, everyday language teaching (cf. Gass, 1997; van Lier, 1996)."

.....(de Bot 2001)

There is a fact that the more foreign language learners practise the language, the more they speak effectively. Speaking is the oral communication of thoughts and feelings. Speech activities encourage students' social competence as well as their understanding and facility with language. Moreover, oral language is accepted a foundation of all language development by many researchers; therefore, the foundation of all learning. It is base for the other language strands. Through speaking and listening, students learn concepts, develop vocabulary and perceive the structure of the English language – essential components of leaning.

Additionally, students who have a strong oral language base have an academic advantage. School achievement depends on students' ability to display knowledge in a clear and acceptable form in speaking as well as writing. To speak fluently and confidently in a variety of situations is a central human need and an important goal of education.

In the light of the important points of speaking language stated above, this study was aimed to investigate the effects of the discussion technique, one of the speaking activities, on students' communicative skills. And it has been concluded that there is a relationship between language practice and efficiency in language. Experiment group showed a great performance during the classroom discussion, and their improvement in language has been observed and illustrated in Table 7.

RQ4 *Is there a relationship between the language use and frequency and students' motivation, participation, willingness, or self-confidence?*

Discussion technique was attempted to provide motivation, encouragement to exchange ideas and concepts between participants and instructor. The researcher aimed to develop students' critical thinking and communicative skills.

Despite the fact that students had difficulty in expressing themselves and their ideas due to lack of linguistic competence and necessary vocabulary, observations done by the researcher present that willingness and efforts to participate in the discussions made the period enthusiastic and interesting.

There may be some reasons for this. First, although discussion topics were chosen by the instructor, they drew students' interest. Issues were the critical points discussed all over the world. Therefore, they related the topic to the everyday life and their culture. Students were highly engaged in this way.

Other reason may be the opportunity to take responsibility of learning process themselves, to be active in the session, to feel confident and involved in the learning process. They didn't have to sit still and wait for the meal served. They controlled the lesson, not the teacher. It was different from teaching process they were accustomed to.

Instructor's attitude might have also contributed for getting students involved. The instructor was an observer and a guide during the discussion session. So students felt safe and comfortable enough to share their thoughts. Sometimes instructor asked some questions to start fire between groups or give a chance to the passive students to participate.

Their motivation and interest in learning process showed considerable increase in language course. Students in experiment group stated their ideas and feelings about this kind of classroom activity. They explained that discussion technique helped them feel more confident in the language acquisition. Moreover, in this way, as they stated, they enjoyed language learning very much. From the general

interviews between the participants and the instructor, it may be concluded that with a good organization and preparation, this technique can be very successful.

4.2. IMPLICATIONS

What is expected from the learners learning a foreign language is not to learn everything in that language and speak as the native-speakers do, but rather to have an ability of communication at an acceptable level. Nevertheless, this goal cannot be achieved in many cases. Instructors and the school management should take into account what skills and qualities our students need and decide the curriculum in the light of this fact. A plan should be consciously formulated, taking account of a range interests and considerations. Curricular objectives must state emphasis on skills rather than knowledge.

Objectives should ;

- be communication oriented,
- suggest the participation of the learners in the learning process actively and consciously,
- aim at developing the sight and personality of the learner,
- encourage the learners to research,

These suggestions show that a learner-centered - or communicative -approach is stood by.

Fostering productive discussions can be difficult for even most experienced instructors. The discussion format requires careful planning, and depends on highly the skill of facilitator to guide the discussion. Goals must be organized and defined clearly. It is also hard to have all students participate actively in discussions. Moreover, instructors must be sure that discussions become focussed or dominated by a group of students.

Although there are some difficulties, or let's say, disadvantages of this technique, teachers must keep in mind that these constraints can be easily solved when teaching skills combined with personal skills. The aim is to motivate and have

students participate in the learning process and many researchers accept the considerable effect of improving speaking skills of learners in the language learning. In this study, discussion technique was observed and was found out to help students to develop their abilities to formulate questions and communicate ideas.

Besides, in order to achieve group dynamics and active participation, students must come to class with some preparations. Outdoor activities also increase their motivation into the study.

4.3. CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the findings and statistical analysis of the study. Next, the findings of the study will be discussed in the light of the current literature.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.0. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, firstly a brief summary of the study will be given. Then, some suggestions will be introduced.

5.1. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The study was and conducted in four pre-intermediate level classes at TAFA. In this study, subjects were 1st grade students who were at the age of 17 or 18. They took pre and posttests. Pretest was conducted in Winter Term to determine participants' oral language proficiency and the second was administered to the participants in Spring Term to see if the experimental group made any progress in speaking skill compared to the control groups.

During the study, the control group students and the experimental group students did the same activities throughout the first semester, but in the second half of the term experiment group was assigned to get prepared for class discussions.

The data collected from the study were analysed to find answer to the following research questions:

RQ1. Does discussion technique work at TAFA?

RQ2. Is there a change in the level of speaking skill of the students who participated in the classroom discussion?

RQ3. What is the relationship between language practice and efficiency in language?

RQ4. Is there a relationship between the language use frequency and students' motivation, participation, willingness, or self-confidence?

As a result, it can be concluded that ALC book series present vocabulary consists of military-oriented terminology useful to the target population, conversations in military environment and life style in military. Reading texts and writing activities also include many examples to present military way of life and vocabulary and also provide students with a sufficient level of technical or professional training conducted by Department of Defence. The ALC book package consists of language laboratory activities booklets which were designed to reinforce the objectives presented in the lessons. However, the listening activities are mostly mechanical repetition drills, and there is not enough time to do all the listening activities as the units in the books are to be done completely and finished as stated in the schedule. Nevertheless, students' listening comprehension and speaking skill are to be developed to help them communicate effectively.

Though the discussion technique applied to the experiment group in order to help their speaking skill develop, experiment group showed not much progress because of time limitation and the lack of enough lessons to do this activity, we cannot say that it did not work at all. Observations in the classroom and students' own remarks illustrate that students enjoyed discussion technique, it was also helpful since they learned new words and used them afterwards effectively and made researches about the topics.

There were students who at first refused to involve in the lesson, and speak. When the discussions started in the classroom, these students asked for permission to state their ideas. It was surprising to see how much successful at defending their sides. This shows us that students were motivated to speak in English by the discussion technique. They had fun and felt secure to speak.

Despite the fact that statistics are not much satisfactory for the experiment group, it is actually clear that "discussion technique" motivated students to speak English, made them feel confident, drew their attention to the lesson, got their

interests, made them search in English, made them involve in the learning process and engaged their minds. They tried to explain and defend their personal point of view to the others. From the descriptive statistics, it is also clear that experiment group has improved considerably in posttest when compared with their pretest results as well as the posttest results of control groups.

This technique has become highly helpful for students to communicate in English. It's the aim of every teacher to engage students in the material they are teaching. It seems that one of the good ways to foster engagement is to let students involve in the learning process actively, let them control themselves, not the teacher. Through discussion technique this aim was determined to achieve this involvement but more practice is necessary. And for those who need to share feelings and experience the discussion is a primary vehicle in assisting in their development.

5.2. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Since developing speaking skill and communicative competence is a large scale, discussion technique was preferred to restrict the study. The data were collected through pre and posttests. The responses of the participants may not reflect their oral proficiency. If we could observe and test students in more comfortable environment and make them feel secure while giving their responses, and record them during both oral examinations in order to evaluate their responses, the reliability of the study would increase.

In addition to DLI's Oral Examination Test, another proficiency test could be used to test their students.

Discussion technique would much work with the students if it could be possible to have more time to carry out.

This study is limited to the learners studying at the ELT department. In a further study, data can be collected from female learners studying at TAFE so that the effect of the discussion technique can be observed.

A similar research can be carried out on other levels of ELT classrooms by using discussion technique so that the best level on which the classroom discussion work can be observed.

I hope this study will be of benefit to both present and future colleagues who teach, study, and practice in the area of classroom discussion.



REFERENCES

BATTLE, Ken

2000. "Using the Discussion Format in Large Classes"
Boulder : University of Colorado (Online)

BERWICK, Richard

1975. "Staging Classroom Discussion".
TESOL Journal 9 : 283-288

BROWN, H. Douglas

2000. **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching**
New York : Pearson Education

BRUMFIT, Christopher

1984. **Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching**
Cambridge : Cambridge University Press

CANALE, Michael

1980. "From Communicative Competence to language Pedagogy".
Richars, J. and Schmidt (Eds.). **Language and Communication**
London : Longman

DE BOT, Kees

1996. "The Psycholinguistics of the Output Hypothesis".
Language Learning 46: 529-555

DE BOT, Kees

2001. "Interaction in the Classroom".
TESOL Journal 35 : 602-603

ELLIS, Rod

1982. "Informal and Formal Approaches to Communicative Language Teaching".

ELT Journal 36.2.1: 73-81

GREEN, J.F. and E.R. Christopher

1997. "Developing Discussion Skills in the ESL Classroom".

TESOL Journal 51 : 135-143

KALTINICK, A. and C.W. Kaltinick

1974. "That Elusive Discussion Class : Some Suggestions for ESL Teachers".

TESOL Journal 8: 339-346

KRASHEN, Stephen

1980. **The Input Hypothesis**

Washington, D.C. : Georgetown University Press

KRASHEN, Stephen

1981. **Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning**

Oxford: Pergamon Press

KRASHEN, Stephen

1985. **Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications**

London : Longman

LONG, H.M. and P.A. Porter

1985. "Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language Acquisition".

TESOL Journal 19: 207-228

LONG, H. Michael

- 1983... "The Native Speaker/ Non-Native Speaker Conversation in the Second Language Classroom" in M. Clarke and J. Handscombe (eds.)...
TESOL 82: 207-205

LONG, H. Michael

- 1990... "The Least a Second language Acquisition Theory Needs to Explain".
TESOL Journal 24: 649-666

MCLAUGHLIN, Barry

- 1987... **Theories of Second-Language Learning**
London : Edward Arnold

MICHAEL, H.L. and P.A. Porter

- 1985 "Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language Acquisition".
TESOL Journal 19: 207-212

MITCHELL, R. and F. Myles

- 1998... **Second Language Learning Theories**
London : Edward Arnold

MOULY, J. George

- 1968 **Psychology for Effective Teaching**
New York : Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

NUNAN, David

- 1989... **Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom**
Cambridge : Cambridge University Press

O'MALLEY, J.M. and A.U. Chamnot

1990... **Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition**

USA : Cambridge University Press

RICHARD, Berwick

1975. "Staging Classroom Discussion"

TESOL Journal 9: 283-288

SWAIN, Merrill

1985. "Communicative Competence: Some Roles of comprehensible Input... and Comprehensible Output in its development"

Gass, S.M. and Madden, C.G.(Eds.) **Input in Second Language Acquisition**

Rowley, Mass : Newbury House

SWAIN, M. and Lapkin, S.

1995... "Problems in Output and the Cognitive Process They Generate : A Step Towards Second Language Learning"

Applied Linguistics 16 : 371-391

UR, Penny

1982 **Discussions That Work: Task-Centred Fluency Practice**

Cambridge : Cambridge University Press

YOUNG, R. and C. Doughty

1988 "Negotiating Context: A Review of Research"

Lantof, J. and Labarca A. (Eds.) **Research in Second Language Learning : Focus on Classroom**

Norwood, N.J. : Ablex

	Instructor 1	Instructor 2	Instructor 3	
1.LAKIN ÜNAL	64	65	72	MS
2.ALİ ÖZKAN	43	39	43	MS
3.ALPER ARDA	53	40	45	MS
4.AYDIN TURAN	51	36	42	MS
5.BİLGEHAN TOPALHAN	52	43	47	MS
6.EMRE.B.TOY	37	38	36	MS
7.EMRE ESLEMEZ	54	50	48	MS
8.EMRE KORKMAZ	56	47	44	MS
9.ERDEM ARIKAN	63	56	59	MS
10.ERSEL ÇOPURLAR	64	60	69	MS
11.ERSUN ATILGAN	50	53	47	MS
12.FERHAT PINAR	44	50	43	MS
13.HAKAN KILINÇ	44	43	41	MS
14.MEHMET SİVRİTEPE	43	55	42	MS
15.MERT AZMİ	38	35	37	MS
16.MURAT CAN UYKU	48	41	50	MS
17.MUSTAFA KURT	60	74	53	MS
18.OKAN OĞUZHAN	42	37	44	MS
19.SELÇUK ÇİFTÇİ	35	38	40	MS
20.SEMİH PUYAN	52	46	52	MS
21.SERKAN ADAL	54	44	43	MS
22.BEGÜM SEZGİN	53	55	46	SS
23.BURCU ÇAVUŞ	54	56	52	SS
24.ÇAĞRI ÖNALAN	65	72	51	SS
25.ERSİN KARPUZCU	33	46	37	SS
26.EŞREF SAYIL	61	76	59	SS
27.GÖKHAN NARİN	77	72	69	SS
28.HAKAN AKPINAR	52	72	54	SS
29.İPEK GÜREL	68	67	60	SS
30.KORAY GÜLLÜ	40	39	38	SS
31.M.KEMAL ŞİMŞİR	48	45	48	SS
32.MUSTAFA OĞUZ	40	25	39	SS
33.NAZİF BAYSAL	55	52	60	SS
34.OĞUZHAN DOĞAN	55	58	47	SS
35.ONUR ETLİ	52	49	50	SS
36.ONUR OKÇU	49	47	48	SS
37.RESUL FİKİR	26	29	31	SS
38.SİNAN ÇAĞLAR	46	45	43	SS
39.ŞAFAK KAYA	77	54	80	SS
40.YETKİN YURTER	72	86	78	SS
41.YOSUN ARIKAN	52	51	53	SS
42.ABDULLAH ERKAN	42	43	51	MB
43.BURAK TUNÇ	46	44	40	MB
44.CİHAN KESKİN	48	53	48	MB
45.ÇAĞRI KUZUCUOĞLU	52	49	43	MB
46.EMRAH GÜRSOY	37	31	38	MB

Appendix 1: List of students and their grades in pretest

	Instructor 1	Instructor 2	Instructor 3	
47.EMRAH KALEM	50	50	57	MB
48.ERDAL KOZAN	54	43	39	MB
49.ERDEM GÜCLÜER	58	45	50	MB
50.GÖKHAN KOCATEPE	44	45	43	MB
51.GÖKHAN KORKMAZ	42	44	53	MB
52.HAKAN ERGENÇOĞLU	56	47	57	MB
53.HASAN KOCABAŞ	52	54	46	MB
54.KEREM AKÇALI	48	53	49	MB
55.M.ALİ DEMİR	52	49	50	MB
56.M.FERHAT GÜZELEL	59	56	41	MB
57.MEHMET A.ÖZ	54	42	48	MB
58.MURAT ÖZCAN	45	37	41	MB
59.ORÇUN KARAKOÇ	44	26	34	MB
60.SALİH ÇELEBİ	50	49	42	MB
61.SERDAR URKAN	43	44	42	MB
62.SİDDİK GÖKTAŞ	45	37	39	MB
63.TURGAY CÜCÜK	40	46	36	MB
64.AHMET YÜKSEL	48	39	51	ME
65.ALİHAN BİBER	42	37	45	ME
66.EREN ÇAKCI	40	39	47	ME
67.ERTAN KORAL	69	76	64	ME
68.KAAN GÜZEL	58	52	50	ME
69.KAMİL KARAKAYA	38	37	39	ME
70.KÜRSAT KIZILTAŞ	45	40	52	ME
71.KUBİLAY KARTAL	68	72	67	ME
72.MUSTAFA KARAMANOĞLU	50	50	49	ME
73.ONUR ÇALIŞKAN	46	45	43	ME
74.SERDAR ULUCAN	51	42	52	ME
75.SERTAC KİRAZ	42	42	39	ME

	Instructor 1	Instructor 2	Instructor 3	
1.Akın ÜNAL	90	90	90	MS
2.Ali ÖZKAN	65	63	60	MS
3.Alper ARDA	74	72	80	MS
4.Aydın TURAN	72	65	68	MS
5.Bilgehan TOPALHAN	70	69	75	MS
6.Emre B.TOY	64	67	66	MS
7.Emre ESLEMEZ	65	65	70	MS
8.Emre KORKMAZ	55	86	60	MS
9.Erdem ARIKAN	78	78	80	MS
10.Ersel ÇOPURLAR	80	76	85	MS
11.Ersun ATILGAN	74	70	75	MS
12.Ferhat PINAR	80	67	65	MS
13.L.Hakan KILIÇ	66	68	65	MS
14.Mehmet SİVRİTEPE	60	58	60	MS
15.Mert ERCAN	58	54	65	MS
16.Murat Can UYKU	60	60	75	MS
17.Mustafa KURT	70	78	75	MS
18.Okan OĞUZHAN	60	62	60	MS
19.Selçuk ÇİFTÇİ	62	67	68	MS
20.Semih PUYAN	84	82	88	MS
21.Serkan ADAL	70	68	77	MS
22.Begüm SEZGİN	67	70	73	SS
23.Burcu ÇAVUŞ	80	78	80	SS
24.Çağrı ÖNALAN	70	75	68	SS
25.Ersin KAPUCU	77	70	75	SS
26.Eşref SAYIL	86	84	85	SS
27.Gökhan NARİN	83	87	84	SS
28.Hakan AKPINAR	84	97	98	SS
29.İpek GÜREL	85	80	88	SS
30.Koray GÜBLÜ	76	75	58	SS
31.M.Kemal ŞİMŞİR	78	82	68	SS
32.Mustafa OĞUZ	70	64	60	SS
33.Nazif BAYSAL	84	87	90	SS
34.Oğuzhan DOĞAN	56	55	60	SS
35.Onur ETLİ	70	73	65	SS
36.Onur OKÇU	72	70	68	SS
37.Resul FİKİR	55	64	55	SS
38.Sinan ÇAĞLAK	73	78	65	SS
39.Şafak KAYA	88	81	80	SS
40.Yetkin YURTER	90	80	80	SS
41.Yosun S.ARIKAN	75	81	75	SS
42.Abdullah ERKAN	57	63	60	MB
43.Burak TUNÇ	60	60	60	MB
44.Cihan KESKİN	88	81	84	MB
45.Çağrı KUZUCUOĞLU	70	65	67	MB
46.Emrah GÜRSOY	65	75	58	MB
47.Emrah KALEM	56	70	58	MB
48.Erdal KOZAN	68	67	58	MB

Appendix 2: List of students and their grades in posttest

	Instructor 1	Instructor 2	Instructor 3	
49.Erdem GÜCLÜER	78	70	75	MB
50.Gökay KOCATEPE	74	70	60	MB
51.Gökhan KORKMAZ	70	69	80	MB
52.Hakan ERGENÇOĞLU	72	74	60	MB
53.Hasan KOCABAŞ	40	52	48	MB
54.Kerem AKÇALI	74	75	65	MB
55.M.Ender DEMİR	65	60	58	MB
56.M.Ferhat GÜZELEL	76	57	68	MB
57.Mehmet A. ÖZ	72	59	65	MB
58.Murat ÖZCAN	68	68	68	MB
59.Orçun KARAKOÇ	52	65	50	MB
60.Salih ÇELEBİ	80	76	70	MB
61.Serdar URKAN	54	66	68	MB
62.Siddik GÖKTAŞ	70	68	64	MB
63.Turgay CÜCÜK	70	64	55	MB
64.Ahmet YÜKSEL	61	58	50	ME
65.Alihan BİBER	57	60	55	ME
66.Eren ÇAKCI	53	57	61	ME
67.Ertan KORAL	88	99	90	ME
68.Kaan GÜZEL	76	70	70	ME
69.Kamil KARAKAYA	46	40	50	ME
70.Kürşat KIZILTAŞ	63	55	58	ME
71.M.Kubilay KARTAL	76	82	75	ME
72.Mustafa KARAMANOĞLU	58	45	51	ME
73.Onur ÇALIŞKAN	57	50	47	ME
74.Serdar ULUCAN	56	60	58	ME
75.Sertaç KİRAZ	48	45	51	ME