

## Turn-Taking Strategies in MacLean's National Leaders Debate 2015

**Arifa Nugraheni**

English Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya  
[arifanugraheni@mhs.unesa.ac.id](mailto:arifanugraheni@mhs.unesa.ac.id)

**Suharsono**

English Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya  
[suharsono@unesa.ac.id](mailto:suharsono@unesa.ac.id)

### Abstrak

Strategi pengambilan giliran adalah strategi yang digunakan di dalam berbagai interaksi, seperti wawancara, percakapan sehari-hari, debat, atau berbagai macam percakapan lainnya. Penelitian ini mencoba untuk menemukan strategi pengambilan giliran pada MacLean's National Leaders Debate 2015. Adapun penelitian ini menganalisa cara partisipan untuk membangun sebuah debat melalui strategi pengambilan giliran karena strategi tersebut memiliki peran penting untuk menganalisa debat ini. Oleh sebab itu, penelitian ini juga menganalisa alasan apa saja di balik terjadinya pengambilan giliran selama debat berlangsung. Untuk melakukan penelitian ini, metode deskriptif kualitatif dipilih untuk menganalisa data percakapan yang ada di dalam debat. Dengan menggunakan media dan metode tersebut, penelitian ini menyajikan beberapa hasil penemuan yaitu bahwasannya di dalam membangun suatu debat, seluruh peserta debat menggunakan strategi pengambilan giliran. Strategi pengambilan giliran tersebut terdiri dari tumpang tindih, interupsi, dan juga sinyal backchannel. Tumpang tindih dan interupsi adalah yang paling banyak muncul di dalam debat. Penelitian ini juga menemukan bahwa ada beberapa alasan mengapa para pendebat dan juga moderator melakukan strategi tumpang tindih. Faktanya setiap strategi memiliki alasan sendiri. Yang pertama, tumpang tindih yang ditemukan di dalam debat dapat dikarenakan untuk memberi sinyal jengkel, memperbaiki, melengkapi, mengingatkan, merespon, memberi pertanyaan, mengambil bagian, dan juga memberikan informasi. Di samping itu, kemunculan interupsi dapat dikarenakan untuk klarifikasi, kelengkapan, dan juga mengambil giliran di dalam debat. Yang terakhir adalah sinyal backchannel yang terjadi untuk dapat merespon pernyataan pendebat yang sebelumnya.

**Kata kunci:** pengambilan giliran, debat

### Abstract

Turn taking strategies are the strategies which are used for taking a turn in many kind of interactions such as interview, daily conversation, debate, or it can be many things of conversation. This study attempted to find out the turn taking strategies used by the participants of MacLean's National Leaders Debate 2015. Meanwhile, this study concerned to analyse the way participants are constructed by the debate through the turn taking strategies because those strategies have the important roles to analyse the debate. Therefore, this study also analysed the reasons of the turn-taking during the debate. In constructing the study, descriptive qualitative method was used to analyse the data in the form of conversation in the debate. By using that media and method, the study presented findings that in constructing the debate, all the participants use the turn taking strategies. Those turn taking strategies consist of overlap, interruption, and also backchannel signals. The overlap and interruption often appeared in the debate. This study also found several reasons why the debaters and the moderator do the turn taking strategies. In fact, each of strategy have their own reasons. First, the overlaps that are found in the debate can be caused for signalling annoyance, correction, completing, reminding, responding, questioning, taking turn, and also informing. Besides, the appearance of interruption are caused by clarification, completion, and also taking the debater's turn. The last one is backchannel signal that are emerged for only responding the previous debaters' statement.

**Key words:** turn-taking strategies, debate

## INTRODUCTION

People communicate towards conversation in their daily activity. They can talk everything since they are comfortable to talk with. Although they are strangers, sometimes they needed each other to earn any information, such as asking some places and others. Actually, to build a conversation is not that hard for somebody who usually relates with people because they always have topics in their mind to share. Having such topics make them be more acquaintance because it can make friend for somebody who does not know each other. Meanwhile, it does not mean that people with uncommunicative look would never do the same. Some of them feel free to talk about everything since it is not about their privacy because they are not friends yet, therefore the conversation had to be under controlled. Thus, they also think that conversations will flow naturally, and it is not a must to have such topics while they talk each other.

Turn-taking is one of the basic mechanisms in conversation and the nature of turn taking is to promote and to maintain talk. For smooth turn-taking, the knowledge of both the linguistic rules and the conversational rules of the target language is required. According to (Kramsch 1998), since common attitudes, beliefs, and values are reflected in the way language is used conversational rules vary in different cultures and different languages.

This study chose MacLean's National Leaders Debate as the object which has 5 subjects, 1 leader of the debate or usually called as moderator and the rest 4 were the debaters. This debate happened last year on August 6<sup>th</sup>, it was during Canadian prime minister's election 2015 campaign. Canadian people were really excited on this debate because probably they knew less or more what their Prime Minister is going to do to their beloved country. Hence, the debaters who consists of Justin Trudeau as the Leader of the Liberal Party, Elizabeth May as the Leader of the Green Party, Tom Mulcair as the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and Stephen Harper as the Leader of the Conservative Party could not assume this as a regular debate because through this debate they could gain the viewers' trust especially Canadian people, therefore they could choose their next Prime Minister.

Analysing turn-taking through debate is a little bit complicated because debate has already had the exact turn but there always appear the phenomena inside, such as the turn taking strategies. Everybody have their own thought so it is possible if they had a different argument each other while doing a discussion. Maclean's National Leaders Debate guided by only one moderator. The moderator's role is very important in a debate which aims to have a limitation in a conversation. Moderator also

leads the debater to determine the direction of the conversation by providing questions to the speakers. Then, the speaker responds to the questions which are taken up by other participant. The process takes place continuously that will be causing disagreement contrasted by the participants. Moderator is the controller that set the course of the debate. The participants would not speak if the moderator does not ask or even invited to speak, but in reality there are many of the participants who violate the rules of the conversation. Violation of the rules of the speech turn is interruption and overlap.

A thesis from State University of Surabaya entitled *A Study of Turn-Taking Used in Interview TV Program "Indonesia Now Exclusive Agnes Monica with Dalton Tanonaka" on Metro TV* has the same topic with this study. This thesis was written in 2014 by Ari Nugroho from Major of English Literature, Faculty of Language and Arts, State University of Surabaya. In his study, he observed an interview between Agnes Monica and Dalton Tanonaka. From the data of the conversation, she discussed the turn taking used which consisted of turn taking systems, turn taking strategies and also turn taking based on Cultural Background of Conversation. Ari used Coates (2004), Yule (1996) and also Kurylo (2013) in his study. The used method of this study was qualitative method. By doing his observation, he found a lot of new phenomena in using the turn taking systems and strategies.

The similarity between Ari's work and this study is both of these studies used the same theories of Coates (2004) and Yule (1996) in analysing the turn taking strategies. However, the differences are Ari analysed the turn taking systems, strategies and also turn taking based on Cultural Background of Conversation, but this study analysed only the turn taking strategies and the reason of it in the debate. Therefore, there is a clear discrepancy that Ari's work did not analyse the reasons behind the turn-taking strategies happened in the conversation. In brief, this study analysed the same topic about turn taking, but the analyses were only considering the turn taking systems and strategies. Therefore, this study also analysed the reasons of the turn taking happened during the debate. The problems which found in this study are:

1. How do the participants construct their turn in the debate?
2. What are the reasons of the turn taking strategies in the debate?

By reading this study, this study is expected can make the knowledge of the readers about discourse analysis which appears in the debate wider. Moreover, it is also hoped that in the future this study can give some information and can be a source for the readers to enrich their knowledge in linguistics branch which is discourse

analysis, especially the turn-taking in the debates, or it can also be a reference for the next research.

## METHOD

This research used the descriptive qualitative method. According to Mack, Woodsong et al. (2005), qualitative method as a type of scientific research which obtained culturally specific information. It means that qualitative researchers seek answers from gathering what they see, hear, and read from people and places and from events and activities in the real world. The data analysis of this study was taken from the transcript of *Maclean's National Leaders Debate* which is taken from [www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/tale-of-the-tape-read-a-full-transcript-of-macleans-debate/](http://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/tale-of-the-tape-read-a-full-transcript-of-macleans-debate/). This study used some theories from Yule (1996), Cook (1989), Coates (2004) helped to answer the first research question. And for answering the second research question, this study used some theories from Yule (1996), Cook (1989), and also Wardhough (1985).

The data of this study consisted of two elements, verbal and non-verbal. The verbal data consisted of the utterances in the forms of words, phrases, or sentences which were taken from the script of *Maclean's National Leaders Debate 2015*. Besides, the non-verbal data consisted of tones, facial expressions, and body languages. The documentation and the script became the source of the data, and the data of the study was the fragment of dialogues which found in the documentation. Watching, listening, and understanding the debate in order to be able to catch the setting of atmosphere, so some good interpretations could be made after that. Because this research needed interpretation, definitely the writer was involved in this research.

For the data analysis technique, this study used technique as follow: condense the data collected, display it in a meaningful way, and the last, draw conclusions. Each action contributes to the refinement of the process until a final conclusion can be reached.

## RESULT

To make better understanding, the result was divided into some parts of analysis, divided by grouping Hazel's interlocutors.

### Turn-Taking Strategies in MacLean's National Leaders Debate

As the existence of debate, every debater might want the viewers' understand and believed in what they said. So the arguments could be very persuading the viewers. Sometimes in delivering the arguments which related to the topic, they did not care if it ruined other's turn to speak. While the debate happened, overlap, interruption,

and even backchannel signals which belong to the turn taking strategies happened anytime during the discussion.

In this debate, there was a time when the debaters excited to the topic and it made them wanted to explain more. Because of the excitement, the overlap happened any time. Mostly, it happened when the speaker needed more time to explain but there was a crosstalk with the other debaters. However, the speaker still continued to speak.

#### 1) Overlap

As the moderator, Paul Wells tend to make sure the debate went well. In overlapping, he often asked some questions to the debaters. That questions always related to the previous debaters' statement. Therefore he was a to the point typical person, he did not want to waste his words in questioning. It could be seen in the datum below.

#### Datum 1.

459. PW : Mr. Harper//

460. TM : **//get us on track to deal with the very real issue of climate change(.)**

461. SH : **Mr. Mulcair//**

→ 462. PW : **is Canada weaker and less respected on the world stage?**

463. SH : Quite the contrary. Mr. Mulcair, according to the Reputation Institute, a recently published study — it's a widely regarded organization — Canada is the most admired — most admired country in the world because we take strong stands, we do what we believe is right.

Now, let's talk about the Security Council of the United Nations. There is a movement at the United Nations to isolate and denigrate the state of Israel. This government has taken a very clear position. We will not — we will not support that. It is wrong. This is the only country in the world whose existence is under threat. It is a friend and ally, one of the best friends and ally— the best friend and ally this country has//

464. PW : **We've got 30 seconds and we cannot go over(.)**  
 465. SH : **in a very dangerous region, and we will never go//**  
 → 466. PW : **Tom Mulcair, very briefly. Justin Trudeau very briefly(.)**  
 467. SH : **along with that anti-Israel position.**  
 468. TM : I'll take no lessons from anyone on defending the right of Israel to defend itself. But we also take a very balanced approach. We want a safe state for Palestinians, and a safe state for Israelis. That's a balanced approach. That's the type of approach Canada has always taken on the world stage//  
 → 469. PW : **Justin Trudeau.**  
 470. JT : **And all//**  
 → 471. PW : **Thirty seconds.**  
 472. TM : **that's the approach that we would take.**  
 473. JT : all parties are in agreement on this. We've been talking about international relations. We have the worst relationship with the United States that we've had in a long time. That's what we need to fix as well.

(4<sup>th</sup> segment part 2 of the debate)

As the moderator, PW had done his job very well. Based on the datum, he asked question to SH but he did overlap with TM. His question answered by SH right after he finished to give the question. In SH's long explanation, PW did the overlap because he wanted to give a chance to the other debater to answer the question. During that time, SH did not finished to explain so he kept stating to his last words. Then, it continued by TM answer. His last words were overlapped by JT and PW. JT did the overlap because he would like to respond on PW pointed on him during the last words of TM explanation. Those two debaters did overlap while the other would like to interrupt them. All in all, they only wanted to complete their unfinished statements.

Justin was the youngest among all debaters, thus, he was likely to speak hurriedly. He was not the type of people who wait. Every time he wanted to speak, he spoke directly and also pointed out the debater who gave the previous statement. It could be seen in the datum below.

Datum 4.

105. SH : *Well, Mr. – Mr. Trudeau*, let's be clear on what the record actually is. Not only do we take both the economy and the environment seriously; we are the first government in history to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while also growing our economy//  
 106. EM : **That's not true.**  
 107. SH : **And how have we done that?** We do that through a sector-by-sector regulatory approach where we –where we regulate absolute reductions in emissions, and we do so in ways that we know will not kill jobs and will not burden **//taxpayers.**  
 → 108. JT : **Mr. Harper//**  
 109. SH : **The alternative presented//**  
 → 110. JT : **Nobody believes you.**  
 111. SH : **//by all of these other parties is a carbon tax.**  
 112. PW : Mr. Mulcair hasn't had a yet.  
 (2<sup>nd</sup> segment part 1 of the debate)

Based on the datum, the debaters who did the overlap in this time were EM and JT. It was not really different with the previous datum because this datum had also had three overlaps. Yet, all of them defined as ineffective overlaps. It was ineffective because there were no response to the one who overlap in stating. Although there were two debaters did the overlap but the dominant was Justin Trudeau. First, the overlap had been done by EM on responding SH's statement. She said **"That's not true"** in her overlap towards SH but he kept stating every single thing from his mind and she probably failed on getting SH's attention. Her purpose on overlapping was only to respond on SH's statement. Second and the last, the overlap had been done by JT. His first overlap was for stealing the turn to talk from JT. The way he pointed on SH made the debaters gave their attention on him and his last overlap was only for completing his previous statement. In sum, this datum had not had the effective overlaps but they had their own reason in overlapping.

Stephen Harper stood as the former Canadian Prime Minister. He should have be the one who responded the other's statement concerning him. Mostly,

he could not accept other debaters' comment about his work. It probably showed in the following datum.

Datum 6.

123. JT : *Mr. Harper – Mr. Harper is continuing to invent attacks, and quite frankly, Canadians are tired of that kind of leadership. You haven't been able to get it done on the environment, Mr. Harper. You haven't been able to get it done on the economy. You haven't built the kind of balance that Canadians expect. If we're going to build strong communities, if we're going to create jobs for our children and grandchildren while protecting our air, our water, our land, we have to actually show leadership//*
124. EM : **But – but//**
125. JT : **and you have //stepped back from any sort of//**
- 126. SH : **Mr. Trudeau, under the government//**
127. JT : **confidence building for government, for Canadians.**
- 128. SH : **emissions are down three percent//**
129. EM : **No(.) No(.)**
- 130. SH : **Under the Liberal government they were up//**
131. EM : **No(.)**
- 132. SH : **//30 percent. That's the difference.**

(2<sup>nd</sup> segment part 1 of the debate)

All the overlaps in the datum above had been done by the one and only SH who was the former Canadian prime minister. There were four times of overlap and right from his start overlap's purpose, he would like to hold the floor. At first, he was not succeed to make up his turn because when he did overlap, JT did not care on him and he finished his statement. At the second overlap, SH successfully got his turn. He explained everything he need to explain so he needed more time to complete his statement. Because of that, the rest of the overlaps did by SH.

Overlaps happened every time all the debaters found the gap in their statements. Therefore, the data below was taken from the third segment of the debate which talked about the democracy.

Datum 7

281. JT : Mr. Mulcair, you are the one who announced that **//position//**
- 282. TM : **What's your number, Justin?**
283. JT : **on separation, on making it //easier//**
- 284. TM : **What's your number?**
285. JT : **My position is the Supreme //Court's position//**
- 286. TM : **What's your number?**
287. JT : that says the number should be set in the context of the next referendum if that ever comes. And your play to try and stoke up that separatist vote for the NDP by announcing at Saint-Jean-Baptiste that this is continuing to be your policy is not worthy of a prime minister.

(3<sup>rd</sup> segment part 2 of the debate)

The datum above consisted of the overlaps that had been done by TM. That datum was started by JT's statement and TM did his overlap in between. TM kept questioning on JT's statement with asking "**What's your number?**". At first, his overlap neglected by JT but fortunately, on his last explanation, JT explained everything clearly and it also answered TM's concerning the number of TM asked. Thus, TM's overlap purposed for signalling the annoyance by him so that he could feel disturb by the question that TM's gave. In conclusion, this datum was identified as an effective datum because there were responses from Justin Trudeau when TM did the overlap every time JT stating.

Next, the data was still taken from second segment on part 2 of the debate and it stated by TM who gave his respond on EM statement.

Datum 8.

190. TM : I share the same concerns as *Miss May* with regard to the Kinder Morgan pipeline that she just talked about. And in fact, that's another example of what Mr. Harper's done to our rules//
191. SH : **Against that one too(.)**
192. TM : **Did you know** that the groups that are involved in those processes, in those hearings for Kinder Morgan, are not even allowed to cross-examine the



company's witnesses? That's a fundamental breach of the rules of natural justice, and that's **//why the public doesn't trust him anymore//**

193. EM : **But do you oppose the pipeline? //Do you oppose the pipeline and the tankers?**

194. TM : **See, here's the difference.** Opposing these pipelines systematically in advance is just as wrong as supporting them//

→195. EM : **So you're prepared//**

196. TM : **in advance because, in both cases, what you need is an objective study//**

→197. EM : **So you've just said that the process is flawed(.)**

198. TM : **In the case of Energy East, for example//**

→199. EM : **//But we should wait for its result?**

200. TM : **where we would be replacing** the super tankers that right now come down the St. Lawrence to Saint-Romuald across from Quebec City, we'd be replacing the extremely dangerous trains that are going through communities all across Canada. That's the type of evaluation that we should do —it's an objective evaluation —if we can get back to a credible system, which we've lost.

(2<sup>nd</sup> segment part 2 of the debate)

There were four times of overlaps had been done EM in the datum above. It started when TM stated about Kinder Morgan pipelines. His first overlap was purposed to earn more information about the explanation and it categorized as the effective overlap because there came a respond from TM concerning EM's question. Instead of continuing his statement, he answered EM's overlap question. Besides, the rest three overlap by EM were identified as ineffective overlap. It caused by there were no respond on TM's next statement concerning EM's overlap statement. He kept focusing on his previous statement and he continued until he finished the statement. The second overlap was purposed to hold the floor but it

failed and the rest two overlaps were purposed to continue the previous statement.

## 2) Interruption

Interruption was a common thing when it turned to the debate. It was one of the strategies that caused a big problem in the way of delivering the argument. Through the debate, debaters might give their opinion to the opponents and they could also persuade the viewers to deal with their statements. Yet, it was not easy because the opponent might interrupt the first debater statement so it would definitely distract the first debater statement to be understood by the viewers. Here the data show how the interruption came up to the debate between the debaters while they were taking their turn.

### Datum 9.

463. SH : Quite the contrary. Mr. Mulcair, according to the Reputation Institute, a recently published study — it's a widely regarded organization — Canada is the most admired — most admired country in the world because we take strong stands, we do what we believe is right.

Now, let's talk about the Security Council of the United Nations. There is a movement at the United Nations to isolate and denigrate the state of Israel. This government has taken a very clear position. We will not — we will not support that. It is wrong. This is the only country in the world whose existence is under threat. It is a friend and ally, one of the best friends and ally— the best friend and ally this country has//

464. PW : **We've got 30 seconds and we cannot go over(.)**

465. SH : **in a very dangerous region, and we will never go//**

466. PW : **Tom Mulcair, very briefly. Justin Trudeau very briefly(.)**

467. SH : **along with that anti-Israel position.**

468. TM : I'll take no lessons from anyone on defending the right of Israel to defend itself. But we also take a very balanced approach. We want a safe state for Palestinians, and a safe state for Israelis. That's a balanced

approach. That's the type of approach Canada has always taken on the world stage//

469. PW : **Justin Trudeau.**

470. JT : **And all//**

→471. PW : **Thirty seconds.**

472. TM : **that's the approach that we would take.**

473. JT : all parties are in agreement on this. We've been talking about international relations. We have the worst relationship with the United States that we've had in a long time. That's what we need to fix as well.

(4<sup>th</sup> segment part 2 of the debate)

Based on the data above, all of three debaters were trying to take their turn to speak up. When the turn was taking by JT, his looks was really arrogant. He's stealing SH's turn to talk but he looked more confident rather than SH. On his turn, he showed his disagreement to SH's statement but on the other side he was a little bit agree with TM's statement although he's not fully supported TM. He gave an interruption to both of the debaters but he was not truly giving his opinion. In fact, he's giving the fact considering with the topic. Therefore there was a time when the moderator wanted to ask JT related with JT's statement but he was not successfully taking his turn so he did not continue to ask. Those data also showed SH's interruption which responded TM statement within repeating his words and he's successfully taking his turn. In conclusion, repeating the word will make the statements are clearer so that catches the opponent's attention to stop stating.

Justin was a decisive typical person. It clearly said through his way of spoke and answered the questions. One of the interruption that had been done by JT showed below.

#### Datum 10.

17. SH : =Well, let's be clear, *let's be clear* what the record is. We have 1.3 million net new jobs created since the global financial crisis, the best record by far in the G-7. That's why incomes are rising across the board in this country and have been rising. That's why we have manufacturing and other sectors outside of energy that are now expanding because, *because* we are able, because we have a balanced budget and are able to make investments in things like infrastructure, in health care, in

benefits for families. Now is not the time to throw us back into deficit and to start to spend tens of billions of dollars we don't have, paid for //by tax hikes. That is the wrong policy.

→18. JT : **Mr. Harper, Mr. Harper the reality is Canadians across this country know (0.1) that times are tough, and the fact is (0.1) you have completely become disconnected from the reality that people are facing right across the country. Your plan isn't working, and we know that. And the risk would be sticking with your plan.**

**Now Mr. Mulcair is good in his criticisms and his questions, (0.1) but is not necessarily good at answering the own questions to him because what we've seen is that he's put forward (0.1) plans for a \$15.00 minimum wage (0.1) He's talking about it across the country and what is actually the case is he's misleading Canadians. He's given Canadians who work in big box stores and behind the checkout counters and in (0.2) in shops and coffee shops false hope because his minimum wage plan (0.1) actually will only help less than one percent of every Canadian who earns minimum wage. And that kind of// false advertising is simply irresponsible.**

19. PW : How about ...

20. TM : Under our plan to introduce a \$15.00 an hour federal minimum wage, over 100,000 Canadians will get a raise. Under Mr. Trudeau's plan, not a single Canadian// will get a raise.

(1<sup>st</sup> segment part 1 of the debate)

The datum above was taken from the first segment of the debate. It started by SH clarification. He explained it in a long way of explanation but unfortunately he was interrupted by JT. JT took his turn when SH almost reached his last words of explanation. As it was bold in the datum, JT interrupted him with calling his name for two times first "Mr. Harper, Mr. Harper" to get SH's attention and it successfully stole SH's turn to speak.

Right after calling SH's name, he continued his explanation toward what had been said by SH. He clarified everything concerning SH explanation. According to him, everything SH said was wrong. He was too excited in clarifying so he was mumbling too much but it did not really disturb his concentrate. Therefore, he was good in interrupting SH.

Next data came from the different segment, it showed the interruption which was done by SH.

Datum 11

150. TM : Mr. Harper and Mr. Trudeau both agree with Keystone XL, which represents the export of 40,000 jobs. I want to create those 40,000 jobs here in //Canada.
151. EM : So Mr. Mulcair, will you stop the Kinder Morgan pipeline?
- 152. SH : **Mr. Mulcair says -Mr. Mulcair //says he supports energy exports//**
153. EM : Are you opposing the Kinder Morgan pipeline as well?
- 154. SH : **Then he goes abroad, he and his party, to argue against Canadian energy exports. You know, a moment ago they talked about landmark decisions by the Obama administration in the United States. They're pushing ahead with coal –with national regulations of coal-fired electricity. We did that in Canada three years ago //across several provinces//**
155. JT : No. Mr. Mulcair – Mr. Harper, you did not do that//
156. SH : **We did that in concert with the provinces//**
157. JT : It was the Ontario government that worked very hard to do that  
(2<sup>nd</sup> segment part 1 of the debate)

The interruption came right after TM made up his argument related with SH. The turn to talk was taken by SH when EM had also interested to ask TM back. She did not successfully make up her answer. Hence, for responding TM's statement, he interrupted TM because he would like to show that TM had the wrong statement so he wanted to clarify. He started his interruption with calling TM's name, it was "**Mr. Mulcair says, Mr. Mulcair says he supports energy exports**". His purpose on calling TM's name for two times was to make TM paid

his attention on him so that he could continue his statement.

There were more interruption happened in this debate. Below was still the data taken from segment three.

Datum 12.

363. SH : Mr. Mulcair, not only do you respect, as I do, the Government of Quebec's position against Senate abolition, it was your position for all the years you were in the Government of Quebec //You should be clear about that(.
- 364. TM : **And Mr. Harper's proving my point. It's a longstanding position. Since the unilateral partitions of the Constitution in '82, every successive Quebec government has said that. That's why I'm not at all hesitant to sit down again with my friend and former colleague Philippe Couillard and work on this very tough issue//**
365. PW : Senate abolition//
- 366. TM : **because I believe** sincerely that the only way to deal with the Senate is to get rid of it. One billion dollars has been spent on the Senate on Mr. Harper's watch. He's done nothing about abolition. He's done nothing about reform. Can you imagine how many child care spaces we could have created with \$1 billion, Mr. Wells?

**(3<sup>rd</sup> segment part 2 of the debate)**

In connection to the data above, TM was the one who interrupted on SH. It started by SH statement with mentioning TM name. He did not accept SH statement so he was taking his turn to speak and it started with saying "And Mr. Harper's proving my point." He wanted to reject all SH statement and he successfully got his turn back. It was the same with the previous data which continued to be an overlap. There was appeared the almost interruption by PW while TM explained his statement and unfortunately it did not success. He knew that at that time PW tried to get his turn to speak so he asked for PW opinion in his last word.

Mostly, Elizabeth May was difficult to take her turn in the debate. Every time she tried to do those strategies, she almost did not get his chance to do it. In interrupting, she started stating with using the word "well". It could be seen in the datum below.

Datum 20.



79. TM : At least you're denying  
 80. SH : //almost exclusively in the energy sector. The rest of the economy is growing. It's projected //to grow this year//  
 →81. EM : **Well, that was my//**  
 82. SH : and into future years. And the way to handle a fall in oil prices is not tens of billions of dollars of increased taxes, increased borrowing and increased spending. That's how countries get themselves into serious long-term trouble.  
 83. PW : Elizabeth //May has been trying to make a point.  
 →84. EM : **Mr. Prime Minister, you made a promise in the Speech from the Throne in 2007 that you would tackle the barriers to trade and labour mobility within this country as an economic union, and it's squarely your responsibility. You said you would go to the trade and commerce clause of the Constitution if needed to be. And now here we are as a country, we have more barriers to trade within Canada than the 28 nation states of the European Union. Why over this period of time, where is your plan //to break down the trade barriers within Canada that //our economy?**

(1<sup>st</sup> segment part 2 of the debate)

Based on the data above, EM tried to get her turn by interrupting SH statement. At first, SH delivered his statement concerning to the Canadian economy. Actually it did not run easily because the other debaters tried to interrupt on him. Even EM tried to steal his turn to speak but she cannot, it could be seen on number 81 because SH kept talking until he finished. PW recognized EM's unsuccessful interruption, so he gave her a chance to speak but right before he finished to talk, EM spoke to give her clarification on SH's statement. She obviously made everything clearly and she even gave SH questions. So, her interruption categorized as an effective interruption. Therefore, another interruption datum showed below and it still happened in the same segment.

### 3) Backchannel Signal

The responder excitement on responding the statements could bring backchannel signals. It showed that actually the others were listened and understands

the debaters' statements. Mostly, verbal backchannel appeared in conversations. It was like "uh-huh", "umm", and so on. Not only that, backchannel signals could appear as simple words or phrase. Normally those responses were showing a clarification from the responder. Thus kind of backchannel signals phenomenon could be found in the data below:

#### Datum 13.

47. TM : Thank you, Paul. What Mr. Harper fails to mention is that he's run up eight deficits in a row. He's added \$150 billion to Canada's debt in the last 10 years, and frankly, last week, as we headed into this campaign, in just one day he spent over a billion dollars. Honestly, Mr. Harper, we really can't afford another four years//of you.

48. SH : We have –we have a budget that is balanced now when other countries don't.

- 49. EM : **Ooh.**

50. PW : And that wraps up very –very punctual of you all, I appreciate that. That wraps up the first round of questions on the economy, but we're only half done on this subject alone.

#### **(1<sup>st</sup> segment, part 1 of the debate)**

From the data above, "Ooh" took a place as backchannel signal to those data. As what could be seen in the data that TM declared her thought to SH's previous argument but then he talked right after TM argument which made EM a little bit shocked. EM responded to SH's argument spontaneously. She did not do that for purpose because she did nothing after responding to SH's statement. Another backchannel signal could be seen in other data below:

#### Datum 14.

423. SH : Well, I – look, I'll let Mr. Trudeau explain his own position. He's been both for and against the legislation at the same time. What I say is this, Paul. Our – our view is very clear, that security and freedom go hand-in-hand. We know that the international jihadist movement that we face is a very serious menace to this planet, including to this country. What we did in developing our legislation is we looked at what modern powers police and security

agencies have across our allies, and we've made sure that we are up to those standards. We've also provided – Mr. Trudeau talks about oversight. We have moved our oversight in a very different direction, not having politicians do oversight. We have poli— we have oversight done by independent experts, by people who are experts in the field, an independent committee, and they are chaired. And – and those – chair – chaired by prominent former judges. I think that's – I think that is a robust system of oversight.

424. JT : When you look —

425. PW : When you support Parliamentary oversight —

→ 426. JT : *Exactly.*

427. PW : — and processes like these —

428. JT : When you look to the core of Reform Party —

429. PW : — why did you change your mind?  
Is it because you don't like these politicians?

(4<sup>th</sup> segment, part 2 of the debate)

Based on the data above, “exactly” was so clear enough. That word was JT's and he directly said that he was agreeing with SH statement. It said right after he had failed interruption but then he said that for responding SH's finished statement. Actually JT was so passionate for responding every statement of his opponents. He looked really spontaneously typical person.

## DISCUSSION

Based on the data analysis, the theory of turn taking and also the turn taking irregularities would be applied in this section. It discussed all the turn-taking strategies which emerged during the debate by the participants. Therefore, the discussion is related with turn taking strategies such as overlap, interruption, and backchannel signals and the last was the reasons of the turn-taking strategies in the debate.

### The Turn Taking Strategies in MacLean's National Leaders Debate

This study had found that although the debate controlled by the moderator, the turn-taking strategies appeared among the debaters to construct the debate. It was the same turn-taking strategies proposed by Yule (1996) that among the three types of the turn-taking

strategies, overlap and interruption were often used by the participants during the debate.

As the most frequently strategies used by the participants in *MacLean's National Leaders Debate*, overlap and interruption were connected each other. In fact, sometimes overlap was the positive sign of cooperative involvement. The turn-taking system is designed to resolve the conversational problem which means that the implementation of designed turn rules which used to avoid overlap may not succeed in providing the current solution at each juncture stated by Schiffrin (1988). However, in this case, the topic of the debate could make up the participants used strategies because their excitement on stating affected their turn to speak. The example could be seen in datum 2 or 13 when Paul Wells asked Stephen Harper concerning the foreign policy topic in the last segment of the debate. Instead of letting SH finished his answer, Paul Wells interrupted him to give the other debaters chance to answer his question and he also overlapped with Stephen Harper in the last minute of Stephen Harper's explanation. Thus, the moderator had the same role as the debaters to use the turn-taking strategies in the debate.

In connection with the debate, turn-taking strategies could appear every time the moderator gave all the debaters questions and those debaters automatically applied overlap, interruption, or even backchannel signals. In addition, there were effective and ineffective turn-taking strategies during the debate those were appeared in each of the turn-taking strategies.

Each participant have their own way to do the turn taking strategies. First, Paul Wells as the moderator often overlap and interrupt to ask some questions to the debaters. Mostly, he mentioned debaters' name first and it followed by the choice question that could provoke the debater's confusing answers. Furthermore, he did the strategies to give alerts to the debaters concerning the time. Another one was Justin Trudeau, the youngest debaters. Every time JT would like to overlap or interrupt his opponent, he often called his opponent's name first until he was sure that the opponent listened to him. In fact, he was really passionate in delivering his statement. It also helped him to get the other debaters' attention and there were some new responses emerge. Furthermore, it provoked the other participants to do the strategies. The other one was Stephen Harper. He often said “well” before he started to respond on the other debaters' statement and he successfully got his turn to speak. Most of his responds were denying the other debaters' statement. Next, the other debater was Thomas Mulcair, whenever he wanted to do those strategies, he was calmer than the way Justin Trudeau did but he seemed like to force his opponent to respond on his statement. It could

be seen in the datum 10 that he repeated his questions for Justin Trudeau until JT responded his question. The last debater was Elizabeth, the one and only women in *MacLean's National Leaders Debate 2015*. She often said "so" before she gave questions to the debaters and it could make her taking her turn.

Overlap was the strategy which represented the excitement of the speaker in a conversation. As what had been said by Coates (2004), *overlap in a given situation can be more tolerated than in other*. This case happened in the *MacLean's National Leaders Debate 2015*. Instead of destroying the debate, the overlaps made the debate ran more interesting because there were so many statements came up from the debaters within it. The overlap happened in the similar way of the interruption and it was also mostly done by Stephen Harper in *MacLean's National Leaders Debate*.

On the other hand, backchannel signal was the last strategy that less appeared in the debate. It caused by these strategies did not provoke the other debaters' statement. The debaters actively took their turns to maintain the conversation and the topic was really debateable, indeed all the debaters were exciting in conducting the debate. According to Yule (1996), responding to the hearer through head nods, smiles, gestures and other facial expression, and also the common vocal indication were still called as backchannel signals. This debate viewed from vocal indication of backchannel signals. The signals that accepted by the hearer was to make sure that they understood what the speaker said. Therefore, it also avoided the silence moment inside the conversation.

In a journal article, King (2011) had written a topic entitled *Power, struggle and control: An Analysis of turn-taking in Edward Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*. She found that turn-taking and turn-management are the central of Martha and George's struggle for the power and the framework provide a useful guide to their respective levels of conversational dominance. By finding out the result of the study, it could also support that the debaters who were dominance in conversation could make up their turn to talk in the debate. As happened in the debate, the dominance conversation was often done by Stephen Harper because he was the former Canadian prime minister and mostly the topic related with the previous minister's job, thus he needed to respond it all by using the turn-taking strategies.

Since the turn taking strategies on *MacLean's National Leaders debate* had been applied by all the participants, it could be concluded that although the debate had the moderator to control all the debaters, the turn-taking strategies appeared every times the debaters did not feel right about the previous statement. As a result,

Stephen Harper as the previous Canadian Prime Minister often applied it all in a whole debate for responding all the other debaters' statements.

### The Reasons of Turn Taking Strategies in the Debate

There were so many overlap and interruption happened in this debate. Some of them might have the same reasons behind. Cook (1989) mentioned that there were some reasons connecting with the overlap phenomena, they were signalling annoyance, urgency, correction, and also completion. This debate was dominated by Stephen Harper because as the previous prime minister, he was criticized by all the debaters. He mostly overlapped for giving the current speaker correction.

According to Wardhough (1985), the reasons of interruption could be showed for clarification or repetition, asking for help, rejection, and completion. Based on that theory, the debate had only the same two reasons with it, those were clarifying and completing. There also appeared the other reason of interruption, it was for taking the turn. The interruption had the same debater dominance like the overlap had, he was Stephen Harper. SH always took his turn of speak to interrupt somebody else if he did not give the same argument with him and he often clarified other's argument during the debate. The interruption for clarification could be seen in the datum 14. Therefore, interruption had also done by the debaters for taking the turn.

There also the reason why backchannel happened during the debate. When backchannel appeared, it meant that the speaker caught whatever the current speaker's said. It stated by Yule (1996) that all the signals can be received by the hearer. The backchannel signals were happened in the ineffective way because it happened in the one way communication where the speaker did not have to respond the opponent's respond. In sum, the debaters showed that they preferred to do the overlap or the interruption rather than giving signals to the current speaker during the debate.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, the research shows that in constructing the debate, all the debaters use the turn taking strategies. Those turn taking strategies consist of overlap, interruption, and also backchannel signals. Among those strategies, overlaps and interruption often appeared in the debate because they can get their turn to speak through those strategies and all the debaters have a big desire to deliver their own argument. In fact, the debaters have their own way to get their turn to speak. For instance, Paul wells and Justin Trudeau call the other debaters' name before they continue to give them

responds. Stephen Harper used the word “well” right before he continue to respond the previous debaters’ statement. The other one is Tom Mulcair who likes to do the strategies directly without politeness and the last is Elizabeth May. She often uses “so” before he respond the other debates’ statement. Moreover, the one who does overlap the most is SH. Besides, the overlap above, all the debaters and also the moderator have done the interruption and the most interruption is constructed by SH. Because he is the former prime minister, thus mostly this debate discussed about his job during his mandate and he has to clarify every single thing related with it. In consequence, whenever the other debaters give their wrong statements about him, he tries to interrupt it. If it isn’t working, the crosstalk appears between him and other debaters so the overlaps definitely happen to complete the statement. In the other hand, those problems above do not affect the quality of the debates. Therefore, the debate goes well and it looks more interesting with the turn taking strategies.

In fact, there are several reasons why the debaters and the moderator do the turn taking strategies. Those reasons captured by the analysis of the debate within using Cook theory. An overlap which happened in this debate is caused by signalling annoyance, correction, and completion. Furthermore, the interruption is caused by clarification for the wrong previous statement, showing the rejection, and same with an overlap, completing the unfinished statement. Meanwhile, the backchannel signals is appeared to let the speaker know that everything the current speaker saying is listened by the hearer. Hence, those are applied by all the participants of the debate when they are in the discussion.

## **SUGGESTION**

Finished on reading this thesis, hopefully the next research with the same topic about turn-taking could analyse not only from discourse analysis perspective but also from pragmatics. The next research might use not only turn-taking strategies but also using the turn taking in a broad discussion. If the analysis used the same object, the debate, it would be nice to analyse it from the different perspective of the debate, such as the role of the moderator, etc. All in all, using the other object is also good because turn-taking wasn’t only appear in the debate but it can be appeared in the other model of conversation.

## **REFERENCES**

- Coates, J. (2004). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Pearson ESL.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Designing a Qualitative Study Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Freely, A. J. and D. L. Steinberg (2009). *Argumentation and Debate Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making Twelfth Edition*, Wadsworth.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method*. New York, Routledge.
- Heldner, M. and H. Edlund (2010). "Pauses, gaps, and overlaps in conversation."
- Johnson, S. L. (2009). *Winning Debates: A Guide to Debating in The Style of The World Universities Debating Championships*. New York, International Debate Education Association.
- King, R. (2011) *Power, struggle and control: An Analysis of turn-taking in Edward*
- Albee’s *Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* 3,
- Kramsch, C. (1998) *Language, Culture, and Voice in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language*. 8, 4-21
- Kurylo, A. (2013). *Inter/Cultural Communication*. Marymount Manhattan College, Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mack, N., C. Woodson, et al. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide*. USA.
- Paltridge, B. (2000). *Discourse Analysis*. London, MPG Books Ltd.
- Sacks, H., E. A. Schegloff, et al. (1974). "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." 50: 696-735.
- Schiffrin, D. (1988). 'Conversation analysis' in Newmeyer, F. J. *Linguistics. The study of language in its socio-cultural context*. Cambridge, University of Cambridge.
- Wardhough, R. (1985). *How Conversation Works*. Oxford, New York, B. Blackwell in association with Andre Deutsch.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language Fourth Edition*. United States of America, Cambridge University Press.