

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1. Theoretical Framework**

##### **2.1.1. Turn-Taking System.**

According to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), turns in conversations are resources. The turns are distributed in a systematic way among participants. Sacks says that turns are taken by participants not only in conversation but also in a period of time when conversation is stopped between two speakers or overlap between them.

The organization of turn-taking in conversation depends on two components. There are a turn-constructive and a turn-allocational components. Nevertheless, Sacks deals with the construction of turn-constructive units or TCU. Then, Sacks only uses the regulation and negotiation of turn allocation at the end of each unit for the next such unit.

Furthermore, a single turn can have one or more than one TCUs. The TCU can be either a single-unit or a multi-unit turn. TCU has two key properties. There are the property of project ability and the property of transition-relevance-place creation. Participants use their knowledge of language and contexts to find information about some sorts of units that possibly occur and the reason. Besides, participants also find information about the point of possible completion at the end of TCU. The point of possible completion at the end of each TCU produces

the possibility of transition among talk-participants, which is a transition-relevance place (TRP).

Moreover, it is important to notice that TCUs are produced as the participants' interaction. Sacks (1974) suggests that structural resources used in conversation are context-free and context-sensitive. In this case, context-free means that the TCUs are available to be used again and recursive. They are free from any certain condition that connects with any particular conversation. Then, context-sensitive means that the use of TCUs is introduced in different designs. The designs depend on what participants want to do and how participants understand the previous event before the conversation.

Related to the turn-allocational component, Sacks suggests a few basic rules. These rules describe the occurrence of turns at a transition-relevance place. The rules are the options for the participants.

Rule 1:

- 2 If the first speaker has identified or selected a particular next speaker, the first speaker has the right to initiate the turn at that moment.
- 3 If there is no selection, then any next speaker may do self-selection at that point. Then, the first self-selected speaker has the right to take the turn.
- 4 If there is no next speaker that has been self-selected, then the current speaker may continue talking with another TCU.

Rule 2:

5. The system of turn-allocational rules is recursive; any option operates, then in the next TRP, the same set of rules repeated.

Furthermore, turn taking is also contributed by intonation. According to Brazil's intonation system (1997), there are four kinds of intonation system. First is termination choice that is related to a stretch of speaker. Second is dominant referring tone. In this case, the speaker might use a rising tone rather than a fall-rise tone in ending a sentence to hold his turn by underlining his/her present status as the dominant speaker. Third is interrogative function of tones which are utterances that take a declarative form but they have an interrogative implication. The last is phatic question that have social function of establishing or maintaining social contact. Nevertheless, in the case of Arab people, according to Deddy and Jalaluddin (1998), personal status decides the intonation of speak.

While the speaker is talking, the listener will give his/her response or reactions but without having an intention to take over the turn. According to Duncan & Niederehe's (as cited in Orestrom, 1983), the function of backchannel is as supports, exclamations, exclamatory questions, sentence completions, and restatements. The most common type of backchannel is supporting backchannel which is always used with falling tone or low intonation.

## **2.1.2 Sequential and Sequence Organization of Conversation**

### **2.1.2.1. Sequential Organization**

Participants always take turns to talk in conversation or talk-in-interaction. Usually, the response or the action of the participants in their next turn is related to the action of previous speakers. According to Heritage (1990), conversation is sequentially organized. Sequential organization of interaction in turn is the

medium for creating dynamic social context (as cited in Nuzuliyanti, 2004). Moreover, Hutchby (1998) suggests that the systematic resources of conversation refer to the sequential order of turn-taking. The sequential order of turn-taking means that turns are connected together into specific sequences

Utterances are produced on turn by turn through the sequential organization of interaction. The turns have connection between one to another. It means that the next turn can be understood as the response to the previous one. A relation between turns is called conditional relevance. A turn and the action can create context or reference for the next turn.

There are two aspects that can be seen in the speakers' next turn. First, the next turn is the place where speakers show their understanding or acknowledgement toward the first turn. It means that the next speaker has performed in order to regard the utterance and the possible completion of the utterance of the prior speaker. Second, the next turn is the analysis of speakers and their understanding of the prior turn's content. It is also includes the action that has been designed to do or as their completion.

Any particular utterance in a certain turn must be understood and interpreted in its sequential context. It must be seen that turn is produced based on some prior condition sets. In this case, the utterances are in the previous turns that create some expectations in the next turns in the sequence. This is based on adjacency principle. Adjacency principle is a principle that operates in sequential ordering or organization of turns or sequences. The result of this principle is adjacency pair sequences.

Furthermore, adjacency pair sequences are sequences of two or more part actions that are usually performed by different speakers. The speakers are differentiated into first pair-parts (FPPs) and second pair parts (SPPs). FPPs are types of utterance such as question, request, offer, invitation, announcement, etc. SPPs are types of utterance such as answer, grant, reject, accept, decline, agree/disagree, acknowledge, etc. The production of the first pair-part anticipates the next turn and strictly controls the second pair-part, for example, question-answer, request-rejection or agreement, offer or invitation and decline or acceptance, and greeting-greeting. When the first pair-part gets projected, (co)participants are responsible to produce the next action that appropriate to it. However, when it does not occur or delay, talking participants also have responsible for the absence or delays and the expansion of a turn or sequence. Therefore, it can cause talk with an adjacency-pair-based sequence of more than two turns.

#### **2.1.2.2. Sequence Organization**

The highlight of conversation analysis is concerned on how meaning and context in conversation that are related to the idea of sequence. Sequence and action are part of context. Then, sequence of conversation, which emerges from previous conversational turn, shapes the meaning of a conversation action.

According to Schegloff (1995), it has been explained that turns are always organized into a coherent sequence rather than the same topic. Sequence organization often refers to action rather than topicality. Adjacency-pair

sequences are considered the general pattern or basic type of sequences into which turns at talk are organized. Those are preference structure, expansion, and sequence-closing sequence.

According to Schegloff (1995), preference structure allows turns at talk and their absence, which is indicated by silence or pause, to be seriously described and explained. According to Schegloff (1995), preference is established on the same composite design of pair-parts and action. In this case, the designed pair-parts are not based on talk participants' psychological orientations but on their interactional or sequential organization. Besides, it is also based on the orientation of their talk toward the success to carry out certain actions.

Furthermore, according Schegloff, expansion includes extra participation by groups of people through extra turns. There are many forms of sequence expansion: pre-expansion, insert expansion, and post expansion.

3. Pre-expansion or pre-sequence can be classified in different types according to the action types of the base sequence, especially the base of FPP. There are generic pre-sequence and pre-pre sequence. Generic pre-sequence is a pre-sequence that is not directed to any certain type of base sequences but to the interlocutors' attention or reciprocity. Pre-pre sequence is a pre-sequence that allows the action to be understood freely.
4. Insert expansion sequences are expansion sequences which are positioned after a base FPP and before a projected base SPP. They are addressed to the base FPP. Besides, they are also initiated by the prospective recipient of the existing base FPP.

5. Post expansion can be classified into two types. There are minimal and non-minimal post expansions. Minimal post expansion is a post expansion that includes the additional of a third turns to a base sequence after SPP. Nevertheless, the turn, that is added, is not designed to project any further inside the sequence talk. Non minimal post-expansion is a post expansion that can take a disagreement that initiate repair sequence. Therefore, it can raise the problem of hearing or understanding of the base SPP or topicalization.

Moreover, according to Schegloff (1955), the basic form of the sequence-closing sequence is made from three turns. The initial turn serves to propose a possible closing of the sequence or topic in progress in the talk or conversation. Then, the recipient of a turn may agree or even refuse to do collaboration in order closes down the talk or conversation. The initiator of the sequence-closing sequence may produce a third move, which is a final closing taken. In this situation, the recipient agrees with the closing proposal of the initiator.

### **2.1.3. Overlap**

According to Schegloff, the overlap in talk-in-interaction often happens in the environment of transition-relevance places. It means that one speaker starts up overlaps because the analysis of prior speaker starts to finish the turn. Usually, it does not happen in the form of a competitive talking, but in the form of a continuer. Typically, in overlap, no more than two persons are talking at the same time. Talk more than two is usually reduced to one. Therefore, most of the overlap occurs to add support to the turn-taking system in speaking at one time.

Moreover, according to Schegloff (2000), even overlapping talk seems to be problematic or competitive, participants have used an overlap management or resolution device to resolve the problematic of overlapping talk, and therefore, it becomes the basic design of one-at-a-time or talking at the same time. The device is the form of 'deflections' such as hitches and perturbations. Hitches are stop for a moment in the continuity of the talk. Perturbations are signs that are left by the character of the talk's articulation to that point. The overlap resolution devices are spread not only during the overlapping talk but also before the overlap.

Schegloff (2000) suggests that most of overlaps are resolved after a single syllable beat. It is done by withdrawing one of the parties at the beginning of the overlap talk in progress. The resolution of overlap indicates the orientation of participants towards the basic design of the turn taking system. It may also to reflect either party's lack of interest or investment in saving the turn space at issue. The reason is when some 'special/outside-turn-taking' interest seems to be depending on the success of a particular moment in talk. Talk participants have been shown to continue to do overlap rather than to resolve or withdraw. Therefore, interactional of speaker needs to appear to against the one-at-a-time, that restricts the turn-taking system on overlap resolution.

## **2.2 Related Studies**

There are few studies about the analysis of talk-in-interaction or conversation in multi-culture. Those are studied by John J. Gumperz (1982), Deborah Tannen (1984), and Afiana (2006).



### **2.2.1. Discourse strategies: studies in interactional sociolinguistics by Gumperz.**

Some of Gumperz's (1982) works use cross cultural communication as his heuristic site. He shows us that we can examine conversations of different signaling system. Gumperz states that the interaction of different signaling system can cause misinterpretation of others intentions and abilities.

Gumperz has analyzed the interaction between inner-city black and middle class white Americans. He follows some steps. First, the interaction between speakers of different cultural or sub-cultural backgrounds is recorded by tape then he transcribes it. Second, the participants are individually interviewed to get their interpretations of the interactions. Third, when it is possible, he compares the cases of cross-cultural communication with the record of similar speech events that include participants of a single cultural background. Fourth, the tape and transcript are examined in order to identify the linguistic strategies for signaling frames. Fifth, Gumperz explains how the cultural differences in interpretive norms led to the differing interpretations and consequently the unsuccessful communication. At last, he checks the cultural basis of interpretive norms by playing segments of the interaction for other members of the cultural groups represented.

### **2.2.2. Conversational style: analyzing talk among friends by Deborah Tannen**

Deborah Tannen (1984) leads the perspective of cross-cultural communication to explain the conversation among Americans that have different

sub-cultural backgrounds. She states that individuals develop unique combinations of signaling habits as they learn from peers in a particular speech community. Usually, the habits are influenced by some factors such as the different regional, ethnic, class, age, and gender. The habits make up an individual's conversational style. The habits amount to slightly or grossly different systems that are used to signal meaning or to achieve the conceptualization of interaction.

When the systems are similar, participants share interpretive norms and meaning which will be understood as intended. Nevertheless, when the systems are different, participants have different norms and intentions that will be misjudged. An example with reference to the turn-taking system is the situation in which speakers have different expectations about the appropriate length of inter-turn pauses. The speaker expects shorter pause repeated but unintentionally he/she “cuts off” the one who expects longer pauses. The shorter pausing speaker interprets the “silence” of the other as evidence of having no intention to speak.

### **2.2.3. Study on talk radio conversation by Afiana (2006)**

This study is about turn taking irregularities in same-sex and mixed-sex conversation. The participants are a female host, a female listener, and a male listener. The setting is in English based on radio program in Surabaya. The writer recorded the interaction of the talk radio. Then she transcribed the data by adapting the transcription convention. Through the transcription, she organized the pattern of interruption and classified the overlaps into transitional and non

transitional. Moreover, she described the significant feature such as minimal responses, hedges, turn-taking irregularities, etc. In short, she found that there were several patterns of turn-taking irregularities which indicated different functions. Interruption in mix-talk conversation indicates the domination of male speaker, the overlap in the same-sex conversation indicating that the next speaker's, and the encouragement of the current speaker to continue. Lastly, she found that there were some utilizing hedges and minimal responses which had different functions such as expressing uncertainty and showing the attention.