

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Outline of Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is an approach to spoken discourse or face to face interaction (Cameron, 2001, p. 87) in a particular habit such as casual conversation, chat, and ordinary narrative among people or group (Paltridge, 2000, p.83). Psathas (1995, p.1) stated that Conversation Analysis emphasizes on socially habitual interactions of the systematic procedures and becomes a tool for studying those interactions. Beside that, Conversation Analysis assumes that utterances always have contextual relevance for one another but not all aspects of context are assumed to have so constant a relevance (Schiffrin, 1994). However, CA sees context more on how it can shape how things are said. Nevile and Walker (2005) stated CA examines how people say things in a context.

The power of CA itself on the natural conversation based on the occurring data and highly detailed of the conversation and revealing transcriptions of recorded voice or video data that can make the analyses easy to find the goals of how he interlocutor interact each other (Nevile & Walker, 2005).

The people ordinary conversation between another such using different kinds of topic which they like most is a main basic form of talk and the main way in which people mingle together, they could share about the information that they have got , and also they have purpose to make a social relations each other. Psathas (1995) states that the form of talk that all other 'talk-in-interaction' is

derived. It explains that conversations are employed in a CA study are not talks that are specifically generated for research purpose. Cameron (2001) also stated that is more appropriate to give the name with 'talk-in-interaction' instead of 'conversation'. Those researcher using those term it is because 'talk-in-interaction' is focus on the talk itself than written text, the talk itself is natural and interactive.

CA does not use theory to ground and to explain its argument. As Ten Have (1999) stated that CA neither utilizes theory nor construct a theory of its own. CA itself divided into two parts: pure CA and applied CA. Pure CA is characterized as procedural study of talk in interaction, 'in itself' and 'for itself' and largely theoretical. More details, applied CA is characterized as the application of methodologies arising from pure CA, largely analytical and often with wider concerns in the realm of psychology, sociology, and so forth. Some of applied CA studies are aimed at proving theories. Schegoff et.al. (2002) as cited in Ayuningtyas (2006), asserts that applied CA study is conducted to answer research questions that are three typically in applied linguistics, education and many other fields of the study. In fact, a pure CA practitioner does not intend to answer those kinds of research questions.

There are rules of turn taking in every conversation and in other speech-exchange systems. In addition, the basic unit of the conversation is the "turn" that is a shift in the direction of the speaking 'flow' (Sacks et.al, 1978). That is why the interaction during the conversation flows smoothly. The deviation of rule can

lead to disorganization of conversation. Beside that, the disagreement and misunderstanding may show up (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

CA offers a solution to this (and other) problem focused on turn exchange. The solution is that Sacks et.al (1974) established the turn taking rules that manage ordinary or mundane conversation. The model consists of a turn construction component and a turn distribution component. To make it clearer, participants of talk use the turn construction component to find that turns are recognizably now just beginning, now still in progress or now ending.

The component of the model identifies that at a point of possible completion, transfer or transition may occur. It means that a study of turn taking organization does not only have dealing with how to do turn taking but also how participants understand what they are doing in their conversations.

The general turn taking rules proposed by Sacks, et. al, (1974):

1. In any turn, the rules of the initial Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) at an Initial Transition Relevance Position (TRP) are:
 - a. If a current speaker employs a Current Speaker Select Next (CSSN) technique, a party selected has both right and obligation to take up the next turn to speak; no other parties has such right and responsibility; and transfer occurs at this point.
 - b. If a turn is constructed to be Non Speaker Select Next, a self-selection for taking the next floor may (but need not) be instituted. First starter may obtain the right; and transfer occurs at this point.

- c. If a current speaker utilizes a Non Current Speaker Select Next technique, he/she may (but need not) continue, unless other party does self-selection.
2. If, at an initial TRP of the initial TCU, neither 1 (a) nor 1 (b) has been operated, and the current speaker employs rule 1(c), which means that he/she has continued, the rule set 1 (a-c) is reapplied in the next TRP, until a transfer is attained.

According to Sack's method above, for any turn, at its first for the first point of a possible completion, if current speaker has selected someone to talk next (e.g by asking someone question) then, he or she should stop at the point, the one who has been selected should begin a next turn and no other participants should begin a next turn. If, by contrast, the current speaker has not selected someone to talk next, then the other parties may self-select and begin a next turn, with the first starter gains the right to be a next speaker. Afterwards, if no one nominates him or herself to take the part, the current speaker may (but need not) continue. In brief, those researcher have proposed several features in mundane conversation such as overwhelmingly one party talks at a time, occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common but brief, what a parties say is not specified, talk can be continuous and discontinuous and so forth (Safitri, 2009).

The TCU (Turn Constructional Unit) is a sign when the participant is finished his or her talk. The TRP (Transitional Relevance Place) is when the position of the participants or the interlocutor give the statements or answer or argument or a question.

2.1.1.1 Conversation Analysis and Talk Show

In this conversation analysis, talk show also used dialogue (face to face) as media of communication between the host and the guest. Judging by using the considerable time devoted to spontaneous dialogue, a considerable part of the talk show could fit well in the frame of conversation. Talk show itself it is a kind of infotainment which has a rule information is provided either directly, simply by breaking the news or by advertising a product, event, etc., or indirectly, by means of the interviewing technique (Ilie, 1999, p. 217).

Talk show itself is not strictly information-focused and does not claim maximum objectivity and impartiality either, since the participants do not rule out the personal and even emotional involvement of both interviewer and the interviewee. Like news interviews, talk show exhibits more often than not question-answer sequences, the interviewer being the show host, while the interviewee or respondent is usually a show guest, a member of the studio audience or a calling-in TV-viewer.

Moreover, the questioning process is sometimes interrupted in talk shows by evaluations of answers or by side comments made by the show host or even by the participants. In such instances, talk show displayed a discursive frame which is similar to debate programs (Ilie, 1999). One of the characteristic that occur during the interaction is the hilarious, melodramatic, embarrassing or implausible situations that are the source of laughter and emotional involvement are definitely expected. In the talk show there is a special scene called 'a therapy session', means that those scene provides an opportunity for participants to share about

their personal problem, physical, mental or social. In addition, the main purpose of talk show is to get people to speak out and to create public awareness about current problems, or the information about the famous people or community that become a hot issue in the society.

Spontaneous talk may occur on and off in semi-institutional discourse (talk show), and so was its length and significance depending on the host's personality and strategy both of the participants during the conversation (spontaneous talk may occur on and off). When the host temporarily stepped out of her institutional role as a show host and started arguing in favor of her personal viewpoint, the guest treated the host as if she were an interlocutor with equal speaking rights (Ilie, 1999).

Cameron (2001, p. 87) stated that despite of its name, Conversation Analysis (CA) deals not only with habitual ordinary conversation but also all of the professional and institutional using conversation as their main communication between them in any situation or settings (Drew and Heritage, 1992), and also the political settings or situation also using conversation to explain their purpose (Hutchby, 1996). Instead of naming the object of study as "conversation", the practitioners stated it "talk-in-interaction". This name was given since CA was developed to analyze talk (rather than written text) and more specifically to the kind of talk that was thoroughly interactive.

Conversation Analysis more concerned on how we can comprehend the meaning and the context appeared in the conversation, which are related and influenced by the chosen topic in every sequence, collaborated with the action and

becoming part of the context. Hutchby (1998, p. 38) stated that Conversation Analysis is used to reveal two things in treating the transition between turns during talk interaction. The first is called 'next turn', a part in which the speakers display their understanding of the prior turn's completion. It concerns with next speaker's understanding of the type of utterance produced by prior speaker. The second important part of Conversation Analysis concerns with the next speaker understands of the prior turn's content.

Bosch, Oostdijk & Ruiter (2004) stated that during the talk between speakers, both of them could change the turn and take the conversation. The turn taking model is affiliated with the culture of a speech community caused by a language based on cultural conventions, strategies, and certain device for regulating the interaction of conversation.

2.1.1.2 Conversation Analysis and Semi-Institutional Talk

In this part the writer wants to explain about the connection between institutional talk and CA in the conversation. There are a lot of researchers examined about the connection of talk-in-interactions within institution, constructing what has become a dominant arm of this approach. Heritage (1995), stated that the work of institutionalized talk to describe the mechanism of the talk in context and it is asserted the interesting arm of CA studies. He added that researches of the institutional exchange have been conducted in a classroom by McHoul (1978), a legal hearing by Maynard (1982), a news interview by

Heritage (1985), emergency service by Whalen and Zimmerman (1989) and so forth.

At first time, the CA practitioners only focus on the organization of mundane conversation. A key argument of the CA enterprise to mundane talks is that it is the basic form of talk (Sacks et.al, 1978). In fact, later works of CA practitioner changed into talks shaped by particular setting than casual talks. It is why the conversation or talk has been shaped into an interesting conversation.

Drew and Heritage (1992) stated that there are three features of institutional talks. First, institutional interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations, which are tied to their institution relevant identities: doctor and patient, teacher and pupil, etc. Second, institutional interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contribution to the business at hand. Last, institutional talk is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific contexts. Heritage (1995) stated that the rules of turn taking in an institutional setting are the modification and transformation from the ones in mundane conversations.

Furthermore, the writer choosing talk show as the main study because it is interesting. Talk show is one of the semi-institutional discourses. It means, the conversation in the talk show itself is typically spontaneous, whereas institutional discourse is commonly defined in terms of purposeful talk.

From the statement that has already been pointed out, casual conversation normally belongs to a private setting, and takes place between minimally two persons who do not act primarily in any official or public role. The question that

the host gives to the guest can be looked as institutionally framed question. The framed institutionally question itself is necessarily followed by answers. As Ilie (1999) stated when the host does not attempt to answer the guest's questions provides further evidence that the guest's questions are not perceived as information eliciting, but rather as argument eliciting, i.e. prompting an argumentative discussion

However, spontaneous talk may occur on and off in semi-institutional discourse too, its length and significance depending on the host's personality and strategy, as well as on the personality, status and involvement of the guests (Ilie, 1999). Those descriptions help the writer to analyze Mel's Update talk show as the arm to get the result. Because in this talk show the question sometimes taken spontaneously out of the frame question and sometimes the question itself is coming from the guest.

2.2 Review of related studies

Conversation Analysis as a social interaction is habitually applied in an ordinary situation, setting, and etc. There were several studies applying turn taking approach. The case study of Chatterbox conducted by Safitri (2011) had a result that the rule 1(a) in the Sacks theory was mostly used conducted for the initiation among chatterbox members (regular and newbie); the other rules only conveyed the strength of the relationship. Because addressing the next speaker is the most effective to pursue identification-recognition by other users and performs attentions getting strategy in a chat room. Participants preferentially address one

another, rather than self-selecting to speak and it is used by newbies to establish relationship and to get acceptance from the regular users.

The second rule from Sacks et.al. mostly used is Rule 1 (b) is only effective for regulars who already have strong relations in which all of the participants will self-selected themselves to answer their friends greetings even though no selection is used. In here (newbies) cannot attract regulars' attention because most of regulars only reply to those who are already familiar with them. If there is no selecting speaker next, most of the openings are not successful. This rule has its own condition if newbies on the same condition face as a new member in Chatterbox.

The second study conducted by Putri (2011) was about turn taking system of news interview aiming to overhearing audience with the interviewer as the main control during the conversation and panel interview. In here, the analysis of the data reveals that the organization of talk in the interview meets the demand of the basic rule of news interview, which is in the framework of Question-Answer format.

The interviewer has become the overhearing audience than as a recipient of the interviewees' talk. The main procedures which performed during the interview are avoid the producing of acknowledgment and the referring interviewer. So, the purpose will gain such the talk for overhearing audience. The interviewer using two techniques. First, acting as a both opponent and supporter side toward the interviewee, depend on what position the interviewee faces stand. Second, is by formalating the gist or upshot of the interviewees' remarks as to

clarify the central point made by them. As the result of this study that the turn taking system had an effect on the interviewer's control that is possible to make him powerless in the conflict and vice versa.

According to this study which mobile phone as the main media is impose more attention from the participants to contribute their turns to the chatroom, the social relations still can establish. It justifies that social ties can influence the way people convey their opening sequences.

Third, a previous study was conducted by Stolt (2008) about turn taking in a case of non-competitive overlap in a conversation between Finnish and British speakers of English. She found that the variety and functions of non-competitive overlapping talk can be great and high frequently produce could cause any inconvenience for the interlocutors. Beside that, the production of simultaneous talk was in the vast majority of cases deliberate. The conversation was video recorded and transcribed for the purpose of the study.

In Sum, the writer found that there were not any previous researches about turn taking using Mel's Update talk show on television. The writer would like to see the overlapping occurred in Mel's Update talk show. On this study the writer wanted to see how overlaps occurred during the talk in Mel's update Talkshow, and examined the start of the overlaps by indicating the semi-natural conversation occurred during the question-answer section between the host and the guest and by applying TCU (Turn Construction Unit) and TRP (Transition Relevant Place).

As Illie (1999) stated, conversationally framed questions during the talk show occurred when the participants in a conversation try to achieve not only

communicative goals, but also certain interactional goals together. So, talk-in-interaction in the talk show always followed by overlapping, which conveyed by the host or the guest or the third person (co-host) to pretend their statement for the target audience in the studio or outside of the studio such society or community which was the fans of the guest.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF THE STUDY