

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

In this chapter, the authors will analyse and interpret data including the transcript record data to be analyzed by using the theory of overlap according to Emanuel & Schegloff (2000). Participants of the data that the author got are female students in the faculty of language and arts from batch 2012. In this chapter the author focuses more on the overlap. The overlap used by the participants was divided into three types of materials that would be the material analysis and interpretation of this research.

Three types are taken from Emanuel & Schegloff's theory (2000). The first is terminal, the second is continues, and the third is conditional access to the turn. Those are the types that the author used as the material to analyze the existing data from recording. The process of data analysis has been done in a way, the author divided each part of the conversation into each section into each type, then the authors can conclude which types are the most commonly used and which, on the other hand, is the least used in the recorded conversations. There are 5 recordings that have been recorded by the author, the recordings were obtained from conversations between women from the faculty of language and art Class 2012. Many places became the background of conversations such as food stores, eating places, malls, and others. In every recording there were different numbers of participants: 3 people, 5 people and others. In this study, the author used a qualitative method based on recording research that has been obtained.

4.1. Overlap

In examining the data transcripts of the recording results, the author used the theory of overlaps from Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson. The theory used to analyze is divided into three types of overlap to analyze the transcripts. There are 12 records that could be in the author's main concern, and in each transcript, there was a conversation that feature different types of overlap on each recording

4.1.1. Terminal overlap

This is the most frequent overlap found in the conversation. In the data transcript, this overlap occurs when the first participant responded to other participants but at same time, the second participant asked question or gave some responds when first participant had not finished his or her turn's. The situation is applied to the conversation between female students as participants of this investigated by the writer. Please refer to the sample below.

In the following recording, terminal overlap often appeared in the recording that has been listened carefully by the author. Terminal overlap is the most frequent type spoken by the participants recorded by the author. In this type, the participant used question words to overlap the conversation.

Recording 3 (Recording 3, 2017)

20. S: *wes ket mau rol rol::*

20. S: It's been a while Rol Rol ::

21. D: → *kalo juju ya::, tidak:: [kalian]*

21. D: → if juju yes ::, not :: [you guys]

22. S: → *[ngomong apa sih?][opo?]*

22. S: → [what are you talking?] [What?]

23. C: → *[Heh eh ah eh]*

23. C: → [Heh eh ahh]

In overlap type, Terminal overlap could be found in data by the author. There is one example of terminal overlap type in recording 3. It occurs at 21st and 22nd sentence in this recording. In this case, there is Terminal types of overlapping that exists when three different participants speak simultaneously at the same time. In the 21st sentence, participant D is speaking i.e. (juju ya ::, not ::) at the same time participant S is interrupting by saying *[what are you talking about?] [kalian ngomong apa sih?]*, and at that moment participant C also cut their conversation by asking a question *[opo?][what?]*. In this case, this overlap rarely occurs. Yet, this overlapping occurs when the participant unconsciously cut the other participant talks.

4.1.2. Continuers

The Continuers is one of the types of overlap by Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson that occurs as a result of the speech disfluency of the previous speaker when another speaker self-selects to continue with the ongoing utterance. An example would be when a speaker is retrieving an appropriate word to utter alike *hmm, uh, eh*, and others when

other speakers make use of this gap to start his/her turn. Take a look at the excerpt below :

Recording 1 (Recording 1, 2016)

1. A=→ itu ... [oh]

1. A = → it ... [oh]

2. B= [ya:: ya:: coba liat ne berapa harga ne coba]

2. B = [yes :: yes :: try to look how much is it]

3. B= → ndak ada harga ne ik [oh ne]

3. B = → there's no price tag on it [oh ne]

4. A= [ne:: ne:: di bawah]

4. A = [that's that's below]

5. B= berapa berapa ... []

5. B = how many ... []

6. A= [aduh berapa ini:: ?]

6. A = [umm how much is this ::?]

7. B= ini tanggal itu tanggal yo::

7. B = this is the date that is the date too ::

8. A=→ oh ne:: ne:: 138.500 [a::]

8. A = → oh ne :: ne :: 138.500 [a ::]

9. B= [Mau::]

9. B = [I Want it ::]

10. A=→ ih:: lucu loh:: [heh]

10. A = → ih , :: it is so cute :: [heh]

11. B= [lucu loh tempat e yah]

11. B = [the case is cute]

12. A= he'e ::

12. A = yep ::

In the first row participant A is talking and suddenly at the same time participant B intercepts the participant A's talk with the expression [oh] then participant B goes on the conversation [ya:: ya:: coba liat ne berapa harga ne coba] [ya :: ya :: take a look the price tag). In this conversation there is a Continuers type that is marked by the phrase Oh in the first sentence. In addition to the first and second lines, Continuers also occurs in 3rd sentence to 4th, 8th to 9th sentence and on the 10th to 11th sentence in recording 1. It can be explained as follows. On 3rd sentence, participant B wanted to ask about [ndak ada harga ne ik] (There is no price) to participant A but participant A intercepted with [oh ne] and then proceeds with the words [ne:: ne:: di bawah] (there is in the below) in this section participants used the same phrase in the sentence in the previous line that utterance oh is included in the Continuers type.

Another example, on the 8th and 9th rows, in this section participant A showed the price to participant B and participant A said (oh ne:: ne:: 138.500)(oh that's that 138,500). Participant A had not finished the word, but then participant B said [a:::] [Mau:::] [a :::] [Want :::]. Participant B said a :: phrase to take the chance of interrupting the conversation from participant A. One more example from recording 1 is on the 10th and 11th rows, participant A said (ih:: lucu loh::) (ih :: it's cute: :) then at the same time participant B cut the conversation with the phrase [heh] [heh] then proceed with talking [lucu loh tempat e yah] (the case is cute). In this section participant B used the expression heh to interrupt participant A. Other than that there are other examples on recording 4. Please refer to the sample below,

Recording 4 (Recording 4, 2017)

44. J= *ak ga wes nanti kasian Didot*
(J= I got this, I'll be sorry to Didot)
45. C= *ganti kertas wae lak wes [la yo::]*
(C= let's just change the paper sheet [yes])
46. D= *[nek ora nulis neng kene sek mengko enteni
Wilo sama Carol]*
(D= [how if I write here and wait for Wilo and Carol])
47. C=*→o::po?* [e::h]
(C= what? [eh])
48. D= *[kok Carol, Carol neng kene og yo] ((laugh))*
(D= [why Carol, Carol is here, isn't she])
49. C=*→ Wilo ma Rani [he'e]*
(C= (is Wilo coming with Rani?))
50. D= *[cah kae rodok nyelampar omah e adoh e rak
jamak mlaku ne tekan Rani] [Wiloka::n]*
(D= (she's a little bit... l, her house is faraway but she come to Rani) (that's Wilo))
51. C= *[mbek rani ka::n]*
(C=(Is she with Rani, isn't she?))

In recording 4 there are also examples of Continuers as in recording 1 above. Continuers is found in sentence 47th and the 49th sentence but is not as much on the first recording above. The sentence to 47th participant C asks (*o :: po?*)(*what?*). Then suddenly at the same time participant D interjected with the expression [*e :: h*] then the participant D continued the conversation by saying [*kok Carol, Carol neng kene og yo*](*why Carol, Carol is in here, isn't she*). It means she forgot that participant C was beside her and Participant D laughed afterwards, in this section participant D interrupted the question that participant C would interrupt using the Continuers using the 'eh' phrase followed by the words that made participant C unable to continue the question she was going to ask.

In the 49th participant C was saying (*Wilo ma Rani*)(*is Wilo coming with Rani?*) but at the same time when participant C had not finished saying what participant C wanted to say suddenly participant D cut off the conversation by expressing a phrase [*he'e*] that

4. B= → [oh ya:: ya:: coba liat ne berapa harga ne coba ?]
4. B = [try to look how much is it?]

5. B= ndak ada harga ne ik []
5. B = there's no price tag on it []

6. A= [oh ne ne:: ne:: di bawah]
6. A = [oh ne ne :: ne :: that's below]

7. B= →berapa berapa:: []
7. B = → how much :: []

8. A= → [aduh berapa ini::?]
8. A = [oh how much ::?]

9. B= ini tanggal itu tanggal yo::
9. B = this date is that is the date too ::

10. A= oh ne:: ne:: 138.500 []
10. A = oh ne :: ne :: 138.500 []

11. B= [a::: Mau:::]
11. B = [a ::: I Want it :::]

12. A= ih:: lucu loh:: []
12. A = ih :: it is so cute:: [heh]

13. B= [heh .. lucu loh tempat e yah..]
13. B = [the case is cute ..]

14. A= he'e ::
14. A = he'e ::

15. A= →lucu ini [ini::]
15. A = → this is cute [this ::]

16. B= → [dari tahun berapa coba::?]
16. B = [since what year ::?]

17. B=→su... sura..surabaja og ya.. [su:rabajakan ?]
17. B = → su ... sura..surabaja ya .. [su: rabajakan?]

18. A=→ [berarti kan masih ejaan lama yah?]
18. A = [it means it's using old spelling yah?]

19. B= Jakarta, bandung semarang, surabaja ... [he'e::]
19. B = Jakarta, bandung semarang, surabaja ... [he'e ::]

20. A= []
 20. A = []

The overlap started from line 1 and line 2 when participant B asked participant A about the thing, that before the participant A done to say something to participant B, participant B asked first to participant A. Participant B asked in line 2 (*mana?*) (*Where*) that mean B (*where is the thing that you already said before?*). The first example is in the second sentence, at the same time participants A and B said the same thing. Participant A said (*itu yang mbok bilang tadi*)(*that's what you already said before*) but suddenly participant B interrupted by saying [*dimana?*] [*Where?*]. The request did not let participant A continue his conversation at the time, that made the Conditional overlap and participant A stopped his conversation. In this section, it includes the third type of overlap that is Conditional overlap. In line 4, line 8, line 16 , and line 18 , overlap also occurred, the same situation like in line1 and line 2.

In Line 3, participant A said (*itu::*)(*that*) that means participant A gave a clue to participant B to understand where the place of the thing that participant A said before was. In line 4, participant B said [*oh ya:: ya:: coba liat ne berapa harga ne coba ?*] (*oh ya:: ya:: try to look how much is it ?*) at the same time, participant B responded and asked participant A while participant A said something. Therefore, in this part of sentence, there is a type of Conditional overlapping in the case of a participant's cutting of the talk in the 4th sentence that cuts participant A's speech saying something but it is finished. Then, participant B interrupted the discussion with a question. Participant B wanted to ask participant A, but at the same time participant A had not finished his words.

In Line 7, participant B said (*berapa ?berapa::*)(how much how much) , in line 8 participant A said[*aduh berapa ini:: ?*][*oh my God , how much is this*]at same time. Participant A responded and interrupted participant B. In this section, participant B had not finished saying the question to participant A but at the same time participant A asked participant B directly by asking [*aduh berapa ini:: ?*][*oh my God, how much is this?*]. Participant A did cut the Conversation at the same time, while participant A had not completed the question he or she would like to ask. This includes the overlap terminal type.

Then in the next example, on 15th line, participant A said (*lucu ini*)(*this is cute*) then at the same time in the 16th sentence participant B said [*ini:: dari taun berapa coba::?*][*this :: since what year ::?*] that made participant A unable to finish the conversation. At the same time in the 15th sentence, participant A and participant B were talking simultaneously, whereas this sentence should be a part of participant A. However, in this section participant B also took part which should actually have not been participant B's turn. Participant B's part is supposed to be in the 16th sentence. In this case, there is Conditional overlap type as overlapping occurs when a question is used to cut off the interlocutor talks as the example above in the 15th sentence.

The final example of recording 1 is found in the 17th sentence and 18th sentence of the conversation that were interrupted by the other participant. For example, in the 17th sentence, participant B said (*su... sura..surabaja og ya..*) (*su... sura..surabaja ya..*). However, at the same time another participant said a question that cut participant B's conversation. The question asked by participant A is [*su :: rabajakan?*] [*that's su:: rabaja?*] While this part of talk does not belong to participant A's part. Then, participant A went on with the next

question [*berarti kan masih ejaan lama yah?*][*that's means it's using old spelling yah?*] that did not allow participant B to continue the talks he said in the 17th sentence. Participant A interrupted the discussion by asking a question to participant B at the same time. This is an example of terminal overlap type. Besides the excerpt above, the writer wants to provide another example of terminal overlaps which was found in one of the investigated data as well :

Recording 4 (Recording 4, 2017)

120. S = *koyo Carol?* [*he'e*]

120. S = Carol's alike ? [He'e]

121. J = [*belum*]

121. J = [yet]

122. S = → *loh de'en di takoki rak* [*sopo?*]

122. S = → loh she was asked not? [who?]

123. D = [] ((*laugh*))

123. D = [] ((laugh))

124. J = → *pada tanya tapi::* [*de'en?*]

124. J = → on the question but :: [her?]

125. S = → [*jawab apa?*]

125. S = [answer what?]

In this example, there is also the type of Conditional overlapping that existed in the 122nd sentence and 123rd sentence. In the following situations participant S and participant D talked to each other, but on the sentence to 122th participant S and participant D speak simultaneously. More precisely participant D took the participant's chance by interrupting the question [*sopo?*][*who?*], before participant S wanted to say (*loh de'en di takoki rak*)(*she was asked not?*) but not finished. So, participant D took the opportunity of participant S. Then participant D told his part in 123rd sentence with a laugh, and the chance for participant S disappeared at the same time.

The next example of Conditional type overlapping is found in 124th sentence. At that time, participant J said something to participant S but participant S interrupted participant J's talk by asking a question to participant J. The unfinished sentence from participant J was (*pada tanya tapi::*) (*in question but ::*) at the same time the participant S interrupted with [*de'en?*] [*she?*]. So, the question by cutting the part of the sentence to 124th participant J can not use the opportunity to finish the sentence he wants to say. In the 125th sentence, participant S went on to ask participant J that is [*jawab apa?*][*answer what?*]. At that moment participant J could not finish the part again, because participant S interrupted participant J talks.

To conclude, Terminal overlap types appear the most in the recording that was collected by the author. It could be seen in the examples above, in each of the overlap types. Terminal overlap type was found almost in the whole data. Many participants cut the conversation to the interlocutor with the Terminal overlap type as mentioned in the example above. Continuers type also often appeared, but not as frequent as the Terminal overlap type. For instance, there are only a few examples on the Continuers type, but in Terminal type case, there are many examples in the recording.

Thereafter, there is also a Conditional overlap type which is the opposite of terminal type and Continuers type. Conditional overlap type was rarely found in data recording. Terminal overlap type appeared because there were many participants involved in a conversation. In the recording, there were at least 3 people, 4 people, and 5 people even up to 8 people. Therefore, Terminal overlap type is also caused by the presence of multiple participants.