Overlap as Conversational Strategies in an American Daytime Talk Show *"The View"*

[1]**Yuli Nurhalima Niapele**

[1]Universitas Negeri Surabaya

[1]*e-mail: yuliniapele@mhs.unesa.ac.id*

[2]**Lisetyo Ariyanto**

[2]Universitas Negeri Surabaya
[2]*e-mail: lisetyoariyanti@unesa.ac.id*

[3]**Slamet Setiawan**

[3]Universitas Negeri Surabaya
[3]*e-mail: slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id*

[4]**Ayunita Leliana**

[4]Universitas Negeri Surabaya
[4]*e-mail: ayunitaleliana@unesa.ac.id*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisa kecenderungan pembicara dalam menggunakan tumpang tindih sebagai strategi percakapan yaitu dengan fokus pada identifikasi *resources/*sumber dan fitur-fitur yang menandai terjadinya tumpang tindih beserta jenisnya yang terjadi di acara Talk Show Amerika yaitu *The View*. Talk show yang memiliki durasi sekitar empat puluh delapan menit tayang pada tanggal 7 November 2019 diunduh dari saluran resminya channel ABC melalui *platform* Youtube. Dalam menganalisa dan mendeskripsikan data, penilitian ini menggunakan pendekatan Analisa Percakapan/ *Conversation Analysis* sebagai metode induktif-kualitatif. Data yang telah dikumpulkan, diambil dari ucapan-ucapan para pembawa acara dan bintang tamu yang telah ditranskripsikan. Data yang telah dipilah, kemudian, diteliti untuk mengeksplorasi tentang bagaimana tumpang tindih digunakan sebagai strategi percakapan oleh pihak pembicara dalam melakukam pergantian giliran bicara. Hasil penelitian mengungkapkan bahwa pihak pembicara di acara *The View* cenderung menggunakan empat jenis tumpang tindih untuk menyampaikan perspektif mereka tentang masalah yang sedang dibicarakan. Klasifikasi tumpang tindih bergantung pada terjadinya pergantian pembicara yang mengarah pada jenis tumpang tindih yang menginterupsi lawan bicara atau yang berkolaborasi dengan lawan bicara. Empat jenis tumpang tindih yang ditemukan adalah permintaan untuk menggantikan giliran (*Turn-request*), Backchannels, Antisipasi pergantian giliran (*Anticipated Turn-Taking*), dan Pelengkap (*Complementary*). Dalam merancang giliran, pihak pembicara cenderung menggunakan dua strategi, yaitu langsung dan tidak langsung.

Kata Kunci: Percakapan Tumpang Tindih, Analisa Percakapan, Startegi Percakapan, The View

ABSTRACT

The present study aims at figuring out the tendency of participants in employing overlap as conversational strategies by notably identifying the resources that herald overlap types along with its features occurring in an American daytime talk show named The View. The forty-eight minutes of the talk show aired on November 7, 2019, was retrieved from the official ABC channel in the Youtube platform that has been videotaped. In analyzing and illustrating the data, the present study employed an approach of Conversation Analysis as an inductive-qualitative method. Data collected from hosts and guests' utterances were transcribed and scrutinized to explore how overlaps are treated in the course of a talk show and parties' strategies of turn holding and turn claiming. The findings revealed that parties in The View orient to use four types of overlap to deliver their perspective on issues being discussed. The classification of overlap types relied on the entailment of speaker change leading to whether it is intrusive or collaborative. Backchannels as a collaborative overlap were used as a high number of overlaps, followed by complementary types, anticipated turn-taking, and intrusive overlap of turn-request as the lowest number of overlaps. In designing the turn, parties tended to use two strategies, namely direct and indirect.

Keywords: Overlapping Speech, Conversation Analysis, Conversational Strategies, The View

INTRODUCTION

Overlap can be deemed a speech event in that it commonly takes place in a conversation and its presence is one of the idiosyncratic features notably face-to-face conversation (Hayashi, 2013). If a conversation involves merely two persons simultaneously talking to each other and they are prone to the system of reducing gaps and overlaps, it may not lead to highly frequent speech overlaps. Once overlap comes into being, the passage of overlap appears to be short as both parties immediately apply a set of strategies to re-establish the system of one-party-at-a-time. In this respect, both parties orient themselves to what Jefferson (1986) calls a legitimate place that is so-called Transitional Relevance Place (henceforth TRP). As suggested by Sacks et al. (1974), overlaps mostly often occurred at or close to the possible turn end or TRP(s). Whereas, if a conversation engages multi-party in it can engender schism of the conversation into multiple conversations increasing a high of speech overlaps in the speaker turns (Shriberg et al., 2001).

Besides, the frequency of overlaps is also engendered by conversation topics, speaker relationships, competing for an early start to obtain the next turn, and mainly premature self-selection. As indicated by Sidnell and Stiver (2013), overlaps occurred due to self-selection and projectability of turn ends. While Yuan et al. (2007) explored factors that affect that speech overlap by examining turn-taking and back-channel type. In this sense, overlaps should be seen as a phenomenon that is closely related to the dynamics of turn-taking because the overlap is one of the features that emerge within turn-taking in the course of conversation. As a feature, overlaps might not merely be short as proposed by Sacks et al (1974) model, but it can also be longer when the incoming speaker commences talking while the current speaker is persistent to continue talking to complete the turn, resulting in the extended overlap.

Concerning turn-taking, Schegloff (2000) divides overlaps to be of two types, namely competitive and non-competitive. Competitive overlaps are referred to those who compete to get turn space while non-competitive overlaps tend to be short as the speaker has no intention to grab the floor. In identifying these two types, several previous studies look at the resources that herald characterization of each type. Jefferson (1983), for instance, finds out the resources that overlaps may occur systematically at any place within the ongoing turn. She explores the precise placement of overlap onsets that are transitional overlaps located at the TRP, recognitional located at points where the incoming speaker has understood the gist of the conversation, and progressional started at the silence after an uncompleted utterance. Those instances of overlap are deemed non-competitive as they are resolved quickly. On the contrary, French and Local (1983) investigate a combination of two prosodic features namely high pitch and increased loudness. When the entry turn of the incoming speaker contains those resources, it refers to competitive overlap in that the incoming speaker attempts to claim the floor while the current speaker has not finished the turn.

Kurtic et al. (2013), moreover, attempt to figure out the resources in multi-party conversation which can be a great indicator to know whether the turn incoming is competitive or non-competitive. In their study, the best indicator is the integration of overlap placement features and two prosodic features. The combination of two resources plays a major role in classifying overlap types. Nevertheless, Tannen (1984) defines overlap of turn-taking type as a constructive feature in keeping the flow of conversation since the speaker intends to show enthusiastic listenership and the interlocutor does not treat overlap as being interrupted. Tannen calls the speakers, who actively overlap within a conversation, as high involvement participants because the speakers' orientation is to avoid intra-turn silences.

In this sense, the aforementioned previous studies analyze overlaps in everyday conversation. The findings might be (slightly) different when the conversation takes place in institutional discourse where the turn has been pre-allocated due to agenda and time restriction. Adda et al (2007) focus on exploring the speech overlap along with the interplay of disfluency in TV political interviews where the number of overlap may be low compared to the mundane conversation. As the interview is in the form of

asymmetrical relations, it may engender speech overlaps between interviewer and interviewee in the communication context. In their analysis, overlaps are viewed as a continuum, so they annotate by labeling overlaps as turn-request, backchannel, anticipated turn-taking, and complementary to figure out whether the overlaps are classified into intrusive or non-intrusive.

In line with Adda et al., this present study attempts to analyze the speech event of overlap by classifying the overlaps into two types that are intrusive and non-intrusive/ collaborative. In contrast to them, the present study is concerned with overlaps in a *talk show* which is a type of institutional interaction that has two distinct features involving mundane and institutional discourse. For instance, the show host can normally act as a conversational monitor, but sometimes also be seen as a co-participant. By combining spontaneous and purposeful talk, the talk show displays its characteristic as semi-institutional discourse (Illie, 2001). A talk show typically takes place "under the control of a moderator", the host, who is monitoring most of the conversation by asking questions and making comments. Since the talk show is a time-limited speech event, the major discussion topics are pre-established, introduced, and controlled by the show host. However, the guests also have the opportunity to twist the topic of the conversation. Talk shows are built on a structure of questions and answers. The host sometimes interrupts the guests due to time/agenda constraints, yet also for argumentative purposes. Whereas, the guest may treat hosts with equal speaking rights as if they were interlocutors, such as when the guest disagrees with the host's arguments.

Accordingly, this present study focuses on examining speech overlaps in an American talk show named *The View.* It is aired on ABC as part of a daytime program featuring five women coming from different generations, backgrounds, points of view. The hosts are Whoopi Goldberg is known as actress and entertainer, Joy Behar as a well-known comedian, Sunny Hostin with the background as Attorney, and two television personalities and political commentators, Abby Huntsman and Meghan McCain. The study analyzes an episode that is Landmark celebration of 5000th episode with prominent couples as guests invited to the show. The Guests are Donald Trump Junior and Kimberly Guilfoyle. The Guests are invited to promote a book entitled *"Triggered: How the Left Thrives on Hate and Wants to Silence Us".* In this episode, guests are asked about a hot issue pertaining to the whistleblower's name being released by Trump Junior which creates confrontational arguments during the talk show, favoring the high number of speech overlaps. The episode of this show, hence, fits to be analyzed under the framework of conversation analysis.

Several earlier studies have been concerned with overlapping speech, for instance, Jorfi (2016), Amadi (2020), Hilton (2016), and Abbas (2020). The first two are the instances of research on a TV program that is similar to the present study. The last focuses on perception experiments toward the classification of overlapping speech in shaping the listener's evaluation, and analysis of overlapping speech in a therapy session.

Jorfi (2016) used Politeness theory, the concept of FTA (Face Threatening the Act), and the FSA (Face saving Act) model (Brown and Levinson, 1978, 1987). The model used an approach to analyze and illustrate selected data. The descriptive-qualitative method was employed in this study. The results revealed that four types of overlap function as conversational strategies contain two negative functions; floor-taking and objection. The other two are positive loads used to confirm and continue the incoming speaker's talk.

Another study is by Abbas (2020) who analyzed the overlapping speech phenomenon using the model of Sacks et al. (1974) and Jefferson (1983). The study focuses on the placement where overlaps begin. The results show the occurrences of overlapping speech due to misjudgment of the TRPs. The incoming speaker cannot project the completion point of the current TCU. Overlap mostly occurs in the terminal overlap, continuers as one of non-competitive overlap happen to encourage the patients to keep talking.

CONVERSATION ANALYSIS IN DEFINING TURN-TAKING DURING THE TALK SHOW

Conversation analysis is an underlying

framework used for examining the way participants orient or respond to conversation. It involves the participants' fashion in designing their talk, how they organize the aspects of turn-taking and features as well as resources that influence speaker change. CA uses audio and video recordings of natural-occurring activities to study the details of action as they are temporally and sequentially arranged, moment by moment by the participants within the context of their activities (Mondada, 2013). It aims to describe the orderliness of activities such as taking turns at-talk. CA provides the guide to contextualize the types of claims, arguments, and evidence in examining the data (Albert, 2017). As a method, CA is well-suited to those concerned with understanding the structural underpinnings of everyday conversation as well as spontaneous naturally social interaction. CA data collection techniques aim to capture the conduct of all of the participants. The most important concepts for this study on talk shows are turn-taking, adjacency pairs, topic organization, and response tokens since the conversation is in the form of a question-answer.

The turn-taking system of talk shows usually has both characteristics of institutional talk and ordinary talk. Thus, the present study attempts to explain the nature of an interactional talk show by showing its semi-institutional character which has been explicated by Illie (2001). So, it is possible to derive some of the basic features of a talk show such as topic management which is controlled by, hosts, and mostly the major discussion topics are pre-established due to the time-limited speech event. However, the guests also have opportunities to change the topic of conversation. Talk shows are built on a structure of questions and answers. The size of the turn is fixed. One may argue that in a Talk show, turn-sizes may vary and that all participants are allowed to switch between long and short turns. However, the fact that the size of the turn is largely determined by the previous turn. And that it often depends on the Host. According to the question-answer format, which accounts for most of the turns occurring in the course of the talk show interaction, it implies that a question always comes before an answer and that the size of the answer is directly linked to the propositional content of the question. Questioning is primarily done by the Host

and Co-Host, who use different types of questions that allow them to control the size of the turn.

OVERLAP AS A FEATURE OF TURN-TAKING

The term overlap is used interchangeably with simultaneous talk. Overlap occurs frequently in the course of conversation during a talk show and is facilitative to the ongoing construction of conversational flow. It refers simply to the co-occurrence of more than one speakers' utterances in conversation. Overlapping speech in a conversation is characterized as competitive and non-competitive. As a feature of turn-taking, overlap occurs in light of self-selection that the incoming speaker tends to use the second principle of turn allocation which is self-selection.

Types of Speech Overlaps

In describing the data, the present study categorized the overlap into two types referring to Adda et al (2007) namely intrusive and collaborative. This term is somehow similar to competitive/intrusive and non-competitive/collaborative. To analyze the data, utterances that comprise overlaps are classified into four types based on the entailment of speaker change. The types which entail speaker change are turn-request and the length complementary. Another two types that result in speaker change are back channels and anticipated turn-takings. Following is the definition of each type according to Adda et al. (2017):

a) Turn-requests are the instances of attempts turn incoming with the intent to interrupt the current speaker due to certain reasons

b) Back-channels signal that interlocutors are actively listening to the ongoing flow of conversation. The utterances in this type vary including response tokens, assessment, news -markers, laughter, and change of activity tokens.

c) Anticipated Turn-Taking may occur at a potential turn end of the primary speaker. The incoming speaker seems to perceive specific cues for anticipated such as clause or phrase boundaries, falling pitch. This type is similar to Jefferson's (1983) type of overlap which is recognition onset. In this type, the incoming speaker has understood

what the current's said. Thus, s/he will directly make an early turn to give his/her response.

d) Complementary label has been introduced for overlaps which aim at complementing that is to add something in a way to enhance the main speaker's topic. It covers a possibly paraphrased repetition of the primary speaker's statement, an explicit agreement or disagreement, a short anticipated answer, a precision forwarded (redirect an opinion or help to advance something) or required, not only on the content but also on the form of the exchange in light of time limit, and a witty remark or the continuation of the utterance

Conversational Strategies in designing turn through overlaps

Afore moving forward, we need to underline that the term "conversational strategies" is used in the Tannenian sense of conversational style which is not meant to imply "deliberating planning", but is used instead to refer simply to "a way of speaking (Tannen, 1984). The use of conversational strategies is not intended to be conscious but is best thought of as "automatic" way participants use in shaping their turn during a conversation (Deng, 1999).

Through overlaps, speakers can use directional cues to manipulate the interaction or they can employ more indirect strategies to prevent others from starting up to establish themselves as the next speaker. In this analysis, the speaker's use of direct and indirect strategies will be focused on turn claiming and turn holding. As Tanaka (2000) mentioned, turns are resources in conversation used by participants to negotiate their allocation to keep the interaction going and prevent it from becoming a monologue. Therefore, turn-taking involves three sub-practices. The first one is a turn claiming where potential incoming speaker tries show him of herself as the new current speaker. The next is turn holding where the current speaker attempts to prevent others from starting up as s/he has not finished the utterances and wants to keep their status as turn occupant over more than one turn constructional unit (henceforth TCU). The last sub practice is turn yielding where the current speaker or potential incoming speaker drops out,

relinquishing the floor to another interlocutor. Characteristic of turn yielding is direct questions that are closely related to address terms (Taboada, 2006), yet address terms are rarely founded even in multi-party conversation.

Overlaps as conversational strategies will be analyzed through participants' orientation to the occurrences of overlap types in the course of conversation. The way participants react to others and the utterances which contain overlap including the resources where overlaps occur as well as features occurring in overlaps and utterances. Strategies are divided into two types, namely direct and indirect. In designing turn claiming and turn holding, speakers seem to use overlaps as their conversational strategies in the sense of delivering their perspective on such issues being discussed in the course of conversation. Direct strategies involve direct requests, direct addresses, recycles/repetitions, machine-gun utterances derived from Tannen (1984), cut-off the speakers which appear to be an interruption, extended overlap, and the use of two prosodic features proposed by French and Local (1983). Whereas, indirect strategies include early start known as latching, changes in pace such as speeding up by compressing the TRP or slowing down, tag questions, and compound TCUs.

Referring to the issue, this study used the conversation analysis approach to identify the way overlaps are treated by participants, and the strategies applied in designing turn to deliver their perspective on the issue appeared in course of the talk show. Meanwhile, to illustrate the data, this present study is inclined to Adda et al. (2007) and Taboada (2006) supported by Neumaier (2019).

METHOD

As the data were presented in the form of words rather than in numbers, the research type of this present study applied the inductive-qualitative method so as to examine and describe *naturally occurring activities* that occurred in the talk show (Stivers and Sidnell, 2013 and Saldaña et al., 2014). Conversation Analysis was used as an approach as it has been attested compatible with the realm of scrutinizing spoken discourse. It covers the aspects of conversation orderliness (Liddicoat, 2007) involving how parties take turns at the talk

and feature occurring in a talk (Sacks et al., 1974) as well as conversational strategies deployed in delivering perspectives pertaining to turn-taking organization (Taboada, 2006). As the qualitative one, the object of the study was the host and co-hosts as well as the guests. The data were derived from the utterances of the objects in a special episode of the landmark celebration of the 5000th episode where the prominent guests were invited to promote a new book entitled *"Triggered: How the Left Thrives on Hate and Wants to Silence Us"*. The show aired on November 7, 2019, was retrieved from the Youtube platform of the official channel named ABC with a duration of forty-eight minutes. The transcription of raw data was downloaded from the subtitle of the channel, then, was transcribed in detail by the researcher. The technique for collecting the data was documentation since the data was a video recording of media interaction. Several procedures were applied to collect the data. First, the data were downloaded to examine and select the excerpts related to types of speech overlap and the strategies used by respective parties in designing their turn(s). Subsequently, the selected excerpts were transcribed by deploying the transcription convention of Hepburn and Bolden (2017) complied with Jeffersonian transcription (2004). Last but not least, the transcribed data were scrutinized using three techniques suggested by Saldaña et al., 2014, namely data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data condensation was the process of collecting data and selecting the data corresponding to the objective of the present study. In the selection process, the data were reduced and labeled based on the categorization of overlap types. Subsequently, the data were displayed in the findings in order to allow conclusion drawing which referred to the verification with respect to the theories used.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

FINDINGS

This section presents types of overlaps initiated by participants in *The View*, that are, Hosts and Guests as well as the strategies or resources used by them in designing the turns. Based on the categorization, overlaps are classified into two types namely intrusive and collaborative overlap. To illustrate the phenomenon of data, overlaps are analyzed due to the entailment of speaker change following Adda et al. (2007) annotation on labeling utterances that contain overlaps supported by Taboada (2006) and Neumaier (2019) on how speakers use some strategies in designing their turn through overlaps. The label of overlaps includes turn request, backchannel, anticipated turn-taking, and complementary.

Turn Request

This type is performed when an incoming speaker requests the turn from the current speaker who is still uttering his point of view and the incoming attempts to terminate the current's turn by recycling her request. Excerpt 1 displays a turn request performed by Sunny who acts as the co-host. In the analysis, the utterances of this type were used four times which is mostly by the host.

```
Excerpt 1 {19:16-19:31}

1    DJT : If I DID tha:t you guy::s would lose your mi:nd↑
2    Aud : -Clapping hands-
3          Under[stand that↑ and you give right        but
           but]
4 →  Sun :      [Can I      can I push back on that a little
           bit↓
              [Don?
5    DJT : So [we-            we stopped (.)
6 →  Who :    [Yeah go ahead go ahead]
7    DJT      [we were gonna  uh-      let me finish=
8 →  Sun : Can [I push back a little bit]
9    Meg : (    )
10 → Sun : =because the because the D:C: hotel
11         your father's DC hotel opened up=    just a couple
           of weeks after his election
12   DJT :                       =Yeah
```

Have a look at excerpt I notably at lines 4, 8, and 10 where Sun, the show host, as the potential incoming speaker is making a request to get a turn to talk. The request "Can I push back on that a little bit?" means the speaker intends to take the turn deliberately yet the current speaker is persistent to continue talking. Hence, the incoming speaker applies some strategies to obtain the floor. The strategies used are direct including recycling or repeating the request three times, direct address that can be seen in line 4 where the

name "Don" of the current speaker is addressed, cut off, and restarts in line 10 that is then realized by the current speaker. In the end, the current relinquish the floor to the incoming speaker. In line 6, another speaker, who roles as a moderator in this show, also helps her partner to continue the talkingby saying "go ahead" two times. This type is proven to entail speaker change which is categorized into the competitive overlap.

Backchannel

Some overlaps are identified as backchannel because participant makes utterances merely in order to react to what others said. This type signals that the interlocutor understands or agrees with the statement of a speaker. The interlocutor tries to confirm the speaker by uttering some response tokens such as "uh-huh"," yeah" or uttering the assessment to the speaker's perspective in order to signal his/her participation as an active listenership. The total frequency of this type was 8.

```
Excerpt 2 {6:04-6:10}

1    Sun : [But Kim Kimberly you're a Lawyer?=
2 →  Kim : =yes
3    Sun : and and  we we've known[ each other=     [you
                                                     were
4 →  Kim :                        [yeah]     =absol[utely
5    Sun : prosecuted I mean did you advise -um-your
             boyfriend
```

The utterance in lines 2 and 4 indicate that the interlocutor who acts as a guest responds to the current speaker by uttering "yes", "yeah" and "absolutely". The utterances aim to confirm the speaker's statement which the interlocutor agrees with the speaker. The word "absolutely" has a strong meaning which is used to emphasize the relationship between speaker and interlocutor in the past that they used to know each other. The interlocutor appears to merely give a short response to the speaker without having the intention to get to the floor. Have a closer look at the speaker utterances in which she uses recycles as a direct strategy to make sure her status aa s turn holder. The recycles can be seen in line 3 where the speaker repeats the word "and" two times. According to this type, the overlaps do not entail speaker change, they can be classified into collaborative overlap.

Anticipated Turn-Taking

This instance has been found during a conversation in the talk show which was repeated six times. It was realized when an incoming speaker was speaking simultaneously with the current speaker. This type is mostly founded at or around TRP. Yet, it may be indicated at non-TRP as long as the incoming speaker recognizes or understands the whole meaning delivered by the current speaker, thus s/he can directly make an anticipated turn in the current's turn.

```
Excerpt 3 {19:07-19:17}

1    DJT : Hunter B:iden utilized his father's vice
                presidency
2            to magically end up on a board in Ukraine
3            with the language he doesn't speak
4            on a business he knows nothing about
5            for eighty [three thousand amount
6 →  Kim :              [eighty three thousand dollar amount
```

The incoming speaker in line 6 appears to get the gist of the current's turn as both of them to have a shared understanding about that issue. Both speakers in this extract are the show guests. They are, known as a couple, invited to this show to promote a new book, and are interviewed regarding the issue of the way one of a guest makes use of his father's presidency to get money. Hence, the guest responds to the host's statement by countering the argument that the one who makes use of the father's status is Hunter Biden. DJT mentions the amount of money "eighty…" in line 5 which is realized by his partner. Therefore, in line 6, Kim simultaneously mentions the amount of money which is the same. This happens because both speakers share the same understanding. Kim uses overlap in this matteras a conversational strategy to claim for the turn. However, the overlap does not result in speaker change and is classified into collaborative as the incoming does not deliberately interrupt the current's turn. This type is similar to Lerner's finding in Hayashi's (2013) research.

Complementary

On labeling this instance, the overlap in this type may entail speaker change and may not result in speaker change due to the length of speakers' utterances in complementing or responding to the issues. In the analysis, complementary had a

frequency of 7. Five of them entail speaker change and two are not. During the conversation, participants sometimes make a short agreement or disagreement that may lead to extended overlap.

```
Excerpt 4 {2:11-2:21} with NO Speaker Change

1    DJT  : So what's the difference [between me retweeting about-
2 →  Sun  :                         [>It's  different  when  the
            President's son does it though<,     isn't [it?]
3    DJT  :                                           [oh ]  oh
            why?
            I mean I'm a - I'm a private citizen putting this out
            there
4            if eve[ryone in this room could have right (   )
5 →  Sun  :        [°you're a campaign surrogate though° (slight
            falling tone)
6    Aud  : -Clapping hands-
7    DJT  : I don't see any dif↑ference or whatsoever↑
```

Sun, as the co-host in this conversation, overlaps the current speaker by making a short anticipated answer. She has no intention to deliberately grab the floor from the current speaker. Even though line 2 uses a direct strategy which is to cut off or terminate the current's turn, she yields the floor as soon as she completes her turn TCU in the form of question tags. The current also overlaps at the transitional turn of "it" as he has comprehended the purpose of that question. Again, in line 5, Sun reacts to the current's turn but in a soft/lower voice which indicates that it has no intention to switch the turn. Thus, this type is classified into collaborative overlap.

```
Excerpt 5 {22:04-22:20} with Speaker Change

1     Who  : because the jokes are making it hard
2             [to clear any bounce  points
3 →   Joy  : [Who says the joke,
4     Who  : Hmm
5 →   Joy  :    [Who says the Joke?              [I'm
              no::t
6 →   DJT  : No[but-            We have to   [be
              able to have
7             that kinda discourse >and look at
8             what's going on in terms of PC culture<
9             this is where I talk [about the book
10    Who  :                       [>There's no such
→             things<
11    DJT  : there i:s
12    Who  : No
13    DJT  : Joy what do you think about like Dave
→             Chappelle
14            or burr or those guys getting canceled.
```

In this excerpt, we can see the feature of a talk show that is a combination of mundane and institutional conversation where the host or moderator has a role to control the conversation by asking questions and giving comments. Yet, the host or moderator also switch their role to be interlocutor which indicates the characteristic of mundane conversation. The host shares the role with a guest. In lines 3 and 5, Joy as a co-host uses recycling as a direct conversational strategy in designing her turn as a turn claiming through overlap. She repeats the utterances two times to ask for clarification from her co-host who interrupts to take control of cross-talking. Joy seems to be interrupted in this sense so she clarifies by asking a question in order to emphasize that she does not say a joke during the talk. Referring to line 6, DJT as a guest seems to ignore the interruption of Joy and Who and continue his perspective on issues being discussed. He also uses an indirect conversational strategy of speeding up the pace marked by signs of inner chevrons (> <). His last TCU is overlapped by Who in line 10 who gives a short answer to the current's turn without having the intention to take the floor. As a host/moderator of the show switches her role to be interlocutor which indicates the characteristic of the talk show as semi-institutional discourse. Her role as interlocutor also occurs in line 12 in which she just makes a short response of "No" to show her explicit disagreement. DJT in line 13 takes the host role to change the trajectory of conversation by using direct address to Joy indicated his turn claiming. In this type, the use of overlaps entails speaker change. Thus, it is considered intrusive overlap.

DISCUSSION

The aforementioned findings of the study indicate that Host and co-Host dominate the overlapping in course of conversation during a talk show. The result of the present study support Adda et al (2007) that the occurrences of overlaps mostly by a host who has a role to control the topic of conversation due to limited time/agenda provided by the producer of a TV program. However, host and co-host also switch their role as interlocutors to elicit information from the guest. This sense is in line with Illie (2001) who proposes the term of the talk show as a semi-institutional discourse which indicates the combination characteristic of two features of conversation are mundane and institutional discourse. The overlaps are initiated

not merely by the host and co-host but also by guests. They share equal rights to overlap each other. When the conversation appears to be cross-talking among participants, then the moderator of the host will directly take control of the conversation as in excerpt 5. The guests also overlap hosts to show their disagreement. Their overlaps are likely short and sometimes may lead to being longer when they extend overlap to counter the host's statement. They keep talking until the host yields the floor to them.

The findings of the present study identify participants' orientation towards two types of overlap which are intrusive and collaborative overlap. Those overlaps are initiated by all conversational participants. To know the characteristic of the two types, the selected data are divided into four types complying with Ad da et al (2007). The overlaps include turn request, back-channel, anticipated turn-taking, and complimentary. Turn-requests are a clear instance that entails speaker change. The occurrences of this type are the least frequency in number due to certain reasons such as the topic has been pre-established, the turn order has been pre-allocated, and turn sizes are mostly controlled by the host acting as Moderator during *The View*. Back-channels and anticipate turn-takings do not result in speaker change. Referring to findings, it can be seen that the occurrences of Back-channels are high in number since the participants attempt to show their involvement by uttering response tokens and assessment to the interlocutor's turn. Anticipated turn-takings are used to collaboratively bolster the statements of the interlocutor as in excerpt 3. Whereas, complimentary may lead to two outcomes either entail speaker change or do not change the speaker's turn. It has been shown in the findings that if complimentary tends to change speaker turn it means the incoming speaker needs to give clarification or object to the question or accusing given by the host to her/him.

Similar to Taboada (2006) and Neumaier (2019), this present study explores the way participants use overlaps as conversational strategies in designing their turn as turn holder and turn claimant. Both turns are using direct and indirect strategies in delivering participants'

perspectives. The most direct strategies used by participants during conversation are recycling, direct request, and direct address. While for indirect strategies, participants use early starts such as latching marked by equal signs in the excerpt, tag questions, and speeding up their utterances by making applying a rush-through technique that is compressing the TCU.

Referring to Tannen's work (1984), overlaps that occur during conversation can be categorized into constructive strategies in which participants use them to maintain the flow of conversation and to show enthusiastic listenership and involvement. Thus, Tannen suggested that these types of overlaps used by active participants are called *High Involvement Strategy*. These strategies involve shorter pauses, faster turn-taking used by hosts and guests, and active listenership indicated by participants' fast responses in answering and commenting on the issue. Accordingly, those strategies emerge in the data of the present study.

CONCLUSION

The present study shows several conclusions regarding the way interlocutors treat overlapping speech in the course of the interaction among multi-party. The utterances comprised of overlapping speeches are classified into two types, namely intrusive and collaborative, by applying the annotation scheme. Then, it can be concluded that, according to the annotation, the overlaps consist of four labels taken from Adda et al. (2007) that are turn-taking, backchannel, anticipated turn-taking, and complementary. From those labels, both host and guest use them interchangeably to express their opinion or to respond quickly to what has been asked. However, the one who often uses speech overlaps is the host who acts as moderator and co-host. Presumably, the show hosts are in charge to handle the conversation and their roles are to ascertain that the show runs well. Furthermore, some strategies in designing participants' turn of claiming and holding are divided into two, namely direct and indirect conversational strategies. The direct strategies include direct addresses, direct requests, recycles, cut-offs, and long passages of overlap. While indirect conversational strategies encompass early starts (latches), speeding up, slowing down, rush through for turn holding, and tag

questions.

REFERENCES

Abbas, N.F. (2020). Pragmatics of Overlapping Talk in Therapy Sessions. *Journal of Language and LinguisticStudies, 16*, 1251-1263.

Adda, G., Adda-Decker, M., Barras, C., Mareüil, P.B., Habert, B., & Paroubek, P. (2007). Speech Overlap andInterplay with Disfluencies in Political Interviews.

Albert, S. (2017), Research Methods: Conversation Analysis. In M. Schober, D. N. Rapp & A. M. Britt (Eds.), The Handbook of Discourse Processes (2nd ed., pp. 99-108). London: Taylor and Francis.

Deng, X. (1999). Chinese and Australian Conversational Styles: A Comparative Sociolinguistic Study of Overlap and Listener Response. https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/1242

French, P., & Local, J. (1983). Turn-Competitive Incomings. *Journal of Pragmatics, 7*, 17-38.

Hayashi, M. 2013. Turn Allocation and Turn Sharing. In The Handbook of Conversation Analysis, Jack Sidnell &Tanya Stivers (eds.), 150-166. Malden: Blackwell

Hilton, K. (2016). The Perception of Overlapping Speech: Effects of Speaker Prosody and ListenerAttitudes. *Interspeech.*

Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-Institutional Discourse: The Case of Talk Shows. Journal of Pragmatics, 33, 209-254.

Jefferson, G., 1983. Two Explorations of the Organization of Overlapping Talk in Conversation, 1: Notes on Some Orderliness of Overlap Onset.

Jefferson, G.D. (1986). Notes on 'Latency' in Overlap Onset. Human Studies, 9, 153-183. Jefferson, G.D. (2004). Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction.

Jorfi, L., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2016). The Types of Overlap as Conversational Strategies in Dispute, the Iranian Live TV Program. *Qualitative Research Journal, 16*, 110-124.

Kurtic, Emina, Brown, G.J., & Wells, B. (2013). Resources for Turn Competition in Overlapping Talk. *SpeechCommunication 55*, 1-23.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2007). An Introduction to Conversation Analysis.

Miles, M., Huberman, A.M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook. Third Edition. United States of America: SAGE Publication, 2014.

Mondada, L. (2013). The Conversation Analytic Approach to Data Collection. In The Handbook of Conversation Analysis, Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), 150-166. Malden: Blackwell

Neumaier, T. (2019). Patterns of Conversational Interaction in Varieties of English

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G.D. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. Language, 50, 696-735.

Schegloff, E.A. (2000). Overlapping Talk and The Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language inSociety, 29*, 1 - 63.

Shirokov, A. (2019). Alexa Hepburn and Galina B. Bolden. Transcribing for Social Research. London: SAGEPublications, 2017.

Shriberg, E., Stolcke, A., & Baron, D. (2001). Observations on Overlap: Findings and Implications for AutomaticProcessing of the Multi-Party Conversation. *Interspeech.*

Sidnell, Jack and Stivers, Tanya. (2013). The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Signes, C.G. (2000). Gregori Signes, C. 2000. A Genre Based Approach to Daytime Talk on Television. SELL Monographs 1. València: Universitat de València. (ISBN: 84-370-4264-X).

Taboada, M. (2006). Spontaneous and Non-Spontaneous Turn-Taking. *Pragmatics, 16*, 329-360.

Tanaka, H. (2000). Turn Projection in Japanese Talk-in-Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*,33, 1 - 38.

Tannen, D. (1984). Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends.

Yuan, J., Liberman, M.Y., & Cieri, C. (2007). Towards an Integrated Understanding of Speech Overlaps in Conversation.