CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this part the writer discusses some theories that give relevant to her study. This case has purpose to more understanding in this research. Those are:

2.1 Conversation

According to Wardaugh (2005, p. 298), “conversation is a cooperative activity also in the sense that it involves two or more parties, each of whom must be allowed the opportunity to participate”. It means that an activity done by two or more people which is one of them must be give opportunity to involve in their conversation.

According to Schegloff, “conversation is admits that there may exceptions – only one person speaks at the time and that person is recognized be the one whose turn it is to speak” (as cited in Wardaugh, 2005, p. 298). It means that only one person that speak in one time and it has turn to start the conversation.

2.2 Turn Taking

According to Sacks et al 1974, 2004, “turn taking is the basic rule in English conversation is that one person speaks at the time, after which they may nominate another speaker or another speaker may take up the turn without being nominated “(as cited in Brian, 2006, p. 113).

According to Burns and Joyce, “Turn taking happens in several moments. These are in particular situations for example in classroom and factor of topic of the
conversation means that whether the interaction in relatively co-operative, how well the speakers know each other, and the relationship between, and relative status of the speakers “(as cited in Brian, 2006, p.115.).

While according to Zimmerman and West (1975) in Coates (1986, p.99), “turn taking sometimes does not happen smoothly. There are particular points in the conversation. That is, turns taking that do not follow with smooth pattern when they want to describe. So, the next speaker has to know who has to speak after the first speaker (as cited in Gunawan, 2006, p.5).

2.3 Interruption

In this case, the writer also gives some theories from some linguists, such as Zimmerman and West (cited in Tannen, 1991), Wardaugh (1985), and Tannen (1991).

According to Zimmerman and West, “an interruption is a violation into turn taking rules in conversation in which the second speaker begins to speak while the first was in the middle of a word or change”. It means that the second speaker cuts the first speaker’s words without giving chance to finish next words (as cited in Tannen, 1991, p. 191).

According to Wardaugh (1985, p. 150), “interruption is a violation of another’s territory or rights. It means that whether someone ask to help or direction of strangers, it is included into interrupt other people’s activity. For example when a
person knocks the door and says “excuse me” it belongs to violating someone’s territory.

Moreover, Tannen (1991, p. 192) states that interruption cannot justified on the basis of a single instance because it is a matter of individual perceptions of rights and obligations, as they grow out of individual habits and expectations. It means that we cannot judge that it is an interruption. We have to see about the situation and topic.

So, the writer concludes that the interruption is a violation in the conversation and also a type of violation of another’s right, as Zimmerman and Wardaugh said before. Whatever the situation it is constant interruption, when the second speaker cut the first speaker’s words and does not give a chance to finish the words.

2.4 Overlap

According to Zimmerman and West (1975, p. 114), “overlaps are instances of simultaneous speech where a speaker other than the current speaker begins to speak at or very close to a possible transition place in a current speaker’s utterance. It means that when the first speaker begins to speak and the next speaker covered the first speaker by his word. So, two voices happen in one time.

Tannen (1991, p. 192) states that overlap is two voices talking at once. It means that when the one speaker says while the other speaker also says in one time. So, the voice of them occurs in one time and the voice is not clear.
All in all, the writer can conclude that overlap is an act of interruption where two voices are heard at the same time. So, the words from second speaker overlap with the last or part of the words of the first speaker.

2.5 Reason of Interruptions and Overlaps

In this study the writer explains the reasons of interruptions and overlaps. It is based on the Wardaugh’s theory (1985). Those are:

2.5.1 Asking for Helping

Asking for help or directions to strangers when they are doing something, it includes in interrupt their activity. So, you must reassure them immediately that your interruption is to be brief by stating its limited purposed (Wardaugh, 1985, p. 151).

For example:
A: Sorry madam, may I borrow your umbrella?
B: (reading book) oh ya, please! You may..

2.5.2 Breaking up

Breaking up happens when the topic of the conversation change or shift another related topic unpredictably (Wardaugh, 1985, p. 151).

For example:
A: We will be right back
B: is there Nova?
2.5.3 Completing

One way of interrupting and taking over a turn which is less offensive than attempting to drown out the speaker is by trying to complete something he or she is saying. The speaker can use words such as: and, but, however, and consequently (Wardugh, 1985, p.153).

For example:
A: So, actually the song is
B: Bad Girl by Agnes

2.5.4 Correcting

Interrupting for the sake of correcting as opposed to seeking clarification is a much more delicate matter. Self correction is always permissible, but too much is likely to reduce your credibility with your listener (Wardaugh, 1985, p. 152).

For example:
A: (song) my life is not like this
B: please sing seriously!

2.5.5 Disagreeing

Disagreeing happen when you hear something with which you sharply disagree or you consider that he speaker is badly misinformed. Some of words that indicates disagreeing; Wait a minutes!, hold on!, that’s not right!, I don’t agree!, or you’ve got. (Wardaugh, 1985, p. 152).
For example:

A: Ok, check it out  
B: wait a minute, after this what is segment?

2.5.6 Seeking Clarification

Seeking clarification is trying to help the speaker communicate what he or she wants to get across to you to the extent that you are willing to point out where the attempt is falling. It means that the speaker does seeking clarification to make it clear what the first speaker said. There are many words which can be used to request a repetition or clarification in the conversation, such as *excuse me, pardon me, or I beg your pardon* (Wardaugh, 1985, p.151).

For example:

A: I did not come last night because of sick  
B: pardon me, are you getting sick?

2.5.7 Showing Agreement

Showing agreements is the reasons of interruption and overlap which is not base on Wardaugh’s theory. The writer follows this theory as cited in thesis (Gunawan, 2006, p.27). Showing agreement means that the second speaker supports and agrees with what previous speaker said. It means that the second speaker has same idea or opinion with previous speaker. For example:

E: I saw you, a: at guys party after the Oscars at least for a little while  
P: ya