

## CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS ON THE USE OF NON-COMPETITIVE OVERLAP

**Genesis M. Egipto**  
**Jessica Q. Balbuena**  
**Jewelito A. de Guzman**  
**Dr. Jomel Manuel**  
[genmegipto@gmail.com](mailto:genmegipto@gmail.com)

Cagayan State University  
Tuguegarao City, Philippines

### *Abstract*

Conversation analysis focuses on interactive and practical construction of everyday interchanges in which people interact on a moment-by-moment, turn-by-turn basis. This study aimed to examine the non-competitive overlap used, and the gender issues and concerns among the university students in their ordinary conversation. The three-part process discourse analytic technique: (Record-Transcribe-Analyze (R-T-A) method was used. Audio-recording was employed as an instrument in gathering the data. Data were analyzed using frequency distribution and results show that terminal overlap is the most commonly used non-competitive overlap, while the least is continuers. Further, in the findings of gender issue and concerns it was found that female to female conversation has the highest frequency and percentage in their issues and concerns.

Thus, it is concluded that non-competitive overlap is being used in ordinary conversations to maintain the flow of the conversation, to encourage someone that is talking, and to let the speaker know that the receiver is listening.

*Keywords:* conversational analysis, non-competitive overlap, turn-taking

### **I. Introduction**

A conversation is the impromptu, spontaneous, everyday exchange of talk between two or more people. While conversational analysis (CA) is a popular approach to the study of discourse, it is a way of thinking about and analyzing the pragmatics of ordinary conversations, focusing on the interactive, practical construction of everyday interchanges.

In addition, conversational analysis is a process in which people interact on a moment-by-moment, turn-by-turn basis. During a sequence of turns participants exchange talk with each other, but, more important, they exchange social or communicative actions. These actions are the moves of conversation considered as a collection of games. Indeed, conversational actions are some of the most important moves of the broader game of everyday life (Nofsinger, 1991). The participants in a conversation take turns, and during their turn each makes a conversational move of some kind. Conversation analysts adopt the view that when people conduct a conversation it is an internationally managed and locally managed phenomenon. That is to say, people organize the construction of a conversation together, cooperatively, and they deal with the organization at a "local" level, one utterance at a time.

There are several parts of CA which are turn-taking, repairs, attributable silence, sequence of conversation, and transcription of conversation. According to Kato (2000), turn taking is one of the basic mechanisms in conversation and the nature of turn taking is to promote and maintain talk. For the smooth flow of turn-taking, the knowledge of both the linguistic rules and the conversational rules of the target language is required.

Aindinlou (2013), underscores the different ways to take turn: back-channeling, overlap, completion and body talk. When two or more participants involving in the conversation try to get the opportunity for talk, overlapping happens and in fact there is a kind of competition for starting or continuing the conversation. Overlaps refer to the instances when more than one person speaks at the same time. Overlaps are also categorized as turn-competitive and turn-non competitive overlaps. Turn-competitive overlaps are designed or received as competing for a turn at talk or for the right to hold the floor by that moment whereas turn-non competitive overlaps are not.

The division of simultaneous talk into competitive and non-competitive instances was first touched upon by French and Local (1983), when discussing the relationship between overlap and turn-taking and what kind of overlapping speech needed to be resolved. Schegloff (2000) divided instances of overlapping talk into those that were “problematic” or competitive with respect to turn-taking and to those that were “unproblematic” or non-competitive with respect to it, and added that “problematic” or competitive instances of overlap challenge the turn of the current speaker and have to be, therefore, resolved in some way.

According to Schegloff (2000), there are four types of overlapping talk that are non-competitive with respect to turn-taking. This includes, terminal overlaps, continuers, conditional access to the turn and chordal overlaps. Terminal overlaps occur when one speaker assumes the other speaker has or is about to finish his/her turn and begins to speak, thus creating overlap.

Continuers (i.e. interpolations such as uh huh, mm hm, context fitted assessment terms etc.; cf. Schegloff 1982, C. Goodwin 1986), by which recipients of another’s talk can show precisely that they understand that the speaker is in the course of an extended turn at talk which is not yet complete. “Conditional access to the turn,” is a process in which a speaker of a not possibly completed turn-in-progress yields to another, or even invites another to speak in his turn’s space, conditional on the other’s use of that opportunity to further the initial speaker’s undertaking. “Chordal” or “Choral” in character (Schegloff, 2000) mean to call attention to forms of talk and activity that are treated by interactional co-participants as not to be done serially, not one after the other, but to be done simultaneously. The first is laughter, whose occurrence can serve as an invitation for others to laugh, but whose elicited product is done in concert with other laughter and not after it.

On the basis of gender and communication, Tannen (1994) said that switching topics is another habit that gives women the impression men are not listening, especially if they switch to a topic about themselves. Women’s conversational habits are as frustrating to men as men’s are to women. Men who expect silent attention interpret a stream of listener- noise as overreaction or impatience. Also, when women talk to each other in a close, comfortable setting, they often overlap, finish each sentence and anticipate what the other is about to say. This practice is often perceived by men as interruption, intrusion and lack of attention.

The present study examines the frequency of occurrence of non-competitive overlap in the conversational discourse among university students and the gender issues and concerns in conversation among interlocutors.

## **II. Research Objectives**

This study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the frequency of occurrence of the non-competitive overlap in the conversational discourse among university students?
  - 1.1 terminal overlaps
  - 1.2 continuers
  - 1.3 conditional access to turn
  - 1.4 chordal
2. How frequent is the occurrence of non-competitive overlap among interlocutors in ordinary conversation?
  - 2.1 Female-female
  - 2.2 Male-male
  - 2.3 Mixed Group
3. What gender biases are displayed in the conversation among the interlocutors?

## **III. Methodology**

This research considered Schegloff's overlap resolution device which entails how participants of a conversation can avoid violating the one-speaker-at-a-time mechanism. This model tackles about the instances wherein overlap occurrences are problematic for the participants in a conversation; what the features of such overlapping talk are; and what constraints and account overlapping talk should meet.

Overlaps take place when multiple turns are occurring at the same time in a conversation. It could be when one participant assumes that the current speaker's turn is done (terminal overlap); when recipients of another talk show that they understand that the speaker is in the course of an extended turn at talk which is not yet complete (continuers); when a speaker of a not possible completed turn-in-progress yields to another, or even invites another to speak in his turn space, conditional on the other's use of that opportunity to further the initial speaker's understanding (conditional access to the turn); or during forms or talk and activity that are treated by interactional co-participants as not to be done serially but simultaneously (chordals).

According to Schegloff, these four types of overlaps are non-competitive and trouble-free, however, there are still instances when these types of overlaps can be considered problematic to the participants of a conversation.

Thus, the researchers determined how these four types of overlaps frequently take place in a conversation among university students and the gender issues and concerns in conversation among interlocutors.

This study used the Input-Process-Output paradigm. The recorded ordinary conversations among male to male, female to female and mixed group were considered as the input of the study, while the process was the analysis of the recorded and transcribed conversations in ordinary conversations. Furthermore,

the output was the identified commonly used non- competitive overlap and the gender issues and concerns displayed in the conversation.

This study analyzed (30) ordinary conversations recorded through audio recorder. The researchers recorded the random conversations using the following instruments: downloadable audio application recorders and the used of pen and notebook to take down the notes for the supplements of the recording and will adapt Duff's (1996) transcription method of conversation. The data was taken from the conversations among the students (female only, male only and mixed gender), specifically from the premises of Campus Library, Mass Communication Park, College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Nook, covered walked, benches, canteen, gymnasium, Campus Registrar and Finance, and student center office.

This study is delimited to video recording because interlocutors will probably be conscious to stir up a conversation among themselves, thus, making the gathering of data difficult.

After the researchers gathered the necessary data, they started to analyze the audio recordings: on male-to-male conversation, female-to-female conversation, female to male conversations. In this study, the type of overlaps used by the interlocutors was analyzed using the frequency count and percentage distribution.

#### IV. Results and Discussion

##### 3. 1 Frequency of Non- Competitive Overlap in Male-Male Ordinary Conversations

Table 1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of non-competitive overlap in male-to-male ordinary conversations. The researchers had recorded ten (10) male to male ordinary conversations within the campus. The table shows that the most commonly used non-competitive overlap was the terminal overlap with a frequency of 14 or 51.85%, followed by conditional access to the turn with a frequency of 7 or 25.93%, the next one is chordal with a frequency of 4 or 14.81%. Furthermore, the least used non-competitive overlap was continuers with a frequency of 2 or 7.41%.

The table shows that man tends to use terminal overlap two times higher than the conditional access to the turn, three times higher than choral and seven times higher than continuers. Terminal Overlap occurs when one speaker assumes the other speaker has or is about to finish his/her turn and begins to speak, thus creating overlap and in which one speaker appears to be starting up by virtue of a prior speaker's incipient finishing of a turn.

Lastly, comparing the result of all female conversations versus all male conversations it shows that the non-competitive overlap on male conversations is two times lower than the result of the female conversation. This clearly proves the claim of Coates (1987), that in an all male group's conversation, man tend to prefer one at a time conversations and shows little overlap rather than an all female conversations that prefer simultaneous speech or multi layered conversations.

**Table 1. Frequency of Overlap in Male-to-Male Ordinary Conversation.**

Overlap	Frequency	Percentage
Terminal Overlap	14	51.85%
Continuers	2	7.41%
Conditional Access to the Turn	7	25.93%
Choral/Chordal	4	14.81%

Total	27	100%
-------	----	------

### 3.1.1 Terminal Overlap

#### Extract 1:

- 1 M1: Josh, tulungan mo nga ako, [Josh  
*Josh, help me here, Josh*
- 2 M2: Oh sige!  
*Oh, ok!*
- 3 → M1: Joke [lang:::  
*I'm only kidding.*
- 4 → M2: [Tutulungan kita diyan, pre.  
*I'll assist you there. buddy.*
- 5 (3.0)
- 6 M1: Joke lang, pre.  
*Buddy, I'm only kidding*

In extract 1, M2 in line 4 committed terminal overlap against M1 in line 3. In line 1, M1 was asking for help from M2 who agreed to help as seen in line 2, however, M1 abruptly took back his favor in line 3, saying that he was only joking. M2 still wanted to show his willingness to help M1, thus committing terminal overlap.

M2 thought that M1 in line 3 had already finished saying his part and with his eagerness to help his friend, M2 immediately answered to assure M1 that he will lend him a hand.

### 3.1.2 Conditional Access to the turn

#### Extract 2:

- 1 S1: Hindi pa sa tatlong laro na yan??  
*(Not yet in those three games?)*
- 2 (3.0)
- 3 S3: Ano. Eh::: Semi-Michael naman to. (1.0) Semi-Michael  
*(But uh, this is semi-Michael. (1.0) Semi-Michael)*
- 4 S1: = Semi-Michael??  
*(Semi-Michael??)*
- 5 (5.0)
- 6 S2: Back muna, tol.  
*(Turn it back, buddy)*
- 7 S3: Maalala ko nung nasa terminal pa lang, unang tanong ni sir Michael kay Bien e yung  
ano e  
*(I remember when we were at the bus terminal, the first question of Sir Michael to Bien was about)*
- 8 → S2: Yung [chess. Haha  
*(The chess board. Haha)*
- 9 → S3: [Chess ampo:::  
*Chess board, such a wh\*re*
- 10 S2: Tinext pa niya sakina noon e “Yung chess”  
*(He even texted me then about it, “the chess board”)*

Extract 2 shows how Student 3 committed “conditional access to the turn” against Student 2. In line 7, S3 asked S2 if he still remembers the question asked by Sir Michael when they were at the terminal. S2

invited S3 to take part in his turn by asking him what the question is even if he knew the question from the beginning.

In this case, it can be observed that S3 is the one who committed the “conditional access to the turn”. This event is a collaborative utterance construction, wherein one participant initiates an utterance and the other participant knowing the answer beforehand had immediately provided for it.

## 4.2 Frequency of Non- Competitive Overlap in Female-Female Ordinary Conversations

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of non-competitive overlap in female-female ordinary conversations. The researchers also recorded 10 ordinary conversations within the campus. The table shows that the greatest non-competitive overlap used was terminal overlap with the frequency of 29 or 60.42 percent, followed by chordal or choral with the frequency of 11 or 22.92 percent. Next is conditional access to the turn with the frequency of 5 or 10.42 percent. And the least used non-competitive overlap was continuers with a frequency of 3 or 6.25%.

This implies that terminal overlap exhibits a strong tendency to be used more on female-to-female conversations between friends. More so, one possible factor for the high frequency of overlap between this group is that women seem to overlap their conversations more, and are better able to hold simultaneous discussions with multiple other people than men.

**Table 2. Frequency of Overlap in Female-to-Female Ordinary Conversation.**

Overlap	Frequency	Percentage
Terminal Overlap	29	60.42%
Continuers	3	6.25%
Conditional Access to Turn	5	10.42%
Chordal	11	22.92%
Total	48	100%

### 3.2.1 Terminal Overlap

#### Extract 3:

- 1 S7: UY NASH!  
(*hey NASH!*)
- 2 S1: Madaming pantalon na sale sa 698 ko:: malalake beh::  
(*in 698 there are many pants available, it has large size*)
- 3 → S3: oo beh:::[99  
(*yeah, there are*)
- 4 → S1: [99 lang  
(*For only 99 pesos*)
- 5 S3: =Oo 99 nalang  
*yeah, it's only 99.*
- 6 6.0
- 7 S1: Atleast kasya mo yun  
*at least, it will fit you well*
- 8 S3: [MAGAGANDA, kasya mo yun!  
(*It's of good quality, it will surely fit you!*)
- 9 S1: [Malalaki kasi::  
*Because it's in large sizes*

10 S1: 99 lang  
(99 only)

In this extract, student 7 calls for Nash because she has something to tell her. However, S1 suddenly grabbed the floor and opened the topic about discounted pants in a department store which took the attention of the interlocutors. Not even knowing that S7 was about to say something, the interlocutors did not anymore let her finish her turn. In this case, a terminal overlap was committed.

A terminal overlap was also committed in line 4. S1 assumed that S3 was already done talking when S3 expressed that she also knows about the sale by saying “oo, beh” in line 3 and so, she began telling her the price of the pants in line 4 which was exactly what S3 said next in line 3 making them utter the price of the pants at the same time.

### 3.3 Frequency of Non- Competitive Overlap in Male-Female Ordinary Conversations

Table 3 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of female-male conversations. The table shows that the most used non-competitive overlap is chordal with a frequency of 21 or 42.86 percent, followed by terminal overlap and continuers with a frequency of 18 or 36.73 percent and a frequency of 8 or 16.33 percent respectively.

Moreover, the least used non-competitive overlap was conditional access to the turn with a frequency of 2 or 4.08 percent. This implies that chordal/choral is the most common used overlap among mixed gender conversations. On the transcribe data, the most used choral is laughter.

**Table 3. Frequency of Overlap in Mixed Gender (Male and Female) Ordinary Conversation**

Overlap	Frequency	Percentage
Terminal Overlap	18	36.73%
Continuers	8	16.33%
Conditional Access to Turn	2	4.08%
Chordal	21	42.86%
Total	49	100%

#### 3.3.1 Chordal

##### Extract 9:

- 1 Jenny: Alla Gin [ Pinariringan ka oh.  
*Gin, he's pertaining to you*
- 2 Giny: [Sir, uupakan na talaga kita.  
*Sir, don't wait for me to punch you*
- 3 Mr. L := Ngayon weirdo:: bu::kas:: pa cute::  
*Weird today, trying hard to be cute tomorrow*
- 4 → Giny: haha[ha  
*hahaha*
- 5 → Jenny: [hahaha  
*hahaha*
- 6 Mr. L : Tipong ganun ba::  
*Things like those*
- 7 → Giny : hahaha  
*hahaha*
- 8 → Jenny: hahaha  
*hahaha*
- 9 Giny: Hindi talaga nakakatuwa sir.



- It's not funny, sir.*
- 10 Jenny, Rashida and Giny : HAHAAHA  
*hahaha*
- 11 Mr. L: (xx) hindi naman ako nagpapatama (xx)  
*I'm not even pertaining to someone*

In lines 4 and 5, Giny laughed and later on Jenny also started laughing. In this case, Giny's laugh served as an invitation for Jenny to start laughing, too. In Giny's case, it served as a mockery towards what Mr. L was saying. It has been discovered that laughter serves the needs of interactional situations and can be used to convey, among other things, intimacy, affiliation, delicateness or difficulty of the topic being discussed, mockery and contempt in addition to humor (Jefferson 1984b, 1985; Jefferson et al. 1987; Haakana 1999, Glenn 2003). Invited laughter comes into being when one speaker invites another speaker to laugh by laughing him-/herself and the recipient, thereupon, accepts this invitation by starting to laugh. (Jefferson 1979: 80)

### 3.3. 2 Terminal Overlap

#### Extract 10

- 1 → M: Mapan ka agpaamponen [sister,  
(*Go and get yourself adopted, sister.*)
- 2 → F1: [Iphone se::ven:::  
(*[Iphone se::ven:::]*)
- 3 M1: Ang INIT INIT NAMAN DITO.  
(*IT'S SO HOT IN HERE*)

In line 2 F1 committed terminal overlap without realizing it. She thought that the speaker in line 1 is already done speaking and in turn committed it. In this conversation between male and female, it signifies that the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> speaker are close enough to overlap each other. It also reveals that they are confident enough that the one who has been interrupted will not get mad over the interrupter.

### 3.4. Frequency of Non-Competitive Overlap among University Students

Table 4 presents the Frequency distribution of Non-Competitive Overlap among university students. The gathered data from the table shows that the most used Non-Competitive overlap was terminal overlap with a frequency of 61 or 49.13 percent, followed by choral/chordal and conditional access to the turn with a frequency of 36 or 29.03 percent and a frequency of 14 or 11.29 percent. The least used non-competitive overlap is continuers with the frequency of 13 or 10.48 percent.

This indicates that terminal overlap is used most commonly by the students. Terminal Overlap occurs because one speaker assumes that the speaker has or is about to finish, thus, creating overlap. This occurrence signifies that student are actively participating in ordinary conversations, because they usually assume and predict that the current speaker is about to end and find the right time to speak. However, due to wrong predictions of when the current speaker will end, they overlap each other.

**Table 4. Frequency distribution of non-competitive overlap among students**

Overlap	Frequency	Percentage
Terminal Overlap	61	49.13%
Continuers	13	10.48%
Conditional Access to the Turn	14	11.29%



Choral/Chordal	36	29.03%
Total	124	100%

### 3. 5 GENDER ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Table 5. Gender issues and concerns frequency and percentage table

Conversation Among:	Frequency	Percentage
Male to Male	10	29.41%
Female to Female	16	47.05%
Mixed group	8	23.53%
Total:	34	100%

Table 5 presents the results of frequency and distribution of the gender issues and concern in an ordinary conversation. The researchers had recorded ten (30 ordinary conversations within the campus, 10 for Male to Male, 10 for Female to Female and lastly 10 for Mixed group conversation). The table shows that Female to Female has the most numbered issues and concerns among the 3 groups, with a frequency of 16 or 47.05%, followed by male to male with a frequency of 10 or 29.41%, lastly mixed group with a frequency of 8 or 23.53%.

The result of the study supplemented the research of Deborah Tannen that women want to be with their families, help others, feel respected and cared about, be a part of a community, be proud of the company they work for and be trusted. All of this reflects their need for connection and relationship. Women talk to build rapport and make connections. They discuss personal topics like relationships, feelings, and past experiences. Women take turns communicating. Women tend to be indirect, tactful, and use more courtesy words. Women accomplish tasks by building relationships first. Women talk out loud to others, processing information externally for decision making.

This clearly answers why female to female conversation has the highest frequency of issues and concerns because it was found that they need to foster relationship with each other. This type of conversation is considered as the “rapport” type talk. The communication behaviors, women tend to possess; feeling, empathy, harmony, closeness, relationships, sharing, cooperation, group and intuitive. Another thing, women communicate in an expressive style.

In the transcribe data that has been analyze, out of the 16 issues and concerns of woman, 12 are directed to the same sex or to women and 2 refers in general while the next 2 pertains to man. This refutes the notion that women always talk about men, in fact in the transcribe data, talking about men has the least tendency to be uttered by women. The 12 issues that has been directed to women always concerns about relationship, issues, body shaming and discriminating the same sex.

While on male-to-male conversation, according to Deborah Tannen, “men are more likely to engage in what is referred to, as report talk, which is primarily characterized by “focus on content”. Men talk about affairs that are public matters, such as sports or politics. During report talk, men demonstrate their knowledge about a subject and will give general information about the topic.” Men view conversation as a means to exchange information and to solve problems.

This clearly answers the reason why men have lesser issues than of women. Firstly, because men shy away from personal topics and lean more in discussing events, sports, news, and facts. They tell more

stories and jokes than women as a way to show status and power. Men are direct, blunt, and usually their speech includes slang or swears words. Men get straight to work on a task and build relationships while working on the project. Men reflect and process information for decision making internally.

According to some researchers, men use an instrumental style of communication. Instrumental style of communication for men is to focus on identifying goals and finding a solution.

In the mixed conversation, it has been concluded that each gender is being sensitive and careful about talking issues and concerns with the opposite sex. Their walls are up so that they will not spill such information. This is because men and women have varying ways of communication. This shows respect in considering each genders preference of topic, some of the topic that we have listed down in mixed conversation depends on the mutual interest of both parties, such as family, religion, gadgets and future plans. This finding agrees with the study of Malenab-Temporal (2018), that language study should not only deal with its linguistic form, but to analyze how these linguistic choices meets the demands of a specific context so that effective communication is accomplished.

### 3. 6 Frequency and percentage distribution of male to male and female to female talking about the opposite sex

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female-Female	2	28.57%
Male-Male	5	71.43%
Total:	7	100%

Table.6 Male to Male and Female to Female talking about the opposite sex.

Table 6 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of how frequent did the listed gender has talked about the opposite sex. The researchers had recorded ten (10) male to male ordinary conversations within the campus and out of the 10 situation, 5 of it has a talked about women or girlfriends. The table shows that there is a higher possibility that the men will talk about the opposite sex with the frequency of 5 or 71.43% out of the 10 conversations, while women has a chance to talk about the opposite sex with a percentage of 28.57% or 2 out the 10 recorded female to female conversations.

The table shows that male to male discourse tends to talked about the opposite sex three times higher than female to female conversation. With the notion that women talk more about the opposite sex than men, this study refutes that notion and found that men had bigger tendency to talked about the opposite sex more than the women.

### 3.7 Swearing and Taboo language

In the research of Coates (1996), the researcher wanted to prove the widespread stereotypes and belief that males use more expletives than females. In his research he emphasizes that male to male conversations uses substantially more taboo words than female to female discourse, while mixed conversations tend to accommodate both sides. The study of Coates agrees with the result of the study of Lakoff (1975) confirming that women tend to avoid coarse language or expletives.

The present study also attests that male-to-male conversations tend to used more taboo words than female-to-female conversations. Out of 15 listed down expletives, 11 are confirmed to be from the all-male conversation, while the rest are from all female conversations. It is quite surprising that there are no expletives used among mixed conversation, this implies that each gender tends to think more before

talking to their opposite sex, or there is a high rate of sensitivity when talking among the opposite gender.

	Frequency	Percentage
Male to Male Conversation	11	73.33%
Female to Female Conversation	4	26.67%
Mixed Conversation	0	0
Total	15	100%

Table 7. The used of expletives among gender.

### 3.8 Women overlap men more in Mixed Conversations

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	11	31.41 %
Female	24	68.57 %
Total	35	100%

Table 7. Women overlap men more in Mixed Conversation

In the 1983 study of Zimmerman and West, they found that in eleven mixed sex pair, men interrupt or overlap women more. They concluded that men's dominance in conversation via interruption mirrors their dominance in contemporary western culture. They also added that men enjoy greater status and power than women in most societies and they are more likely than women to assume they are entitled to take over the conversation.

However, the present study found that out of 35 listed overlap between male and female conversations it was observed that women overlap or interrupt men more with a frequency of 24 or 68.57 percent while men have an overlap frequency of 11 or 31.41 percent.

The reason why there are differing results is that Zimmerman and West transcribed recorded data has subjects that were white, middle class and less than 35 year of age. While in this study, all the subjects are: Asian (Filipino), and under 25 year of age. The present study implies that overlap clearly depends on the culture, race, class and age of the speakers. In the end, women and men feel interrupted by each other because of their differences in what they are trying to accomplish within a discourse.

## V. Conclusion

The present study has confirmed previous findings that female-to-female conversation has more issues and concerns than that of the other group because woman tend to talk more about their feelings, in order for them to create and maintain relationship. It also has been proven that male to male conversations uses more swear words than that of the other groups. In addition, this study also found one possible factor for the high frequency of overlap between female-to-female discourse, that women seem to overlap their conversations more, and are better able to hold simultaneous discussions with multiple other people than men. More importantly, this conversational analysis found that non-competitive overlap has been used to maintain group discussion in an ordinary conversation among university students.

These four types of overlapping talk by Schegloff (2000), can provide a better understanding and perspective with regards to the way male and female communicate in ordinary conversations, and how gender could greatly affect the way ordinary people communicate with the same or opposite sex. By observing the different genders interact through ordinary discourse, it can be seen how male and female had varied reasons about the instances wherein overlap occurrences are problematic for the participants in a conversation; what the features of such overlapping talk are; and what constraints and account overlapping talk should meet. As men and women have varying ways of communication, we need to show respect and consider each gender preference of their choice of topic and way of interaction.

### References

- Aidinlou, Naser Assadi & Dolati, Kamram (2013). "A Comparison Study of Males and Females Turn-Taking Frequency in Turkish." *Journal of basic and Applied Scientific Research*. Ahar Branch : Islamic Azad University.
- Coates, J. (1987). EPISTEMIC MODALITY AND SPOKEN DISCOURSE. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 85(1), pp. 110–131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-968X.1987.TB00714.X>
- Coates, J. (1996). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. London: Longman.
- French, P., & Local, J. (1983). Turn Competitive Incomings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 7, 701-715.
- Jefferson, G. & Schegloff, E.A. 1975. *Sketch: Some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation*. Paper delivered to the 74th Annual Meetings of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco.
- Jefferson, G. 1983. *Two explorations of the organization of overlapping talk in conversation: Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset*. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature* 28.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). "Notes on Some Orderliness of Overlap Onset". *Discourse Analysis and Natural Rhetoric*. 500, 11-36.
- Kato, F. (2000). *DISCOURSE APPROACH TO TURN-TAKING FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF TONE CHOICE BETWEEN SPEAKERS*. University of Birmingham. <https://bit.ly/3FILtBM>
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and women's place*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Malenab-Temporal, C. (2018). Conversation Analysis of ESL Learners' Speech Acts in Classroom Discourse. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6. Retrieved at <http://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/APJMR-2018.6.3.07.pdf>
- Nofsinger, R. E. (1991). *Everyday Conversation*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publishing, Inc.
- <https://ijase.org>



Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn- taking for Conversation. *Language in Society*, 29, 1-63.

Schegloff, E.A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men in the workplace: Language, sex, and power*. New York: Avon Books.

West, C. and Zimmerman, D. (1977). Women's Place in Everyday Talk: Reflection on Parent-Child Interaction. *Social Problems*, 24, pp 221 – 29.

Zimmerman, D. & West, C. (1975). Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in Conversation. *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance* :105-129.