CHAPTER EIGHT

PROSODY AND THE MANAGEMENT OF INTERACTION IN INTERVIEWS

8.1 Introduction

Chapter Seven is concerned with examining the notion of prosodic prominence and how speakers deploy this prosodic resource for the purpose of facilitating the communication of "messages" or information. In this chapter, the focus will be on examining the prosodic features that function as cues in the management of interviewer-interviewee verbal interaction, concentrating in particular on their role in assisting participants undertake interactional work of various kinds.

The work that is most relevant to the issues being investigated in the present study is the research initiated by Sacks and his colleagues into the sequential organisation of talk (e.g. Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff 1990). Of particular interest is the importance that their approaches accord to context and to sequential organisation in understanding and producing the talk the interactants are engaged in.
Starting from the work of Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz (1976) as well as Gumperz (1982, 1992a and 1992b), it is assumed that the process of understanding utterances in discourse is facilitated by certain verbal and non-verbal devices that construe the context in which utterances become interpretable (see Auer, 1992). They cue interlocutors in with respect to what is relevant "now" and what is relevant "next" in ongoing discourse. Following this kind of reasoning, the use of prosodic features can serve as signalling cues in the management of conversational interaction and in the interpretation of different activity-types in conversation.

The concern here is to find out exactly how prosody and what prosodic cues contribute to this process of contextualization. It is assumed that the answers to these questions will be related to principles of conversational organisation and interactional strategy. Therefore, in order to identify its contextualisation function, prosodic phenomena will be examined at turn transitions and especially within certain types of speaker activity like turn-holding or turn-yielding, turn-competitive incomings or non-competitive incomings and restarting or continuing.

The analysis will be a linguistic analysis which uses ethno-methodological thinking and conversation analytic methodology. The structural analysis will be supported by a sequential analysis which shows that a recipient orients himself to the identified clusters of signalling cues.
8.2 Turn Taking Procedure

Being a kind of social talk whereby roles of participants are predetermined, the turn-taking procedure of broadcast interview is characterised by the assymetrical power relationship between the interviewer and interviewee. Hirsch (1989:153) gives a list of the rights and obligations of participants of interviewees, some of the more relevant ones are as follows:

(1) An interviewer has the right and obligation to select an interviewee as next speaker and with that selection he must stop speaking.

(2) An interviewee has the obligation to take next turn as speaker upon being selected by an interviewer.

(3) An interviewee has the right to self select.

(4) An interviewer has the right and sometimes the obligation to preempt the turn of an interviewee, i.e. he has the right and sometimes the obligation of interrupting an interviewee.
Given conditions (1) and (2), the interchange of speaking turns between interview participants should be smooth for the interviewee is required to speak once the interviewer relinquishes his turn after addressing the interviewee with a question. It is obviously useful for the interviewee to be able to decide as early as possible that the interviewer is about to finish or has finished to ensure the taking over of turn at the appropriate moment with undue hesitation.

The turn-taking behaviour exhibited in the data of broadcast interviews examined point to the fact that the distribution of talk across participants generally occur with no gap or slight gap (see Table 1 in Appendix D). The precise timing of entry suggests the presence of contextualising cues which the speakers could have deployed to signal turn-completion. As regards this, it is assumed that prosodic cues enter into the inferential process by providing information on possible turn construction units. How the speaker deploys prosody as a resource to indicate the completion of his turn and how the recipient uses the cues to project turn completion will be examined in section 8.3.

The fact that the interviewer has the right to interrupt a turn while it is still in progress implies that the occurrence of overlapping speech (though few) is unavoidable (see table 1). Nevertheless, despite being interruptive in the sense of entering a turn while it is still in progress, such a
behaviour does not necessarily constitute the intent to take away the turn from the turn occupant.

An overlap can be directly turn competitive in the sense of wanting the turn now at the moment of entry and not later after the completion of the interviewee's turn or non-turn competitive in the sense of having no intention of taking over the turn. The interviewer is also not spared from being interrupted. However, the interruption is usually brought about by his own doing in the sense that it is the interviewer who first interrupts the interviewee's on-going turn and the interviewee may respond to it by a return competition. The occurrence of the interviewee interrupting the interviewer is less frequent. It happens in cases when the interviewer comes in before the completion of the interviewee's turn and the interviewee interrupts to take away the turn from the interviewer.

When overlaps occur one participant eventually gives up his turn and the other gains right to the turn. Relinquishing the turn can easily be accomplished by not continuing or "fading out". What is more difficult is for the turn occupant to hold his turn in order to get his contribution to a satisfactory end in the face of such a competition. When a turn is lost before completion, a strategy often used to complete an unfinished prior talk is to resume it when the turn is regained.
From the description of speaker activity in the context of a dyadic turn-taking organisation, one can identify the following sequential locations at talk:

**Sequence 1: Entry**

**No Gap**

a1-> A: ..... = (where A completes his turn)

B: =..... (where B begins to address A's turn by latching to it immediately)

**Minimal gap**

a2-> A: ..... (where A completes his turn)

B: (0.23) ..... (where B begins to address A's turn after a slight pause)

**Minimal overlap**

a3-> A: ..... [] (where A completes his turn)

B: []..... (where B begins to address A's turn just before its completion with a slight overlap)
Sequence 2: Response to Interruption

Return Competition

A: ..... (where A completes his turn)

B: ..[.] (where B begins to address A's turn but is preempted by A's incoming)

A: [ ].[.] (where A begins his interruptive entry)

b-> B [ ]..... (regains his turn by a return competition)

Yielding a Turn

A: ..... (where A completes his turn)

c-> B: ..[.] (where B begins his talk and gives his turn away to A)

A: [ ].... (where A makes his entry)

Sequence 3: Overlapping entry

Non-competitive

A: ..... (where completes his turn)

d-> B: ..[.].. (where B begins to address A's turn and is able to complete his turn despite interruption)

e-> A: [ ] (where A comes in in-overlap with B but has no intention of grabbing B's turn)
Competitive

A: ..... (where A completes his turn)
B: ..[.] (where B begins to address A's turn but drops out in the face of competition)

f-> A: [.]... (Where A comes in in-overlap and takes over the turn)

Sequence 4: Resumption

Continuation/R审at

A: ..... (where A completes his turn)
B: ..[.] (where B begins to address A's turn but yields his turn in the face of competition before completion)
A: [.]... (where A comes in in-overlap with B to take over the turn)
g-> B: ..... (where B comes in to resume his curtailed turn after the termination of A's turn)

The speaker, who seldom employs talk to display his intent, has to rely on some other means of contextualising his talk as a particular kind of speaker activity. This chapter begins with the premise that the Malay speaker deploys particular contextualising cues, i.e. prosodic, lexical and/or syntactic cues at particular points in the on-going discourse to make available to the recipient the following information:
(1) that he is completing a turn (arrowed a1, a2 and a3).

(2) that his overlapping speech is turn-competitive (arrowed f) or non-turn competitive (arrowed e).

(3) that in the face of competition he is yielding his turn (arrowed c) or doing a return competition (arrowed b).

(4) that he is continuing a prior talk which has been prematurely cut off or doing a fresh start (arrowed g).

The main focus of this paper will be on the signalling of these kinds of speaker activity via a speech style that is unlike the speaker's normal speech style. In order to constitute this distinctive speech style, a particularly marked prosody is used in co-occurrence with syntactic and lexical choices in particular sequential environments identified in the diagram above as arrowed a1, a2, a3, b, c, d, e, f and g.

It is assumed that participants can ascertain the type of activity by evaluating co-occurring set of cues, and changes in prosodic characteristics are an essential component of that constellation of signs which (a) mark the boundary in the flow of events and (b) identify the new activity as such.
8.3 Prosodic Cues and Turn-taking Organisation

Research on the management of talk as developed within conversational analysis focuses on the distribution of turns at talk in conversation and interactional functions of utterances. Recently it has been pointed out that

"close attention to phonetic detail combined with conversation analytic techniques can reveal interesting and important regularities in the organisation of everyday talk, and can assist researchers in the understanding of the contextualisation of talk by conversational participants."

(Local, 1992:272)

The phonetic cues that have been associated with turn-taking organisation include the following:

1. Pitch phenomena - this includes pitch movement such as falling or rising pitch and relative pitch height such as high <HH> or low <LL>

2. Loudness - forte <ff> or piano <pp>

3. Tempo - allegro <al al> or lento <l l>, realised by the shortening or lengthening of syllables
8.3.1 Turn-completion

The findings that the exchange of turns occurs with no gap or minimal gap and minimal overlap have given rise to the notion of turn projectibility. It is postulated that hearers can predict turn-relevance-points (TRP), i.e. locations at which speaker change occurs, from the linguistic surface features of the prior talk. The role of syntactic factors in this predictive process has already been established. Recent research in the management of talk highlights the contribution of prosody in projecting turn-completion (Levinson, 1983; Cutler and Pearson, 1986; French and Local, 1986; Gumperz, 1992).

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), for example, note the significant role prosody plays in turn-taking organisation, particularly in characterising the syntactical unit produced, i.e. whether the unit is a one-word question or is the beginning of a sentential construction.

Levinson (1983) takes into account both syntactic and prosodic factors in his definition of turn-units such that turn units are regarded as "syntactic units (sentences, clauses, noun phrases and so on)" whose boundaries are determined "in part by prosody, and especially intonational cues" (1983:297).
It is assumed that to co-participate in an appropriate fashion at an appropriate moment recipients closely monitor the unfolding of the speaker's utterance, paying close attention to not only the projective possibilities made available by its emerging syntactic structure (e.g. the type of unit that is about to occur), but also those made available by its prosody.

8.3.1.1 Slight or No Gap Turn Transition

Extracts 8.1 and 8.2 provide examples of sequentially appropriate start by next speakers after turns composed of single-item, single-phrase, single-clause or two-constructions with no gap or slight gap:

**Extract 8.1**

1B `<DIRANTAイル>`
   `<H H>`
   `<f f>`
2A `=dibelenggu`
B `is chained`
A `is restrained`
Extract 8.2

3A bukan 'PENYAKIT=
     <f     f>

->4B = 'BUKAN penyakit 'YA=

5A = mhm
     <L  L>

A Not an illness
B It's not an illness yes
A mhm

Extract 8.3

6A bermaknalah ha: sudah hampirlah pilihanraya 'NAMPAKNYA
     <L     L>

7B (0.12) mm itu tidak boleh tentu jugak

A Meaning that the election is going to be held soon?
B That cannot be determined also.

Extract 8.4

8A Ini ada mak bapak mampu datok yang ada nak antar anak ke luar
    negri TU macamana pulak 'DATOK

->9B (0.16) Itu terpulang kepada ibu 'BAPA

A There are some parents who can afford and want to send their
    children overseas. What's your opinion on this, datuk?
B That depends on the parents.

It is observed that each turn-unit ends with a falling intonation. In extract 8.1 "dirantai" (is chained) carries this pitch, in 8.2 "penyakit" (disease), in 8.3 "nampaknya" (it appears) and in 8.4 "datok" (an address form). In each case, the following speaker’s turn start is accomplished with no gap or a slight gap. For example, the responses in Extracts 8.1 and 8.2 are immediately latched to the prior utterance, while those in 8.3 and 8.4 begin after a brief pause of 120 msec. and 160 msec. respectively.

Syntactically, each turn unit is made up of different syntactic units, i.e. in 1B, a lexical item, in 3A, a phrase, in 6A a clause and in 8A a sequence of two clauses; yet prosodically the speaker characterises them as complete turn units by giving them a falling intonation and are regarded as so by the recipient.

As seen in the above extracts, the projectibility of unit-types is accomplished with "no gap" or "slight gap" starts by next speakers with the help of prosodic cues particularly pitch features. Such a precise timing of turn start suggests that the speaker is closely monitoring for the ending of current turn. The use of intonation as a cue to turn-completion is clearly illustrated in 8A above whereby, syntactically, there are two possible completion points, i.e. after "tu" and after "datok". However, the speaker
signals the wish to continue after "tu" by giving it a rising pitch and by lengthening it which is said to indicate non-finality.

8.3.1.2 Minimal Overlap Turn Transition

The other type of next speaker start which is interesting to examine in this context is its entry at a possible turn-completion place which results in a minimal overlap with the current speaker's on-going discourse. This overlap occurs at a place where the current speaker seems to "fade out" prosodically, i.e. a marked downstep in loudness and pitch. This kind of talk which is termed as "tail away" can on occasion have a pitch reaching the bottom of a speaker's range and loudness reaching the level of inaudibility. Support for this is evident in the illustrations below:

**Extract 8.5**

10A  (0.61) Jadi ya: kalau (0.12) orang biasa nak berurus (0.23) dengan kumpulan teknologi logam ni a: maca MACAMANA

|<L L>|<L L>

|<DEC>

11B  a: ^BIASANYA orang biasa yang akan datang

|<f f>|

|<H H>|
A So yes if the common people want to deal with this metal technology group. How do they go about it, doctor?

B Usually it is the common people who will come to us.

**Extract 8.6**

12A jadi a: kalau kita jadi pengusaha takut nanti satu hari ini akan habis `LOGAM ni

<f f> <>L

<>p

[->13B kehabisan logam

<H H>

< CRES >

A so if we become an entrepreneur, there is the fear of metal depletion

B Metal depletion

The talk starts in Extracts 8.5 and 8.6 occur with no waiting for turn completion which results in a slight overlap. In 8.5, the overlap occurs on "doktor", a term of address and in 8.6 the overlap occurs on "ni" a determiner. In each case the overlap occurs at a place which suggests itself as proximal to a likely completion point. According to Sack, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) this kind of overlap is caused by "projectibility of
possible completion or transition-relevance places" (i.e. places where current speaker can or should exit). This over-anticipation of turn-end could be accounted for partly by the presence of some prosodic cues which signal that the current speaker is approaching the end of his turn or occurs where a turn transition place has been misprojected for systematic reasons, e.g. where an address term or a tag has been appended (Levinson, 1983).

For example, in Extract 8.5, the interviewer seems to tail away prosodically towards the end of his turn, uttering "doktor" (an address form) with a pitch lower than that of "macamana" (a question word meaning "how") and with diminuendo loudness reaching the point of being almost inaudible in the production of "tor", the point where overlap occurs. The deployment of these prosodic cues by the interviewer to communicate the giving away of turn prompts the interviewee to make his entry just prior to the completion of turn.

In extract 8.6 "ni", the place where the overlap occurs, is preceded by a falling pitch on "logam". Being the unstressed syllable after the nucleus it contributes to the realisation of the falling nucleus by remaining low. Together with syntax, the falling pitch on "logam" causes the second speaker to misproject the first speaker's turn end resulting in slight overlap.
As the initiator of talk, the interviewer selects the interviewee as next speaker by addressing him with questions or assertions that require some kind of response and the interviewee is obliged to supply the relevant response resulting in what is known as an adjacency pair of question/answer sequence. Once questions are posed or assertions made, the interviewer will relinquish his turn. As can be seen in Extracts 8.1 through 8.6, this giving away of turn is communicated with the deployment of prosodic cues like pitch features and loudness in co-occurrence with syntactic units to signal turn-unit completion.

Fully aware of the obligation put upon him as interviewee, his response will usually be made without undue hesitation. The prosodic signal sent by the interviewer to mark the end of his turn and the interviewee's receipt of these signals as such is crucial to the smooth transition of turn from the interviewer to the interviewee. According to Levinson (1983) "the recurrent split second speaker transition" can be accounted for by the final shape of a turn which he regards as the determining criterion for predicting turn-unit end (p. 279).
8.4 Turn-yielding or Turn-holding

The significant role played by prosody in projecting talk is best seen in the context in which the deployment of prosodic cues help in the characterisation of speaker activity as turn-yielding or turn-holding. The speaker can signal the wish to hold the turn by extending his talk beyond possible turn-transition points and ignore a potential speaker’s attempt of taking over the turn. Extracts 8.7 and 8.8 for example, provide a good case of how the speaker uses prosody to secure his turn at a possible transition point:

Extract 8.7

14A Dia akan lama makin lama makin kurang ke
a-> MACAMANA
b->15B (0.34) a: <laugh>
   <>L
   <>f
   [ 
   c->16A ^JADI: supply and demand ni ... (0.32)
   <HH>
   <f f>

A Will the amount decrease over the years?

B a: <laugh>
A So this supply and demand ...

Extract 8.8

17A (0.23) sekarang ni brakenya

a-> ASBESTOSKAN
b->18B (0.41) a:
    <>H
    <>f
    [c->19A ^JADI boleh digantikan dengan brake jugak
    <HH>
    <f  f>
    <al al>

A Now the brake is asbestos, isn't it?
B So it can be replaced with brake also.

If one examines the first half of the current speaker's discourse, the initial observation that can be made is that in 8.7 the entry point for B's attempt at making his contribution is subsequent to "macamana" (How?) and in 8.8 the entry point is subsequent to "asbestoskan" (it is asbestos) which suggest themselves as likely completion points. While "macamana"
is a wh-word which has been postpositioned, "asbestoskan" is the final lexical item in a request for confirmation.

Both "macamana" (arrowed (a) in 8.7) and "asbestoskan" (arrowed (b) in 8.8) are not only syntactically located at a possible turn-transition point, but also are prosodically marked as complete by the assignment of a falling pitch. The brief pause following "macamana" and "asbestoskan" further creates a context which is suggestive of turn-end. In both instances B's entry is halted by A's in coming utterance (arrowed (c)) whose prosodic characteristics of forte loudness and high pitch constitute an effective turn-holding strategy causing B to drop out willingly. In 8.8 the prosodic cues of loudness and pitch is also accompanied by allegro tempo.

The wish to secure the turn has prompted speaker B (arrowed c) in 8.7 to produce his utterance without prior planning resulting in his inability to complete it. Once he is assured of gaining the floor he pauses briefly to allow him time to reformulate what he wants to say.

Thus given the possibility of interruption from the interviewer, the holding of turn will be more difficult for the interviewee. The development of the interviewee's talk within a turn will be sensitive to the fact that the interviewee is not guaranteed specific time duration in turn but must contend with being interrupted. As can be seen it is particularly difficult to
hold turn at a possible transition end since it is at this point that a potential speaker will usually make his contribution. That being so the interviewee can disregard the interruption and continue to hold his turn. Likewise the interviewee can also take the floor from the interviewer (e.g. Extract 8.9). This is common in cases where the interviewer grabs the turn before completion and the interviewee makes his entry to take over the turn.

Consider the following exchange in this respect:

**Extract 8.9**

20B lima puluh enam ora:ng=

a->21A kumpul[lan]

\[<L L>\]

\[<p p>\]

b->22B \^[\{ter\}masuk \{pegawai\ dan juga kumpulan

\[<f f> < DEC >\]

\[<H H> <L L>\]

sokonganlah

\[<L L>< H\]

\[<f f>\]
B fifty people=
A =group
[
B including the officer and also the
supporting staff.

Extract 8.10

23A a: maknanya kita tak boleh UJI sekali DUA=
24B =l [see]
c->25A ^[DAH] kata 'OK
   <HH>
   <f f>
A Meaning that we cannot test it once or twice and says it's OK
B I see

In 8.9 the interviewer's incoming speech (arrowed (a)) is halted by
the interviewee's overlapping talk (arrowed b) which clearly suggests itself
as wanting to keep the turn. B's interruptive speech is produced with a
comparatively higher pitch and forte loudness beginning at a point marked
<h and <f, and once the turn is secured there is a downstep of pitch level
and volume occurring immediately after "pegawai" (officer). "kumpulan"
(group) the words that straddle the interviewee's completion point being
prosodically insignificant (low pitch plus piano loudness) and recognisably incomplete does not suggest itself as turn-competitive.

Likewise in 8.10, the audibly prominent incoming of A's contribution (arrowed c) has secured A the next turn despite the fact that B has already started with his turn. While Extract 8.9 presents an example of the relinquishing of turn before completion, Extract 8.10 gives an example of the yielding of turn at a possible completion point.

The issue of turn-occupant's fading out at an unlikely turn-completion point is further addressed in Extracts 8.11 through 8.13.

**Extract 8.11**

26A penglibatan bumiputra dalam industri ini

macamana doktor ramai ke

< L L >

< DEC >

a-> ataupun [???]  

< L L >

< > creaky

< DEC >

[}
b->27B yang sebenar sekanga (0.21) darip (0.25) kita

A What about the involvement of Bumiputra in industries?
Many or [???

B Actually now ... from ... we I divide into two groups.

Extract 8.12

a->28B jadi kita pun (0.73) [a:] saya

B>[mak]sud sa:

maksud saya: sekarang ni kereta proton

B So we a: I what I mean nowadays proton

Extract 8.13

30A jadi yang kecil-kecil pun ada jugak ya

macamana=
a->31B = a: macam [yang]
< l  l >
<DEC>
b->32A    ^[YANG] kecil-kecil yang macam
<   H   >
<   f   >
yang yang

A  So there are also small ones, eh. How?
B  a like ...
A  the small ones like like like ...

In Extract 8.11, the current speaker who yields his turn at an unlikely
completion point gradually fades out by decreasing volume to a point of
unintelligibility marked [??] in the data. The choice to yield the turn to the
current speaker is brought about by his own willingness to give up the turn
rather than being pressured to do so by the next speaker. The pitch of the
talk after "doktor", a likely completion point, is noticeably lower than the talk
preceding it. The tempo is slower and it is characterised by diminuendo
loudness. These prosodic cues strategically deployed as a resource to
signal turn-yielding and recognised as such by the next speaker receives a
reply which is immediately latched on to "pun" (arrowed a).
In Extracts 8.12 and 8.13, the turn occupant's talks produced in the environment of overlapping talk has the characteristic of yielding to interrupter's competition. Not only are they incomplete, they are prosodically less prominent than the interruptive speech. Both "a: saya" (arrowed a), Extract 8.12) and "a: macam yang" (arrowed a), Extract 8.13) are noticeably quieter and lower in overall pitch than the incoming interruptee's contribution (arrowed 6).

8.5 Overlaps

Researchers have shown that participants time precisely both when and how to begin their talk relative to an ongoing turn (Jefferson:1973; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson:1974). Thus in most cases when overlaps occur they are not brought about by the failure in turn-taking organisation. Their occurrence can be motivated by reasons other than those brought about by the interrupter's misjudgement of the current speaker's turn-completion and the timing of his own turn start.

The aim of this section is to look at how the interviewer-interviewee utilise prosodic features in the construction of their interruptive speech. By analysing overlapping speech, the analyst will be able to identify the contextualisation cues deployed by participants to characterise the incoming contribution as follows:
(1) turn-competitive- where the interruptive speech presents itself as turn-competitive as wanting to secure the turn from the current speaker at the point of interruption

(2) non-competitive- where the interruptive speech does not suggest itself as turn-competitive

The recipient whose talk is interrupted can either relinquish the turn to the competitor or continue to hold the floor.

Attempts have been made to identify the factors that contribute to the realisation of overlaps as turn-competitive or non-turn competitive. Among the contributory factors are:

(1) the location of the interruptive speech in the ongoing talk
    Eldesky (1981))

(2) the thematic relation of the interruptive speech to the ongoing turn (Bennet (1980))

(3) the syntactic and segmental characteristics of the interruptive speech (Jefferson and Schegloff (1975))
On examining the data of broadcast interviewee, it is found that factors (1) and (2) do not on their own contribute to the realisation of overlaps as either turn competitive or non-turn competitive. What does appear to play a role in constituting the character of the overlapping speech as such are its prosodic characteristics (cf. French and Local (1986)). Sections 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 will examine the prosodic features of the interruptive utterances with the aim of identifying the prosodic characteristics associated with these two kinds of speaker activity, competing or not competing for a turn.

8.5.1 Non-turn competitive overlaps

Non-competitive overlaps are those which are heard as being produced in the course of another's turn but as being unequipped for and unaddressed to the task of securing the turn from the current speaker (French and Local (1986)). There is no suggestion that the interrupter wishes to say anything further or that he intends to compete for the turn.

A non-competitive overlap can be an expression of agreement with what is being said by the current speaker, e.g. "ya slow ya" in (yes slow yes) (34B), or a self repair, e.g. "lebuhraya" (highway) in (37A), or a conclusion derived from what is being said, e.g. "kena tahu" (must know) in (39B) or a recycled material, e.g. "price earning" in (40A):
Extract 8.14

33A Ada kanser dia makan waktu ah gejala dia lambat

\[<H \quad H><L \quad L>\]

\[<f \quad f>\]

\[\rightarrow 34B \quad [Ya slow ya]\]

\[<L \quad L>\]

\[<\text{DEC}>\]

A There is a type of cancer which takes a long time, ah
the symptoms appear much later.

B Yes slow yes

Extract 8.15

35A a: tak tak tak tak sesak dijalani ya

36B a: '^[biasanya] dalam sepuluh minit je

\[<L \quad L>\]

\[<i \quad i>\]

\[\rightarrow 37A \quad [lebuhraya]\]

\[<L \quad L>\]

\[< > \text{creaky}\]

\[<\text{DEC}>\]

\[<<al \quad al> (0.25)\]

A No congestion on the road, eh?
B. Usually in ten minutes only.

A. Highway

Extract 8.16

38A kita tak tahu apa sebenarnya dalam
ubat-ubat kayu tu
jadi akan menimbulkan 'MASALAH
[tetapi] aha kena tahulah saya ghasa
<L  L>

-> 39B [kena tahu]
<L  L>
<p  p>
<al  al>

A. We do not actually know what the herbal medicine
contains. So it will cause problems but I feel we
should know.

B. should know.
Extract 8.17

40A Tadi Cik Halim pada mula-mulanya berceritakan tentang price 'EARNING

[PE PE Jadi] dia mesti cepat kira.

<H
$f$

41B [price earning] <laugh>

$L$

<f

<al

A Just now Cik Halim at first talked about price earning.

B Price earning.

[0

A PE PE So he must be quick at counting

Not only do the overlaps perform different functions, they also differ as regards the place at which they enter a turn in progress. The overlap (arrowed) in Extract 8.15 occurs after a filled pause, a verbal device often used to prevent interruption from the other speaker while the current speaker plans his utterance. However, in this instance the second speaker still makes his entry to correct her earlier contribution by substituting "jalanraya" with "highway", thus causing an overlap at a non-completion
point. In Extract 8.14, the entry (arrowed) is also at an unlikely completion point, i.e., during the production of "makan waktu" (takes time). The overlaps in Extracts 8.16 and 8.17 are at a possible completion point i.e., after the final item in a clause, i.e., "masalah" ((problem), marked 38A) and "price earning" (marked 41BA) whose falling pitch indicates utterance end.

From this examination one can conclude that the entry point of an interrupter's speech, that is whether it begins at a possible completion point or non-completion point, does not in itself contribute to its realisation as non-competitive.

The first observation that can be made is that non-competitive overlaps are unremarkable in terms of duration, thematic content and prosodic manifestation, particularly their pitch height and loudness. As can be seen in the above Extracts the non-competitive overlaps are unusually short consisting of three words (e.g. 34B), a single word (e.g. 37A) and two words (e.g. 39B and 41B). Content-wise they have nothing much to add to whatever that has been said in the preceding talk. Rather than seen as serious attempts at grabbing turns they are characterisable as "brief agreements" e.g. "ya slow ya", "brief repairs", e.g. "lebuhraya", "quips", "asides", repetition, e.g. "kena tahu", "price earning", etc.
The overall pitch level of these overlaps is lower than the current turn. In 34B this low pitched utterance is also accompanied by piano loudness and allegro tempo. In 37A, the utterance begins relatively loud and ends with diminuendo loudness and its overall loudness is relatively quieter than the speech that it interrupts. The incoming speech in 39B is relatively quieter than the speech contained in the current turn. In 41B, the repeated utterance is uttered low and has allegro tempo. Although it has forte loudness its low pitch makes it less audible than the in-overlap.

The results attained from the analysis so far can be summarised as follows. In the extracts the following prosodic and syntactic cues are used to signal non-turn competitive overlaps:

\[ [+\text{low overall pitch}], [+\text{piano loudness}], \]

\[ [+\text{allegro tempo}], [+\text{markedly short utterance}] \]

8.5.2 Turn-competitive Overlaps

An overlap is said to be turn-competitive when it enters a turn in progress with the intention of gaining the floor not later when the current speaker finishes his turn but now at the moment of speaking. The second speaker is thus seen as competing with the current speaker for possession of floor.
Most of the turn-competitive overlaps are triggered off by the interviewer, who unlike the interviewee, has the right to preempt the interviewee's turn. The interviewee may relinquish his turn or hold it despite the interviewer's interruption which may suggest itself as a return of competition. If the interviewee decides to relinquish his turn, he can reclaim it if he sees the need to do so, which may result in another turn-competitive encounter forcing one of them to give up the turn. Thus although the turn taking conditions in broadcast interviewee allocate the right to the interviewer and sometimes the obligation to preempt the interviewee's turn, in practice the interviewee need not concede if he feels the need to finish off whatever he intends to say.

Consider the following exchange which appropriately exemplifies the turn-competitive encounter between the interviewer and interviewee which results in one party conceding and the other party continuing and a return of competition:

Extract 8.18

42A kalau selera kita berkurangan kita kena ber (0.22) kita kena SYAKLAH [hah dok]

a->43B [a a: TAK]

< f >
ITU salah satu daripada 'GEJALA la

<say>

[[saya NAK] sebutkan eh=

<H H>

<f f>

<al al>

b->44A [ha ha OK ha]

<k> <H>

<f><p>

c->45B =banyak lagi geja[lanya ya]

<H H> <L L><H>

<f>

d->47A [ah YA] ITU manuallah

<f f>

<H H>

<l>

48B (0.23) ya

[

49A kalau misal kata [kalau selera]

<f f> <L L>

< DEC >
51A =ah jadi kalau berat badan kita turun=
52B =turun=
53A =kita kena syak

A If our appetite is not good we have
   to be suspicious yes doctor?
B ah no. It's one of the symptoms, I want to mention.
   There are many other symptoms.
A ah that is manual then.
B ah
A If let's say our appetite
B appetite, body weight=
A ah so if our body weight decreases=
B =decreases=
A =we should be suspicious=
B =should be suspicious.

In extract 8.18, there are altogether four turn-competitive encounters
marked with arrows a, b, d and e. Out of the four, the second encounter
(arrowed (b)) does not lead to the taking over of turn by the interruptee
eventhough the point of entry is at a possible completion point based on the fact that "gejalalah" is the last content-word in a clause and has a falling intonation. At the onset of the interruption, there is a change in the prosodic characteristics of turn-occupant's talk (arrowed b). There is a noticeable stepup in pitch from "la" to "sa", which is kept high throughout the talk, and a noticeable acceleration thereon. This tempo speed-up gets the speaker into a subsequent turn constructional unit. Taken together with the fact that the turn occupant does not relinquish the turn but continues to produce a recognisably complete talk, the change in the prosodic features of the talk can be seen as a return of turn competition.

In 43B, the interviewee who wishes to correct the prior statement made by the interviewer comes in in-overlap (arrowed a) with the interviewer's talk. The interviewer responds by relinquishing the turn before completion. The interviewee signals the intention to continue by making his incoming prosodically prominent by assigning it forte loudness and high overall pitch.

The interviewer's overlapping speech (arrowed d) which is characterised by a combination of high pitch, forte loudness and lento tempo, succeeds in securing him the turn when the interviewee terminates his turn after completing his talk (arrowed (c)). The step-up in pitch and increase in loudness begins at the onset of interviewer's new contribution,
that is after expressing receipt of the interviewee's prior talk with "ya". Despite the interruption from B, the interviewee continues his turn to the point of completion with no modification in prosody either upon or subsequent to the onset of the interruption until the point of the appended "tag", i.e. "YA". He continues at much the same loudness, pitch and tempo as that part of speech prior to the interviewer's entry.

The fourth turn-competitive encounter occurs at a non-completion point (arrowed (e)). The interviewee's incoming contribution is made prosodically prominent with the assignment of overall loudness and lento tempo, the combination of which produces what might be referred to as an "emphatic" speech effect. The in-overlap speech of the turn-occupant is comparatively quieter and shows a change of loudness, i.e. beginning with forte loudness at the beginning of the turn and ending with piano loudness, fading out gradually leaving his turn incomplete. The interviewee proceeds to continue and ends his turn with a mid-level pitch whose final syllable is lengthened.

In order to ensure that the prosodic features manifest in the above data are not merely incidental, it is useful to consider some other data in which a similar kind of phenomena can be discerned. In extract (8.17), for example, the interrupter signals the wish to take over the turn at a non-completion point by assigning his overlapping speech global high pitch and
global forte loudness. Likewise in (10) the interrupter's overlap is made audibly more prominent than the interruptee's overlap by its higher pitch and forte loudness. In both cases the onset begins high and accompanied by forte loudness.

Although the overlap in Extract 8.19 below has global high pitch and forte loudness, the interruption onset begins low and level at "ha". A stepped-up pitch is only noticeable in the production of "jadi" which is the beginning of the interrupter's contribution to the current turn. "ha" being a receipt of prior talk is not made audibly prominent by the assignment of high pitch. The onset of turn competition begins at "jadi" whose pitch and loudness features characterise it as such.

**Extract 8.19**

54A Tanpa | [asbestos]

\[<H H> <L L> <\ DEC > \]

\[<\ I > (1.0)\]

55B [ha:^JADI beSI:]lah tu

\[<I > <H H>\]

\[<f f>\]

\[<CRES>\]

besi belaga besi
From the above analysis several initial observations can be made. The first is that the place where an overlapping speech occurs does not directly contribute to its realisation as turn competitive. For example, in Extract 8.18 the entry points for utterance arrowed a and b is at a possible completion point while overlaps arrowed d and e enter at a non-completion point, yet they are all turn-competitive.

Second, the realisation of overlap speech as turn competitive or non-turn competitive is not determined by its thematic relation to the content of the ongoing speech in the sense of whether it expresses agreement or disagreement with whatever is being said. In the data selected for analysis, both turn competitive overlaps, e.g. "ha ha okay" (arrowed b) and "ah ya" ((ah yes), arrowed d) in Extract 8.18 and non-competitive overlaps, e.g. "ya slow ya" (yes slow yes) in Extract 8.14 (marked 34B) display agreement with the thematic content of the current turn. Nevertheless, if one looks at the kind of contribution that the competitive overlap makes to the ongoing discourse that it interrupts, one can see a great difference. The fact that it is turn competitive suggests that the interrupter has something to contribute, e.g. reformulating the prior talk (marked 43B), making clear what is required (marked 32 A), supplying additional information (marked 50 B), requesting for confirmation (marked 55B), etc.
From the preliminary analysis, the results can be summarised as follows: that the interrupter makes the fact of his turn requirement available to the interruptee by deploying the following prosodic cues:

\[ [+ \text{ forte global loudness } \langle f \rangle] \]
\[ [+ \text{ high global pitch } \langle H \rangle] \]
\[ [+ \text{ increased loudness at the onset}] \]
\[ [+ \text{ pitch upstepped at the onset}] \]
\[ [+\text{lento tempo } \langle l \rangle] \]
\[ [+\text{ allegro tempo at the beginning of interruption}] \]
\[ [+\text{ high density of accented syllables (in relation to unaccented)}] \]

In the above extracts, the prosodic features that have the effect of contextualising speech as turn-competitive and not as "mere interruptions" are high pitch in cooccurrence with forte loudness and at times lento tempo. It is also observed that in comparison with unaccented syllables turn-competitive interruption appears to have more accented syllables.

The assignment of these cues make the part of the talk so marked prosodically prominent to the extent that it communicates to the recipient the interrupter's wish to continue and calls for the recipient's display of alignment with respect to the wish thus expressed which is the yielding of
turn to the interrupter. In this respect the response of the turn-occupant to the interruptive speech thus in part contributes to the recognition of interruption as turn competitive, particularly when the yielding of turn occurs before completion. Faced with a competition for the turn, the turn occupant can display an interest in regaining the floor and his turn at talk by prosodic marking of high pitch and forte loudness.

8.5.3 Pitch and Loudness as Resources for Turn Competition

The results of selected data analysis illustrate that the prosodic features of high pitch and forte loudness of interrupter’s speech make for a hearing of that speech as directly competitive for turn itself. It is observed that when an overlap is not characterised by high pitch and forte loudness, the turn occupant proceeds to complete his turn as if he is not interrupted, i.e. with no modification to the prosodic characterisation of his speech. In Extracts 8.14 through 8.17, the on-going speech which is interrupted by a non-competitive overlap does not show a change of pitch, volume and tempo either upon or subsequent to the onset of the interruption. The turn-occupant continues to produce his speech at almost the same loudness, pitch and tempo; hence, the in-overlap is left unmarked. This prosodic “non-reaction” of the turn occupant to an overlap that is absent of \(<H+F>\) shows how speakers orient to \(<H+F>\) as constitutive of turn-competitive overlaps. (cf. French and Local (1986)).
While overlaps minus \(<H+F>\) receive no "prosodic response" from the turn occupant, overlaps plus \(<H+F>\) are reacted to with a noticeable prosodic change in the turn-occupants' in-overlaps \(i.e:\):

1. A step down in pitch and diminuendo loudness indicate the termination of current turn.

2. A step up in pitch and forte loudness and at times accompanied by deceleration indicate a return competition.

That being so the next issue that needs to be addressed is the extent of the presence of \(<H+F>\), \(i.e.\) its beginning point and its end. According to French and Local (1986) the onset of the overlap itself is marked with \(<H+F>\) and that \(<H+F>\) are dropped with the gaining of turn, \(i.e.\) when the current speaker drops out. Earlier analysis of the selected data supports the fact that turn-competitive overlaps begin with \(<H+F>\). What is still at issue is when do interrupters cease to deploy \(<H+F>\).

In Extracts 8.20 through 8.22, the incoming talk (arrowed (b)) is followed by current speaker drop out (arrowed (a)). The turns-at-talk indicated by arrow (b) are prosodically hearable as competing for the turn and the turn-occupant orients to the prosodic characterisation of the overlap by relinquishing his turn.
In all of the Extracts, it is observed that the interrupter deploys \(<H+F>\) right from the speech onset, thereby making the fact of turn requirement immediately available to the recipient. The focus of examination will be to discover whether the deployment \(<H+F>\) extends beyond termination point or that whether deployment stops as soon as the turn of the current speaker terminates.

On examining several examples of overlapping speeches, it is found that while there are cases which show that the interrupter drops \(<H+F>\) once having secured the turn, there are also cases of overlaps whose prosodic characteristics of \(<H+F>\) extend beyond the point of termination (e.g. in extracts 8.18 (arrowed a, e and f). This seems not to be in line with what French and Local observe in their data.

Extracts 8.20 (arrowed b), 8.21 (arrowed b) and 8.22 (arrowed b) are good examples of how the interrupter stops the deployment of \(<H+F>\) after succeeding in securing a turn.
Extracts 8.20

56A tiap seratus ribu orang seratus lima puluh
akan kena kanser ... ha ni apa macam doktor
ni=

a->57B =ha [memang tepat dan]
   <L      L>
   < DEC >

b->58A ^[Ni kanser Ni] ada macam-macam doktor ya
   <H      H>
   <f      f>

A Every hundred thousand people, one hundred will
suffer from cancer. How can this happen doctor?

B That's true and

A There are many types of cancer, yeah?

Extract 8.21

59A Mana lebih berat datuk ya nak cari duit
atau pun nak membesarkan anak

60B (0.42) tanggungjawab ya tanggungjawab
pada [saya:]
   <H H>
   <f f>
A Which is more difficult Datuk, to find money
or to raise a child.

B Responsibility yes. Responsibility. To me it is the
parents' responsibility.

A ah

B my responsibility

Extract 8.22

63A free trade maknanya e: itu

< >DEC

[  

64B pedagangan [bebas]
In Extract 8.20 speaker A who at first decides to give up his turn to speaker B after addressing him with a question (marked 56A), changes his mind and expresses the wish to continue his turn by beginning his subsequent entry (marked 58A) with a high pitched and forte "ni" and these features are maintained until the next "ni". This stretch of talk is not only more noticeable and salient than the in-overlap but also the portion of A's subsequent talk, i.e. "ada macam-macam doktor ya" (there are many types, yes doctor?). The securing of turn by A with B's turn termination sees a cease in the deployment of <H+F> after "ni", a stressed syllable at a post-overlap position. Once the turn is gained with the yielding of current turn, there is a noticeable step down in pitch and decreased loudness.
In Extract 8.21, the shift to relatively low pitch and decreased loudness is noticeable after the interrupter’s termination of turn-competition. "AH" (marked 62B) the onset of a return of competition which is uttered with a high pitch combined with forte loudness makes A’s in-overlap almost unintelligible. Once the speaker feels that the turn is secured the prosodic features of <H+F> are dropped.

The return of competition (marked 65A) in Extract 8.22 is characterised at its onset by a very high pitch and extra loudness which prosodically drowns the interrupter’s in-overlap. When the turn is secured with the termination of A’s turn, the speaker drops <H+F> producing with a noticeably lower pitch and decreased loudness than the onset.

Likewise, the onset of the interruptive overlaps in fragments 8.23 through 8.26 are marked by [+ high pitch] and [+ increased loudness] but unlike those in Extracts 8.20 through 8.26 these two features extend beyond the point of current speaker’s drop-out. In 8.23, even after the termination of the current turn (arrowed (a)), the speaker still maintains the same loudness, pitch and tempo in the talk following the overlap (arrowed (b)) which is a repeat of the overlap. Prosodic modification occurs only upon the production of "sekang" (arrowed (d)) which is uttered noticeably lower and quieter than the preceding segment (arrowed c).
B We must find technical schools that can develop their areas of specialisation.

A which which which are marketable.

B which are marketable?

A Nowadays what are marketable Datuk?
In the above Extract, A's incoming contribution (arrowed b) is prosodically designed for turn competition with the onset of interruption marked by a very high pitch and extra loudness. The overlap itself has the prosodic features of [+high global pitch], [+increased global loudness], [+high density of accented syllables] which gives it an emphatic effect. By drowning B's in-overlap prosodically which results in it being inaudible (indicated by (???) in the data) A succeeds in taking over the turn pushing B out before he could finish his utterance. A's hasty incoming (67A) which is not clearly phrased has caused B to respond with a question (marked 68B) that requests for clarification.

In 8.24 below the pitch characteristics of B's incoming utterance, "bagaimana pulak kualitinya" (how is its quality), i.e [+ global high pitch] and [+ global loudness], identify it as turn competitive and these features extend beyond the current speaker's termination point (arrowed a). Overwhelmed by the prosodic prominence of the interruption, speaker B indicates the giving away of turn by a sudden drop in volume to the point of inaudibility on "kita", the interruption's entry point.

Extract 8.24

a->70B dana: sekang n[i:] kita

\(<\ H \ < \ DEC \ >\n
\(<L>\)
Notice that the talk post interruption (arrowed b) in Extract 8.24 indicated by \(<ff>\) \(<HH>\) has the pitch and loudness features of the overlapping speech. A noticeable change in pitch and loudness is observed in the production of "doktor" (an appended address form) whose low pitch realisation is the result of a continuation of a high fall on "TI". The low pitch which is maintained throughout the utterance is also accompanied by a relatively quieter loudness than the prior talk.

In Extract 8.25 below, B's turn "PERWAJA" (the name of a corporate body) is cut off by A's incoming repair of his preceding question which is not clearly phrased. B appears to have some difficulty in responding to A's initial question and this is reflected in the lento pace in the production of "PEWAJA" and the prolongation of its final syllable, an overt indication of hesitation. Thus upon A's entry (marked 74A) B relinquishes his turn without any resistance. A's in-coming contribution until "sebenarnya"
(arrowed (a)) is more audible than B's in-overlap. This audibility is brought about by the combination of high pitch and forte loudness which begins from the point when B makes his entry and extends till "sebenarnya", which is situated outside the overlapping portion. The overlapping speech is also uttered with a tempo speed-up. A's hastiness in producing his utterance causes him to make a mistake which he repairs in his following talk after "sebenarnya" (arrowed (b)) and this repair sequence is marked by a noticeably lower overall pitch, quieter loudness and a fast beginning tempo.

Extract 8.25

72A bila keluar PERWAJA

73B (0.3) PER[WAJA:]

< L  L >

< ral  > (0.6)

a->74A [PERWAJA] tu SEBENARNYA

<f  f >

<H  H >

<al  al > < ral  >

b-> mungkin doktor tahu agaknya

<L  L >

<al  al >

macamana PEWAJA
A When was PERWAJA formed?
B PERWAJA...
A PEWAJA is actually...

Probably you know how PERWAJA is.

In Extract 8.26 below, speaker A who gives away the turn to B decides to enter B's ongoing discourse to explain what he means by "yang kecil" (that is small). The commencement begins with a step up in pitch on "yang" plus forte loudness. The overall pitch is high and loudness crescendo with the last syllable being the loudest. There is also a noticeable tempo speed up at the beginning of the interruption but the pace slows down towards the later half of the interruption. A's post overlap which is subsequent to B's dropping out still retains \( <H+F> \) and has lento tempo giving it the "emphatic" effect.

**Extract 8.26**

74A jadi yang kecil-kecil pun ada jugak ya

macamana:=

a->75B =a:[macam yang ??? steel]

76A [YANG kecil-kecil yang MACAM yang] YANG (0.2)

\(<H \quad H>\)

\(<f \quad f>\)

\(<al \quad al> <l \quad l>\)
yang melakukan kerja-kerja pewaja

\(<H \quad H>\)

\(<f \quad f>\)

A: So there are also small ones, yes. How?

B: a: like steel???

[  
A: the small ones like like which do the work of

PERWAJA

The above analysis illustrates that the deployment of \(<H+F>\) extends beyond the termination point of current speaker's turn. This sustension is probably brought about by the need to hold the turn in order to get the contribution across because at the point of the current speaker drop-out, the interrupter has not completed what he started at the point of entry. Thus the portion of speech which is marked with \(<H+F>\) is actually a continuation of the overlap and the appropriacy of the post overlap syntax as a completion of the overlap provides further support for this assumption. The speaker indicates the post-overlap as being part of the overlap by retaining the prosodic features of the former, i.e \(<H+F>\) thereby signalling to the recipient that he still wants to continue.
In Extracts 8.24, 8.25 and 8.26, <H+F> extend to include the segment of speech which syntactically suggests itself as being a continuation of the overlap. In Extract 8.20, the features of <H+F> extend to the portion of speech which is a repetition of the overlap so that the pitch and loudness features of the former match those of the latter. This pitch and loudness matching indicates that the recycled material is a continuation of the overlap (cf. section 3.4 on Continuation).

From the analysis of the selected exchanges, the following observations are made:

(1) that non-turn competitive overlaps are not characterisable by <H+F> and that these overlaps do not result in prosodic change of the in-overlaps

(2) that onset of turn competitive overlaps is produced with a combination of high pitch and forte loudness

(3) that the characteristics of high pitch and forte loudness are retained even after the termination of the current speaker's turn
(4) that the turn-occupant yields his turn to the interruptee by prosodic "fade out"

3.6 Continuation or Restart

Given the possibility of interruption or preemption, the problem often faced by both the interviewer and interviewee is how to ensure the completion of their talk when confronted with competition from the other party for the possession of turn. In section 3.3, several instances have been cited which show how the speaker deploys the prosodic cues of pitch height and loudness to signal a return competition in the face of competition for the next turn. In such a case the interrupter shows alignment by terminating his attempt at taking over the turn thereby allowing the interruptee to complete his turn.

As can be seen in the selected extracts (e.g. Extracts 8.23 through 8.26), the commencement of interruptive incoming at a non-completion point in the current turn has often resulted in the turn being prematurely curtailed or cut off. A common strategy often employed by an interruptee in the face of such an interruption is to resume what was being said in the prematurely curtailed talk when he regains his turn with the termination of the interrupter's turn.
This section is concerned with this particular type of speaker activity in a particular sequential location: that in which an interrupter comes in clearly prior to the completion of another's turn prematurely curtailing that turn followed by the interruptee in-coming contribution which is heard as resuming the prior talk which has been cut off. In order to give some preliminary indication of the focus of this section consider the following extracts.

In extracts 8.27 through 8.32, the interruptive incoming (arrowed b)) causes the current speaker to drop out at a place which is an unlikely completion point (arrowed (a)). The speaker who later gains the floor resumes the curtailed turn (arrowed (c)). The interrupted turns (arrowed (a)) display incomplete syntax at the point of drop-outs, e.g. "dia ada iron pow ..." (it has iron pow...) in Extract 8.27, "bukan tak dapat." (not that we cannot) in Extract 8.28, "dan pembuatan dan dan ..." (and manufacturing and and...) in Extract 8.29, "a: dia ..."(a: he...) in Extract 8.30, "kita nak buat (???)" (we want to do...) in Extract 8.31 and "bagi saya ..." (to me...) in Extract 8.32. As can be seen in the extracts, this incomplete syntax gets completed post the interruption (arrowed (c)), i.e when the talk resumes after the gaining of turn.
Extract 8.27

a->77B makna dia ada iron pow...

b->78A logam lainlah=

<H H>
<f f>
<l l>(0.9)

c->79B =dia ada iron powder

<l l>(0.8)

<H H>
<f f>

d-> ada copper, ada (???) ada (???) dan

<L L>
<p p>

sebagainya

<L L>

<>creaky

B Meaning it has iron pow...

A Other metal then

B It has iron powder, copper, (???) ada (???)

and so on.
Extract 8.28

a-> 80A mm bukan [tak dapat]

     <L     L>

b-> 81B   [ha ini susah]=

c-> 82A =bukan tak dapat nak belajar ustaz

     kadang-kadang mungkin ambil ringan ke ...

     A not that we cannot

     [  

     B   ha this is problematic=

     A not that we cannot learn ustaz. But, sometimes we may tend to

     treat it lightly.

Extract 8.29

a-> 83B Factory banyak akan dibuat sebab negara kita

     kita memasuki bahagian perindustrian dan

     pembuatan [dan dan]

     <L     L>

     < DEC >

     [so apa]=

b-> 84A
85B = [DAN] itu salah satu bahagian saja

<P>

86A (0.6) a: dia:

[H]

87B logam=

88A = daripada logam dan (0.22) dia ada mixture sebenarnya.

A a: it

[B]

metal=

A = from metal and it contains a mixture actually.

Extract 8.31

89B ^JADI kita mesti tahu tentang apa pelaburan yang

a-> kita nak 'BUAT misal
b->90A

    kegiatannya = <al al>

    <H H>
    <F F>

'BERTAHAN

    < CRES >

B so we must know about what investment we are going to make

for example

[A its activities= B =ah its activities, its projects so that we can maintain

Extract 8.32

92B (0.24) Saya rasa itu yang paling penting

a-> bagi saya [a: ???] <L L> < DEC >

b->93A [itulah] ada ada [orang ha]

<f f><p>

<H H><L
On examining the lexico-syntax that constitutes the beginnings of the post interruptions, it is found that while those of Extracts 8.27, 8.28 and 8.29 contain recycled material (highlighted) from the preinterruptions, the post interruption beginnings of Extracts 8.30, 8.31 and 8.32 do not. In Extract 8.30, one aspect of the post talk beginning which distinguishes it from those in 8.27 through 8.29 is its lexical constitution, i.e. that the repetition is not material from the preinterruption but from the prior interruptive talk. From a lexical point of view, the post interruption beginning in Extract 8.30 does not post a possibly appropriate completion of the preinterruption.
Although the material that makes up the post interruption beginning of Extract 8.31 is not recycled material, the post interruption (arrowed (c)) is heard as a continuation of the preceding curtailed talk (arrowed (a)). The presence of the recycled material in Extracts 8.27 and 8.28 contributes partly to this hearing. Likewise the appropriacy of the post interruption syntax as a completion of prior talk in Extracts 8.31 also contextualises the former as a continuation of the latter. Nevertheless, despite having repeated material from the preinterruption as its beginning the post-interruption in Extract 8.29 (arrowed c) is not prosodically hearable as a continuation of the preceding talk. The speaker contextualises the post interruption talk as a fresh start, beginning the talk with a step up in pitch on "dan" which is uttered relatively louder than the preinterrupted "dan". There is therefore no prosodic matching between the material in the pretalk and that in the post talk.

The repeated material in Extract 8.32, i.e. "bagi saya" (to me) is not the onset of the post-interruption. It is located subsequent to B's response to A's interruption, which expresses receipt of talk. That being so its "non-initial" location is not a factor in determining whether it is a continuation of the prior talk or not. For example, in Extract 8.31, i.e. "kegiatanya" (arrowed c), located "non-initially" is contextualised as a continuation by pitch matching. The slight fall on "buat" (do) results in a non-low end pitch.
The beginning pitch of "ah", the filler, matches the end pitch of the curtailed talk, thus contextualising the post interruption as a continuation.

From the examination it is observed that neither the lexical constitution of the beginning of the interruption nor the location of the part which is a continuation of the curtailed turn alone makes for a hearing of that part of talk as continuations of prior talk. Such an observation provides the basis for investigating (along with the lexico-syntax that constitutes the beginning of the interruptee's post-interruption talk) the role of prosodic features in the contextualisation of part of talk as a continuation of what was being said in the prior talk.

The first observation made is that the prosodic cues deployed by speakers as a resource to contextualise part of his talk as a continuation are primarily pitch features and loudness. It appears that the pitch and loudness characteristics of the post interruption which are hearable as continuations of pretalk match those of the post interruptions (cf. Local:1992). In Chapter 6 of this thesis, the findings point to the fact that speakers contextualise the speech unit located after a pause as a continuation of the preceding segment by matching the endpitch of the former with the beginning pitch of the latter. In cases such as this, the endpitch of the prepausal segment is non-low and the end syllable prolonged indicating incompletion.
In Extract 8.27, the repeated material, i.e. "dia ada iron pow ..." (arrowed (c)) whose prosodic characteristics parallel those of the preinterruption (arrowed (a)) comes off as a continuation of the pre-dropout. Speaker B repeats the whole incomplete utterance and subsequently complete it. The repeated material still maintains its previous low pitch, forte loudness and lento tempo.

In Extract 8.28, the utterance indicated by arrow (c), i.e. "bukan tak dapat" (not that we can't) has the curtailed talk, "bukan tak dapat" (arrowed (a)), as its beginning. The repeated utterance does not only match the words that it repeats lexically but also prosodically. By uttering the repeated material with the same pitch, loudness and tempo as the preempted turn, the speaker makes the repetition hearable as a continuation of the previous talk.

In Extract 8.29, the prosodic characterisation of the post interruption "dan" (and) differs noticeably from "dan" the end word of the predrop. While the former is uttered low and has piano loudness, the latter is uttered noticeably louder and is accompanied by a much higher pitch. This modification in its prosodic features makes it hearable as a restart rather than a continuation of what was being said previously, although syntactically the post interruption is an appropriate continuation of the preceding incomplete talk.
In Extract 8.30, the post interruption talk, "daripada logam ..." is contextualised as a continuation of the preinterruption by both syntactic and prosodic cues. Although the beginning is not marked by a lexical repeat from the cut off turn, the post interruption is an appropriate continuation of the preceding syntax, "dia". Prosodically, "dia" is characterised by a non-low level pitch (indicating incompleteness) and forte loudness. The prolongation of the final syllable which is a manifestation of a hesitation phenomenon indicates verbal planning on the part of the speaker. "daripada" the initial word in the post interruption begins with a pitch which matches that of the endpitch of the curtailed talk and has the same loudness. Like "dia" the final syllable of "daripada" is lengthened to allow time for verbal planning.

What is interesting in Extract 8.31 is that the post talk contains two types of speaker activity, i.e., a continuation of the prior curtailed talk in the form of examples "kegiatan, pembuatannya" and a new contribution in the form of an additional point, "supaya kita dapat bertahan" (so that we can withstand) with a step up in pitch to the beginning of the latter from a low endpitch of the former. This is accompanied by an increased loudness and a tempo speed-up.
The above observations illustrate that the placement of the continuation in the post-interruption talk does not seem to bear a direct relationship to the contextualisation of the post interruption as a continuation of the prior talk or a new start.

Extract 8.32 addresses the issue that resumption is not determinable by lexical repetition alone. When B takes her turn with the termination of the interruptive talk (arrowed c), B is not heard as continuing her previous talk although B's post-interruption contains recycled material from that prior talk. The change in the prosodic characterisation of the repeated material "bagi saya" is designed to contextualise it as a new contribution. The post-talk "bagi saya" is louder than its first mention in the pretalk which is marked by decrescendo loudness and the beginning pitch of the post-talk is noticeably higher than the end of the pre dropout talk. While the endpitch of "bagi saya" in the post interruption is relatively high and level, the endpitch in the pre interruption is marked by decreased pitch span.

The selected cases cited above illustrate that pitch and loudness matching between turns is a locally available device resource for situating the utterance as a continuation of a preempted talk. The preliminary observation provides evidence that the deployment of prosodic cues is used as a resource to signal the status of parts of talk as continuations or
new starts. So far it has been suggested that the the post-talk in Extracts 8.27, 8.28, 8.30 and 8.31 are hearable as continuations of prior talked, whereas that in Extracts 8.29 and 8.32 are hearable as fresh starts. It is also indicated that the positioning of the onset of resumption in the post interruption and the lexical constitution of its beginning does not alone make for the hearing of that part of talk as directly turn competitive.

Consider the following extracts which provide further support for the above observations. While the recycled material located post the interrupter's response to the immediately preceding talk is hearable as a new start rather than a continuation of the previously mentioned talk that in Extracts 8.33, 8.34 and 8.35 is mere continuations.

**Extract 8.33**

95B adakalanya kitapun daripada golongan masyarakatpun (0.32) takut juga bagaimana

a-> TINDAKAN [a:] a: | kerajaan kita?? ..

< L L >

<H H>

< DEC >

[
b->96A  
a: ada suruh tanya

< H H >
< f f >

| datuk tadi
< L L >
< f f >

c->97B  'YA a: tindakan kerajaan kita terhadap (0.32)

<>H
<>f

< L L >
< p p > < DEC >

d->  ^kalau kita nak pukul suratkhabar kita kena pukul kerajaan

< HH >
< f f >

B There are times when we the common people are afraid
how the action of the government???

A There are people who want me to ask datuk just now

B Yes, the action of our government we a: a: ... If we
want to hit the press we have to hit the government.
Extract 8.34

98B jadi dalam keadaan yang (0.51) apa yang dipanggil uncertainty

[ha:] jadi DALAM

<H H>

<f f>

b->99A [ha] tak tak menentu

[c-> 100B a: TAK menentu

<H> <L L>

<d-> dalam keadaan yang tak menentu

<H H><L L>

<f f>

B So in a situation which is referred to as uncertainty

A uncertainty

B uncertainty. In a situation which is uncertain.

Extract 8.35

101A Anak-anak kadang-kadang dia tak minat

nang belajar. ah Jadi macamana (0.23)
a-> sekang kita nak mengatur
    <L       L>
    <p       p>

b-> 102B a: mesti ada balancelah=
    <H H>
    < CRES >

c-> 103A =ha: ^nak mengatur [dia oghang ni]
    <f> <H H> <L L>
    <CRES > < DEC >

d-> 104 [cara-cara nak] mengaturkan
    <L       L>

A Children sometimes are not interested to study.
    So how? Now we want to manage them

B ah there must be a balance then.

A ha to manage them

B ways to manage them.

Extract 8.36

105A Ni firma-firma gergasi yang mengawal
    firma-firma kecil kecil ni macam mana
    pulak datuk ha=
a->106B ha dalam <laugh>
  
  <HH>

  < >CRES

  [ 

b->107A tu la dia=

  <L  L>

c->108B =dia oghang pulak yang main datuk= 

  <H         H> <L         L>

  <f        f>

d-> 109B =`YA

  <f>

  <H>

e-> dalam bisnes Cik Zainal ada persaingan

  <H H> <L         L>

A What about these big firms controlling the small
ones Datuk?

B ha in this aha yes

  [ 

A that's it=

B =They are the ones who are unscrupulous Datuk=

A =yes. In business Cik Zainal there is competition.
In Extract 8.33, speaker A interrupts speaker B (arrowed b) before the completion of B's turn (arrowed a). Prior to the interruption, "kerajaan" (government) is uttered much quieter than "tindakan" (action) and with a lower pitch indicating that the speaker is approaching the end of his utterance, but before he could end it A enters the ongoing discourse causing B to fade out yielding the turn to A. When B resumes his turn (marked 97b), the beginning pitch of the repeated material "a: tindakan kerajaan ..." (a: the government's action) begins low continuing the end pitch of the prior curtailed talk, "kerajaan ...". The post drop also retains the piano loudness of the predrop, "kerajaan". The matching of pitch and loudness parameters contextualise the post-interruption as a resumption of the predrop.

It is interesting to note that the receipt of the prior talk, "ya" (yes) has a different prosodic characterisation, i.e. it is uttered loud with a high fall. Likewise the change from a mere continuation of what was left unfinished, i.e. "a: tindakan kerajaan kita" to making a new contribution to the discourse (arrowed d) is marked by a step up in pitch at the onset of the new contribution.

In Extract 8.34, the post interruption (arrowed c) begins with a repetition of A's utterance, "tak menentu" following which is the resumption of the curtailed talk. The speaker indicates the boundary between the
former and the latter by a step up in pitch and forte loudness at the beginning of the continuation (arrowed (d)). Although the onset of the resumption (i.e. "dalam" (in)) is not situated at the beginning of the post interruption, the pitch height and loudness matching with the word it repeats contributes to making it prosodically hearable as a continuation of the curtailed turn.

In Extract 8.35, speaker B’s incoming contribution (arrowed b) cuts of A’s turn (arrowed a) before its completion. When speaker A regains his turn (arrowed c) with the termination of B’s talk, he begins his utterance by expressing receipt of the prior talk "ha" with a low fall accompanied by forte loudness. Subsequently, he echoes the last two words of his incomplete utterance (i.e. "nak mengaturkan") giving them a relatively higher pitch and producing them louder than the prior mention indicating that the second mention is not just a mere picking up of what was left unfinished but a restart of that unfinished utterance. Realising that the recipient has not shown an attentiveness to the material in his cut off turn, speaker A does a new start assigning his prior mentioned utterance audible prominence.

In 8.36, speaker B’s turn (arrowed a) is cut off by A’s incoming comment about the unscrupulous dealings of giant companies. B relinquishes his turn to A with a laugh. When A ends his contribution B expresses receipt of prior talk (arrowed d) with a high fall "ya" and
immediately proceeds to resume his curtailed turn which is hearable as a continuation (arrowed (d)). The repeated word "dalam" whose pitch and loudness characteristics match those of his curtailed talk contextualises that utterance as a continuation of the latter. After producing "dalam" there is a noticeable step-down in pitch on the subsequent word and accompanied by decreased loudness.

It seems clear from the examination that the matching of pitch and loudness characteristics of the pre-interruption and those of the post interruptions is not of merely analytic import. From the analysis that has been done so far it appears that pitch and loudness phenomena are resources available to interviewer and interviewee to demarcate the status of part of his talk as a continuation or of the curtailed talk or a fresh start.

Evidence has been presented to show that the prosodic characterisation of certain material in the post interruption contributes to making that part of talk

(1) hearable as a resumption of a prior curtailed turn although it does not contain recycled material from the latter,

(2) hearable as a new start rather than a continuation even though
its lexical constitution points otherwise

(3) hearable as a continuation despite the fact that the onset of
the continuation is not the beginning of the post interruption

Finally, observe how in the following exchange, the different prosodic
classification between the endpoint of the pretalk and the onset of the
post talk makes the latter hearable as doing a new start rather than merely
continuing whatever was being said previously. The high falling on "berat
(arrowed (a) indicates utterance end. The high level pitch of forte "dan"
indicates its status as a beginning of a new talk, rather than a continuation
of a curtailed talk.

Extract 8.3

a->110A selalu orang beranggapan ini mesti BERAT
            <      >CRES

b->111B   'YA 'BERAT=

c->112A   ^ [DAN] berat ni mesti mahal
           <H>
           < f>
8.7 Conclusion

What is seen in this chapter is an approach to discourse that takes into account not only the prosodic manifestation of the verbal material along with its lexico-syntax constitution but also the sequential progression of talk within its locus of occurrence. By focusing on the way prosody contextualises speaker activity in relation to adjacency pairs, turn-taking and continuance or restart completion, one can see how attention to the sequential progression of talk can reveal the interactional functions of prosody (both within and across turns) in a two-party interview such as competing or not competing for turns, relinquishing or holding turns or doing a return competition, continuing or restarting.

It is recognised that the essential organisation basis for turn-taking in broadcast interviews is based on the preallocation of turns by the turn taking conditions specified in section 8.2. This preallocation of turns together with the existence of adjacency pairs which require the next speaker to produce at that point a second pair contribute to ensuring a smooth interchange of speaking turns between speakers.

As regards the role of prosody in the management of turns, what is advanced here is that prosody in cooccurrence with syntax and semantics serves to provide information on possible turn construction units (i.e
whether or not a speaker is about to complete his turn or need more time to talk). Although these cues are not the essential organisational basis for turn taking in interviews, their role in indicating the completion of turn-constructional units cannot be denied.

Findings from the examination point to the fact that the completion of turn constructional unit is usually associated with a falling intonation and non-completion is associated with a rising intonation or level pitch. As has been illustrated it is the pitch contour of a syntactic unit, e.g. word, phrase or clause that projects it as a turn-constructional unit. The other cues available to signal that a speaker is about to end his turn include a downstep in pitch and reduced loudness. Cases have been cited to support the fact that the speaker at times indicates the wish to end his turn by trailing away and this is prosodically marked by a noticeable lowering of pitch and diminuendo loudness. The split second transition of speaker turn that frequently occurs in the data suggests that participants closely monitor for the ending of current turn.

Another issue addressed is the role of prosody in the contextualisation of interrupters' overlaps as competitive or non-competitive for turns and interruptee's in-overlaps as turn yielding or turn-holding. Two prosodic cues, i.e pitch height and loudness in particular have
been identified as playing a major role in signalling the status of speaker activity as such.

The interrupter indicates the wish to take over the turn by the assignment of high pitch and forte loudness to his overlapping speech and these features may be dropped on the termination of current speaker turn or may be retained beyond the point of dropout and this sustension does not go beyond what is perceived as a continuation of the prior overlap. Once this is finished a modification in pitch features and loudness occurs. The prosodic features of \(<H+F>\) which are deployed at the onset of the interruption makes the intention of taking over the turn immediately available to turn occupant. By modifying the prosodic characterisation of his in-overlap, the turn occupant can make his response hearable as turn-yielding or turn-competing.

While the giving away of turn is marked by prosodic "phase out", i.e. decreased pitch height and diminuendo loudness gradually reaching the point of unintelligibility, a return competition is signalled by a step-up in pitch and, increased loudness and at times tempo speed-up which usually occurs around the beginning of the return competition. Often in doing this the return competition seems to be usurping the isochrony-timing so that one gets the feeling that somehow that it has managed to end the overlapping speech and continue with the turn without the presence of
overlap. A non-competitive overlap is marked by being relatively lower in pitch and quieter than the turn-occupant's in-overlap. Although at times the non-competitive term is uttered with forte loudness the low pitch which accompanies it makes it prosodically less prominent than the in-overlap.

The non-prosodic cues which contribute to the realisation of overlaps as non-competitive include their content which suggests itself as not making a substantial contribution to the ongoing discourse and their briefness which identifies them as not serious attempts at turn competing. From investigating possible links between prosodic features and the contextualisation of speaker activity as competitive or non-competitive for turns, the focus has thus been expanded to explore the subsequent prosodic response of the turn-occupant to an overlap marked by \( <H+F> \) or unmarked by \( <H+F> \).

The next issue examined is the contextualisation of speaker activity as a resumption of the prior talk which has been cut off prematurely. It is found that the speaker indicates the status of his post talk as a continuation of his prior talk by matching the pitch and loudness characteristics of the former to those of the latter. The examination is restricted to parts of talk which are sequentially located subsequent to an interruptive speech whose status as continuations of the pre-dropouts is indicated by the assignments of prosodic cues which parallel those of the pre-dropouts.
Along with prosodic cues there are, however, other non-prosodic features of talk which contribute to making the post interruptive contribution hearable as a continuation. In particular by utilising the resources of lexical repeats and syntactic completion the interruptee is able to signal that his subsequent contribution is a resumption of the incomplete preceding syntax. The significance of prosodic cues in the contextualisation of speaker activity as such is further supported by the evidence which shows that the prosodic cues are used as resources to distinguish that part of talk which is a response to the prior talk from that which is a continuation of the incomplete preceding turn, although both are located in the post-interruption position.