

## Overlaps in Internet-Mediated Conversation: A Case Study of a Telegram Phone Interaction

Preity Zinta<sup>1</sup>, Ayumi Ayumi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>English Department, Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author's Email: [ayumi@hu.m.unand.ac.id](mailto:ayumi@hu.m.unand.ac.id)

### Article History:

Submission: January 13, 2026 | Revision: March 10, 2026 | Accepted: March 18, 2026

---

### Abstract

**Background:** In digital communication contexts, such as audio phone calls via messaging applications like Telegram, overlaps may occur differently due to the absence of visual cues and varying levels of speaker coordination, particularly among second-language users. **Aims:** This article investigates overlaps that occurred in an audio phone call conversation on Telegram. This research aims to identify classifications and types of overlaps as well as to comprehend the overlaps resolution devices employed by the speakers: two Indonesian women using English during the conversation. **Methods:** The research method used here is a descriptive-qualitative analysis. The study applied Anthony J Liddicoat's theory to define overlap resolution devices. As for the classifications and types of overlaps, the study uses Adda et.al (2007) and Niapele's et.al (2022) concept. The data is taken from an audio phone call conversation via Telegram. **Result:** Incorporating evidence from review of related studies, data, and result of investigation, this current research demonstrates that of four overlaps classifications, it is found that the most commonly employed classification goes to backchannel following the other with the next order being in anticipated turn-taking, turn request, and length complementary. Additionally, the use of overlaps resolution device such as perturbations and hitches are evenly used by both speakers in addressing the overlaps. It also shows that speaker behavior (latching) plays an extensive part for the overlaps to occur. **Implications:** These findings contribute to the field of conversation analysis by highlighting how overlap phenomena function in digital spoken interactions, particularly in second-language communication contexts. The study also provides practical insights for language teaching and communication training by emphasizing the importance of managing overlaps and turn-taking strategies to improve interactional competence in real-life and online conversations.

**Keywords:** Classifications of overlaps, Conversation Analysis, Overlap resolution devices, Social Interaction, Telegram Phone Call, Transcription, Types of overlaps.

### Introduction

We human converse with each other on a daily basis, hence as suggested by Liddicoat (Liddicoat, 2007, 2021) conversation is regarded as the "prevalent uses of human language". Conversation is the process of exchanging thoughts, ideas, and feedback built along with interlocutors involved in a conversation. As a matter of fact, conversation is not simply considered as talking or interacting with others, yet it has a set of systematic rules which governs the sequential organization of talk (Gavioli, 2022; Have, 2007; Schegloff, 2012; Sidnell, 2010). Such social activity requires turn-taking protocol to accomplish a well-managed speaking turn so the

occurrence of overlaps will not disrupt a conversation. However, according to Goffman (1964) speaking is a social activity whose importance is often overlooked. Since conversation centers on the allocation of speaking turns, the process of turn-taking naturally creates opportunities for overlaps to occur during interaction .

Overlapping in talk is a condition of two or more speakers talking once a time and is regarded as the conversational strategy used by speakers during the conversation being run(Liddicoat, 2007, 2021; Schegloff, 2000). Such interactional phenomenon happens due to either one speaker does not wait until the completion of Transition Relevance Place or cannot receive proper signs of Transition Relevance Place. As with so many people are not aware that they subconsciously conduct a significant linguistic form and rules called turn-taking when conversing, it is important to acknowledge that speakers of a conversation are expected to abide the mechanism of turn-taking in order to reach the successful speaking activity without being overlapped (Donnarumma et al., 2017; Huang, 2023; Mori, 2021; Sacks et al., 1974). Still, it is unfortunate, as explained by Wardaugh (2010), that we often fail in playing by the rules and tend to ignore and violate specific procedures as we indulge in the give-and-take of conversation.

There are many reasons lying behind the occurrence of overlaps in a conversation, such as lack of awareness towards turn-taking, the assertion of dominance, enthusiasm and excitement, and disruption from internet connection in the context of telephone talk conversation, etc (Heldner & Edlund, 2010; Oertel et al., n.d.; Takeda, 2023; Weingartová et al., 2014) . From this point forward, Mey (2001) suggests that “turn” is the fundamental aspect for good speaking “flow” since it determines “*how people go about allocating turns to each other or themselves*”. Accordingly, it underlies the turn-taking mechanism comes into exist in which they include taking, holding, and yielding the floor.

In dealing with this topic, as stated by Liddicoat (2021) ethnomethodology is used as an approach to closely look into the social order in a conversation which often gets regarded ordered but actually it forms chaos. The study of ethnomethodology focuses on the small scale social order inspected through social abilities of special society’s members exerting influence on the ways people follow the messages and the social circumstances they encounter. As for the theory employed for this research, it is built upon Silitonga et al (2022) and Paltridge (2012), that Conversation Analysis (henceforth called CA) is found compatible since it aims to examine structural organization of ‘ordinary conversation’, one of which goes to the overlaps. The study focuses on the overlaps, mainly looking at the classifications as well as types of overlaps and how they ought to be resolved, produced by the two speakers in a natural conversation audio on a telegram phone call feature. This article discusses the classifications and types of the overlaps and the devices used in resolving the overlaps.

By carrying out such research with specific focus on overlaps in the online conversation, it prodigiously creates a worthwhile contribution to the study of Conversation Analysis. Moreover, this research article is expected to help gain understanding of the classifications as well as types of overlaps and its resolution device in the conversation.

Research on conversational overlap has been widely discussed in previous studies. Schegloff (2000), examines the mechanisms used to resolve overlapping talk and explain how

overlap occurs within the turn-taking organization of conversation. His study shows that participants employ specific overlap resolution devices to manage simultaneous talk, indicating that overlap is an organized component of conversational interaction rather than a random disruption. Handayani (2008) analyzes overlaps in talk show interaction and identifies several types of overlap onset; transitional, recognitional, and progressional, showing that overlaps occur naturally in conversation since both speakers participate in overlapping. Similarly, Cantrell (2014) finds that many overlaps and interruptions in casual family conversations function cooperatively and contribute to building rapport and solidarity among participants. More recently, Niapele et al. (2021) show that speakers in the American talk show *The View* use overlaps strategically to maintain participation and manage conversational turns. Together, these studies suggest that conversational overlap is not only a disruption but a structured and meaningful feature of interaction.

This study aims to identify the classifications and types of overlaps that occur in a natural audio-recorded conversation using the Telegram phone call feature and to understand the overlap resolution devices employed by participants to manage overlapping talk during the interaction.

## **Methods**

### ***Research Design***

The method of this research refers to the qualitative approach in doing the analysis to answer the research questions. The systematic process of this research includes collecting and analyzing the data. This research uses a transcript of a by-telegram recorded spoken data as the primary data acquired from a conversation audio on Telegram Phone Call Feature split into several sequences performed by two women using English as the main language.

### ***Data Collection***

When it comes to the data collection, it went through several procedures: 1) The conversation audio on Telegram which has been available in automatically recorded by Telegram Phone Call Feature is recorded again on the iPhone screen recording to be divided into sequences to avoid large size to be later uploaded in Google Drive. 2) The results of screen recording of the conversation are then stored into the gallery and uploaded on Google Drive to move them to the PC. 3) Each part of the videotaped recording conversation in drive is downloaded and the inserted into ELAN application to help make the transcript and apply the transcription symbols. The conversation transcript is divided based on the data card/the cut of overlapping conversation. This is done to help the writer establish focus on overlaps in that conversation. As for the secondary data, the writer makes use of books, journal articles, websites, and past researches to support the writer's arguments and statements when analyzing and explaining the data into descriptive explanations.

### ***Data Analysis***

In analyzing the data, this research uses the collected data and Conversation Analysis theory by Harvey Sack (1987) which studies the organization and the orderliness of social interaction, involving the systematic examination of verbal and nonverbal behaviors such as turn-taking that bears an interactional phenomenon as overlaps, pauses, gestures, etc to understand how

people communicate with each other. To begin the analysis, the data is filtered which conforms to the objectives of this study (overlaps). Second, the data on the transcript are divided per datum of overlapping conversation in order to define the overlaps classifications and its types also in order to see the overlap resolution devices employed by the speakers. Then, to know how overlaps are resolved, the writer will define what devices are used by speakers to resolve the overlaps, in which each of overlaps datum will be scrutinized with the guidance of Anthony J Liddioat's book (2021) in chapter 4 page 91 and articles by Adda et.al (2007) & Niapele (2021, p. 16). To support the implication might occur, the author employs Conversation Analysis theory according to Anthony J Liddioat as the main reference and other references involved for complementary guidance in application of investigating overlapping speech data as well as conveying supportive conversational move with regard to not all overlaps are deemed problematic overlaps.

## **Results and Discussion**

The analysis of the transcribed Telegram phone call conversation identified nine instances of overlapping speech. Overlap in conversation is divided into two types: Intrusive/non-intrusive, also termed as intrusive/collaborative. These two types of overlaps have been classified into four classifications with each of the two being different from the two types that may first entail speaker change or result in the speaker change. As explained by Adda et.al (2007), Turn Request and the Length Complementary are in the categorization of entailing speaker change. In the meantime, other two classifications which are Back-Channel and Anticipated-Turn Taking constitute resulting in speaker change. For the record that of four there are two overlap classifications claimed collaborative: the backchannel signals (marked by very short overlaps) and anticipated turn-taking, this is when the participants of a conversation have already understood the whole sayings of the current speaker while she or he has not finished delivering it to the end. The other two interruptive classifications include turn request and complementary. Below is the discussion of the attached result in table above.

### **Datum 1**

50	→P:	=it's um (0.59) called before I go to sleep you
51		know it is also filmed (0.43)you know if you if
52		if you know that that film but I [haven't]
53	→C:	[Yeah ]
54	√P:	=watched the film yeah I haven't watched the film
55		I just um I just[go you know like a go
56	→C:	[What do you ()

In datum 1, it is seen that an overlapping speech occurs in the lines 52 and 53. Here, the current speaker has not finished talking when the incoming speaker sends “Yeah”. Based on Adda et.al (2007, p. 4) & Niapele (2021, p. 16), the classification and type of overlap is backchannel, which is categorized as collaborative overlaps. Another overlap occurs in line 56 when the incoming speaker enters the floor while the current speaker's sentence is incomplete. In this case, the overlap is classified as turn request which is categorized as interruptive. During this overlap





overlap. In response to the overlap, the current speaker deploys hitches by repeating the utterance to maintain the floor.

### Datum 6

146 →P: I mean like so (0.35) oka:y (0.28) so I [think]  
147 C: [ (hh) ]  
148 √P: =I'm gonna just like one person to: yu know like  
149 uh (0.39)be the second author yih know ofc they  
150 have to con[tribute]  
151 →C: [Yeah ]  
152 √P: =Y know I don't want them to put the their name  
153 only so they have to work (0.41)with me (0.45)  
154 owh ya (0.46) it's a lil bit pissed off yih know  
155 but (1.18)I can do nothing because that's my  
156 lecure's (1.21) request yih know like for the  
157 final exam (0.55)so yeah=

Datum 6 demonstrates the speaker behavior in responding to the overlapping speech. An overlap occurs in line 147 when the incoming speaker produces a laugh while the current speaker is still talking. The current speaker responds by employing latching in line 148. Another overlap occurs in line 151 where the signal “Yeah” is classified as backchannel, categorized as collaborative overlap. The current speaker again employs latching in line 152 to maintain the floor.

### Datum 7

158 →C: =Alright(0.81)so::: I think you are talking  
159 about your (0.88) <ye:s the the examination  
160 Proj[ect or something  
161 →P: [yeah yeah yeah  
162 →C: [ I ]  
163 →P: [yeah]  
164 √C: =↑I wanted to ask you about the title of your  
165 thesis (0.65) yih know=  
166 →P: =owh thesis la last time that I:: (0.70)  
167 [was really]  
168 →C: [yea::h ] ()  
169 →P: fuzzy on [ahh]  
170 →C: [uhm]  
171 (1.35)

Datum 7 contains four signals of backchannel which occur in line 161, 163, 168, 170. These overlaps is categorized as collaborative overlaps. During the overlapping sequence from lines 160

to 163, the speaker employs latching, indicated by higher pitch at the beginning of the utterance to continue the unfinished talk.

### Datum 8

206       →P:       =So what do you [think?]  
207       →C:                               [ Yes ] (1.42) so actually I am  
208                               still in two minds whether I want to choose  
209                               literature (0.53) or [linguistics]  
210       →P:                               [uhm aah     ] (0.84) aah  
211                               Ohh (0.61) [do you also     ]  
212       →C:                               [about education]  
  
216       →P:       ↑You also have [to choose]  
217       →C:                               [uhmm     ]  
218       √P:       =the interest event though you are (0.66)  
219                               Eng[lish] education  
220       →C:        ↑[Yes ]  
221                               (1.16)

Line 207 in datum 8 indicates anticipated turn-taking, which is categorized as a collaborative overlap. Line 210 is classified as backchannel, while 217 and 220 are also classified as backchannel overlaps. In managing the overlap, the current speaker employs latching in line 218.

### Datum 9

226       →C:       Eh ↑no like actually I have two choices (0.73)  
227                               Yes (0.35) but it's [ ( ) ]  
228       →P:                               [uhm]  
229       √C:       =here actually (0.27) yes um (0.85)<whether I  
230                               wa:nt t:o choose like (0.66) literature yih know  
231                               sastra right b:ut (0.73) um if I (0.52)↑like  
232                               actually (0.26) my lecturer told us that (0.82)  
233                               talking about or analyzing or (0.37) yea just  
234                               talking about (0.28)um literature aspects (0.58)  
235                               rather than the linguistic one like  
236                               Edu[cational stuff like that]  
237       →P:                               [emmmmm uhmm yaaa ]  
238                               (0.89)

The overlapping above demonstrates collaborative type in the classification of backchannel that occurs in lines 228 and 237. The current speaker manages the overlap by doing latching to re-establish the floor as she is yet to finish talking.

The results indicate that the overlapping talk in the Telegram phone call conversation is primarily collaborative rather than disruptive. The frequent occurrence of backchannel signals suggests that participants actively demonstrate understanding and involvement in the conversation. This supports the view in conversation analysis that overlap does not necessarily indicate interruption or conflict but can function as a cooperative interactional resource. The presence of anticipated turn-taking highlights the interactive nature of the conversation. In these cases, the listener anticipates the completion of the speaker's utterance and contributes to the conversation before the turn is completed. This kind of overlaps reflect a shared understanding of the topic and conversational engagement between participants.

Although intrusive overlaps such as turn requests are also observed, they do not appear to significantly disrupt the flow of the interaction. Instead, speakers employ various overlap resolution devices to maintain the organization of conversation. Latching, perturbation, and hitches allow speaker to re-establish control of the floor and continue their turn when overlaps occur. Overall, the result suggest that overlapping talk in natural conversation functions as a dynamic mechanism that facilitates interaction rather than hindering it. The collaborative nature of most of the overlaps indicates that participants use overlapping speech as a communicative strategy to signal attention, agreement, and understanding while maintaining the flow of the conversation. .

## **Conclusion**

This study investigates the classifications, types, and resolution devices of overlapping talk in a Telegram phone call conversation. The analysis identified nine instances of overlapping speech. Based on the research findings, overlaps are categorized into collaboratives overlaps and backchannel. Collaborative overlaps include backchannel and anticipated turn-taking. The interruptive overlaps include turn request and length complementary. Collaborative overlaps occur when the incoming speaker has already understood the current speaker's utterances and begins speaking near the Transition Relevance Place (TRP), while interruptive overlaps occur when the incoming speaker attempts to take the floor before the current speaker completes the turn. The most appeared classification is backchannel (collaborative), followed by anticipated turn-taking, turn request, and length complementary (interruptive). Additionally, the use of overlaps resolution device such as perturbations (changes in pitch, volume, or speaking pace), and hitches (repetition of utterances) are evenly used by both speakers in addressing the overlaps. It also shows that speaker behavior (latching) plays an extensive part for the overlaps to occur. Overall, it can be understood that the overlaps in a conversation should not always be considered as the interruptive one, yet beginning to talk when one is midsentence can be a way of denoting an enthusiastic engagement to the topics/ideas of what the speaker is saying. This cooperative overlap is a part of conversational ethic, showing an active listening and engagement between speakers. In addition, it can be concluded that the way speakers handle the overlaps is mostly by doing latching. This speaker behavior is proven successful in resolving and preventing the overlaps to re-occur.

## **Originality Statement**

The authors declare that this article is their own work and to the best of their knowledge it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been accepted for publication in any other published materials, except where

DOI: 10.70036/cltls.v3i1.38

[ISSN 3030-3664](https://citrus.buxdu.uz/) (online), <https://citrus.buxdu.uz/>, published by Bukhara State University

Copyright © Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

(CC BY)

due acknowledgement is made in the article. Any contribution made to the research by others, with whom the authors have worked, is explicitly acknowledged in the article.

### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

The authors declare that this article was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

### **Copyright Statement**

Copyright © Authors. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate, and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this license may be seen at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

### **References**

- Adda, G., Adda-Decker, M., Barras, C., Boula de Mareüil, P., Habert, B., & Paroubek, P. (2007). Speech overlap and interplay with disfluencies in political interviews. *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Paralinguistic Speech: Between Models and Data*. <http://sf.net/projects/trans/>
- Cantrell, L. (2014). The power of rapport: An analysis of the effects of interruptions and overlaps in casual conversation. *INNERVATE: Leading Undergraduate Work in English*, 6, 78–85.
- Chowdhury, S. A., Danieli, M., & Riccardi, G. (2015). The role of speakers and context in classifying competition in overlapping speech. *Proceedings of INTERSPEECH*, 1844–1848. <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2015-68>
- Donnarumma, F., Dindo, H., Iodice, P., & Pezzulo, G. (2017). You cannot speak and listen at the same time: A probabilistic model of turn-taking. *Biological Cybernetics*, 111(2), 165–183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00422-017-0714-1>
- Gavioli, L. (2022). Conversation analysis. In F. Zanettin & C. Rundle (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and methodology* (pp. 223–238). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158945-17>
- Goffman, E. (1964). The neglected situation. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6, Part 2), 133–136. [https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl\\_3.02a00090](https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl_3.02a00090)
- Handayani, M. Y. (2008). *A conversation analysis of overlaps in talk show “Conversation with Michael Eisner”* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Andalas]. Universitas Andalas Repository. <http://repository.unand.ac.id/10809/>
- Have, P. ten. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Heldner, M., & Edlund, J. (2010). Pauses, gaps and overlaps in conversations. *Journal of Phonetics*, 38(4), 555–568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2010.08.002>
- Huang, Y. (2023). The priority structure behind overlap of multi-person conversation. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 9(1), 217–219. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ijeh.v9i1.9415>
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2021). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350090675>

- Mori, H. (2021). Pitch contour separation from overlapping speech. *Proceedings of INTERSPEECH*. <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2021-2164>
- Niapele, Y., Ariyanti, L., Setiawan, S., & Leliana, A. (2021). Overlap as conversational strategies in an American daytime talk show *The View*. *Language Horizon: Journal of Language Studies*, 9(3), 13–22.
- Oertel, C., Włodarczak, M., Tarasov, A., Campbell, N., & Wagner, P. (2012). Context cues for classification of competitive and collaborative overlaps. *Proceedings of Speech Prosody 2012*. <https://doi.org/10.21437/SpeechProsody.2012-180>
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Silitonga, M. E., Pasaribu, A., & Sinambela, E. (2022). An analysis of turn-taking strategies used by lecturers and students through online class. *Jurnal Mutiara Pendidikan Indonesia*, 7(1), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.51544/mutiarapendidik.v7i1.3011>
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54–69). Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29, 1–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500001019>
- Schegloff, E. A. (2012). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208>
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Takeda, L. U. (2023). Overlaps in collaboration adjustments: A cross-genre study of female university students' interactions in American English and Japanese. *Pragmatics*, 33(2), 285–312. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.21009.tak>
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (6th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Weingartová, L., Churaňová, E., & Šturm, P. (2014). Transitions, pauses and overlaps: Temporal characteristics of turn-taking in Czech. In N. Campbell, D. Gibbon, & D. Hirst (Eds.), *Speech Prosody 7* (pp. 502–506). <https://doi.org/10.21437/SpeechProsody.2014-88>