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Abstract

This thesis is a study about types of interruption and functions of interruption in a television talk show named Indonesia Lawyers Club. This study aims to identify the types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. The main theory used in supporting this study is a theory of types of interruption proposed by Ferguson (1977). In conducting this study, the researcher used a descriptive qualitative method. The results of this study found that there are four types of interruption found in the talk show. They are simple interruption (SI), overlap interruption (OI), Butting-in interruption (BI) and silent interruption (SLI). OI is the most dominant types of interruption found in the data. There are 9 occurrences of OI (36%), 8 occurrences of SI (32%), 5 occurrences of BI (20%) and 3 occurrences of SLI (12%).
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Introduction

Conversation is a form of communication that occurs between two or more people (speaker and listener) in order to exchange messages, ideas, or information. According to Liddicoat (2007: 1), conversation is the way in which people socialize, develop, and sustain their relationship with each other. To build a good conversation, the people involved in that conversation should know when to talk and to listen. That is why, they should understand
about turn-taking. Sacks (1974: 696) says that turn-taking is used to talk in interviews, meetings, debates, ceremonies, conversations, etc. It refers to speech exchange Systems.

Wooffitt (2005: 26) states that at the start of any period of interaction, neither party knows in advance how many turns they will take, what the topics will be or the order in which they will be addressed, how long each turn may be, whether or not someone else will join in, and if they do, how turns are to be allocated among the respective parties, and so on. However, gaps or overlaps sometimes occur in conversation. In many cases, turn taking may not always succeed because more than one person talks at the same time. It may be caused by interruption.

In some cases, interruption is considered disturbing and impolite by many people. However, interruption is not always disturbing and impolite in conversation. Interruption sometimes can be helpful for both speaker and listener. It depends on the types and functions of interruption. Based on this phenomenon, the researcher is interested to analyse it.

To analyse this phenomenon, conversation analysis (CA) is required. Conversation analysis is a branch of discourse. Paltridge (2012: 90) states that Conversation analysis is an approach to the analysis of spoken discourse that looks at the way in which people manage their everyday conversational interactions. It examines how spoken discourse is organized and develops as speakers carry out these interactions. In conversation analysis, the data can be in the form of video or tape-recording that is transcribed.

The data of this research is the utterances in the form of sentences of camp number 01 and camp number 02 in Indonesia Lawyer Club (ILC) with the theme *Menjelang Debat Capres 2019: Penegakkan Hukum Dimata 01 & 02*. Candidates number 01 are Joko Widodo and Ma'ruf Amin. While, candidates number 02 are Prabowo Subianto and Sandiaga Salahuddin Uno. Jokowi-Ma'ruf's camp is Boni Hargens, Henry Yosodiningrat and Maman Immanulhaq. Prabowo-Sandi's camp is Dahnil A. Simanjuntak, Rachland Nashidik and Rocky Gerung.

The debate is led by karni Ilyas as the President of Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC) and followed by Haris Azhar, Henry Yosodiningrat, Rachland Nashidik, Maman Immanulhaq, Dahnil A. Simanjuntak, Fahri Hamzah, Boni Hargens, Rocky Gerung, Sujilwo Tejo, and Refly Harun. The debate has been held on Tuesday, January 15, 2019, at 8:00 PM at TV One studio. The debate lasted for about 2 hours. Indonesia Lawyers Club
(ILC) is Indonesian talk-show broadcast on TV One that discusses legal and criminal issues for 210 minutes. ILC is broadcast every Tuesday at 8:00 PM and Sunday at 7:30 PM led by Karni Ilyas as the President of ILC.

The researcher chooses Indonesia Lawyers Club with the theme *Menjelang Debat Capres 2019: Penegakkan Hukum Dimata 01 & 02* because Indonesia has recently held the presidential election and many debates about the presidential election has emerged. This phenomenon attracts the researcher's attention to make it as the data in this study. Besides, there are many interruptions found out during the debate, especially interruptions that are carried out by Jokowi-Ma'ruf's camp and Prabowo-Sandi's camp.

This research will analyse the types of interruption in conversation analysis by using a theory proposed by Ferguson (1977) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103). According to Ferguson (1977), there are four types of interruption, which are simple interruption, overlap interruption, butting – in interruption and silent interruption.

**Research Methods**

This research used a descriptive qualitative method to analyse the interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. Descriptive qualitative method is a research data that is usually in the form of words, instead of numbers. It helps the researcher to develop initial conceptions and to produce or to revise conceptual framework (Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, 2014). The research presents the data in the form of qualitative approach because it focuses on the analysis of textual or non-numerical data.

The object or the data that is analysed in this research is in the form of utterances of the debate participants in Indonesia Lawyer Club (ILC) with the theme *Menjelang Debat Capres 2019: Penegakkan Hukum Dimata 01 & 02* that are transcribed into a text by the researcher because this research aims to identify the types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club and to find out the functions of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. And the source of the data is Indonesia Lawyer Club YouTube Channel.

Creswell (2014) states that the data collection steps include setting the boundaries for the study, collecting information through unstructured or semi structured observations and interviews, documents, and visual materials, as well as establishing the protocol for recording information. Steps in collecting the data were as follows: downloading the data.
from Indonesia Lawyers Club YouTube Channel, watching the video of the debate, transcribing the data into a text, reading the full transcription text, understanding the contents of the transcription text especially the interruption found in the debate, listing the types and the functions of interruption that are found in the data and collecting all the data needed.

The data of this research were analysed using these following steps of descriptive qualitative method (Creswell, 2014). They are organizing and preparing data for analysis, reading through all data, coding the data, generating descriptions/themes for analysis, interrelating themes/descriptions and interpreting the meaning of themes/descriptions.

## Results and Discussion

### Results

The researcher found that there are 25 interruptions in the Indonesia Lawyers Club that are carried out by the both camps. The type of interruption which is used most dominantly is OI which appears 9 times. Then, there is SI which appears 8 times, BI which appears 5 times and SLI which appears 3 times. The results of the types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club are presented in the table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Types of Interruption</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Simple Interruption</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Overlap Interruption</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Butting-in Interruption</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Silent Interruption</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

This section discusses the types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. The identification of the types of interruption is based on a theory proposed by Ferguson (1977) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103). Those types are simple interruption, overlap interruption, butting – in interruption and silent interruption. Based on the data of this research, the researcher found that there are 25 interruptions carried out by Jokowi – Ma’ruf’s camp and Prabowo – Sandi’s camp in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. The type of interruption which is used most dominantly is overlap interruption (OI) which appears 9 times.
Then, there is simple interruption (SI) which appears 8 times, butting – interruption (BI) which appears 5 times and silent interruption (SLI) which appears 3 times.

**Simple Interruption**

Simple interruption is the type of interruption that occurs 7 times in the data. Simple interruption occurs when an interrupter successfully takes the floor and makes the interrupted person stops his/her sentence, so his/her sentence is incomplete. Some occurrences of simple interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club are shown below.

**DS(02):** .... *Oleh sebab itu, maka memang yang harus dipastikan pertama itu adalah kita punya presiden yang memimpin, pemimpin yang memimpin tanpa bisa diintervensi oleh pihak manapun. Nah, salah satu, salah satu upaya | salah satu upaya*

.... Therefore, the first thing to be ascertained is that we have a president who leads, a leader who leads without being able to be intervened by any party. Well, one of, one of efforts | one of efforts

**HY(01):** *Sebentar, ini harus diklarifikasi, yang dimaksud dengan presiden pemimpin yang tidak mau memimpin itu contohnya apa, dalam kasus yang mana, dan diintervensi itu, yang mengintervensi siapa, dalam kasus yang mana. Jadi kita jangan menyebar kebohongan nanti salah persepsi masyarakat. Ini ditonton oleh jutaan orang.*

Wait, it must be clarified. What is the meaning of a president who does not want to lead? What is the example? In what case? And intervened one, who does intervene? In what case? So, we don't spread lies. The people will have a wrong perception. It's watched by millions of people.

**DS(02):** *Jadi, baik, saya lanjutkan. Pemimpin yang memimpin itu dia mampu menangani banyak hal dengan kepemimpinan yang kuat....*

So, well, I will continue. The meaning of a leader who leads is he is able to handle many things with a strong leadership....

(1 / 00:56:11 - 01:06:45)

From the dialogue above, DS who is a current speaker is successfully interrupted by HY. HY interrupts DS by saying “*Sebentar, ini harus diklarifikasi....*” In that situation,
DS stops talking and listens to HY, so DS’s utterance is incomplete. However, DS continues talking after HY finish his interruption by responding what HY said.

**RG(02):** *Oke ya oke. Jadi, saya lanjutkan* |
Okay, okay. So, I will continue |

**MI(01):** *Tunggu, saya tambahin dulu, Bang Rocky. Jadi, pernah sebelumnya sebelum rapat di KPU, apakah nanti ada pertanyaan-pertanyaan seperti itu. Nah, ternyata ketika rapat, dan dari pihak BPN, Mas Budi Priyo Santoyo, itu bilang, sebaiknya nggak ada debat karena itu akan menjatuhkan martabat* |
Wait! Let me say something, Mr. Rocky. So, Before the KPU meeting, there will be a question like that later? Well, in fact, when the meeting, and from BPN, Mr. Budi Priyono Santoyo, said that there should not be debate because it will break a dignity |

**S:** *Jangan jangan begitu ngomongnya.*
Don’t don’t talk like that.

**RG(02):** *Gini gini gini, bukan* |
Well well well, don’t |

**MI(01):** *Nah, jadi sesungguhnya* |
Well, the truth is |

**DS(02):** *Bukan itu konteksnya.* |
It is not the context. |

**RG(02):** *Bukan ituila. Bukan itu yang saya bilang* |
No, it is not what I say |

**MI(01):** *Ya, nggak, bukan, ya saya paham Bung Rocky....* |
Yes, no, no, yeah I understand Mr. Rocky.... |

The dialogue above is another example of simple interruption found in the data. In the dialogue above, RG who is a current speaker is successfully interrupted by MI. MI interrupts RG by saying “*Tunggu, saya tambahin dulu, Bang Rocky.....*” Although MI then is interrupted by RG and other speakers, MI finally can take the floor and complete his utterance.

**Overlap Interruption**
Overlap interruption is the most dominant type of interruption that occurs 9 times in the data. Overlap interruption occurs when the interrupter tries to interrupt the current speaker, but he/she does not succeed completely, because the interrupted person keeps talking until he/she completes his/her sentence. At the same time, the interrupter keeps talking even though the interrupted person has finished his/her utterances. In other words, they share the floor. The following dialogues show some occurrences of overlap interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club.

**RG(02):** Oke, artinya pertanyaan itu yang digantung di kepala publik tidak berani saudara jawab.
Okay, it means that you don’t dare to answer the question which is asked by the public.

**HS(01):** Sudah dijawab |
It has been answered |

**RG(02):** Apa?
What?

**HS(01):** Anda ini mengajukan pertanyaan, kalau semestinya finalis mengajukan pertanyaan kepada Jokowi. Pertanyaannya seperti yang anda kemukakan tadi |
You ask a question, if a finalist asks a question to Mr. Jokowi. The same question as you ask |

**RG(02):** Eh saudara
Eh you

**HS(01):** Saya katakan kalau itu saya saja yang jawab nggak usah Jokowi |
I have told you, I will answer it. Mr. Jokowi doesn’t need to |

**RG(02):** Ya sudah jawab saja
Alright, just answer it

**HS(01):** Jawabannya yes terlibat sesuai dengan keputusan dari dewan kehormatan Perwira |
The answer is yes, he was involved in accordance with decision of the honorary board member |

**RG(02):** Oke. Nah, itu yang saya tunggu
Okay. Well, that’s what I’m waiting for

**HS(01):** Sudah itu.
That’s it.

**RG(02):** Ya sudah, jadi |
Okay, so |

**HS(01):** Ya sudah apalagi? |
Yeah that’s it. What’s else? |

(5 / 01:48:50 – 01:49:18)

In the dialogue above, RG tries to interrupt HY to clarify HY’s answer about whether Mr. Prabowo has been involved in human rights violation or not by saying “Apa?” However, RG is not successful completely, because HY keeps talking until he completes his utterance.

**BH(01):** Kata siapa sama? Gimana logika Pak Rocky | ini? |
Who says it’s the same? Where is your logic, Mr. Rocky? |

**RG(02):** Loh jadi? |
So? |

**BH(01):** Saya tidak mengerti. Begini begini begini, gini gini |
I don’t understand. Listen to me! |

**RG(02):** Ntar dulu |
Wait |

**BH(01):** Saya, gini gin, Ini menariknya Bang Rocky ini ya. |
I, well well, Mr. Rocky is interesting. |

**RG(02):** Begini ya Saudara Boni |
Listen to me, Mr. Boni |

**BH(01):** Ntar ntar ntar |
Wait wait wait |

**RG(02):** Anda mau jadi berapa kali jadi kadal menginterupsi saya? |
How many times do you want to be a lizard to interrupt me? |

**BH(01):** Nggak, karena anda cicak. Itu masalahnya. Saya harus menginterupsi | hmm |
No, because you are a gecko. That’s the problem. I have to interrupt you | hmm |

(7 / 01:49:33 – 01:49:50)

The dialogue above is another example of overlap interruption found in the data. In that situation, RG interrupts BH because he needs for clarification about Mr. Prabowo’s involvement in human rights violation by saying “Loh jadi?”, but BH does not give him a
chance. However, RG keeps interrupting him even though he cannot complete his utterance. In this situation, they share the floor because they talk at the same time.

**Butting – in Interruption**

Butting – in interruption is the type of interruption that occurs 5 times in the data. Butting – in Interruption occurs when the interrupter fails to interrupt the current speaker, because the current speaker keeps talking and ignores the interrupter, so the interrupter decides to stop interrupting the current speaker. The following dialogues show some occurrences of butting – in interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club.

**RG(02):** Justru Pak Jokowi nggak mampu jawab. Saya bayangkan dia nggak mampu jawab. Karena itu, coba Boni jawabnya apa?

Since Mr. Jokowi can’t answer it. I can imagine he can’t answer it. Therefore, what’s your answer, Boni?

**BH(01):** Nggak, begini begini, saya tanya balik kepada anda, Bung Rocky. Apakah pernah ada pengusutan secara resmi oleh institusi TNI tentang tindakan penculikan dan penghilangan pada 1998? Saya tanya pada anda |

No, well well, I ask you, Mr. Rocky. Was there an official investigation done by the TNI institution of the acts of kidnapping and disappearance in 1998? I ask you |

**RG(02):** Ya justru

Yeah because

**BH(01):** Ada nggak naskah resminya?

Is there an official document?

**RG(02):** Saya finalis. Saya hanya tanya itu [laughing]

I’m a finalist. I just ask it. [Laughing]

(3 / 01:46:45 – 01:47:06)

In the dialogue above, RG interrupts BH to show his agreement that there is an official investigation done by the TNI institution by saying “Ya justru”. However, RG fails to interrupts BH because BH keeps talking.

**BH(01):** Nggak nggak, pertanyaan saya adalah anda. Nggak pertanyaan saya adalah anda punya informasi nggak soal kasus ini, bahwa sudah ada investigasi resmi dan nama beliau ada didalam | daftar itu.
No no, my question is do you. No my question is do you have information about this case that there has been an official investigation and his name is on | that list?

**RG(02):** *Oke, jadi*  
Okay, so |

**BH(01):** *Nah, sekarang kamu mau membuat kesimpulan yang macam apa?*  
Well, what kind of conclusion do you want to make now?

**RG(02):** *Itu*  
That’s

**BH(01):** *Kamu mau membuat kesimpulan final seperti kamu menjawab pertanyaan anak SD, A B C ? Rocky Gerung adalah apa? A. Filsuf, B. Nabi palsu, C. Misalnya atau misalnya let say, let say let say itu contoh. Artinya | kalau itu yang kamu ma, let say*  
Do you want to make a final conclusion like you answer primary school question, A B C? Who is Rocky Gerung? A. Philosopher, B. False prophet, C. For example or for example let’s say, let’s say let’s say it’s an example. It means |

| if that’s what you want, let’s say

**RG(02):** *Oke, gini ya*  
Okay, listen to me!

**BH(01):** *Kalau itu yang kamu mau saya kira | kita pun*  
If that’s what you want, I think | we

**RG(02):** *Ya jawab*  
Yeah, just answer it

**BH(01):** *Kita pun akhirnya terjebak dalam kedunguan intelektual |*  
We are finally trapped in an intellectual ignorance |

**RG(02):** *Justru saya membongkar*  
Instead, I expose

**BH(01):** *Karena karena, tunggu dulu, karena pertanyaan itu tidak akan pernah membutuhkan jawaban tertutup |*  
Because because, wait, because that question never requires a closed answer|

**RG(02):** *Ini*  
This is
BH(01): *Institusi resmi TNI sudah melakukan investigasi dan Pak Jokowi tidak akan mungkin mengatakan ya atau tidak karena proses pengadilannya belum tuntas. Yang menjadi PR sejarah adalah kapan pengadilan dituntaskan* |

The official TNI institution has conducted an investigation and Mr. Jokowi will not be able to say yes or no because the court process has not been completed. The history’s duty is when the court is completed |

RG(02): *Barusan, dengar dengar*

You just, listen listen to me

BH(01): *Makanya tadi saya katakan, makanya tadi saya katakan Pak Jokowi ayo, karena kepolisian*

That’s why I said, I said, “come on Mr. Jokowi”, because of the police |

RG(02): *You*

You

BH(01): *Sebentar, ntar ntar, ntar ntar, makanya tadi saya katakan Pak Jokowi karena kepolisian sudah membentuk tim investigasi gabungan untuk kasus Novel....*

Wait, wait wait, wait wait, because of that I said that Mr. Jokowi because the police has formed a joint investigation team for the Novel Baswedan case....

(4 / 01:47:10 – 01:48:38)

The dialogue above is another example of butting – in interruption found in the data. In that situation, RG tries to interrupt BH in many times to develop the topic being discussed, which is about human rights violations by saying “Oke, jadi”. However, RG fails because BH keeps talking and ignores him.

**Silent Interruption**

Silent interruption has the lowest number of occurrence which is 3 times. Silent interruption occurs when the current speaker pauses before finishing his/her sentence because of something such as he/she may forget the word that he/she wants to say or he/she may want to take a breath. However, that silence is taken over by another speaker. The following dialogues show occurrences of silent interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club.

.... Let’s make a simulation. What is the answer to that question? You can’t say that there’ll not be that question. Perhaps, it will. Tell me what the answer is.

HY(01): Saya rasa kalau itu nggak usah Jokowi yang jawa. Saya aja bisa jawab | I think Jokowi doesn’t need to answer that question. I can answer it |

RG(02): Ya apa?

Yeah, what?

HS(01): Sesuai dengan putusan | dari dewan kehormatan tetap dia dipecat karena melanggar HAM. Saya aja yang jawab itu.

In accordance with the decision | of the honorary council, he is fired for violating human rights. Let me answer it.

RG(02): Justru Pak Jokowi nggak mampu jawab. Saya bayangkan dia nggak mampu jawab. Karena itu, coba Boni jawabnya apa?

Since Mr. Jokowi can’t answer it. I can imagine he can’t answer it. Therefore, what’s your answer, Boni?

(2 / 01:44:20 – 01:46:50)

In the dialogue above, RG takes the floor and asks HY when HY pauses before continuing his utterance to know his opinion about Mr. Prabowo’s involvement in human rights violation by saying “Ya apa?” In this situation, HY probably pauses to find appropriate words before continuing his utterance.

RG(02): Oke, saya teruskan ya. Oke, jadi menurut Pak Jokowi, Pak Prabowo terlibat |

Okay, I will continue. Okay, so, according to Mr. Jokowi, Mr. Prabowo was involved |

HY(01): Bukan Jokowi yang jawab | saya Henry Yosodiningrat yang jawab disini.

It is not Mr. Jokowi who answered it. It’s me, Henry Yosodiningrat who answered it here.

RG(02): Iya, kan sama jawaban dari tim itu kan, masa jawaban berbeda-beda. Yang benar aja loh.

Yes, your team’s answer is the same, isn’t it? It can’t be different.

(6 / 01:49:19 – 01:49:32)
The dialogue above is another example of silent interruption. In the dialogue above, HY takes the floor when RG pauses before continuing his utterance to show his disagreement with RG’s opinion about according MR. Jokowi, Mr. Prabowo is involved in human rights violation by saying “Bukan Jokowi yang jawab | saya Henry Yosodiningrat yang jawab disini.”

Conclusion

Based on the research results and discussions of types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club, the researcher draws a conclusion as follows:

In accordance with the first objective of the research, that is to identify the types of interruption in the Indonesia Lawyers Club, there are four types of interruption carried out by the both camps in the debate. They are simple interruption (SI), overlap interruption (OI), Butting-in interruption (BI) and silent interruption (SLI). Among the four types of interruption that appear in the debate, OI is the most dominant type of interruption found in the data. SI is the next type of interruption that appears dominantly after OI, and it is followed by BI. In contrast to OI, SLI has the lowest number of occurrence.
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