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ABSTRACT

This thesis entitled “Conversation Analysis of Interruption Found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club” is a study about types of interruption and functions of interruption in a television talk show named Indonesia Lawyers Club. There are eleven participants in the talk show, including the President of Indonesia Lawyers Club. This study aims (1) to identify the types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club, (2) to find out the functions of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. In conducting this study, the researcher employed a descriptive qualitative method since the data of this study are in the forms of words, phrases, clauses and sentences. 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). SI is the most dominant types of interruption found in the data. There are 20 occurrences of SI (51.28%), 9 occurrences of OI (23.08%), 6 occurrences of BI (15.38%) and 4 occurrences of SLI (10.26%). The results of this study also found that there are six functions of interruption employed in the talk show. They are agreement (AGR), clarification (CLA), assistance (ASS), disagreement (DIS), floor taking (FT), and tangentialization (TAN). Disagreement is the most dominant function of interruption found in the data. There are 21 occurrences of disagreement (53.85%), 11 occurrences of clarification (28.21%), 3 occurrences of floor taking (7.69%), 2 occurrences of agreement (5.13%) and 1 occurrence of assistance and tangentialization (2.56%).

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, Interruption, Types of Interruption, Functions of Interruption.
ABSTRAK

Skripsi yang berjudul “Conversation Analysis of Interruption Found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club” ini adalah sebuah kajian tentang jenis-jenis interupsi dan fungsi-fungsi interupsi di dalam sebuah program bincang-bincang televisi yang bernama Indonesia Lawyers Club. Ada sebelas partisipan dalam acara bincang-bincang tersebut, termasuk Presiden Lawyers Club itu sendiri. Kajian ini bertujuan: (1) untuk mengidentifikasi jenis-jenis interupsi yang ditemukan di dalam acara Indonesia Lawyers Club, (2) untuk menemukan fungsi-fungsi interupsi yang ditemukan di dalam acara Indonesia Lawyers Club. Dalam mengerjakan kajian ini, peneliti menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif karena seluruh data yang digunakan berupa kata, frasa, klausa dan kalimat. Hasil kajian ini menemukan bahwa terdapat empat jenis interupsi yang ditemukan di dalam acara bincang-bincang tersebut, yaitu simple interruption (SI), overlap interruption (OI), Butting-in interruption (BI) dan silent interruption (SLI). SI adalah jenis interupsi yang paling mendominasi yang ditemukan di dalam data. SI terjadi sebanyak 20 kali (51.28%), OI terjadi sebanyak 9 kali (23.08%), BI terjadi sebanyak 6 kali (15.38%) dan SLI terjadi sebanyak 4 kali (10.26%). Hasil kajian ini juga menemukan bahwa terdapat enam fungsi interupsi yang terdapat di dalam acara bincang-bincang tersebut, yaitu agreement (AGR), clarification (CLA), assistance (ASS), disagreement (DIS), floor taking (FT), dan tangentialization. DIS adalah fungsi interupsi yang paling dominan yang ditemukan di dalam data. DIS terjadi sebanyak 21 kali (53.85%), CLA terjadi sebanyak 11 kali (28.21%), FT terjadi sebanyak 3 kali (7.69%), AGR terjadi sebanyak 2 kali (5.13%), dan TAN terjadi sebanyak 1 kali (2.56%).

Kata Kunci: Analisis Percakapan, Interupsi, Jenis-jenis Interupsi, Fungsi-fungsi Interupsi.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Language plays a very important role in human life. It is a social phenomenon. Language as a means of communication is used to deliver messages, to argue or to express ideas, desires, and emotions to each other in society. Language is used in various fields, including business, government, education, law, entertainment, etc. In other words, language cannot be separated from human life in order to interact with one another. In general, the people interact through conversation.

Conversation is a form of communication that occurs between two or more people (speaker and listener) in order to exchange messages, ideas, or informations. 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 the participants in Indonesia Lawyer Club (ILC) with the theme *Menjelang Debat Capres 2019: Penegakkan Hukum Dimata 01 & 02*. For candidate number 01 are Joko Widodo and Ma'rif Amin. While, candidates number 02 are Prabowo Subianto and Sandiaga Salahuddin Uno. Jokowi-Ma'rif's party is Boni Hargens, Henry Yosodiningrat and Maman Immanulhaq. Prabowo-Sandi's party 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 Boni Hargens, Dahnil A. Simanjuntak, Fahri Hamzah, Haris Azhar, Henry Yosodiningrat, Maman Immanulhaq, Rachland Nashidik, Refly Harun, Rocky Gerung and Sujiwo Tejo. The debate has been held on Tuesday, January 15th,
2019, at 8:00 PM at TV One studio. The debate lasted for 2:45:58 hours. The source of the data is a video of Indonesia Lawyers Club with the theme Menjelang Debat Capres 2019: Penegakkan Hukum Dimata 01 & 02 that was taken from Indonesia Lawyers Club YouTube Channel (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y50qA9wt4og) and transcribed into text by the researcher.

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 party and Prabowo-Sandi's party. For this reason, the researcher intends to analyse this study.

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. Sukarni Ilyas who is known more by name Karni Ilyas is Indonesian journalist, editor in chief, host and enforcer. He was born on September 25, 1952 in Balingka, Agam, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia.

This research analyses 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) and the functions of interruption in conversation analysis by using a theory proposed by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li's Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse (2001: 269).
1.2 **Problems of the Study**

Based on the background of the study, the problems of the study that would be discussed are:

1. What are the types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club?
2. What are the functions of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club?

1.3 **Objectives of the Study**

Based on the problems of the study above, the objectives of the study are:

1. To identify the types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club.
2. To find out the functions of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club.

1.4 **Scope of the Study**

In conducting this research, the researcher limits the field which will be analysed to avoid misdirection. This research focuses on the analysis of the types of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club 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). The research also focuses on the analysis of the functions of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club by using a theory proposed by Murata (1994) and supported by Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li's *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269).
1.5 Significances of the Study

The results of this research are supposed to be helpful theoretically and practically to the readers which are as follow:

1. Theoretically, this research is expected to give an understanding and to enrich the study of clause complex in the field of conversation analysis, especially dealing with interruption.

2. Practically, this research is expected to give contribution to the readers, especially English Department’s students of University of Sumatera Utara in enriching their knowledge about conversation analysis of interruption. This research also can be a further reference to the readers who are interested in the study of conversation analysis.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter discusses the review of related literature which contains several theories related to interruption in conversation analysis which are used to guide the process of this research. The theories are about conversation, conversation analysis and interruption. In conducting this research, the researcher used some information from books, journals, internet websites and relevant studies of previous researches to support the idea of the analysis.

2.1 Conversation

Conversation can be defined as a form of communication that occurs between two or more people (speaker and listener) in order to exchange messages, ideas, or information. Liddicoat (2007: 1), stated that conversation is the way in which people socialize, develop, and sustain their relationship with each other. According to Brinker / Sager (2006) in Şaban Köktürk's International Journal of Linguistics (2012), a conversation is defined as an event conjointly established by at least two speakers during which the participants chat about at least one topic.

Based on the two definition of conversation conveyed by Liddicoat (2007) and Brinker and Sager (2006) in Şaban Köktürk's International Journal of Linguistics (2012), it can be concluded that conversation is an event which is at least two speakers communicate to discuss about a topic in order to sustain and develop their relationship in social life.

Conversation has become a special attention since a long time ago. At the first, the nature of talk has been denigrated as a subject for study. However, by
considering the role of conversation in social life, it is important to understand conversation as a linguistic activity. And since the 1960s, the analysis of conversation has become a field of the study (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990: 283).

### 2.2 Conversation Analysis

According to Liddicoat (2007: 2), Conversation analysis was originated from the ethno-methodological tradition in sociology proposed by Harold Garfinkel in the late 1960s and the study of social interaction by Erving Goffmann in the early 1970s. Following their works, Harvey Sacks, a Sociologist from the University of California, Los Angeles, began to examine a corpus of recorded telephone calls to the Los Angeles Suicide Prevention Center as a pioneering research of conversation analysis. His work was then developed by Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson.

According to Nguyen Van Tam (2016) in International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS), conversation analysis is interpreted briefly as an approach to the analysis of a spoken language. It only focuses on discussing text rather than other aspects. While Paltridge (2012: 90) cited 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. Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that conversation analysis is an approach to the analysis of spoken language in the form of text to know how the people interact in social life. It means that conversation analysis is one of branch of discourse analysis.

In the study of conversation analysis, there are several aspects of conversational interactions. Paltrridge (2012: 93) divided the aspects into conversational openings and closings, turn taking, sequences of related utterances (adjacency pairs), preferences for particular combinations of utterances (preference
organization), feedback, repair, discourse markers and response tokens. Beside the eight aspects stated by Paltridge, there are still other aspects such as backchannel and interruptions.

However in this research, the researcher is interested only in analysing interruption as one of the aspects in conversation analysis. 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) and the functions of interruption in conversation analysis by using a theory proposed by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden in Han Z. Li’s *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269). Following is the study or the theory of interruption.

### 2.3 Interruption

In many cases, turn taking in conversation may not always succeed because more than one person talking at the same time. It may be caused by interruption. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) said that to have an ideal conversation, the conversation should be organized so that no interruption occurs. Wardaugh (2006: 302) briefly defined interruption as the process of changing the topic prematurely in conversation.

Beaumont (2009: 910) in Chera Kurnia Larasati’s undergraduate thesis (2014) entitled *A Conversation Analysis of Interruptions in Modern Family Season 1 Series* assumes that interruption is speech performance that happens when a person starts to talk while the current speaker is talking and finally giving his/her floor. According to Beattie (1982: 93), interruption is a deviation from turn-taking rule. The basic rule
of turn taking is that when someone speaks, another listens, and after he/she completes his/her sentence, then the other person can speak, so the conversation goes well. However, people sometimes talk at the same time to interrupt the interlocutor. So, it can be said that the interruption is a deviation from turn-taking rule.

Ferguson (1977) in Beattie’s *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103) divides interruption into four types. They are simple interruption, overlap interruption, butting-in interruption, and silent interruption. While, there are three functions of interruption suggested by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li’s *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269): cooperative interruption, intrusive interruption, and neutral interruption. However, there are only two functions of interruption that will be discussed in this study. They are cooperative interruption and intrusive interruption. Cooperative interruption is divided into agreement, assistance, and clarification. While intrusive interruption is divided into disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangentialization.

### 2.3.1 Types of Interruption

Zimmerman and West (1996) stated that men interrupt more often than women in a male-female conversation. However, Beattie (1981a) did not find difference in either frequency or type of interruption between men and women in university tutorials. Ferguson (1977) in Beattie’s *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103) divides interruption into four types. The following are the four types of interruption according to Ferguson (1977).
a. Simple Interruption

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. In this situation, the interrupted person listens to the interrupter until he/she finishes his/her sentence, then the interrupted person gets his/her floor back. The example is as follow:

MT: ... People forget/that he was one of the best ministers of social/services this country's ever had

\[ \text{and he} \]

DT: \[ \text{but that's one kind of public spending.} \]

(Beattie, 1982: 101)

In the conversation above, DT immediately interrupts MT. In this situation, DT becomes an interrupter, while MT becomes an interrupted person. The simple interruption is showed here, where DT successfully takes the floor and makes MT stops her sentence to listens to DT's utterances.

b. Overlap Interruption

Overlap interruption occurs when the interrupter and the interrupted person talks in the same time. In other words, they share the floor. In this situation, the interrupter tries to interrupt the current speaker by taking the floor, 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. There is not break during this situation. The following is an example of overlap interruption.
LG: Not every other other country ev-every other malpractice our driving/our driving the way we behave in the street/

\begin{align*}
\text{everything else why are trade unions different}
\end{align*}

JC: \textit{look trade unions are a voluntary body}

trade unions are covered by the law too/they are covered by the law in a great many ways.

(Beattie, 1982: 102)

In the conversation above, overlap interruption is presented. In that situation, JC tries to interrupt LG. However, he is not successful completely, because when he will interrupt to express his opinion about the topic that is delivered by LG, LG keeps talking to complete his sentence. At the same time, JC also delivers his opinion completely even though LG repeats his words such as word 'other' to stop JC from interrupting him.

c. Butting - in Interruption

Butting - in interruption presents simultaneous speech. In this situation, there is not floor taking. It is because the interrupter fails when he/she tries 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. Below is an example of butting - in interruption.

JC: ... but if anybody suggests that in a democracy you can do more than that/then they're saying this shouldn't be a

\begin{align*}
\text{Democracy}
\end{align*}

LG: \textit{everybody else's malpractices}

JC: \textit{now heavens}
for heaven's sake/in Eastern Europe/you can/you can/perhaps enforce guidelines.

(Beattie, 1982: 102)

In the conversation above, butting - in interruption appears. In that situation, LG who becomes an interrupter fails to take the floor, because JC who becomes an interrupted person keeps talking and ignore him as if there is not disruption from LG. It makes LG gives up and decides to stop interrupting JC.

d. Silent Interruption

If the previous type is not found simultaneous speech, on silent interruption, simultaneous speech is found because the current speaker is silent before finishing his/her sentence. That silence is taken over by another speaker. Actually, the current speaker wants to continue his/her utterance, but 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, before continuing his/her utterance after a short pause, he/she is already interrupted instead by another speaker.

DT: ... and you gave a list which included/most of the public sector workers who have been on strike in the last few months/you said you would/pursue those disruptive elements with

(0)

MT: unremitting hostility, quite right

DT: yes and is that a word

MT: you have seen destructive elements today/yesterday on the television

(Beattie, 1982: 103)
The example above shows silent interruption. There is not simultaneous speech found in that conversation. In that situation, MT interrupts DT when DT pauses before continuing the sentence. However, since DT is interrupted by MT, she cannot complete the sentence and the floor is taken by MT to respond to what the DT has said.

2.3.2 Functions of Interruption

Zimmerman and West (1975) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103) define interruptions as ‘Violation of speaker’s turns to talk which disrupt the speaker’s turn to speak’. It means that interruption has a negative meaning. In some cases, interruption is considered disturbing and impolite in conversation. However, interruption is not always disturbing and impolite. Interruption sometimes can be helpful in a certain situation. It depends on the functions of interruption. In fact, interruption basically functions to take the floor in conversation by interrupting or cutting the first speaker's utterance before he/she finish his/her sentence.

Murata (1994) in Han Z. Li’s *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269) divides interruption into two functions. The two functions are cooperative interruption and intrusive interruption.

1. Cooperative Interruption

According to Murata (1994), cooperative interruption aims to help the current speaker by coordinating on the process of the ongoing conversation. It refers to the interrupter's enthusiasm and interest in the topic brought by the current speaker by giving a feedback even though the current speaker does not complete his/her
utterance yet. Murata does not give sub-categories for his cooperative interruption. However, Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li's *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269) divide cooperative interruption into two sub-categories. They are agreement and clarification. Whereas Han Z. Li (2001) adds one sub-category named assistance.

**a. Agreement**

Agreement is one of the two functions of interruption stated by Kennedy and Camden (1983). Interruption functions as an agreement if the interrupter interrupts the current speaker to show his/her concurrence, compliance, understanding, and support. The interrupter can show his/her agreement by adding, developing, or elaborating the idea which is delivered by the current speaker. Below is an example of interruption that shows agreement.

01 A: hm it is just that Selene is thinking one step further. (---)  
02 because well (. ) it's her fa:ther,  
03→ her [fa:ther has ] a new wi:fe,  
04→ B: [that's right]  
05 A: i mean it's a different situation.  

(Köktürk, 2012: 559)

As seen in the conversation above, B interrupts A to justify or approve what A has said by just saying "That's right". In this case, A just agrees to B's words without giving a reason.
b. Clarification

This function of interruption stated by Kennedy and Camden (1983) emerges when the interrupter needs for clarification from the current speaker by asking the current speaker to clarify or to explain the information or the message which is delivered before to make it clearer. In other words, this function aims to make the interrupter understand clearly what the current speaker has said. This function usually emerges in the form of question. The following is an example of clarification.

Lil: Bertha's lost, on our scale, about fourteen pounds

Damora: Oh :: no::.

→ Jean: Twelve pounds I think, wasn't it. =

→ Daisy: Can you believe it?

→ Lil: Twelve pounds on the Weight Watcher's scales.

(Sacks and Schegloff : 707)

In the conversation which consists of three people above shows clarification as the function of interruption. In that situation Jean interrupts Lil to clarify what Dean has said by saying "Twelve pounds", which previously Lil has said "fourteen pounds".

c. Assistance

Assistance is the function of interruption which is added by Han Z. Li (2001). In this situation, the interrupter realises that the current speaker needs for help to complete his/her utterance. The current speaker probably forgets something that he/she wants to say, so the interrupter helps him/her by providing word, phrase or
even sentence which is forgotten by the current speaker. The example of assistance is as follow.

M: So, I think she should be given the /the/

C: /The/ choice.

M: The choice. Or given the right to choose.

(Beaumont et al, 2004: 120)

In the example above, assistance appears as the function of interruption. M’s statement is incomplete because he / she forgets the next word that he / she wants say. In this case, C realises that M needs help, so he / she interrupts M to help her by telling the next word.

2. Intrusive Interruption

Intrusive interruption is the opposite of cooperative interruption. According to Murata (1994) in Han Z. Li, intrusive interruption poses threats to the current speaker because it disrupts the process of the ongoing conversation by taking the current speaker's floor intentionally. Intrusive interruption actually shows the meaning of the interruption itself which is considered annoying and impolite. Murata divides intrusive interruption into three sub-categories. They are disagreement, floor taking, and topic change. And one additional sub-category proposed by Kennedy and Camden (1983), it is tangentialization.

a. Disagreement

This function is the opposite of agreement where the interrupter does not support the current speaker's utterance. Otherwise, the interrupter cuts negatively what the current speaker says. Disagreement appears when the interrupter disagrees
with the idea or the utterance of the current speaker, so he/she interrupts the current speaker immediately to deliver his/her opinion. The following is the example of disagreement.

J: But by the time you get out of the shower and get your d- self ready,
→ M: Well I'm not ready. I haven't kept you waiting yet though, have I?
J: Michael, you will, I know you will

(Sacks and Schegloff : 722)

The example above shows disagreement as the function of interruption. In that conversation, M interrupts J because he disagrees to J's statement. J has said that M would get ready, but M actually does not agree with J by saying that he is not ready.

b. Floor Taking

Floor taking emerges when the interrupter takes the floor with the aim of developing the topic being discussed by the current speaker. In this case, the interrupter does not intend to change the topic being discussed by the current speaker, but he/she just want to develop or expand it. The example of floor taking is as follow.

(6) 1 Peg: The part I didn't like was putting
  2 everybody's snow pants and boots
  3 and
→ 4 Marge: Oh yeah that was the worst part,
  5 Peg: and scarves
→ 6 Marge: and get them all bundled up in boots
  7 and everything and they're out for half
an hour and then they come in and
they're all covered with this snow and
they get that shluck all over

Peg: All that wet stuff and

Jan: That's why adults don't like snow huh?

Marge: That's right.

Peg: Throw all the stuff in the dryer
and then they'd come in and sit for
half an hour

Marge: And in a little while they'd want
to go back out again.

Peg: Then they want to go back out again.

(Tannen, 1989: 278)

In the conversation which consists of three people above, floor taking emerges. Marge interrupts Peg to develop the topic being discussed. In this case, it seems that Marge feels interested in the topic brought by Peg, so she gives her opinion.

c. Topic Change

If in the previous function (floor taking), the interrupter takes the floor to develop the topic being discussed by the current speaker. In topic change, the interrupter takes the floor with the purpose to change the topic being discussed by the current speaker. It probably occurs because the interrupter is not interested in the topic or he/she may be interested in other topic, so he/she changes the topic. In this
case, the interrupter is more aggressive than in the floor-taking. Below is the example of topic change.

H:  I think [that]  
W:  Do you want some more salad?  

(Tannen, 1989: 269)

In the example above, W interrupts H to change the topic that is brought by H because he/she wants to offer a salad. Whereas, H just wants to say what he/she is thinking about. W’s interruption makes H cannot complete what he wants to say.

d. Tangentialization

Tangentialization is the additional function of interruption proposed by Kennedy and Camden (1983). In this situation, the interrupter summarizes the information that the current speaker wants to say because that information has ever been delivered in the previous conversation or it is already known by the interrupter, so the interrupter does not want to hear that information anymore. Here is the example of topic change.

Y:  Dia ituh dia kaya ngelakuin (2) memperlakukan gue enak aja nyaman  
He he is like do (2) treat me nice like just being comfortable  
gitu sebenernya sama personalitinya dia gue juga ga seratus persen in.  
actually with his personality I am also not a hundred percent very in  
R:  Kalo kata gue ya kalo udah dapat gitu mendingan lu jalanin dulu aja  
In my opinion if you already have like this it’s better to just go on with him  
tapi jangan terlalu pake hati [yang gimana itu] itu kan sakit.  
but just do not give wholeheartedly [things like that] that hurts  
Y:  [iya iya iya] iya I know I know
[yes yes yes] yes I know I know

gue udah anticipate maksudnya ibaratnya kalo misalkan ga ada dia

I already anticipate I mean if for example he is not there anymore

gimana ya udah ga pa pa ga masalah.

well that’s okay not a problem.

(Augustina Lestary, 2017: 58)

In the example of tangentialization above, it can be seen if Y interrupts R because she does not want to hear what R will say next because she already knows. It can be proved by Y who says "Yes I know I know", where previously, R tries to give W a piece of advice.

2.4 Relevant Studies

In conducting this research, the researcher uses some references about conversation analysis of interruption to support this research. The following are some relevant studies to support this research.

Han. Z. Li (2001) through his journal *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* investigates whether culture plays a role in the use of interruption in conversations especially in simulated doctor-patient conversations. This research involves 40 Canadians and 40 Chinese as the participants who formed in 40 dyads in experimental conditions. This research results four findings. The first one is in the Chinese speaker-Chinese listener interactions, cooperative interruptions occur more frequently than intrusive interruptions. The second one is Canadians who serve as doctor show more intrusive interruptions than cooperative ones. The third one is the two intercultural groups show more unsuccessful interruptions than the two intracultural groups. The last one
is in the intercultural conditions, intrusive interruptions occur more frequently than cooperative interruptions.

The journal above contributes in helping the researcher to understand the functions of interruption in conversation analysis proposed by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) in conducting this research. The differences between the research above and this research are the research problems and the data. The research above aims to investigate whether culture plays a role in the use of interruption in conversations especially in simulated doctor-patient conversations. The data in the research above is utterances of 40 Canadians and 40 Chinese. Whereas, this research aims to identify the types of interruption proposed by Ferguson (1977) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103) and to find out the functions of interruption suggested by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983). The data in this research is a debate video of Indonesia Lawyer Club (ILC) that is transcribed into a text.

Chera Kurnia Larasati (2014) analysed a conversation analysis of interruptions in *Modern Family Season 1 Series*. There are two problems in this study. The first one is what types of interruptions are presented in *the TV series Modern Family Season 1* and the second one is what functions of the interruptions are presented in *Modern Family Season 1*. This research uses a descriptive qualitative method. The source of the data is the transcript of the dialogues spoken by the characters in *Modern Family Season 1* and the video of the series. The result of this research shows that simple interruption is the highest frequency of the types of interruptions with 34 times out of 57 total data (59.65%) and butting-in interruption as the lowest frequency of the type of interruptions with 2 data (3.51%). For the
functions of interruption, disagreement gets the biggest percentage with 35.09% and appears 20 times and clarification with only 1 occurrence (1.76%).

The research above contributes in helping the researcher to understand the types of interruption and the stated by Ferguson (1977) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103) and functions of interruption in conversation analysis proposed by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) in conducting this research. The problem of the study in this research is the same as the research above. The first problem of the study is to identify the type of interruption in conversation analysis proposed by Ferguson (1977) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103) and the second problem is to find out the kind of function of interruption in conversation analysis proposed by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li's *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269). The differences between the research above and this research are the data and the method of the study. The data of the research above is the transcript of the dialogues spoken by the characters in *Modern Family Season 1* and the video of the series. Meanwhile, the data in this research is a debate video of Indonesia Lawyer Club (ILC) that is transcribed into a text. The research above uses a descriptive qualitative method proposed by Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009). While in conducting this research, the researcher uses a descriptive qualitative method proposed by Creswell (2014).

Amalia Lestari Putri (2014) analysed a socio-pragmatic on interruptions performed by the male characters in *New Girl: Season 2 TV Series*. This research has three problems of the study. They are What the linguistic features are employed in
the interruptions performed by the male characters in *New Girl: Season 2 TV series*,
What types of interruptions appear in the conversation by the male characters in *New Girl: Season 2 TV series*, and What the purposes of the interruptions are performed by the male characters in *New Girl: Season 2 TV series*. A descriptive qualitative method is used in this research. The data is in the form of dialogues which contain interruptions performed by the male characters in *New Girl: Season 2 TV series*. While the source of the data the script of *New Girl: Season 2 TV series* episode 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, and 22. The result suggested that command becomes the highest frequency of feature with 18 times out of 34 total data. Meanwhile, swearing becomes the lowest frequency of feature with 2 times out of 34 total data. Besides, overlap interruption becomes the highest frequency of types of interruption with 27 times out of 34 data and simple interruption with 3 times out of 34 data as the lowest frequency. As the last result, disagreement becomes the highest frequency of the purpose of interruption with 11 times out and clarification becomes the lowest frequency with one time out of 34 total data.

The research above contributes in helping the researcher to understand the types of interruption and the stated by Ferguson (1977) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan (1982:101-103)* and functions of interruption in conversation analysis proposed by Murata (1994) in conducting this research. The differences between the research above and this research are the research problems, the theory of functions of interruption used, the data, and the method of the study. The research above solves three problems of the study. The first problem is to identify linguistic features in the interruptions performed by the male characters in *New Girl: Season 2 TV series*. The second one is to identify the types of interruption which appear in the conversation
by the male characters in *New Girl: Season 2 TV series*. And the last one is to find out the purposes of the interruptions performed by the male characters in *New Girl: Season 2 TV series*. Meanwhile, this research only has two problems of the study. They are 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. The research above and this research use the same theory in analysing the type of interruption. It is the theory proposed by Ferguson (1977) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103). However, for the functions / purposes of interruption, the research above and this research use the theory which is slightly different. The research above uses the theory suggested by Murata (1994) and Zhao and Gantz (2003: 354). Whereas in this research, the researcher uses the theory of Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li’s *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269). The data of the research above is in the form of dialogues and script of *New Girl: Season 2 TV series* episode 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, and 22. Whilst for this research, the data is a debate video of Indonesia Lawyer Club (ILC) that is transcribed into a text. For the method of the study used, the research above uses a descriptive qualitative method proposed by Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009). Meanwhile, this research uses a descriptive qualitative method proposed by Creswell (2014).
2.5 Conceptual Framework

![Conceptual Framework Diagram]

**Figure 2.1 Conceptual Framework**
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Following the previous chapter, this chapter discusses the information on the side of research methodology. This chapter also presents the procedures used in conducting the research. It concerns how the researcher collects and analyses the data.

3.1 Research Design

At this stage of the study, the researcher discusses the research method used to understand about the steps in conducting the research. In this research, the researcher uses a descriptive qualitative method. The aim of this research is to analyse a holistic picture or non-numerical data, to answer the question ‘what’ in the study, and to give a deep understanding. According to Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2014) in their third editions book entitled *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*, qualitative data 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. According to Creswell (2014), qualitative designs focus on data collection, analysis, and writing, but they originate out of disciplines and flow throughout the process of research (e.g., types of problems, ethical issues of importance).

Qualitative method usually works with a small number of the data analysed as a sample. While quantitative method generally works with a large number of the data analysed as a sample to find a statistical significance. The findings of qualitative research have a quality of indeniability. Method of analysis is divided into exploring,
describing, ordering, explaining, and predicting. Furthermore, this study used descriptive qualitative research because it was conducted 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.

### 3.2 Data and Source of Data

Creswell (2014) divides qualitative data into four types. They are qualitative observation, qualitative interviews, qualitative documents, and qualitative audio and visual materials. In this research, the type of the data is qualitative audio and visual materials because it is in the form of videotape that is transcribed into a text.

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. The source of the data is Indonesia Lawyer Club YouTube Channel ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y50qA9wt4og](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y50qA9wt4og)). The debate is led by Karni Ilyas as the President of Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC) and followed by Boni Hargens, Dahnil A. Simanjuntak, Fahri Hamzah, Haris Azhar, Henry Yosodiningrat, Maman Immanulhaq, Rachland Nashidik, Refly Harun, Rocky Gerung and Sujiwo Tejo. The debate has been held on Tuesday, January 15, 2019, at 8:00 PM at TV One studio. The debate lasted for 2:45:58 hours.
3.3 Data Collection

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. In order to ease the process of analysis, the researcher takes several steps in collecting the data as follow:

a. Downloading the data from Indonesia Lawyers Club YouTube Channel.
b. Watching the video of the debate.
c. Transcribing the data into a text.
d. Reading the full transcription text.
e. Understanding the contents of the transcription text especially the interruption found in the debate.
f. Listing the types and the functions of interruption that are found in the data.
g. Collecting all the data needed.

3.4 Technique of Data Analysis

The technique of data analysis used in this research is the interactive models proposed by Creswell (2014) that consists of six steps of data analysis. The six steps of data analysis 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.
3.4.1 Organizing and Preparing Data for Analysis

This step involves transcribing the data, scanning the material, typing field notes, cataloguing all of the visual material, and sorting and arranging the data into different types depending on the sources of information.

3.4.2 Reading through All Data

This step provides a general understanding of the information and an opportunity to understand its overall meaning. At this stage, the researcher starts to write notes in the form of transcripts or observational field notes, or recording general thoughts about the data. While for visual data, sketchbook of ideas begins to form.
3.4.3 Coding the Data

Rossman & Rallis (2012) states as cited in Creswell (2014) that coding is the process of organizing the data by bracketing chunks (or text or image segments) and writing a word representing a category in the margins. It involves taking data (text or pictures) gathered during data collection, dividing sentences (or paragraphs) or images into categories, and labelling those categories with a term based on the actual language of the participant (it is called an *in vivo* term).

3.4.4 Generating Descriptions/Themes for Analysis

In this step, the coding process is used to generate descriptions of the setting or people. It involves a detailed rendering of information about people, places, or events in a setting. The coding is also can be used to generate themes or categories. These themes are the ones that appear as major findings in qualitative studies and are often used as headings in the findings of studies. They should display multiple perspectives from individuals and be supported by diverse quotations and specific evidence.

3.4.5 Interrelating Themes/Descriptions

In this step, the researcher should determine how the description and themes are represented. The most popular approach is to use a narrative passage to convey the findings of the analysis. Many qualitative researchers use visuals, figures, or tables as adjuncts to the discussions. In this research, the researcher uses table to display the findings of the analysis as follows:
Table 3.1 Types and Functions of Interruptions Found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club

| No. | Types of Interruption          | Functions of Interruption | Percentage (%) |
|-----|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
|     |                                | Cooperative Interruption  |                |
|     |                                | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN | Total |
| 1.  | Simple Interruption            |     |     |     |     |    |    |     |       |
| 2.  | Overlap Interruption           |     |     |     |     |    |    |     |       |
| 3.  | Butting-in Interruption        |     |     |     |     |    |    |     |       |
| 4.  | Silent Interruption            |     |     |     |     |    |    |     |       |
|     | Total                          |     |     |     |     |    |    |     |       |
|     | Percentage (%)                |     |     |     |     |    |    |     |       |

3.4.6 Interpreting the Meaning of Themes/Descriptions

In the last step, the researcher makes an interpretation of the findings of the analysis. It can be the researcher's interpretation about what lessons can be learned. It can also an interpretation derived from comparison with information obtained from the literature or theories. In this way, author informs that the findings confirm the past information or diverge from it. In many qualitative articles, researchers also discuss the literature at the end of the study.

Based on the steps of data analysis proposed by Creswell (2014) above, the researcher analyses the data which is in the form of utterances of the debate participants as follows:

1. Reading the clauses or sentences.
2. Identifying the clauses or sentences.
3. Analysing the clauses or sentences based on the theory proposed by Ferguson (1977) in Beattie’s *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103) about the types of
interruption and a theory proposed by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li's *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269) about the functions of interruption.

4. Classifying the clauses or sentences into four types of interruption based on Ferguson's theory (1977) in Beattie's *Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan* (1982:101-103).

5. Classifying the clauses or sentences into seven functions of interruption based on a theory proposed by Murata (1994) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li's *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269).

6. Making conclusion.
CHAPTER IV
DESCRIPTION AND FINDINGS

This chapter presents the description and finding of conversation analysis of interruption on a television talk show program: Indonesia Lawyers Club. This chapter describes the data analysis and reveals the answers of the research problems. The data is a video of Indonesia Lawyers Club with the theme *Menjelang Debat Capres 2019: Penegakkan Hukum Dimata 01 & 02* that was taken from Indonesia Lawyers Club YouTube Channel and transcribed into text by the researcher. There are eleven participants in the debate, including the president of Indonesia Lawyers Club. The debate participants will be symbolized by letters as follows: Boni Hargens (BH), Dahnil A. Simanjuntak (DS), Fahri Hamzah (FH), Haris Azhar (HA), Henry Yosodiningrat (HY), Kurni Ilyas (KI), Maman Immanulhaq (MI), Rachland Nashidik (RN), Refly Harun (RH), Rocky Gerung (RG) and Sujiwo Tejo (ST). This chapter consists of two main parts. They are data description and finding.

4.1 Data Description

This part provides a deep explanation and the examples of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. This part is divided into types of interruption and functions of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club.

4.1.1 Types of Interruption Found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club

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). He divides interruption into simple interruption (SI), overlap interruption (OI), butting - in interruption (BI) and silent interruption (SLI).

Based on the data of this study, the researcher found that there are 39 interruptions in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. The type of interruption which is used most dominantly is SI which appears 20 times. Then, there is OI which appears 9 times, BI which appears 6 times and SLI which appears 4 times.

4.1.1.1 Simple Interruption

Simple interruption is the type of interruption that occurs 20 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:** .... 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:** 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:** 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....)
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.

FH: ....Ya karena -nya saya sebenarnya berterima kasih kepada ILC ini, bang Karni, ya, karena kita nanti didalam konsepsi pembentukkan negara hukum, itu jasa ILC ini saya kira lebih besar dari jasanya negara itu, ya |
(Yeah because of that, I actually thank ILC, Mr. Karni, yeah because we, in the conception of the establishment of a legal country, ILC’s contribution are bigger than this country’s, yeah |)

KI: Jangan terlalu dong.
(Don’t mention it!)

FH: Yaa, | karena |
(Yeah, | because)

KI: Negara ini lebih luas
(This country is wider)

FH: Karena negara ini kadang-kadang berhenti memberikan pengertian tentang hukum, ya. Negara terjebak kepada, apa namanya, mengeluh ya. Negara terjebak keluar dari narasi....
(Since this country sometimes stops giving the explanation about law. It’s trapped in, what should we call it? A complaint, right? It’s stuck out of narrative....)

(5 / 01:07:59 – 01:30:52)

The dialogue above is another example of silent interruption found in the data. In this situation, KI successfully interrupts FH to show his disagreement that actually ILC’s contribution in establishing a legal country is not bigger than the country’s contribution itself by saying “Jangan terlalu dong.” However, FH finally tells the reason for his statement.

For further occurrences of simple interruption found in the data, see appendix number 2, 3, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38 and 39.
4.1.1.2 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:** 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:** Sudah dijawab | (It has been answered |)

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

**HS:** 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:** Eh saudara (Eh you)

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

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

**HS:** Sudah itu. (That’s it.)

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

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

(9 / 01:48:50 – 01:49:18)
In the dialogue above, RG tries to interrupts 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: Kata siapa sama? Gimana logika Pak Rocky ini?
(Who says it’s the same? Where is your logic, Mr. Rocky?)
RG: Loh jadi?
(So?)
BH: Saya tidak mengerti. Begini begini begini, gini gini
(I don’t understand. Listen to me)
RG: Ntar dulu
(Wait)
BH: Saya, gini gin, Ini menariknya Bang Rocky ini ya.
(I, well well, Mr. Rocky is interesting.)
RG: Begini ya Saudara Boni
(Listen to me, Mr. Boni)
BH: Ntar ntar ntar
(Wait wait wait)
RG: Anda mau jadi berapa kali jadi kadal menginterupsi saya?
(How many times do you want to be a lizard to interrupt me?)
BH: Nggak, karena anda cicak. Itumasalahnya. Saya harus menginterupsi
hmm
(No, because you are a gecko. That’s the problem. I have to interrupt you
hmm)

(11 / 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.

For further occurrences of overlap interruption found in the data, see appendix number 14, 18, 22, 25, 28, 33 and 35.
4.1.1.3 Butting – in Interruption

Butting – in interruption is the type of interruption that occurs 6 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.

BH: 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: Oke, jadi (Okay, so)

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

RG: Itu (That’s)

BH: Kamu mau membuat kesimpulan final seperti kamu menjawab pertanyaan anak SD, A B C? Rocky Gerung adalah apa? A. Filosuf, 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: Oke, gini ya (Okay, listen to me)

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

RG: Ya jawab (Yeah just answer it)

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

RG: Justru saya membongkar (Instead, I expose)

BH: 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: Ini
(This is)

BH: *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: *Barusan, dengar dengar* | (You just, listen listen to me)

BH: *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: *You* | (You)

BH: *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....)

In the dialogue above, 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.

FH: *Kalau bisa ada simulasi lain, Bang Rocky. | Supaya* | (Can we use another simulation, Mr. Rocky? | So)

RG: *Oke, jadi bagaimana you mau akal sehat? | Dengan sok sok, sok* | (Okay, what kind of common sense do you want? | By by, by)

FH: *Karena gini. Saya jawab. Saya bantu jawab ya Bung Rocky ya, | karena ini nggak akan fair kita bahas diforum kecil.* | (Since, I’ll answer it. I’ll help answering it, Mr. Rocky. Since, it will not be fair if we discuss it in a small forum.)

RG: *Oke. Ya saya fair. Dua-duanya saya tanya.* | (Okay, yeah I’m fair. I ask the both parties.)

The dialogue above is another example of butting – in interruption found in the data. In this situation, RG fails to interrupt FH because FH keeps talking, so he cannot complete his utterance. Rocky interrupts FH to ask more explanation from HY (the opposite party) about common sense by saying “Oke, jadi bagaimana you
mau akal sehat? | Dengan sok sok, sok”. However, FH interrupts RG again. And this time, RG responds him.

For further occurrences of butting - in interruption found in the data, see appendix number 7, 23, 24 and 32.

4.1.1.4 Silent Interruption

Silent interruption has the lowest number of occurrence which is 4 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.

**RG:** ....Kita bikin simulasi saja. Pertanyaan itu jawabannya apa. Anda nggak bisa bilang nggak akan ada pertanyaan itu. Mungkin aja ada. Coba apa jawabannya kira-kira.
(.... 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:** Saya rasa kalau itu nggak usah Jokowi yang jaw. Saya aja bisa jawab |
(I think Jokowi doesn’t need to answer that question. I can answer it |)

**RG:** Ya apa?
( Yeah, what? )

**HY:** 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:** 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?)

(6 / 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:** 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:** 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:** 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.)

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 involving Mr. Jokowi, Mr. Prabowo in human rights violation by saying “Bukan Jokowi yang jawab | saya Henry Yosodiningrat yang jawab disini.”

For further occurrences of silent interruption found in the data, see appendix number 1 and 17.

### 4.1.2 Functions of Interruption Found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club

This section discusses the functions of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. The identification of the functions of interruption is based on a theory proposed by Murata (1994) and supported by Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li's *Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse* (2001: 269). Murata (1994) divides interruption into two functions. The two functions are cooperative interruption and intrusive interruption. And then, Kennedy and Camden (1983) divide cooperative interruption into agreement (AGR) and clarification (CLA) and Han Z. Li (2001) adds assistance (ASS). While, Murata
(1994) divides intrusive interruption into disagreement (DIS), floor taking (FT), and topic change (TC) and Kennedy and Camden (1983) add tangentialization (TAN).

Based on the data of this study, the researcher found that there are 39 interruptions in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. The function of interruption which most dominantly appears is DIS which appears 21 times. Then, there is CLA which appears 11 times, FT which appears 3 times followed by AGR which appear 2 times. ASS and TAN are the function of interruption that appear less frequently which are 1 time. Meanwhile, TC is not found at all in this research.

4.1.2.1 Cooperative Interruption

Cooperative interruption aims to help the current speaker by coordinating on the process of the ongoing conversation. It usually occurs to show the interrupter's enthusiasm and interest in the topic that is being discussed by the current speaker. Kennedy and Camden (1983) in Han Z. Li’s Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse (2001: 269) divide cooperative interruption into agreement and clarification, and Han Z. Li (2001) adds one function named assistance.

4.1.2.1.1 Agreement

Agreement is the function of interruption that occurs 2 times in the data. Agreement occurs when the interrupter interrupts the current speaker to show his/her concurrence, compliance, understanding, and support. The two occurrences of agreement in the data are shown below.

RG: 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:** 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:** Ya justru
(Yeah because)

**BH:** Ada nggak naskah resminya?
(Is there an official document?)

**RG:** Saya finalis. Saya hanya tanya itu [laughing]
(I’m a finalist. I just ask it [laughing])

(7 / 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, RC cannot complete his utterance because BH keeps talking, so RG decides to let BH finish his utterance.

**BH:** ....Kita juga mengapresiasi Polri tenyata sudah merespon itu, tapi kita juga mau melihat masa lalu seperti apa, tapi kalau misalnya kita seret diskusi ini pada hal-hal yang bersifat tuduhan ya misalnya Pak Rocky tadi suruh jawab, apakah Pak Prabowo pelanggar HAM? Ya jelas bukan, secara hukum. Bukan |
(We also appreciate that the National Police has responded, but we also want to see what the past looks like, but if we bring this discussion to an accusation, yeah for example, Mr. Rocky has asked to answer, is Mr. Prabowo a human rights violator? Of course not, based on the law, he isn’t. He isn’t )

**RG:** Yaudah
(Alright)

**BH:** Siapa bilang Pak Prabowo pelanggar HAM secara hukum? |
(Who says that Mr. Prabowo is legally human rights Violator? )

(23 / 02:00:31 – 02:01:59)

The dialogue above is another example of agreement found in the data. In the example above, RG interrupts BH to show his agreement that Mr. Prabowo is actually not a human rights violator by saying “Yaudah”. However, BH keeps talking and ignores RG.
4.1.2.1.2 Clarification

Clarification is the next function of interruption that appears dominantly in the data after disagreement which is 11 times. Clarification occurs when the interrupter needs a clearer explanation from the current speaker by asking the current speaker to re-explain the information or the message delivered before. The following dialogues show some occurrences of clarification found in the data.

**HY:** Kita sama-sama pernah merasakan, pernah mengetahui bahwa harga daging sapi di Indonesia ini pernah mencapai RP 150.000 per kilo. Sementara di negara lain itu hanya 40.000, 45.000. Jokowi mencari penyebab, kemudian ternyata terungkap bahwa itu adalah permainan dari mafia daging sapi yang dikendalikan oleh ada sekitar 28 perusahaan penggembong sapi. Mereka itulah yang mengendalikan itu. Ini adalah satu mafia dan ini sekarang sudah diselesaikan. Artinya suatu keberanian yang selama ini praktek itu sering terjadi, muncul tenggelam, muncul tenggelam. Dipemerintahan Jokowi brek selesai habis | tidak pernah muncul.

(We have ever experienced, ever known that beef price in Indonesia has reached Rp 150.000 per kilogram. While in another country, it’s only Rp 40.000, Rp 45.000. Jokowi has managed to find the cause. And then, it has been revealed that it’s because of a mafia that consists of about 28 cow bearer companies. They have controlled it. It’s because of a mafia, and it has already been resolved. It means that it’s courage that during this time, this practice often occurs. It appears then disappears. It’s finished | under Jokowi’s leadership.)

**KI:** Ya tapi 130.000 juga satu kilo. Apa ada mafia yang baru lagi yang gantiin?

(Yeah, but it’s still Rp 130.000 per kilogram. Is there a new mafia that changes the old one?)

**HY:** Bahwa harga naik lagi tentunya karena permintaan juga, mungkin karena, mungkin juga di luar negeri. Sekarang saya belum belum lihat data terakhir ya. Di luar negeri mungkin juga bisa 150.000 juga | atau 140.000 sekarang.

(The price goes up again definitely because of market demand too. It’s probably because. Perhaps, in abroad. I have not seen the latest data. In abroad, it’s probably Rp 150.000 | or Rp 140.000 now.)

(2 / 00:35:59– 00:36:57)

In the dialogue above, KI successfully takes the floor and interrupts HY because he needs for a clearer explanation about the reason for the high price of beef which is caused by a mafia. And whether that mafia is changed by a new one or not?
Because the beef price is still high. KI interrupts HY by asking “Ya tapi 130.000 juga satu kilo. Apa ada mafia yang baru lagi yang gantiin?” And then, HY responds him by giving a clearer explanation.

**RG:** [laughing] Ini dia mau jawab, you halangin coba. | Loh ini Dahnil mau jawab. Ngapain you
((laughing] He wants to answer it, but you obstruct him. | Dahnil wants to answer. Why do you)

**FH:** Ini ini Bung Rocky punya, punya simulasi lain gak Om Rocky? Punya simulasi lain gak?
(You, Mr. Rocky, do you have another simulation, Mr. Rocky? Do you have another simulation?)

**RG:** Punya masih banyak. Tenang tenang!
(Yes, I do. Calm down!)

**FH:** Yaudah |
(Alright !)

**RG:** Saya sa sa saya. Ya
(I I I. Yeah)

**FH:** Geser aja simulasi jangan yang ini. [Laughing]
(Just change the simulation. Don’t use this one. [Laughing])

(19 / 01:56:52 – 01:57:08)

The dialogue above is another example of clarification found in the data. In the dialogue above, FH successfully interrupts RG to ask another simulation by saying “Ini ini Bung Rocky punya, punya simulasi lain gak Om Rocky? Punya simulasi lain gak?”, so the debate participants will understand more about the topic being discussed by Rocky. In this case, Rocky cannot complete his utterance.

For further occurrences of clarification found in the data, see appendix number 4, 6, 9, 11, 20, 24, 28, 33 and 37.

### 4.1.2.1.3 Assistance

Assistance has the lowest number of occurrence which is 1 time. Assistance occurs when the interrupter realises that the current speaker needs for help to complete his/her utterance because he/she probably forgets something that is wanted to say. The following dialogue shows the occurrence of assistance found in the data.
The dialogue above is the example of assistance found in the data. In the dialogue above, KI takes the floor to help HA by giving him an appropriate word when he cannot complete his sentence because he does not know what the appropriate word which is suitable for the meaning of the word ‘euphemism’. That word is ‘Penghalusan’.

4.1.2.2 Intrusive Interruption

Intrusive interruption shows the meaning of interruption that is considered disturbing and impolite because it disrupts the process of the ongoing conversation by taking the current speaker's floor intentionally. Murata divides intrusive interruption into disagreement, floor taking, and topic change. Besides, Kennedy and Camden (1983) add tangentialization.

4.1.2.2.1 Disagreement

Disagreement is the most dominant function of interruption found in the data which is 21 times. Disagreement appears when the interrupter interrupts the current speaker to show his/her disagreement with the idea or the utterance of the current
speaker. The following dialogues show some occurrences of disagreement found in the data.

**HY:** *Bahwa harga naik lagi tentunya karena permintaan juga, mungkin karena, mungkin juga di luar negeri. Sekarang saya belum belum lihat data terakhir ya.* Di luar negeri mungkin juga bisa 150.000 juga | atau 140.000 sekarang.  
(The price goes up again definitely because of market demand too. It’s probably because. Perhaps, in abroad. I have not seen the latest data. In abroad, it’s probably Rp 150.000 | or Rp 140.000 now.)

**KI:** *Gak, 60.000 di Singapur.*  
(No, it’s Rp 60.000 in Singapore.)

**HY:** *Saya belum bisa, belum bisa memastikan harga diluar itu bang Karni. Terima kasih.*  
(I can’t, I can’t confirm the price in abroad, Mr. Karni. Thank you.)

In the dialogue above, KI successfully interrupts HY for the second time to show his disagreement about the beef price in other countries which are not as expensive as in Indonesia, because the beef price in Singapore is actually cheaper than in Indonesia. He interrupts HY by saying “*Gak, 60.000 di Singapur.*”

**MI:** *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 should be no a debate because it will break a dignity |)

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

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

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

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

**RG:** *Bukan itualah. Bukan itu yang saya bilang*  
(No, it is not what I said)

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

(14 / 01:50:30 – 01:51:36)
The dialogue above is another example of disagreement. In the dialogue above, RG and DS who are Prabowo – Sandi’s camp try to interrupt Jokowi – Ma’ruf’s camp, MI, because they do not agree with what MI says about there should not be a debate because it will break the dignity. In this situation, RG says, “Gini gini gini, bukan”, while DS says, “Bukan itu konteksnya.”

For further occurrences of disagreement found in the data, see appendix number 5, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38 and 39.

4.1.2.2.2 Floor Taking

Floor Taking is the function of interruption that occurs 3 times in the data. Floor taking occurs when the interrupter interrupts the current speaker to develop the topic being discussed by the current speaker. The two occurrences of floor taking in the data are shown below.

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

MI: 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 a debate because it will break a dignity |)

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

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

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

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

RG: Bukan itulah. Bukan itu yang saya bilang
(No, it is not what I say)

MI: Ya, nggak, bukan, ya saya paham Bung Rocky....
(Yeah, no, no, yeah I understand Mr. Rocky....)
In the dialogue above, RG who is a current speaker is successfully interrupted by MI. MI interrupts RG to develop the topic being discussed by the debate participants about the question asked by RG and about there should not be a debate because it will break the dignity 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.

RG: Oke, jadi bagaimana you mau akal sehat? | Dengan sok sok, sok
(Okay, what kind of common sense do you want? | By by, by)

FH: Karena gini. Saya jawab. Saya bantu jawab ya Bung Rocky ya, | karena ini nggak akan fair kita bahas diforum kecil.
(Since, I’ll answer it. I’ll help answering it, Mr. Rocky. Since, it will not be fair if we discuss it in a small forum.)

RG: Oke. Ya saya fair. Dua-duanya saya tanya.
(Okay, yeah I’m fair. I ask the both parties.)

FH: Jadi gini, presidennya Pak Habibie, lewat. Gusdur, lewat. Ibu Mega juga lewat. Di zaman Ibu Mega, Ibu Mega memilih Pak Prabowo sebagai calon wakil presiden....
(Well, President Habibie has passed. President Gusdur has passed. President Mega has passed. When Mrs. Mega has become a president, she has chosen Mr. Prabowo as the vise president....)

KI: Ya
(Yeah)

FH: Mungkin simulasi ini agak berat ini kalau kita bahas malam ini.
(This simulation is probably a bit heavy if it is discussed tonight.)

(21 / 01:57:14 – 01:58:20)

The dialogue above is another example of floor taking found in the data. In this situation, FH successfully takes the floor and interrupts RG to develop the topic being discussed by RG by saying “Karena gini. Saya jawab. Saya bantu jawab ya Bung Rocky ya, | karena ini nggak akan fair kita bahas diforum kecil”, so RG cannot complete his utterance.

For one more occurrence of floor taking found in the data, see appendix number 8.
4.1.2.2.3 Topic Change

Topic change occurs when the interrupter takes the floor with the purpose to change the topic being discussed by the current speaker because he/she is not interested in the topic being discussed. However, function of interruption belongs to topic change is not found at all in this study.

4.1.2.2.4 Tangentialization

Tangentialization has the lowest number of occurrence which is 1 time just like assistance. Tangentialization occurs when the interrupter summarizes what the current speaker wants to say because it has ever been delivered in the previous conversation or it is already known by the interrupter, so the interrupter does not want to hear it anymore. The following dialogue shows the example of tangentialization found in the data.

BH: *Hak Asasi, Hak Asasi Manusia itu, Hak Asasi Manusia itu bang. Saya kira dalam hal ini saya setuju dengan anda, Bung Rocky. | Hak Asasi memang hak* 
   (Human rights, human rights, human rights are. I think I agree with you, Mr. Rocky, in this case. | Human rights)

RG: *Tu, dia saja bilang setuju dengan saya. Bilang dia yang salah. Saya sudah pasti benar tu.* 
   (See! He says that he agrees with me. Tell him, he’s wrong! I’m definitely right.)

BH: *Hak. Saya selesaian dulu [laughing]. Hak asasi itu memang melekat pada diri, karena sifatnya dia kontrol, apa, eksistental, delusi ontology....* 
   (Right. Let me finish it [Laughing]. Human rights are inherent in ourselves because they control, what, existential, ontology delusion....)
   *(29 / 02:04:15 – 02:04:54)*

In the dialogue above, RG interrupts BH to summarize what BH wants to say about human rights by saying “*Tu, dia saja bilang setuju dengan saya. Bilang dia yang salah. Saya sudah pasti benar tu.*” Actually, in this case, BH agrees with RG that human right are inherent in ourselves.
4.2 Findings

There are 39 interruptions found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club. The researcher found four types of interruption in the data, which are simple interruption (SI), overlap interruption (OI), Butting-in interruption (BI) and silent interruption (SLI). SI is the most dominant type of interruption found in the data. There are 20 occurrences of SI (51.28%), 9 occurrences of OI (23.08%), 6 occurrences of BI (15.38%) and 4 occurrences of SLI (10.26%). The researcher also found six functions of interruption, which are agreement (AGR), clarification (CLA), assistance (ASS), disagreement (DIS), floor taking (FT), and tangentialization (TAN). Disagreement is the most dominant function of interruption found in the data. There are 21 occurrences of disagreement (53.85%), 11 occurrences of clarification (28.21%), 3 occurrences of floor taking (7.69%), 2 occurrences of agreement (5.13%) and 1 occurrence of assistance and tangentialization (2.56%).

To make it more complete, the researcher counted the dominant types of interruption and functions of interruptions found in the data by putting them into percentage using the general formula of percentage (Bungin, 2001: 118) as follows:

\[ N = \frac{f(x)}{n} \times 100\% \]

\( N \) : the percentage result

\( f(x) \) : total types of the sub category

\( n \) : total types of all categories

Based on the general formula of percentage above, the findings of the data analysis or data description are presented in the following table.
| No.   | Types of Interruption          | Functions of Interruption | Total | Percentage (%) |
|-------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|----------------|
|       |                               | Cooperative Interruption  |       |                |
|       |                               | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |       |                |
| 1.    | Simple Interruption           | -   | 4   | -   | 13  | 2  | -  | 1   | 20    | 51.28%          |
| 2.    | Overlap Interruption          | -   | 4   | -   | 5   | -  | -  | -   | 9     | 23.08%          |
| 3.    | Butting-in Interruption       | 2   | 2   | -   | 1   | 1  | -  | -   | 6     | 15.38%          |
| 4.    | Silent Interruption           | -   | 1   | 1   | 2   | -  | -  | -   | 4     | 10.26%          |
| **Total** |                               | 2   | 11  | 1   | 21  | 3  | 0  | 1   | 39    | 100%            |
| **Percentage (%)** |                               | 5.13% | 28.21% | 2.56% | 53.85% | 7.69% | 0% | 2.56% | 100% |
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

The following is the example of the data that is in the form of word, phrase, clause and sentence: (a) “Apa?” (the example in the form of word), (b) “Setengah menit setengah menit” (the example in the form of phrase), (c) “Institusi resmi TNI sudah melakukan investigasi dan Pak Jokowi tidak akan mungkin mengatakan ya atau tidak karena proses pengadilannya belum tuntas.” (the example in the form of clause) and (d) “Sebentar, ini harus diklarifikasi.” (the example in the form of sentence). Besides, based on the research description and findings of types and functions of interruption in the Indonesia Lawyers Club, the researcher draws two conclusions as follows:

1. 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 found in the data. 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, SI is the most dominant type of interruption found in the data. OI is the next type of interruption that appears dominantly after SI, and it is followed by BI. In contrast to SI, SLI has the lowest number of occurrence.

2. In accordance with the second objective of the research, that is to find out the functions of interruption found in the Indonesia Lawyers Club, there are six functions of interruption found in the data from seven functions. They are agreement (AGR), clarification (CLA), assistanc (ASS), disagreement (DIS),
floor taking (FT), and tangentialization (TAN). Among the six functions of interruption that appear in the debate, disagreement is the most dominant function of interruption that appears. Clarification is the next function of interruption that appears dominantly after disagreement. The next function of interruption that is found in the data is floor taking followed by agreement. Meanwhile, assistance and tangentialization has the lowest number of occurrence. While topic change (TC) are not found in the data.

5.2 Suggestion

Based on the results of the research, the researcher would like to give some suggestion as follows:

1. To the Students of English Department
   It will be better if the students of English Department pay more attention to conversation analysis deeply because there are a lot of phenomena in human daily conversations that can be studied and analysed. By learning the conversation analysis, the students’ conversation skills will be improved. They are not only able in using spoken or written language, but also in understanding the conversation structures and its occurrences.

2. To the English Department of University of Sumatera Utara
   It is suggested that the English Department of University of Sumatera Utara can add Conversation Analysis as a new subject to be studied to improve the students’ knowledge and skills in understanding not only the spoken and written language, but also its phenomena and structure.
3. To the Other Researchers

To the next researchers who want to conduct the similar research, it is suggested that they should understand all of the conversation analysis aspects especially dealing with interruption, so that they will not face any significant problem in the future in conducting the research. This research is focused only in the types and the functions of interruption. So, the next researcher is suggested to analyse the interruption phenomena in other perspectives.
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APPENDIX I

Indonesia Lawyers Club
Menjelang Debat Capres 2019: Penegakan Hukum Di mata 01 & 02

[Commercial break]

Karni : Pemirsia, dalam keadaan yang terbaik, manusia itu adalah makhluk yang paling mulia dibanding makhluk-makhluk lain di muka bumi ini, tapi tanpa hukum dan keadilan, manusia itu adalah makhluk yang terburuk kata Aristoteles. Sekarang giliran dari Mas Maman Immanulhaq.

Maman : Terima kasih bang Karni dan seluruh pemirsia ILC. Dalam nawacita jilid 2 jelas sekali yang pertama adalah penegakan sistem hukum yang tanpa korupsi dan bermartabat dan terpercaya itu menjadi salah satu misi capres cawapres Joko wi - Ma'ruf Amin. Tentu ini menjadi prioritas bagi kami, terutama di periode kedua nanti. Yang pertama Jokowi sudah jelas menjadikan hukum tidak sebagai instrumen kekuasaan tetapi instrumen untuk menegakkan keadilan. Ini jelas kalau kita melihat dibeberapa kasus misalnya. Banyak orang bertanya kenapa orang-orang yang ada di partai koalisi pendukung Jokowi ini masih tetap saja, apa namanya, ditangkap misalnya soal korupsi. Ini menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada intervensi sama sekali. Jokowi memberikan, apa namanya, kepercayaan penting kepada KPK termasuk kepada Kepolisian untuk menegakkan hukum. Nah, ketika kita ngomong soal korupsi misalnya, di Perpres no. 43 2018 sudah jelas bahwa yang disasar oleh Jokowi bukan hanya korupsi perseorangan, tapi korporasi. Ini sebuah kemajuan besar. Saya dua kali di- digundul untuk dukung eksistensi KPK zamannya pak SBY dengan teman-teman, dan sampai hari ini saya melihat bahwa sesungguhnya komitmen Jokowi untuk menjadikan apena penegakan atau mewujudnya good governance itu menjadi prioritas. Nah, ketika penegakan HAM, kita tahu bahwa dari satu pemerintahan ke pemerintahan yang lain, kesulitan selalu terjadi seperti apa yang dikatakan oleh bang Haris. Dulu saya dikontrak juga ngikut beliau. Tetapi satu hal bahwa kita harus mengakui ada kemajuan. Yang pertama, presiden menginstruksikan kepada Jaksa Agung untuk Menindaklanjuti seluruh laporan-laporan dari Konmas HAM. Ini sebuah kemajuan. Yang kedua, kalau buktinya sulit diketemukan maka sesungguhnya ada jalur non Yudisial. Walaupun beberapa keluarga yang menjadi korban pelanggaran Hak Asasi Manusia berat menolak itu. Tetapi paling tidak ini sudah ada kemajuan dibanding dari pemerintahan-pemerintahan yang lama. Begitu pula kita bisa melihat sesungguhnya reformasi agraria. Minoritas yang tidak dijadikan komunitas pengalihan isu dan lain sebagainya itu terjadi hari ini. Bagaimana ada kemajuan yang sangat mendasar dalam penegakan Hak Asasi Manusia di zaman Jokowi ini. Dan saya rasa ini bagian penting untuk melibatkan CSO NGO dan lain sebagainya agar Indonesia lebih maju dan kita tidak mungkin sangat kemanusiaan. Saya masih ingat ketika bom bom bom Thamrin terjadi, Presiden Jokowi sedang ada di rumah saya di Jatiwangi. Ketika itu disebut paling penting yang saya dengar dari Jokowi ketika itu adalah dia bilang saya lebih senang berhadapan dengan ribuan santri yang akan menatap Indonesia dengan optimisme tanpa hoax, tanpa fitnah, tanpa radikalisme dan terorisme daripada mengikuti genderang kelompok teroris yang terus-terus mencoba melakukan delegitimasi terhadap negara, terhadap aparat dan lain sebagainya. Nah, inilah sebenarnya yang menjadi fokus bagi kita sebenarnya dan sangat sangat apa sangat sangat menjadi harapan kedepan bahwa Jokowi adalah sebuah harapan untuk penegakan hukum,
untuk menegakkan hak asasi manusia, untuk penangangan terorisme dan juga tentu penanganan korupsi karena Indonesia tidak akan pernah hancur karena berbeda karena kita memang Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. Indonesia tidak akan pernah hancur karena bencana karena sesungguhnya kita bagian dari daerah yang selalu terkena bencana. Yang akan menghancurkan Indonesia adalah korupsi yang dilakukan kelompok elit dan keputusasaan kelompok elit yang tidak diberi harapan karena ditakut-takuti oleh pemerintah Indonesia akan hancur dan sebagainya. Kita tahu kalau hari ini, saya baru pulang dari Kuala Lumpur bang Karni. Saya bangga banget ketika Mahathir menyebutkan inilah Indonesia kedepan menjadi harapan dan kita yakin akan menjadi negara maju 4 besar di dunia. Terima kasih bang Karni.

Karni : Optimisnya bang Maman ini luar biasa. Sekarang, Dahnil Simanjuntak.
Dahnil : Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. Assalamualaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh. Terima kasih Buya Karni.
Karni : Wa'alaikumsalam.
Dahnil : Pertama, Prabowo - Sandi itu fokus memang. Ada lima fokus dan tig fokus yang ketiga adalah penegakan hukum yang berkeadilan, yang adil dan penguatan demokrasi. Jadi dua hal ini saling melengkapi dalam perspektif Prabowo dan sandi. Nah, tentu untuk, apa, untuk menawarkan solusi-solusi kepemimpinan, Pak Prabowo dan Bang Sandi membangun tradisi menyimak, menyimak perasaan yang dialami oleh publik, menyimak rasa keadilan publik di tengah masyarakat. Nah, masyarakat menemukan fakta ketidakadilan yang mereka alami. Nah, tentu fakta-fakta itu kemudian berangkat dari kami bang, Pak Prabowo dan Bang Sandi bangun tradisi berpikir. Jadi ketidakadilan ini kenapa hadir, setelah menyimak itu kemana ketidakadilan ini masih ada kriminalisasi di banyak tempat yang dialami bukan hanya oleh petani bukan hanya oleh buruh tapi juga oleh kelompok agama umama dan sebagainya. Nah, ini kita pikirkan bersama-sama untuk menemukan solusi, apa sih solusinya? Ternyata salah satu solusi pentingnya dan masalah yang hadir dan itu harus ditemui kenali formula penyelaisannya itu adalah kepemimpinan yang tidak memimpin. Jadi, kami menemukan fakta ada presiden yang tidak memimpin kepemimpinan yang tidak memimpin bukan dalam konteks mengintervensi hukum. Jadi ibarat hukum itu satu rel, kalau kemudian dia berjalan di rual luar rel yang sudah disediakan, maka pemimpin presiden harus memastikan dia kembali pada relnya. Itu fungsi dari kepemimpinan yang memimpin tadi. Nah, kepemimpinan yang tidak memimpin itu kemudian menyebabkan banyak, apa, orang-orang atau para pihak yang mempunyai otoritas di sekitar presiden dan kemudian di sekitar hak kekuasaan itu menggunakan hukum untuk kepentingan-kepentingan politik. Ini yang mengkhawatirkan bagi kami, intervensi politik terhadap penanganan hukum dan penegakan hukum, itu bukan hanya merusak hukum itu sendiri tapi merusak demokrasi lebih lebih luas. 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

Henry : 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 menyebab kebohongan nanti salah persepsi masyarakat. Ini ditonton oleh jutaan orang.

Dahnil : Jadi, baik saya lanjutkan. Pemimpin yang memimpin itu dia mampu menangani banyak hal dengan kepemimpinan yang kuat. Jadi maka oleh sebab itu, salah satu misalnya dalam upaya memastikan hukum tetap berjalan di rel nya misalnya secara teknis saja kami ingin pastikan misalnya Jaksa Agung itu harus dipimpin atau ditunjuk. Jaksa Agung itu adalah orang-orang yang berintegritas dan independen, dalam bahasa Pak Prabowo dan Bang Sandi kita harus pastikan walaupun mereka berdua adalah orang politik, harus pastikan Jaksa Agung itu dijabat oleh orang-orang yang independent dan bukan berasal dari partai politik untuk memastikan intervensi terhadap hukum itu tidak terjadi. Nah, itu yang secara teknis akan dilakukan oleh Pak Prabowo dan Bang Sandi. Kemudian yang kedua, terkait dengan tadi misalnya banyak tantangan apa pelanggaran HAM masa lalu yang tadi disebutkan oleh Bung Haris dan sebagainya. Pak Prabowo tentu berangkat dari prajurit, seorang prajurit
berani bertanggung jawab terhadap apapun yang dia lakukan, bahkan beliau menyebutkan kalau memang ada pengadilan silakan saja diadili. Nah, tentu beliau akan juga memfasilitasi misalnya ketika beliau jadi presiden memastikan bawasannya kasus-kasus pelanggaran HAM masa lalu seperti Talangsari, seperti apa Trisakti, seperti Semanggi, seperti kemudian Aceh, kasus DOM di Aceh, kemudian apa kasus-kasus pelanggaran HAM terhadap petani-petani dan sebagainya juga kemudian diselesaikan termasuk kasus Novel Baswedan. Jadi terkait dengan itu, penerimaan dan sikap beliau clear karena ini terus diulang-ulang seperti tadi kemudian disebutkan, maka Beliau juga berulang kali menyatakan secara satria ndak ada masalah. Jadi kepemimpinan beliau sama sekali tidak ada beban terkait dengan pelanggaran-pelanggaran HAM itu. Yang jelas, beliau akan memastikan bawasannya orang-orang yang berada di sekitar beliau itu adalah bukan orang-orang yang melakukan pelanggaran HAM, orang-orang yang bisa memberikan masukan dan memastikan hukum itu berlaku adil. Kemudian terkait korupsi. Nah, ini jadi perhatian khusus misalnya Pak Prabowo itu menyebutkan ya korupsi kita memang sedang mengalami stadium 4. Nah, misalnya beliau menyebutkan contoh kita lihat indeks persepsi korupsi Indonesia semenjak 95 sampai dengan 2017. Jadi KPK misalnya membuat indeks persepsi korupsi itu per jabatan presiden. Kalau Kemudian tadi Kang Maman menyebutkan membaik justru di era Pak Jokowi. Nah, memang ada permasalahan dengan penanganan kasus korupsi dan kepemimpinan penanganan korupsi di Indonesia. Nah, ini kemudian harus diperbaiki dengan cara-cara yang lebih menyeluruh. Nah, bagi kami ada apa ada pendekatan yang kami sebut sebagai three in one policy misalnya, kemudian mendorong memastikan misalnya hakim, kepolisian, kejaksaan dan sebagainya. Itu salary-nya cukup. Memang ini klasis tapi kemudian ini harus dilakukan, bahkan dalam konteks gaji harus dipastikan mereka mereka lebih makmur ketimbang dibandingkan dengan pejabat-pejabat negara yang lain. Kemudian ada infrastruktur sistem yang diperbaiki, ada perhatian-perhatian kita selama ini kurang pada perbaikan sistem untuk memastikan penanganan korupsi bekerja dengan baik. Kemudian ketiga tentu perhatian terkait dengan penanganan Korupsi adalah kontrol terhadap aset dan sebagainya. Nah, yang paling operasional tentu adalah bagaimana caranya menguatkan KPK sebagai salah satu institusi-institusi penanganan korupsi, pencegahan dan penanggulangan korupsi. Nah, ini bisa dikuatkan misalnya secara fiskal untuk memperbesar itu klasis yang bisa kita lakukan kemudian yang paling penting adalah menguatkan KPK secara internal, melalui apa? Melalui penyidik-penyidik yang independen. Kita ingin memastikan dan ingin mendorong memastikan misalnya KPK punya penyidik independen yang lebih banyak misalnya dalam waktu 5 tahun itu bisa ada tambahan 300 sampai dengan 400 penyidik independen yang di-hire oleh KPK dengan independen itu tadi. Sehingga tidak ada conflict of interest, tidak ada konflik antar institusi di dalam KPK dan KPK bisa bertindak lebih cepat dan lebih baik. Nah, kemudian yang terakhir Bang Karni, korupsi-korupsi yang yang apanya yang menyentuh hajat hidup orang banyak ini menjadi perhatian khusus bagi Pak Prabowo dan Bang Sandi. Menyentuh hajat hidup orang banyak itu makannya adalah korupsi-korupsi di pangan misalnya, korupsi-korupsi yang terkait dengan sumber daya alam dan sebagainya. Jangan sampai kemudian permasalahan korupsi kita itu sekedar ramai di media tapi kemudian tidak punya impact secara langsung terhadap masyarakat. Oleh sebab itu, korupsi-korupsi di sektor pangan, korupsi di sektor sumber daya alam ini menjadi apa fokus yang penting bagi Pak Prabowo dan Bang Sandi. Misalnya tadi jangan sampai kemudian muncul Kementerian Perdagangan bilang impor kemudian kementrian Bulog bilang tidak perlu, tapi kemudian presiden diam, tidak bisa bilang apa-apa. Sehingga tetap dilakukan impor. Nah, ini yang tadi yang saya maksud sebagai presiden yang tidak memimpin. Nah, dalam hal ini, Pak Prabowo harus bisa pastikan dan akan bisa pastikan bawasannya kalau harus impor, kalau tidak impor, tentu itu adalah keputusan yang didasari oleh data yang benar, bukan oleh kepentingan rente. Saya pikir itu.

Karni           : Baik, pemirsa, kita rehat sejenak.
[Commercial break]

Karni : Pemirsya, setelah mendengar orasinya Fahri Hamzah, kita lanjutkan diskusi kita. Sekarang giliran Boni Hargens.

Boni : Selamat malam. Terima kasih, Bang Karni. Setelah dua jam akhirnya saya bicara juga. [Laughing]

Karni : [Laughing]

Boni : Saya dari tadi mendengar dari bapak-bapak ini. Saya menyepakati dua hal, bang. Satu, bahwa proses politik ini seharusnya menjadi sebuah Perhelatan konseptual. Jadi, sebuah kontestasi, kontestasi gagasan, bukan perang atau bukan pertempuran yang bersifat pragmatis. Yang kedua, bahwa isu debat pertama 17 Januari ini ya isu sentral soal Hak Asasi Manusia, soal korupsi, soal pertahanan dan keamanan. Saya mengibaratkan perdebatan kali ini soal ada sampah yang menumpuk di ujung sungai, di muara. Lalu pertanyaannya adalah siapa yang ahli dibalai mengangkat sampah ini. Padahal ada pertanyaan lain yang lebih penting, siapa yang menyebabkan sampah ini menumpuk disini? Dan bagaimana kita bisa mengantisipasi supaya sampah ini tidak lagi menumpuk dan mengganggu aliran sungai?

Empat tahun Pak Jokowi disibukkan oleh kerja keras untuk membersihkan sungai yang tumpuk sampahnya luar biasa. Dalam isu HAM misalnya, dalam isu HAM ada panggaran Hak Asasi Manusia berat dimasa lalu sudah dua puluh tahun lebih tidak tuntas-tuntas. Dan Pak Jokowi empat tahun juga belum mampu untuk menuntaskan itu. Lalu diera Pak Jokowi tadi disebut oleh teman-teman dari oposisi adalah kasus misalnya penyiraman Novel Baswedan. Saya kira kita perlu mengapresiasi inisiatif dari Kepolisian yang merespon rekomendasi dari Komnas HAM. Saya kira kita perlu mengapresiasi inisiatif dari Kepolisian yang merespon rekomendasi dari Komnas HAM soal kasus ini dengan membentuk tim investigasi, investigasi gabungan kemarin tanggal 18 Januari. Saya kira ini inisiatif yang baik, dengan efektif masa kerja yang enam bulan. Dan perlu juga nanti dilanjutkan misalnya komitmen dari pemerintahan Pak Jokowi untuk membentuk tim gabungan investigasi penyelesaian kasus penculikan dan penghilangan aktivis yang terjadi tahun 1998. Dan harus ditetapkan masa masa efektif kerjanya misalnya enam bulan atau delapan bulan. Sehingga ini ada kepastian juga buat masyarakat bahwa memang pemerintahan ini juga memang mau menegakkan Hak Asasi Manusia. Tetapi sekali lagi harus dilihat juga sampah-sampah menumpuk ini kenapa. Dan dalam konteks ini, disu Hak Asasi Manusia, saya melihat posisi pak Prabowo akhirnya sedikit, bukan sedikit, sangat kontras tertinggal dibelakang pak Jokowi karena namanya ada didalam daftar tadi Haris sudah bilang didalam daftar orang-orang yang harus bertanggung jawab pada beberapa pelanggaran hak asasi dimasa lalu. Ya meskipun dikubu Pak Jokowi juga kita harus akui ada beberapa teman dari masa lalu juga terseret di dalamnya. Tetapi, saya melihat proses demokratik ini berjalan dengan baik, dengan efektif, dengan efisien dan efektif.

Tetapi Pak Jokowi sendiri sebagai pribadi sangat bersih dari dosa sejarah seperti ini. Lalu yang kedua, soal masalah korupsi. Ini persoalan yang bagi saya sendiri sebagai akademisi, saya melihat korupsi ini satu virus besar yang menyebabkan proses demokratik ini berjalan dengan baik. Kita berteriak pada narasi yang gagah-gagah, dan ahlinya narasi hebat tu Pak Rocky. Tetapi sebenarnya kosong semuanya. Karena pada rongrongan oleh kor-praktek korupsi yang luar biasa di instansi-instansi pemerintahan, di DPR, di termasuk dipartai politik. Nah, ini bukan perkara satu tahun, perkara dua tahun. Ini perkara puluhan tahun, tiga puluh dua tahun orde baru itu adalah sebuah masa penghancuran demokrasi, sebuah masa yang paling korup dalam sejarah Indonesia, dan lalu kita menuntut Pak Jokowi selesaikan dalam empat tahun, buat saya ini kurang fair juga. Tetapi bahwa harus dan terus melakukan pembahasan. Dan disituah saya melihat ada kemajuan besar dalam empat tahun ini dengan mengusung gagasan pemerintahan yang bersih, clean government, good government. Pak Jokowi mampu memperlihatkan bahwa korupsi itu bisa diberantas. Saya sepakat dengan Pak Fihary, bahwa wajar kominar disesuaikan oleh pemerintahan itu, karena mususahnya pendekatan ini ke dalam pembahasan itu dan dari ini mereka mampu melakukan koordinasi, karena kasus Pak Budi Gunawan itu buat saya ini sebuah kasus yang sangat memalukan bagi kinerja pemerintah hukum ketika itu. Dan kita bangga bahwa konstitusi-konstitusi ini kemudian belajar dari pengalaman itu untuk kemudian melakukan inter-agency coordination. Jadi, koordinasi antara antar antar sektor. Itu dari sisi. Lalu dari sisi pertahanan dan keamanan, saya belum masuk
ke teknis soal visi misi dari para kandidat. Tetapi, saya melihat disini akan menjadi perdebatan sangat yang seriuss. Ini melihat dari konstilasi pertarungan ini, kelompok-kelompok tim suksesnya. Lalu kemudian, apa, ponsutul politik yang mereka bangun sebagai agenda visi misi ataupun program kerja di sub pertahanan keamanan. Ini kita lihat di kubu Pak Prabowo misalnya, saya baca ada ada ada visi misi bahwa akan membangun pertahanan keamanan yang lebih kuat dengan meningkatkan anggaran pertahanan setiap tahun secara reguler. Ini juga menarik. Tetapi nanti mesti ada penjelasan yang lebih masuk akal, korelasinya dengan ekonomi, dengan kesiapan physical, dengan pendapat negara dan sebagainya dan sebagainya, karena sebagian besar dalam visi misi yang saya baca dikubu Pak Prabowo itu luar biasa hebat diatas kertas, tetapi kita tahu bahwa itu akan sangat sulit untuk diwujudkan. Ketika ada didalam ruang kekuasaan banyak tantangan yang akan muncul. Yaa misalnya membenahi korupsi. Ini bagaimana mungkin ya, karena belum berkuasa aja sudah ada kader Pak Prabowo - Sandi yang terseret kasus korupsi, meskipun belum diproses di pengadilan. Ya artinya saya melihat apakah nanti debat ini menjadi sebuah tontonan yang mencerdaskan dan memberi harapan atau kita akan diseret lagi ke dalam ruang kosong dimana kita semua akhirnya digamangkan oleh proses politik ini. Nanti perdebatan soal Hak Asasi Manusia tentu saja diatas kertas Pak Jokowi akan menang menghadapi Pak Prabowo, karena bebas dari beban sejarah. Tetapi sekali lagi, pertanyaan terbesar diuAMH adalah kalau Pak Prabowo yang jadi presiden, mampu nggak Pak Prabowo misalnya mengusut tuntas kasus penculikan atau penghilangan aktivis 1998 misalnya. Itu akan jadi retorika memang. Atau misalnya Pak Jokowi kembali terpilih, bisa konkrit apa misalnya yang harus dilakukan untuk mencegah kemungkinan pelanggaran HAM seperti dalam kasus Novel Misalnya. Ya dan saya nnta kenapa saya lebih optimis kalau Pak Jokowi berkuasa lagi kita berada pada gerak linear yang meyakinkan bahwa dalam berbagai dimensi bangsa ini akan lebih baik termasuk didalam penegakkan HAM, didalam pemberantasan korupsi dan sebagainya. Tetapi sekali lagi ini baru memasuki debat pertama dan ini akan ada lima debat dan pada kuartal pertama proses politik ini kita sudah sebutulnya dimbakukkan oleh praktek politik ini menjadi pertarungan kebohongan, pertarungan fitnah, pertarungan kebencian. Dan warna itu begitu kental. Warna itu retorika kita. Saya kira itu Bang Karni | sebagai provokasi awal dari saya. Terima kasih.

Karni : Baik, terima kasih. Giliran Rocky Gerung.

Rocky : Bagus tadi Saudara Boni berupaya untuk mengolah beberapa imajinasi supaya bisa dihasilkan solusi itu. Dan Pak Fahri tadi memperlihatkan kualitas orang legislator. Jadi, setelah Pak Fahri bicara itu ada standard legislator. Narasinya harus segitu. Debatnya harus tingkat paradigmatic itu. Demikian juga seputulnya tim sukses harus ditingkat itu. Sekarang coba saya uji secara, dalam simulasi sejauh mana kita bisa meradikalisir kasus ini. Pak Jokowi, “Pak Jokowi, apakah Pak Prabowo pelanggar HAM?” Publik ingin kalimat itu diucapkan oleh finalis, tapi finalis nggak bisa ucapkan itu. Dia cuma disuruh bikin pertanyaan dan akan diundi. Sangat mungkin pertanyaan itu
tak terundi karena memang tak dibuat. Tapi demi keadilan logika, sekarang pasti kalau saya tanyakan itu, "Pak Jokowi, apakah Pak Prabowo terlibat dalam pelanggaran HAM?" Bayangkan kegugupan Pak Jokowi untuk menjawab pertanyaan itu. Tapi saya tahu saudara-saudara bisa bantu Pak Jokowi untuk menjawab itu. Ada tiga orang didepan saya, tolong bantu beri jawaban, kira-kira apa jawabannya. Kang Maman, Saudara Henry atau Boni Hargens. Kita bikin simulasi saja. Pertanyaan itu jawabannya apa. Anda nggak bisa bilang nggak akan ada pertanyaan itu. Mungkin aja ada. Coba apa jawabannya kira-kira.

**Henry:** Saya rasa kalau itu nggak usah Jokowi yang jawab. Saya aja bisa jawab.

**Rocky:** Ya apa?

**Henry:** Sesuai dengan putusan dari dewan kehormatan tetap dia dipecat karena melanggar HAM. Saya aja yang jawab itu.

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

**Boni:** Nggak, begini begini, saya tanya balik kepada anda, Bung Rocky. Apakah pernah ada penguatan secara resmi oleh institusi TNI tentang tindakan penculikan dan penghilangan pada 1998? Saya tanya pada anda.

**Rocky:** Oke, jadi.

**Boni:** Nah, sekarang kamu mau membuat kesimpulan yang macam apa?

**Rocky:** Itu.

**Boni:** Kamu mau membuat kesimpulan final seperti kamu menjawab pertanyaan anak SD, A B C D? 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 mau, kalau itu yang kamu mau, kalau itu yang kamu mau, let say

**Rocky:** Oke, gini ya.

**Boni:** Kalau itu yang kamu mau saya kira kita pun.

**Rocky:** Jawab.

**Boni:** Kita pun akhirnya terjebak dalam kedunguan intelektual.

**Rocky:** Justru saya membongkar.

**Boni:** Karena karena, tunggu dulu, karena pertanyaan itu tidak akan pernah membutuhkan jawaban tertutup.

**Rocky:** Ini.

**Boni:** 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.

**Rocky:** Barusan, dengar dengar.

**Boni:** Makanya tadi saya katakan, makanya tadi saya katakan Pak Jokowi ayo, karena kepolisian.

**Rocky:** You.

**Boni:** Sebentar, ntar ntar, ntar ntar, makanya tadi saya katakan Pak Jokowi karena kepolisian sudah membentuk tim investigasi gabungan untuk kasus Novel. Sebaiknya juga bentuk tim investigasi gabungan untuk kasus penculikan penghilangan 1998. Dan perlu saya sampaikan juga, Bang Karni. Saya tidak melarang cicak atau kadal menginterepsi saya, silahkan, Artinya. Silahkan Bung Bung Rocky mau mau merespon saya? Terima kasih.

**Rocky:** Tidak, saya nggak menginterepsi, memang hak saya buat bicara. You yang jadi kadal. [Laughing] Oke ya saudara kadal, saya.

**Karni:** Ya ya anda lanjutkan anda lanjutkan. Serius dulu.

**Rocky:** Oke, artinya pertanyaan itu yang digantung di kepala publik tidak berani saudara jawab.

**Henry:** Sudah dijawab.

**Rocky:** Apa?
Henry : Anda ini mengajukan pertanyaan, kalau semestinya finalis mengajukan pertanyaan kepada Jokowi. Pertanyaannya seperti yang anda kemukakan tadi.
Rocky : Eh saudara
Henry : Saya katakan kalau itu saya saja yang jawab nggak usah Jokowi
Rocky : Ya sudah jawab saja
Henry : Jawabannya yes terlibat sesuai dengan keputusan dari dewan kehormatan Perwira
Rocky : Nah, itu yang saya tunggu
Henry : Sudah itu.
Rocky : Ya sudah, jadi
Henry : Ya sudah apalagi?
Rocky : Oke, saya teruskan ya. Oke, jadi menurut Pak Jokowi, Pak Prabowo terlibat
Henry : Bukan Jokowi yang jawab | saya Henry Yosodiningrat yang jawab disini.
Rocky : Iya, kan sama jawab dari tim itu kan, masa jawaban berbeda-beda. Yang bener aja loh.

Boni : Kata siapa sama? Gimana logika Pak Rocky | ini
Rocky : Loh jadi
Boni : Saya tidak mengerti. Begini begini begini, gini gini |
Rocky : Niar dulu
Boni : Saya, gini gini. Ini menariknya Bang Rocky ini ya.
Rocky : Begini ya Saudara Boni |
Boni : Niar ntar ntar
Rocky : Anda mau jadi berapa kali jadi kadad menginterupsi saya?
Boni : Nggak, karena anda cicak. Itu malaslahnya. Saya harus menginterupsi | hmm
Karni : Ya ya ya udah jangan debat yang begitulah.
Boni : Seriously. Nggak, begini Bang. Inikan dia memaksa kita untuk mewakili seolah-olah menjadi Presiden Jokowi menjawab pertanyaan ini |
Karni : ya saya
Boni : Yang pertanyaannya buat saya pertanyaan anak SD seperti yang saya tanyakan tadi |
Karni : Oke saya
Boni : Rocky Gerung adalah siapa? A. Filsuf, B. Nabi palsu, C. Tukang fitnah, |
Karni : Ya makanya
Boni : D. Atau orang gila misalnya |
Karni : Saya mau stop |
Boni : Mau lihat jawab apa?
Karni : Mau stop simulasi itu. Nggak pake simulasi.
Boni : Nggak apa-apa bang, kalau misalnya |
Karni : Nggak, nggak perlu
Boni : Misalnya ni, misalnya gua nggak boleh interupsi bang dan ini forum buat oposisi, let say ini forum oposisi. Oke. Jangan pakai verifikasi publik dan jangan pernah undang saya ke ILC. Ini ini ini kalau saya nggak boleh interupsi.
Karni : Kok anda jawab begitu? |
Boni : Loh nggak
Karni : Yang saya mau stop dia, simulasi dia.
Rocky : Oke ya oke. Jadi saya lanjutkan |
Maman : Tunggu saya tambahkan 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 |
Someone : Jangan jangan begitu ngomongnya.
Rocky : Gini gini gini, bukan
Maman : Nah, jadi sesungguhnya |
Dahnil : Bukan itu konteksnya.
Rocky : Bukan ituah. Bukan itu yang saya bilang
Maman : Ya nggak bukan ya saya paham Bung Rocky. Saya ingin mengatakan bahwa anda menginginkan publik sebuah pertanyaan-pertanyaan yang menggantung dan muncul seperti yang diinginkan Bang Fahri tadi, sebuah konsep besar, tetapi lebih jujur. Tapi itulah yang sebenarnya. Kita bisa kritik bareng-bareng bahwa sesungguhnya KPU pun mencoba untuk. Ini sangat formalis satu. Tapi kita berharap didebat yang pertama ini ada elaborasi yang lebih dalam,. persoalan-persoalan HAM ini. Jadi,
menurut saya, sudah pasti tidak akan ada pertanyaan itu yang pertama. Yang kedua, bagaimana caranya? Justru itu nanti tim sukses inilah yang menjadikan isu-isu itu dielaborasi dan dikemukakan oleh para paslon atau capres cawapres. Itu maksudnya.

Terima kasih.

Karni : Baik, saya |
Dahnil : Nggak
Karni : Saya kira tidak perlu pakai simulasi lagi | anda berhadapan dengan kenyataan saja.
Rocky : Saya saya saya, hak saya sekarang menerangkan itu. Ngapain saudara bicara lagi soal teknis. Tadi kita sepakat untuk bicara ditingkat paradigm itu, ya. Kan tadi saya ajukan itu sebagai talk experiment. Apa namanya talk experiment? Ya di kepala kita, kita bikin konstruksi itu tu. Jadi, nggak usah suruh dicek apa aturan KPU. Memang saya tidak didalam rangka itu, mengulas problem ini ni. Saya lanjut ya pertanyaannya. Saudara nggak perlu jawab, saya buatkan jawabannya tu juga didalam talk experiment. Kalau Pak Jokowi menjawab, "Saya tidak tahu atau tidak terlibat", debatnya berhenti. Kalau Pak Jokowi bilang, "Ya, Pak Prabowo terlibat". Maka, yang harus ditangkap pertama adalah Pak Jokowi, karena dia tahu ada kejahatan dan dia biarkan bertahun-tahun. That's logic. Oke ya |

Boni : Saya saya
Rocky : Tunggu tunggu tunggu, sekarang saya balik supaya fair itu |
Boni : Begini begini begini
Rocky : Tunggu tunggu, ini dia mau ngambil lagi ni bagian |
Boni : Gini gini gini Pak Rocky gini. Saya paham. Saya ada di kepala kamu dan saya melihat ada beberapa ruang kosong disitu. Jadi, kamu mau bertanya kepada Pak Jokowi, apakah Pak Prabowo ini pelanggarHAM atau tidak. Itu sebuah pertanyaan tertutup. Sementara fakta ini, kita harus lihat ada fakta hukum, ada fakta politik. Secara hukum, Pak Prab Pak Prabowo tidak ada satupun kekuat keputusan hukum ber- yang bersifat berkekuatan hukum tetapi menyatakan Prabowo Subianto sebagai pelanggar Hak Asasi Manusia. Belum. Tetapi, bahwa ada sebuah peristiwa penculikan dan penghilangan dan disana ada investigasi resmi oleh institusi TNI ketika itu, termasuk Pak Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono ikut menandatangani soal pemberhentian Pak Prabowo pada saat itu. Dan kemudian ada upaya penyelidikan, dibentuk tim pencari fakta. Dan proses peradilannya belum jalan karena mentok di tim pencari fakta dan tidak jelas proses ujung kasus ini. Makanya saya bilang, kita butuh dorongan lagi, supaya pemerintah ini juga bisa membentuk tim investigasi gabungan yang baru, supaya ini tuntas. Jadi, jangan anda menyeret Pak Prabowo pada perdebatan kusir si A pelanggar HAM atau bukan. Kamu membawa kita ke aw- ke langit, tetapi kamu sendiri merayap di- ditanah itu loh. Buat saya tidak masuk akal.

What's the point? |

Karni : Saya kira cukup, dia lagi.
Rocky : Ya, harusan saya, saudara batalkan prinsip saudara sendiri. Dari awal saudara bilang Prabowo terlibat HAM itu. Sekarang saudara ragu akhirmnya kan | udah [Laughing]
Boni : Kama, Rocky, saya tidak senang bermain kata-kata seperti kamu. Saya sedan bicara kebenaran ya. Anda inikan orang yang cantik menari didalam, apa, alunan musik, sampai musik berhenti pun anda masih menari. Jadi, saya ingin bicara soal fakta, karena ketika kita mengatakan si A terlibat, itu kita bicara secara hukum. Harus diingat itu. Dan meskipun itu |

Rocky : Ini ini ini tadi [laughing]
Boni : Meskipun itu perdebatan politik, meskipun itu perdebatan politik, tetap fakta hukum yang menjadi acuaninya, karena berat tuduhan itu. Maka, yang saya bilang itu tadi, tuntaskan kasus penculikan dan penghilangan dengan membentuk tim investigasi gabungan, seperti yang dilakukan oleh Polri dalam kasus Novel tanggal 8 Januari kemarin. Sampai disini masuk nggak ke ruang kepala sana?

Rocky : Nggak ada karena kosong semua. | You aja bukan
Boni : Ya karena kamu kosong. That's the problem. You tidak mungkin masuk karena kamu tidak melihat pintu masuknya.

Rocky : Saya lanjut ya.
Karni : Udah?
Boni : Nggak, nggak apa-apa, silahkan.
Karni : Nggak anda cukup. Nggak kalau | [Talking to Boni]
Rocky : Saya balik pada prinsip tadi. Kita lagi bermain di dalam kepala pikiran. Point berikutnya tu, kalau misalnya pertanyaan itu diajukan kepada Prabowo. Tadi saya bertanya kepada Pak Jokowi. Sekarang saya fair, sebagai finalis, saya bertanya kepada Pak Prabowo, "Saudara Prabowo Subianto, apakah Anda terlibat didalam pelanggaran HAM di 1998?" Yang mesti jawab siapa? Saudara nggak perlu jawab. Saya tanya kepada tim | Prabowo

[Audiences laugh]

Henry : Nggak anda ini sudah menyimpang dari konteks |
Rocky : Tunggu dulu, bukan karena itu.
Henry : Maaf Bang Karni.
Rocky : Jadi, saya mau fair. Saya nggak, saya tidak mengebank saudara. Dia juga saya tanya kok. Gimana.

Henry : Nggak nanti dulu. Tema kita malam ini adalah Penegakkan Hukum dan HAM, sebelum. Jadi, kalau anda ini sudah berrandai-andai semua. Seandainya seandainya. Sementara KPU sudah membuat ketentuan. | Yang anda andai-andaikan ini nggak masuk dalam perdebatan.

Rocky : Ya itu aruson KPU. Saya tidak peduli.
Henry : Jadi, anda hanya akan mengacaukan suasana saja. Hanya ingin cari panggung Anda ini, saya lihat. Dan sebelumnya saya nggak kenal orang ini. Saya baru tahu sejak ditampilkan di ILC. Dan selalu cari panggung, selalu mencerca pemerintah. Itu saja yang saya lihat. Jadi, malas sebelumnya saya untuk debat, apalagi diskusi dengan orang macam ini. Cukup Bang Karni.

Rocky : [laughing] Ini dia mau jawab, you halangin coba. | Loh ini Dahnil mau jawab. Ngapain you.

Fahri : Ini ini Bung Rocky punya, punya simulasi lain gak Om Rocky? Punya simulasi lain gak?

Rocky : Punya masih banyak. Tenang tenang.
Fahri : Yauda |
Rocky : Saya sa sa saya. Ya
Fahri : Geser aja simulasi jangan yang ini. [Laughing]
Dahnil : Menghalangi orang menjawab, pelanggaran HAM. [Laughing]
Rocky : Ayo dicicil.
Fahri : Kalau bisa ada simulasi lain, Bang Rocky. | Supanya
Rocky : Oke, jadi bagaimana you mau akal sehat? | Dengan sok sok, sok
Fahri : Karena gini. Saya jawab. Saya bantu jawab ya Bung Rocky ya, | karena ini nggak akan fair kita bahas diforum kecil.

Rocky : Oke. Ya saya fair. Dua-duanya saya tanya.
Fahri : Jadi gini, presidennya Pak Habibie, lewat. Gusdur, lewat. Ibun Mega juga lewat. Di zaman Ibu Mega, Ibu Mega memilih Pak Prabowo sebagai calon wakil presiden. Lalu, Pak SBY sepuluh tahun lewat. Pak Jokowi juga lewat nampaknya itu. Jadi, nggak fair isu ini sebelumnya kita angkat karena semua sudah bukan menjadi masalah hukum, tapi menjadi masalah politik. Nah, kalau mau jawabannya masalah politik, saya kira baru berdebat kita setelah pilpres, baru. Ya kita melihat apakah presiden baru punya determinasi untuk menghilangkan beban sejarah bangsa ini, tidak saja beban dari tahun 90-an, bahkan dimasa-masa yang lalu kalau kita masih punya beban sejarah ya semuanya harus kita buang, karena itulah yang menyebabkan bangsa ini bisa terbang tinggi kalau bebannya nggak ada. Saya kira gitu Bang Karni. Jadi, tolong Bung Rocky |

Karni : Ya
Fahri : Mungkin simulasi ini agak berat ini kalau kita bahas malam ini |
Rocky : Oke, Oke, saya saya permudah. Saya bantu jawabnya itu ya. Kalau jawaban tadi, kalau pertanyaan tadi, apakah saudara Prabowo Subianto terlibat didalam pelanggaran HAM 1998? Seharusnya Pak Prabowo bilang begini, "Saya nggak bisa jawab. Yang bisa jawab itu adalah Pak Jokowi, karena panglima saya waktu itu adalah Pak Wiranto yang adalah sekarang anak buahnya Pak Jokowi itu." Kan gampang ajakan? Kan yang mesti jawab siapa? Ya panglimannya. Prabowo bisa bilang begini, Loh loh hiririki ada panglima tertinggi. Silahkan dijawab itu.

Boni : Hah ini, ini, disitus Roc, di disitus Pak Rocky kurang baca. Kan sudah dijelaskan oleh mereka diberbagai forum publik di media bahwa kasus itu tidak atas perintah
pimpinan. Tidak atas perintah pimpinan. Kalau nggak cek, tanya Agung Gumela! Tanya | Pak Wiranto! Hadirkan! Nah ituloh.

Rocky : Ya karena itu, kenapa nggak, kenapa nggak dituntut? Ini ini [Laughing]
Dahnil : Ya saya jelaskan. Saya pikir | ya ya
Karni : Ya ya ya sekaran, sekaran dua dua berhenti dulu coba.
Dahni : Ya dibanyak kesempatan Pak Prabowo sudah menyebutkan beliau adalah prajurit. Prajurit yang diperintah oleh pimpinannya. Itu catatan penting. Dan beliau tentu sebagai prajurit terikat dalam janji dan sumpah beliau. Jadi, itu catatan penting. Kemudian yang kedua, beliau terbuka sekali dengan proses pengadilan. Tadi disebutkan Bang Fahri, zaman Pak Habibie, kemudian zaman Gusdur, bahkan dizaman Megawati, kemudian berpasangan dengan Ibu Megawati itu ndak pernah keluar isu-isu HAM ini. Kemudian, di zaman Pak Jokowi yang kemudian empat tahun yang lalu berjanji akan menuntaskan kasus-kasus HAM itu juga tidak diselesaikan, termasuk kasus-kasus HAM yang lain, Talang Sari, kemudian Aceh dan sebagainya |
Karni : Ya saya kira cukup.
Dahnil : Jadi dalam konteks itu. Saya mau katakan begini, Bang Karni, abuse of power itu bukan hanya sekedar tentang penyalahgunaan kekuasaan, tetapi abuse of power itu juga bisa bermakna ketika kita punya kekuasaan tidak menuntaskan sesuatu yang kita pahami yang bisa dituntaskan itu yang terjadi pada saat ini menurut kami.

Boni : Bang Karni. Saya kira dari tadi kita nggak berbeda. Dalam isu HAM ini, kita nggak punya pandangan yang berbeda. Bahwa ada fakta pelanggaran HAM bahwa negara harus tegas. Itu yang kita bahas dari tadi. Cuma anda kan sorot ke kasus Novel. Kita juga mengapresiasi Polri tenyata sudah merespon itu, tapi kita juga mau melihat masa lalu seperti apa, tapi kalau misalnya kita seret diskusi ini pada hal-hal yang bersifat tuduhan tuh ya misalnya Pak Rocky tadi suruh jawab, apakah Pak Prabowo pelanggar HAM? Ya jelas bukan, secara hukum. Bukan |

Rocky : Yaudah
Boni : Siapa bilang Pak Prabowo pelanggar HAM secara hukum? |
Rocky : Loh kena- kenapa?
Boni : Karena tidak ada peradilan HAM yang mengadili seorang Prabowo Subianto]
Rocky : Loh kenapa tim? |
Boni : Tapi ada peristiwa |
Dahnil : Tapikan berulang kali itu di-implifire bahwasannya Prabowo pelanggar HAM dan sebagainya. [Laughing]
Boni : Tetapi ada peristiwa, bahwa ada peristiwa penculikan dan penghilangan itu pasti ada yang bertanggung jawab dan institusi TNI ketika itu sudah melakukan investigasi. Dan ini sekarang kita dorong pemerintah supaya lakukan investigasi lanjutan. Misalnya, sebagai komitmen di dalam debat besok. Bukan berarti ya apa ini sebuah jawaban dari Pak Jokowi, bukan. Ini sebuah komentar kita, gituloh. Thank you.

Rocky : Oke, saya saya tahu Pak Jokowi nggak mungkin jawab | karena itu
Karni : Jangan jangan bersaut-sautan begitalah |
Rocky : Oke ya
Karni : Anda ngomong apa pendapat anda |
Rocky : Oke, oke, saya terus ya hak saya itu ya. Saya ajukan itu sebagai problem karena dari awal Pak Jokowi itu tidak punya komitmen terhadap Hak Asasi Manusia. Jangan potong dulu ya. Saya terangkan dulu ya Saudara Yosodiningrat ya. Pernah dalam forum ini saya terangkan, hari pertama di 2014 debat presiden, Tim Jokowi mengatakan Hak Asasi Manusia bukan prioritas kami. Ada di media massa. Jadi, itu pre-text sebetulnya untuk mengangkat Pak Wiranto yang juga namanya ada didalam dokumen-dokumen internasional pelanggaran Hak Asasi Manusia, karena itu ketika nama Pak Wiranto diucapkan ke publik, itu adalah semacam, saya nggak mau sebut kedunguan, tapi semacam ketidaksopanan presiden terhadap para pejuang Hak Asasi Manusia. Presiden tidak sopan mengangkat Pak Wiranto. Ngakap poin saya tu? Jadi, dari awal problemnya adalah atau masalahnya adalah presiden tidak tahu masalahnya. Itu itu soalnya tu. Dia nggak bisa bedain, sama seperti Pak Yosodiningrat tidak bisa bedain antara Hak Asasi Manusia dan hak warga negara. Kan Anda tadi terangkan, ya itu atau Maman juga itu rada konyol kalau. Kan udah
dipenuhi. Hak, Hak Asasi Manusia itu diberi listrik. Loh, Hak Asasi Manusia bukan itu. Hak Asasi Manusia tidak perlu dipenuhi, dilindungi. Kan, hak itu melekat pada saya, pada saudara. Jadi, tidak saya peroleh dari saudara. Hak Asasi Manusia itu dilindungi. Hak warga negara dipenuhi.

Henry : Itu salah. Itu salah. Saya.
Rocky : Belum
Henry : Hak Asasi Manusia itu harus diberikan dulu, dipenuhi dulu.
Rocky : Maksudnya diberikan oleh siapa?
Henry : Setelah terpenuhi baru dilindungi.
Rocky : Astaga
Henry : Bagaimana mau melindungi sesuatu yang belum dipenuhi.
Rocky : Karena itu disebut hak asasi. Woss
Henry : Presiden Jokowi sejak awal memenuhi hak-hak yang merupakan hak asasi.
Rocky : Nah, ini dia.
Henry : Hak dasar dari warga negara.
Rocky : Nah, gini ya. Ginilah. Begini ni yaa. Tenanglah. Saya sa saya pastikan dulu ya.
Henry : Itu sudah dipenuhi seperti saya uraikan sejak awal. Jadi, kalau anda mengatakan bahwa hak itu dilindungi belum dipenuhi, anda keliru. Pemenuhan dulu baru pelindungan.

Boni : Setengah menit setengah menit.
Karni : Uda udah dulu. Heh heh. Anda berdua saja ya nggak jelas nanti apa.
Rocky : Dari siapa?
Boni : Sebentar saja. Saya mengenai Bang Rocky sama Bang Henry.
Karni : Ini waktu tinggal satu menit. Saya harus kasih Anda atau dia?
Boni : Hak Asasi, Hak Asasi Manusia itu. Hak Asasi Manusia itu bang. Saya kira dalam hal ini saya setuju dengan anda, Bung Rocky. | Hak Asasi memang hak
Rocky : Tu, dia saja bilang setuju dengan saya. Bilang dia yang salah. Saya sudah pasti benar tu.
Boni : Hak. Saya selesaiin dulu. [Laughing]. Hak asasi itu memang melekat pada diri, karena sifatnya dia kontrol, apa, eksistensial, delusi ontologi. Jadi, dia ada prinsip demokrasi dalam penegakannya. Nah, tetapi ketika negara dengan kekuasaannya merampas hak itu terjadi yang namanya violence against human rights. Nah, disitulah pelanggaran. Nah, itu yang terjadi pada zaman Orde Baru, Soeharto 32 tahun. Itu yang terjadi dan menumpuk perkara ini sampai hari ini. Nah, disitu persoalan. Thank you, Bang Karni.

Rocky : Yaudah udah. You cuma mau bilang untuk |
Karni : Baik udah cukup. Anda tinggal satu menit lagi cuma.
Rocky : Ya, oke. Karena itu disitu. Kalau kita mau bicara tentang soal-soal konseptual tadi seperti diawali oleh Saudara Fahri. Itu sebenarnya bikin banyak kekacauan, Saudara Yosodiningrat. Saya tambah lagi ya, dan tolong Saudara Boni terangkan pada beliau ni. Dengar aja. You sebut tadi bahwa Jokowi berhasil menegakkan Hak Asasi Manusia karena hukuman mati dilaksanakan, karena undang-undang Ormas dijalankan. Loh di dalam traktat Hak Asasi Manusia dulu, hukuman mati itu melanggar hak asasi manusia | undang-undang Ormas itu melanggar Hak Asasi Manusia.

Henry : Tidak tidak, saya boleh jelaskan itu, hak saya itu untuk menjelaskan. Dalam, kalau anda. Anda hanya baca Pasal 28I, baca 28J. Kemudian dalam ICCPR sudah ditentu dijelaskan bahwa hak asasi itu yang boleh dilanggar itu ada yang non derogable rights dan ada yang derogable rights.
Rocky : Salah salah
Henry : Itu hak dasar
Rocky : Tidak
Henry : Hak yang tidak boleh dikurangi. Hak untuk diadili.
Rocky : Tapi human, You you
Henry : Dengan sisi peradilan yang benar. Hak dalam undang-undang tentang HAM sendiri, nyawa yang ada dalam kandungan ibu, seorang bayi yang sudah bernyawa.
Rocky : Derogable atu non derogable?
Henry : Boleh digugurkan | boleh dihilangkan demi keselamatan ibu
Rocky : Oke, hak asasi membunuh orang derogable atau non derogable?
Henry : Dalam keadaan ini, didalam ICCPR dijelaskan yangboleh dikurangi Hak Asasi Manusia itu termasuk pembu- hukuman mati, antara lain terhadap kejahatan kemanusiaan, hak kejahatan luar biasa. Ini kejahatan luar biasa. Dan internasional sudah menyatakan kejahatan narkotika kejahatan luar biasa. Kejahatan yang mengancam keselamatan semua bangsa. Jadi, nggak ada alasan bahwa anda mengatakan bahwa pelaksanaan hukuman mati adalah pelanggaran HAM, karena hukuman mati yang dijatuhkan itu sudah melalui proses peradilan yang benar. Terbuka untuk umum. Dikoreksi oleh pengadilan diatasnya. Jadi anda keliru kalau mengatakan bahwa pelaksanaan hukuman mati itu melanggar HAM. Salah itu.

Rocky : Oke, saya nggak mau jawab. Nanti dirumah Saudara Boni terangkan pada beliau tu, konsep dasar dari Hak Asasi Manusia itu, ya |

Karni : Ya sudah

Rocky : Bahwa itu tidak boleh diambil dengan alasan apapun nyawa manusia itu, oke.

Karni : Baik cukup.

Rocky : Oke, saya masih boleh lanjut?

Karni : Ya, boleh. Satu menit lagi deh saya tambah.

Rocky : Satu menit. Tadi apa soalnya. [Laughing]. Oke, saya pindah soal korupsi ya. Korupsi itu sekarang jadi semacam tontonan kelas tiga, sebab yang diberitakan adalah KPK menangkap tikus di daerah, gitu. Sibuk motong ranting pohon. Ngejar duit sepo- seperak. Akarnya nggak mau dibongkar. Itu soalnya. Zaman SBY itu, menterinya ditangkap semua itu. Akarnya disitu tu. Kalau sekarang samar-samar. Kepala daerah yang merasa dia bakal ditangkap KPK, itu daftar jadi anggota Nasdem, karena ada Jaksa Agung disitu. Jadi, kita lihat soal-soal semacam ini yang anda. [Laughing]. Yang dipromosikan |

Maman : Tapi Bupati Cianjur, Nasdem, ditangkap juga bang.

Rocky : Iya

Maman : Iya, jadi |

Rocky : Iya tentu

Maman : Jangan melihat satu kaset seperti itu.

Rocky : Iya tentu saja, tentu saja mesti ada tontonan supaya nggak terlalu bagaimana you. Kita perlu ada soal. [Laughing] Jadi, sebetulnya ini ada lima kali debat. Dan kita mesti sodorkan soal yang radikal untuk diperdebatkan sebetulnya. Kalau nggak ada di KPU ya kita jalankan disini. Fungsi ILC kan itu. Cuma, GARBI itu Gerakan Arah Baru ILC gitu.

[Laughing]

Rocky : Jadi, sekali lagi. Saya saya nggak ada urusan dengan siapa ingin mendapatkan suara paling banyak, tapi saya peduli dengan cara kita untuk jujur mengucapkan apa yang menjadi kejengkelan publik, bukan disensor itu. Nah, sekali lagi. Ini, ini ada kesibukan lain. Kenapa kita nggak mau debat hal-hal yang fundamental, yang paradigmatic? Karena kita tergoda untuk masuk ke pameran elektabilitas, jumlah massa yang hadir. Kayak kemenangan, anak-anak UI itu, apa namanya, bikin ilmu UI. Tapi nggak ada presiden dan nama saya, nama Fahri segala macam itu juga. Itu saja. Tujuan itu. Fungsi ILC kan itu. Cuma, GARBI itu Gerakan Arah Baru ILC gitu.

[Laughing]

Rocky : Kan ajib. Itu, itu yang menyebabkan kenapa tadi kita seolah-olah sudahlah nggak usah ngomong itu, itu KPU sudah atur itu. Jadi, kita sendiri itu cemas untuk bicara hal yang fundamental. Padahal memilih presiden adalah menguji sampai tingkat yang paling fundamental. Konseptualnya tu. Jadi, sekali lagi, saya tetap menganggap bahwa dua hal ini menjadi semacam kepura-puraan bila hal-hal yang konseptual tidak diterangkan oleh tim suksesnya pada calonnya. Saya, bagaimana mungkin kalau menjadi tim sukses yang nggak yang tidak kompak sebagai tim kalau soal prinsip Hak Asasi Manusia beda, bertiga ni beda beda gitu, kan kacau tu |

Boni : Ini ini ini Rocky melakukan pencemaran nama baik. Saya tegaskan, bang. Saya bukan tim sukses siapapun.

Rocky : Ya maksud saya o- |

Boni : Kuma cek di KPU, nama saya nggak ada disana.

Rocky : Memang, tapi otakmu sama dengan otak tim suksesnya | sudah itu saja.
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Boni : Sama dengan otak, sama dengan otak kamu. Kamu kan jubirnya oposisi kamu.
Rocky : Ya saya menguji dia tadi. Saya menguji dia.
Boni : Nggak, otak kamu otak oposisi kok.
Karni : Oke
Boni : Loh mau apalagi coba?
Karni : Oke, selesai. Kita rehat pemirsa.
Boni : Siapa yang mau berbohong disini?
[Commercial break]
## APPENDIX II

| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS  | IO | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption | | |
| 1.  | 00:24:15–00:29:39 | HA: "... Oke kalau penjelasannya apa? Nah, jadi yang muncul saya khawatir kedepan, satu, Jokowi nanti pihaknya karena dia pertahana yang muncul dalam pidato lebih banyak pada eufimistik aja, bahasa-bahasa | | | | | | | |
|     |      | KI: "Penghalusan Politeness | | | | | | | |
|     |      | HA: "Perhalusan dari program-program mereka yang sebetulnya nanti begitu masyarakat nonton, dua hari lagi, mereka mau protes dimana? Paling ya di sosial media.... Politeness of their programs that actually when the people watch it, where wil they protest two days later? Perhaps, on social media.... | | | | | | | In this situation, Karni takes the floor to help Haris by giving him an appropriate word when he cannot complete his sentence because he does not know what the appropriate word which is suitable for the meaning of the word ‘euphemism’. | |

**Explanation**

In this situation, Karni takes the floor to help Haris by giving him an appropriate word when he cannot complete his sentence because he does not know what the appropriate word which is suitable for the meaning of the word ‘euphemism’.
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS IO BI SLI          | AGR CLA ASS DIS FT TC TAN |             |
| 2.  |      | Kita sama-sama pernah merasakan, pernah mengetahui bahwa harga daging sapi di Indonesia ini pernah mencapai Rp 150.000 per kilo. Sementara di negara lain itu hanya 40.000, 45.000. Jokowi mencari penyebab, kemudian ternyata terungkap bahwa itu adalah permainan dari mafia daging sapi yang dikendalikan oleh ada sekitar 28 perusahaan penggembong sapi. Mereka itulah yang mengendalikan itu. Ini adalah satu mafia dan ini sekarang sudah diselesaikan. Artinya suatu keberanian yang selama ini praktek itu sering terjadi, muncul tenggelam, muncul tenggelam. Dipemerintahan Jokowi brek selesai habis | √ | | In this situation, Karni successfully takes the floor and interrupts Henry because he needs for a clearer explanation about the reason for the high price of beef which is caused by a mafia. And whether that mafia is changed by a new one or not? because the beef price is still high. |
Sekarang saya belum belum lihat data terakhir ya. Di luar negeri mungkin juga bisa 150.000 juga | atau 140.000 sekarang.
The price goes up again definitely because of market demand too. It's probably because. Perhaps, in abroad. I have not seen the latest data. In abroad, it's probably Rp 150.000 | or Rp 140.000 now.
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 3   |      | **HY**: Bahwa harga naik lagi tentunya karena permintaan juga, mungkin karena, mungkin juga di luar negeri. Sekarang saya belum belum lihat data terakhir ya. Di luar negeri mungkin juga bisa 150.000 juga | IS | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption | In this situation, Karni successfully interrupts Henry for the second time to show his disagreement about the beef price in other countries which are not as expensive as in Indonesia, because the beef price in Singapore is actually cheaper than in Indonesia. |
|     |      |              | OI | AGR | DIS | TC | TAN | |
|     |      |              | BI | CLA |      |    |     | |
|     |      |              | SLI | ASS |      |    |     | |
|     |      |              | √  |     |      |    |     | |
|     |      |              |     | √   |      |    |     | |
|     | 00:36:47–00:37:02 | **KI**: Gak, 60.000 di Singapur. |     |     |      |    |     | |
|     |      |              |     |     |      |    |     | |
|     |      |              |     |     |      |    |     | |
|     |      | **HY**: Saya belum bisa, belum bisa memastikan harga diluar itu bang Karni. Terima kasih. I can’t, I can’t confirm the price in abroad, Mr. Karni. Thank you. |     |     |      |    |     | |
|     |      |              |     |     |      |    |     | |
|     |      |              |     |     |      |    |     | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 4.  | 00:56:11 – 01:06:45 | DS: ... 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 | IS | Cooperative Interruption | Henry successfully interrupts Dahnil because he needs for clarification of what Dahnil has said about a president who does not lead by giving an example, so the people who watch the debate do not misunderstand. | |
|     |      |              | OI | Intrusive Interruption | |
|     |      |              | BI |                         | |
|     |      |              | SLI |                         | |
| No. | Code | Conversation |
|-----|------|--------------|
| 5.  | 01:07:59 – 01:30:52 | FH: ...Ya karena -nya saya sebenarnya berterima kasih kepada ILC ini, bang Karni, ya, karena kita nanti didalam konsepsi pembentukan negara hukum, itu jasa ILC ini saya kira lebih besar dari jasanya negara itu, ya | |

Yeah because of that, I actually thank ILC, Mr. Karni, yeah because we, in the conception of the establishment of a legal country, ILC’s contribution are bigger than this country’s, yeah |

KI: *Jangan terlalu dong.*
Don’t mention it!
FH: *Yaa, | karena*
Yeah, | because
KI: *Negara ini lebih luas*
This country is wider
FH: *Karena negara ini kadang-kadang berhenti memberikan pengertian tentang hukum, ya. Negara terjebak kepada, apa namanya, mengeluh ya. Negara terjebak keluar dari narasi....*
Since this country sometimes stops giving the explanation about law. It’s trapped in, what should we call it? A complaint, right? It’s stuck out of narrative....

| Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| IS | O | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption |
| ✓ | | | | ✓ | |

In this situation, Karni successfully interrupts Fahri to show his disagreement that actually ILC’s contribution in establishing a legal country is not bigger than the country’s contribution itself. However, Fahri finally tells the reason for his statement.
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | SI | OI | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption |                        |
|     |      |              | IS | O | BI | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |
| 6.  | 01:44:20 – 01:46:50 | RG: .....Kita bikin simulasi saja. Pertanyaan itu jawabannya apa. Anda nggak bisa bilang nggak akan ada pertanyaan itu. Mungkin aja ada. Coba apa jawabannya kira-kira. .... 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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Rocky takes the floor and asks Henry to know his opinion about Mr. Prabowo’s involvement in human rights violation when Henry is silent before continuing his utterance. |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 7.  | 01:46:45 – 01:47:06 | **RG:** 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:** 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 | IS | O | BI | SLI | AGR | √ | √ | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption | In this situation, Rocky interrupts Boni to show his agreement that there is an official investigation done by the TNI institution. However, he fails to interrupts Boni because Boni keeps talking. |
|     |      | **RG:** Ya justru Yeah because **BH:** Ada nggak naskah resminya? Is there an official document? **RG:** Saya finalis. Saya hanya tanya itu [laughing] I’m a finalist. I just ask it.[laughing] |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | IO | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption |
|     |      |              | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |

| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | IO | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption |
|     |      |              | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |

In this situation, Rocky tries to interrupt Boni in many times to develop the topic being discussed, which is about human rights violations. However, he fails because Boni keeps talking and ignores him.

BH: 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: Oke, jadi |
Okay, so |
BH: Nah, sekarang kamu mau membuat kesimpulan yang macam apa? |
Well, what kind of conclusion do you want to make now? |
RG: Itu |
That’s |
BH: 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: Oke, gini ya |
Okay, listen to me |
BH: Kalau itu yang kamu mau saya kira | kita pun |
If that’s what you want, I think | we
RG: Ya jawab
Yeah just answer it

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

RG: Justru saya membongkar
Instead, I expose

BH: 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: Ini
This is

BH: 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: Barusan, dengar dengar
You just, listen listen to me

BH: 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: You
You

BH: 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....
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 9.  | 9    | RG: Oke, artinya pertanyaan itu yang digantung di kepala publik tidak berani saudara jawab. | SLI | **√** | In this situation, Rocky interrupts Henry because he needs to clarify Henry’s answer about whether Mr. Prabowo has been involved in human rights violation or not. However, they share the floor because Rocky keeps talking when Henry interrups him. |
|     | 01:48:50 – 01:49:18 | HY: Sudah dijawab | IS |  |  |
|     |                  | RG: Apa? | OI |  |  |
|     |                  | HY: Anda ini mengajukan pertanyaan, kalau semestinya finalis mengajukan pertanyaan kepada Jokowi. Pertanyaanya seperti yang anda kemukakan tadi | BI |  |  |
|     |                  | RG: Eh saudara | SLI | **√** |  |
|     |                  | HY: Saya katakan kalau itu saya saja yang jawab nggak usah Jokowi | IS |  |  |
|     |                  | RG: Ya sudah jawab saja | OI |  |  |
|     |                  | HY: Jawabannya yes terlibat sesuai dengan keputusan dari dewan kehormatan Perwira | BI |  |  |
|     |                  | RG: Oke.Nah, itu yang saya tunggu | SLI | **√** |  |
|     |                  | HY: Sudah itu | IS |  |  |
|     |                  | RG: Ya sudah, jadi | OI |  |  |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | IO | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption |            |
| 10. | 01:49:19 – 01:49:32 | **RG:** Oke, saya teruskan ya. Oke, jadi menurut Pak Jokowi, Pak Prabowo terlibat | | | | | | | In this situation, Henry takes the floor when Rocky pauses before continuing his utterance to show his disagreement with Rocky’s opinion about according to Mr. Jokowi, Mr. Prabowo is involved in human rights violation. |
|     |      | **HY:** Bukan Jokowi yang jawab | | | | | | | |
|     |      | **HY:** yang jawab | | | | | | | |
|     |      | **HY:** saya Henry Yosodiningrat yang jawab disini. | | | | | | | |
|     |      | **HY:** It is not Mr. Jokowi who answered it. It’s me, Henry Yosodiningrat who answered it here. | | | | | | | |
|     |      | **RG:** Iya, kan sama jawaban dari tim itu kan, masa jawaban berbeda-beda. Yang benar aja loh. | | | | | | | |
|     |      | **RG:** Yes, your team’s answer is the same, isn’t it? It can’t be different. | | | | | | | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | O  | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption |              |
| 11  | 01:49:33 – 01:49:50 | BH: *Kata siapa sama? Gimana logika Pak Rocky* | | | | | | | |
|     |      | Who says it’s the same? Where is your logic, Mr. Rocky? | | | | | | | |
|     |      | RG: *Loh jadi?* | | | | | | | |
|     |      | So? | | | | | | | |
|     |      | BH: *Saya tidak mengerti. Begini begini begini, gini gini* | | | | | | | |
|     |      | I don’t understand. Listen to me | | | | | | | |
|     |      | RG: *Ntar dulu* | | | | | | | |
|     |      | Wait | | | | | | | |
|     |      | BH: *Saya, gini gini. Ini menariknya Bang Rocky ini ya.* | | | | | | | |
|     |      | I, well well. Mr. Rocky is interesting. | | | | | | | |
|     |      | RG: *Begini ya Saudara Boni* | | | | | | | |
|     |      | Listen to me, Mr. Boni | | | | | | | |
|     |      | BH: *Ntar ntar ntar* | | | | | | | |
|     |      | Wait wait wait | | | | | | | |
|     |      | RG: *Anda mau jadi berapa kali jadi kadal menginterupsi saya?* | | | | | | | |
|     |      | How many times do you want to be a lizard to interrupt me? | | | | | | | |
|     |      | BH: *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 | | | | | | | |
|     |      | In this case, Rocky interrupts Boni because he needs for clarification about Mr. Prabowo’s involvement in human rights violation according Mr. Jokowi and his team, but Boni does not give him a chance. However, Rocky keeps interrupting him. | | | | | | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| 12. | 01:49:46 – 01:50:29 | **BH:** Nggak, karena anda cicak. Itu masalahnya. Saya harus menginterupsi | IS | Cooperative Interruption | In this situation, Karni manages to interrupts Boni many times. However, Boni keeps talking. And he finally successfully interrupts Boni and makes Boni stop his utterance. In this case, Karni interrupts Boni to show his disinterest in the topic being discussed by Boni because the debate is not going well, so Karni interrupts Boni to stop the debate. |
|     |      |   | IO | Intrusive Interruption | |
|     |      |   | BI | |
|     |      |   | SLI | |
|     |      |   |   | |
| KI: | Mau stop simulasi itu. Nggak pake simulasi. |
|----|------------------------------------------|
|    | I want to stop this simulation. No simulation anymore. |
| BH: | Nggak apa-apabang,kalaumisalnya | |
|    | It’s okay, sir. If for example | |
| KI: | Nggak, nggak perlu |
|    | No, no need |
| BH: | Misalnya ni, misalnya gua nggak boleh interupsi bang |
|    | dan ini forum buat oposisi, let say ini forum oposisi. |
|    | Oke. Jangan pakai verifikasi publik dan jangan pernah |
|    | undang saya ke ILC. Ini ini kalau saya nggak boleh |
|    | interupsi. |
|    | For example, for example, I can’t interrupt, sir. And |
|    | this forum is for the opponent, let say that it’s the |
|    | opponent’s forum. Okay, don’t use public verification |
|    | and don’t ever invite me to ILC. It’s it’s if I can’t |
|    | interrupt. |
| KI: | Kok anda jawab begitu? | |
|    | Why do you say it? | |
| BH: | Loh nggak |
|    | No |
| KI: | Yang saya mau stop dia, simulasi dia. |
|    | That I want to stop is him, his simulation. |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS                   | O                        |             |
| 13. | 01:50:30–01:51:36 | RG: *Oke ya oke. Jadi, saya lanjutkan* | OGR       | CLA | AGR | DIS | FT | TC | TAN | In this situation, Maman successfully interrupts Rocky to develop the topic being discussed by the debate participants when Rocky just wants to continue to deliver his opinion, so rocky can not continue his utterances. |
|     |      | MI: *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* | BI        | ASS | DIS | FT  | TC | TAN |             |
|     |      | S: *Jangan jangan begitu ngomongnya.* | BI        | ASS | DIS | FT  | TC | TAN |             |
|     |      | RG: *Gini gini gini, bukan* | BI        | ASS | DIS | FT  | TC | TAN |             |
|     |      | MI: *Nah, jadi sesungguhnya* | BI        | ASS | DIS | FT  | TC | TAN |             |
|     |      | DS: *Bukan itu konteksnya.* | BI        | ASS | DIS | FT  | TC | TAN |             |
|     |      | RG: *Bukan ituah. Bukan itu yang saya bilang* | BI        | ASS | DIS | FT  | TC | TAN |             |
|     |      | MI: *Ya, nggak, bukan, ya saya paham Bung Rocky....* | BI        | ASS | DIS | FT  | TC | TAN |             |

In this situation, Maman successfully interrupts Rocky to develop the topic being discussed by the debate participants when Rocky just wants to continue to deliver his opinion, so rocky can not continue his utterances.
| No. | Code | Conversation |
|-----|------|--------------|
| 14. | 01:50:30 – 01:51:36 | MI: *Tunggu, saya tambahin dulu, Bang Rocky. Jadi, pernah sebelumnya sebelum rapat di KPU, apakah nanti ada pertanyaan-pertanyaan seperti itu. Nah, tanya ketika rapat, dan dari pihak BPN, Mas Budi Priyo Santoyo, itu bilang, sebaiknya nggak ada debat karena itu akan menurunkan martabat* | In this situation, Rocky and Dahnil who are Prabowo – Sandi’s camp try to interrupt Jokowi – Ma’ruf’s camp, Maman, because they do not agree with what Maman says. However, they share the floor because Maman keeps talking when Rocky and Dahnil interrupt him. |
| | | MI: *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 a debate because it will break a dignity* | |
| | | S: *Jangan jangan begitu ngomongnya.* | |
| | | RG: *Gini gini gini, bukan* | |
| | | MI: *Nah, jadi sesungguhnya* | |
| | | DS: *Bukan itu konteksnya.* | |
| | | RG: *Bukan itulah. Bukan itu yang saya bilang* | |
| | | MI: *Ya, nggak, bukan, ya saya paham Bung Rocky....* | |

**Table:**

| Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| IS                  | OI                         | BI | SLI |
| Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption | |
| AGR                  | CLA                        | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |

In this situation, Rocky and Dahnil who are Prabowo – Sandi’s camp try to interrupt Jokowi – Ma’ruf’s camp, Maman, because they do not agree with what Maman says. However, they share the floor because Maman keeps talking when Rocky and Dahnil interrupt him.
| No. | Code  | Conversation                                                                 | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15  | 01:51:40 – 01:54:16 | RG: .... Maka, yang harus ditangkap pertama adalah Pak Jokowi, karena dia tahu ada kejahatan dan dia biarkan bertahun-tahun. That’s logic. Oke ya | IS          | Cooperative Interruption | AGR  | ✓                                 | In this situation, Boni tries to take the floor (to interrupt Rocky) to show his disagreement of Mr. Prabowo’s involvement in human rights violation according to Mr. Jokowi, but he fails at first because Rocky keeps talking. However, Boni finally can take the floor because Rocky does not continue his utterance. |
|     |       | .... So, Mr. Jokowi is the one who must be arrested first, because he knows there is a crime and he lets the crime happen for years. That’s logic. Okay | SI          | Intrusive Interruption   | ASS  | ✓                                 |                                                                                                                                  |
|     |       | BH: Saya saya I I                                                              | BI          |                           | FT   |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                  |
|     |       | RG: Tunggu tunggu tunggu, sekarang saya balik supaya fair itu                 | SI          |                           | TC   |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                  |
|     |       | BH: Begini begini begini                                                      | SI          |                           | TAN  |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                  |
|     |       | RG: Tunggu tunggu, ini dia mau ngambil lagi ni bagian                          | IS          |                           |      |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                  |
|     |       | BH: Gini gini gini Pak Rocky gini. Saya paham. Saya ada di kepala kamu dan saya melihat ada beberapa ruang kosong disitu. Jadi, kamu mau bertanya kepada Pak Jokowi, apakah Pak Prabowo ini pelanggar HAM atau tidak. Itu sebuah pertanyaan tertutup.... | IS          |                           |      |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                  |
|     |       | BH: Well well, Mr. Rocky. I understand. I’m in your head and I see there are some empty rooms there. So, you want to ask Mr. Jokowi, is Mr. Prabowo a violator of human rights? It’s a closed question .... | IS          |                           |      |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                  |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | IO | BI | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |
| 16  | 01:54:19 – 01:55:19 | RG: Ya, barusan saya, saudara batakan prinsip saudara sendiri. Dari awal saudara bilang Prabowo terlibat HAM itu. Sekarang saudara ragu akhirnya kan | SI | OI | BI | SLI | √ |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|     |      | BH: Kamu, Rocky, saya tidak senang bermain kata-kata seperti kamu. Saya sedang bicara kebenaran ya.... |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|     |      | RG: Ini ini ini tadi [laughing] |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|     |      | BH: Meskipun itu perdebatan politik, meskipun itu perdebatan politik, tetap fakta hukum yang menjadi acuannya, karena berat tuduhan itu ....Sampai disini masuk nggak ke ruang kepala sana? |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|     |      | RG: Nggak ada karena kosong semua. |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|     |      | BH: Ya karena kamu kosong. That's the problem. You tidak mungkin masuk karena kamu tidak melihat pintu masuknya. |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

In this situation, Boni successfully interrupts Rocky because he manages to stop Rocky from talking to show his disagreement of what Rocky said about Prabowo’s involvement in human rights violation.
| o. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|    |      |              | IS       | O    | BI   | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |          |
| 17 | 01:55:26 – 01:56:14 | RG: .... Yang mesti jawab siapa? Saudara nggak perlu jawab. Saya tanya kepada tim | | | | | | | | | | | In this situation, Rocky is silence before completing his utterance and that silence is taken over by Henry to show his disagreement of Rocky’s utterance. According to Henry, Rocky’s utterance deviates from the context. |
|    |      | HY: Nggak anda ini sudah menyimpang dari konteks | | | | | | | | | | | |
|    |      | RG: Tunggu dulu, bukan karena itu. | | | | | | | | | | | Wait, it’s not because of that. |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 18. | 01:55:26 – 01:56:52 | HY: Nggak anda ini sudah menyimpang dari konteks | SI | AGR | In this situation, Rocky tries to take the floor again, but when he interrupts Henry to show his disagreement, Henry keeps talking and successfully completes his utterance. So, in this case, they share the floor. |
|     |      | RG: Tunggu dulu, bukan karena itu. | OI | CLA | |
|     |      | HY: Maaf, Bang Karni | BI | ASS | |
|     |      | RG: Jadi, saya mau fair. Saya nggak, saya tidak menjebak saudara. Dia juga saya tanya kok. Gimana. | SLI | DIS | |
|     |      | So, I just want to be fair. I don’t, I don’t trap you. I ask him too. What do you thing? |   | FT | |
|     |      | HY: Nggak nanti dulu. Tema kita malam ini adalah Penegakan Hukum dan HAM .... |   | TC | |
|     |      | Wait! Our theme tonight is Law Enforcement and Human Rights .... |   | TAN | |
|     |      | RG: Ya itu urusan KPU. Saya tidak peduli. |   |   | |
|     |      | Yeah, that’s the problem of the KPU. I don’t care of it. |   |   | |
|     |      | HY: Jadi, anda hanya akan mengacaukan suasana saja. Hanya ingin cari panggung Anda ini, saya lihat. Dan sebelumnya saya nggak kenal orang ini .... |   |   | |
|     |      | So, you will only mess up the atmosphere. I think you just want to make a sensation. And I don’t know him before .... |   |   | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | O  | BI | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |          |
| 19. | 01:56:52 – 01:57:08 | RG: [laughing] *Ini dia mau jawab, you halangin coba.* | √ |     |    |    | AGR |     |     |     |     |    |    |    | In this situation, Fahri successfully interrupts Rocky to ask another simulation, so the debate participants will understand more about the topic being discussed by Rocky. In this case, Rocky cannot complete his utterance. |

FH: [laughing] *Loh ini Dahnil mau jawab. Ngapain you* [laughing] He wants to answer it, but you obstruct him. [Dahnil wants to answer. Why do you

FH: *Ini ini Bung Rocky punya, punya simulasi lain gak Om Rocky? Punya simulasi lain gak?* You, Mr. Rocky. Do you have another simulation, Mr. Rocky? Do you have another simulation?

FH: *Punya masih banyak. Tenang tenang!* Yes, I do. Calm down!

FH: *Yaudah* Alright

RG: *Saya sa sa saya. Ya* I I I. Yeah

FH: *Geser aja simulasi jangan yang ini.* [Laughing] Just change the simulation. Don’t use this one. [Laughing]
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| 20. | 01:57:11 – 01:57:20 | FH: *Kalau bisa ada simulasi lain, Bang Rocky. | SLI | √ | In this situation, Rocky fails to interrupt Fahri because Fahri keeps talking, so he cannot complete his utterance. Rocky interrupts Fahri to ask more explanation from Henry (the opposite party) about common sense. |
|     |      | RG: *Oke, jadi bagaimana you mau akal sehat?* | SI | √ | |
|     |      | FH: *Karena gini. Saya jawab. Saya bantu jawab ya Bung Rocky ya, karena ini nggak akan fair kita bahas diforum kecil.* | BI | | |
|     |      | RG: *Oke. Ya saya fair. Dua-duanya saya tanya.* | OI | | |
|     |      | | | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 21. | 01:57:14 – 01:58:20 | **RG:** *Oke, jadi bagaimana you mau akal sehat?* [Dengan sok sok, sok]  
Okay, what kind of common sense do you want? [By by, by]  
**FH:** *Karena gini. Saya jawab. Saya bantu jawab ya Bung Rocky ya, karena ini nggak akan fair kita bahas dforum kecil.*  
Since, I’ll answer it. I’ll help answering it, Mr. Rocky. Since it will not be fair if we discuss it in a small forum.  
**RG:** *Oke. Ya saya fair. Dua-duanya saya tanya.*  
Okay, yeah I’m fair. I ask the both parties.  
**FH:** *Jadi gini, presidennya Pak Habibie, lewat. Gusdur, lewat. Ibu Mega juga lewat. Di zaman Ibu Mega, Ibu Mega memilih Pak Prabowo sebagai calon wakil presiden.*  
Well, President Habibie has passed. President Gusdur has passed. President Mega has passed. When Mrs. Mega has become a president, she has chosen Mr. Prabowo as the vise president.  
**KI:** *Ya*  
Yeah  
**FH:** *Mungkin simulasi ini agak berat ini kalau kita bahas malam ini.*  
This simulation is probably a bit heavy if it is discussed tonight. | IS | O | Bi | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |
|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| √  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

In this situation, Fahri successfully takes the floor and interrupts Rocky to develop the topic being discussed by Rocky by giving more explanation, so Rocky cannot complete his utterance.
| No. | Code | Conversation |
|-----|------|--------------|
| 22. | 01:58:21 – 01:59:17 | **RG:** ... Kan gampang ajakan? Kan yang mesti jawab siapa? Ya panglimanya | Prabowo bisa bilang begini, Loh loh hirarki ada panglima tertinggi. Silahkan dijawab itu!  
... It’s easy, isn’t it? Who should answer it? The commander | Prabowo can say it. Hierarchically, there is a commander in chief. Answer that, please!  

**BH:** *Hah ini, ini, disitu Roc, di- disitu Pak Rocky kurang baca. Kan sudah dijelaskan oleh mereka diberbagai forum publik di media bahwa kasus itu tidak atas perintah pimpinan. Tidak atas perintah pimpinan. Kalau nggak cek, tanya Agung Gumela! Tanya | Pak Wiranto! Hadirkan! Nah ituloh.  
Huh! You you you, Mr. Rocky lacks reading. They have explained it in many public forums in the media that that case was not ordered by the leader. Not ordered by the leader. You can check it, ask Agung Gumela! Ask | Mr. Wiranto! Bring them here! That’s it.  

**RG:** *Ya karena itu, kenapa nggak, kenapa nggak dituntut? Ini ini* [Laughing]  
Yeah, because of it, why wasn’t, why wasn’t he prosecuted? It’s it’s [Laughing]

| Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| IS                    | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |
| OI                    | BI  | SLI |     |     |    |    |     |

| Explanation |
|-------------|

In this situation, Rocky and Boni share the floor. Boni interrupts Rocky to show his disagreement. In this case, Boni reminds Rocky if the case is not ordered by the leader.
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | IO | BI | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |
| 23. | 02:00:31 – 02:01:59 | BH: .... Kita juga mengapresiasi Polri tenyata sudah merespon itu, tapi kita juga mau melihat masa lalu seperti apa, tapi kalau misalnya kita seret diskusi ini pada hal-hal yang bersifat tuduhan ya misalnya Pak Rocky tadi suruh jawab, apakah Pak Prabowo pelanggar HAM? Ya jelas bukan, secara hukum. Boni | √ | | | | | | | | | | | |
|     |      | We also appreciate that the National Police has responded, but we also want to see what the past looks like, but if we bring this discussion to an accusation, yeah for example, Mr. Rocky has asked to answer it, is Mr. Prabowo a human rights violator? Of course not, based on the law, he isn’t. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|     |      | RG: Yaudah | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|     |      | Alright | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|     |      | BH: Siapa bilang Pak Prabowo pelanggar HAM secara hukum? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|     |      | Who says Mr. Prabowo is legally human rights violator? | | | | | | | | | | | | |

In this situation, Rocky interrupts Boni to show his agreement that Mr. Prabowo is actually not a human rights violator. However, Rocky cannot be said to successfully interrupt Boni, because Boni ignores him and keeps talking.
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 24. |      |              | IS  O  BI  SLI | Cooperative Interruption  Intrusive Interruption | In this situation, Rocky interrupts Boni to clarify what boni says. However, Rocky fails to interrupt Boni, because Boni ignores him and keeps talking. |
|     |      | BH: Siapa bilang Pak Prabowo pelanggar HAM secara hukum? | SI  OI  BI  SLI | ASS  DIS  FT  TC  TAN | |
|     |      | Who says Mr. Prabowo is legally human rights Violator? | | | |
|     |      | RG: Loh kena- kenapa? | | | |
|     |      | So, wh- why? | | | |
|     |      | BH: Karena tidak ada peradilan HAM yang mengadili seorang Prabowo Subianto | | | |
|     |      | Because there is not human rights court that can try Prabowo Subianto | | | |
|     |      | RG: Loh kenapa tim? | | | |
|     |      | So, why does team of? | | | |
|     |      | BH: Tapi ada peristiwa | | ✓  ✓ | |
|     |      | But, there is an event | | | |
|     |      | DS: Tapikan berulang kali itu di-implifire bahwasannya Prabowo pelanggar HAM dan sebagainya. [Laughing] | | | |
|     |      | But, It has repeatedly been implied that Prabowo is human rights violator and so on. [Laughing] | | | |
|     |      | BH: Tapi ada peristiwa, bahwa ada peristiwa penculikan dan penghilangan itu pasti ada yang bertanggung jawab, dan institusi TNI ketika itu sudah melakukan investigasi.... | | | |
|     |      | But, there is an event, that there is a kidnapping and disappearance, there must be someone who is responsible, and the TNI intitution has conducted an investigation at that time .... | | | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |             | IS | O | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption |                         |
|     |      |             |    |   |    |    | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN | In this situation, Dahnil interrupts Boni to show his disagreement that what Boni says now about Mr. Prabowo who is not a human rights violator is different from what he has said before. |
| 25. | 02:01:07-02:01:33 | BH: *Tapi ada peristiwa* | | | | | | | | | | | | But, there is an event. But, it has repeatedly been implied that Prabowo is a human rights violator and so on. [Laughing] |
|     |      | DS: *Tapikan berulang kali itu di-implifire bahwasannya Prabowo pelanggar HAM dan sebagainya.* [Laughing] | | | | | | | | | | | | But there is an event, that there is an abduction and disappearance, there must be someone responsible and the TNI institution has conducted investigation at the time.... |
|     |      | BH: *Tetapi ada peristiwa, bahwa ada peristiwa penculikan dan penghilangan, itu pasti ada yang bertanggung jawab dan institusi TNI ketika itu sudah melakukan investigasi....* | | | | | | | | | | | | But there is an event, that there is an abduction and disappearance, there must be someone responsible and the TNI institution has conducted investigation at the time.... |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
|   |      |              | IS | O | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption |                        |
|   |      |              | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |                  |
| 26 | 02:01:33-02:03:37 | RG: *Oke, saya saya tahu Pak Jokowi nggak mungkin jawab karena itu*  
Okay, I I know that Mr. Jokowi will not answer it | | | | | | | | In this situation, Karni successfully interrupts Rocky, so Rocky cannot complete his utterance. Karni interrupts Rocky to tell him and Boni to not argue and to ask Rocky to deliver his opinion about human rights. However, Rocky continues his utterance after Karni finish talking. |
|   |      | KI: *Jangan jangan bersaut-sautan begitulah*  
Don’t argue, please! | | | | | | | | |
|   |      | RG: *Oke ya*  
Alright | | | | | | | |
|   |      | KI: *Anda ngomong apa pendapat anda*  
Tell us about your opinion! | | | | | | | |
|   |      | RG: *Oke, oke, saya terus ya hak saya itu ya. Saya ajukan itu sebagai problem karena dari awal Pak Jokowi itu tidak punya komitmen terhadap Hak Asasi Manusia....*  
Okay okay, I will continue. It’s my turn. I ask it as a problem because from the beginning, Mr. Jokowi does not have a commitment to human rights.... | √ | | | | | | | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS  | O  | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption | |
|     |      |              | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN | |
| 27. | 02:01:39-02:03:43 | RG: ... *Loh Hak Asasi Manusia bukan itu. Hak Asasi Manusia tidak perlu dipenuhi, dilindungi. Kan hak itu melekat pada saya, pada saudara. Jadi, tidak saya peroleh dari saudara. H*ak Asasi Manusia itu dilindungi. *Hak warga negara dipenuhi* | √ | | | | | | In this situation, Henry successfully interrupts Rocky to show his disagreement of human rights, that according to him, human rights must been given or fulfilled first, and then protected. While according to Rocky, human rights are not fulfilled, but it is protected. |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 28. | 02:03:40 – 02:04:09 | HY: *Hak Asasi Manusia itu harus diberikan dulu, dipenuhi dulu* | Types of Interruption: | Functions of Interruption: | In this situation, Rocky tries to interrupts Henry repeatedly to clarify about who gives human rights, but he fails to interrupt Henry because Henry keeps talking and ignores him. However, they share the floor in this case. |
|     |      | RG: *Maksudnya diberikan oleh siapa?* | IS | Cooperative | Intrusive | |
|     |      | HY: *Setelah terpenuhi baru dilindungi* | OI | Interm | Interruption | |
|     |      | RG: *Astaga!* | BI | | |
|     |      | HY: *Bagaimana mau melindungi sesuatu yang belum dipenuhi?* | SLI | | |
|     |      | RG: *Karena itu disebut sebagai hak asasi. Woss* | | | |
|     |      | HY: *Presiden Jokowi sejak awal memenuhi hak-hak yang merupakan hak asasi* | | | |
|     |      | RG: *Nah, ini dia* | | | |
|     |      | HY: *Hak dasar dari warga negara* | | | |
|     |      | RG: *Nah, gini ya. Ginilah. Begini ni yaa. Tenanglah. Saya sa sa saya pastikan dulu ya.* | | | |
|     |      | HY(01): *Itu sudah dipenuhi seperti saya uraikan sejak awal. Jadi, kalau anda mengatakan bahwa hak itu dilindungi, belum dipenuhi, anda keliru. Pemenuhan dulu baru pelindungan* | | | |
|     |      |     | | | |

---

**Types of Interruption**

- IS (Interpersonal Style)
- OI (Orientation)
- BI (Behavioral)
- SLI (Social)

**Functions of Interruption**

- Cooperative
- Intrusive

**Explanation**

In this situation, Rocky tries to interrupts Henry repeatedly to clarify about who gives human rights, but he fails to interrupt Henry because Henry keeps talking and ignores him. However, they share the floor in this case.
| BH:          | and they have not been fulfilled first, you’re mistaken. First fulfillment and then protection |  |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|  |
| KI:         | Setengah menit setengah menit. Half minute half minute.                                       |  |
| RG:         | That’s enough. Hey hey. You both make it unclear.                                             |  |
|             | Dari siapa? By whom?                                                                         |  |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     | 29   |              |                       |                           |             |
|     |      | BH: *Hak Asasi, Hak Asasi Manusia itu, Hak Asasi Manusia itu bang. Saya kira dalam hal ini saya setuju dengan anda, Bung Rocky.* | | | In this situation, Rocky successfully interrupts Boni to conclude about what Boni wants to say. Actually, in this case, Boni agrees with Rocky that human rights are inherent in ourselves. |
|     |      | RG: *Tu, dia saja bilang setuju dengan saya. Bilang dia yang salah. Saya sudah pasti benar tu.* | | | |
|     |      | BH: *Hak. Saya selesaiin dulu. [Laughing]. Hak asasi itu memang melekat pada diri, karena sifatnya dia kontrol, apa, eksistential, delusi ontologi....* | | | |
|     |      | BH: *Rights. Let me finish it [Laughing]. Human rights are inherent in ourselves, because they control, what, existential, ontology delusion....* | | | |

| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     | 29   |              |                       |                           |             |
|     |      |              | IS | O | BI | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |           |
|     |      |              |   |   |    |     |    |     |     |    |    |    |    | | |


| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| 30. | 02:04:55 – 02:05:35 | **RG:** Yaudah udah. You cuma mau bilang untuk | IS SI | **Cooperative Interruption** | AGR √ |
|     |      | **KI:** Baik udah cukup. Anda tinggal satu menit lagi cuma. Alright, that’s enough. It’s only one minute left | OI BI SLI | **Intrusive Interruption** | DIS √ |
|     |      | **RG:** Ya, oke. Karena itu disitu. Kalau kita mau bicara tentang soal-soal konseptual tadi seperti diawali oleh Saudara Fahri. Itu sebenarnya bikin banyak kekacauan, Saudara Yosodiningrat.... Yeah, okay. Because of it. If we want to talk about the conceptual problems like what Mr. Fahri said, it actually makes many troubles, Mr. Yosodiningrat.... | FT TC TAN | | |

In this situation, Karni successfully takes the floor to remind Rocky that he has one minute to complete his utterance. And then, Rocky continuing his utterance after Karni interrupts him.
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 31. | 02:04:57 – 02:05:53 | RG: "... Loh di dalam traktat Hak Asasi Manusia dunia, hukuman mati itu melanggar hak asasi manusia | SI | √ | In this situation, Henry successfully interrupts Rocky and makes Rocky stop talking to show his disagreement about human rights that can be violated and that cannot be violated. |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | O  | BI | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |          |
| 32. | 02:05:33 – 02:06:02 | HY: *Tidak tidak, saya boleh jelaskan itu, hak saya itu untuk menjelaskan. Dalam,, kalau anda. Anda hanya baca Pasal 28I, baca 28J. Kemudian dalam ICCPR sudah ditentu dijelaskan bahwa hak asasi itu yang boleh dilanggar itu ada yang non derogable rights dan ada yang derogable rights* | SI | O  | BI | SLI | √   |     |     |     |     |     |     | In this situation, Rocky interrupts Henry to show his disagreement about human rights that can be violated and that cannot be violated. However, he fails because Henry keeps talking and ignores him. |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | O | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption | |
| 33. | 02:05:55 – 02:06:56 | HY: *Hak yang tidak boleh dikuangi. Hak untuk diadili | √ |   |   |   | AGR |   | |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   | CLA |   | |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   | ASS |   | |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   | DIS |   | |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   | FT  |   | |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   | TC  |   | |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   | TAN |   | |
|     |      | RG: *Tapi human. You you |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      | HY: *Dengan sisi peradilan yang benar. Hak dalam undang-undang tentang HAM sendiri, nyawa yang ada dalam kandungan ibu, seorang bayi yang sudah bernyawa |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      | RG: *Derogable atau non derogable? |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      | HY: *Boleh digugurkan | √ |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      | RG: *Oke, hak asasi membunuh orang, derogable atau non derogable? |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      | HY: *Dalam keadaan ini, didalam ICCPR dijelaskan yang boleh dikuangi Hak Asasi Manusia itu termasuk pemburu- hukuman mati, antara lain terhadap kejahatan kemanusiaan, hak kejahatan luar biasa .... |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

In this situation, Rocky interrupts Henry to clarify what Henry says about derogable rights and inderogable rights. However, in this case they share the floor and Rocky fails because Henry ignores him.
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | IO | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption | |
| 34  | 02:07:18 – 02:08:35 | RG: "... Kepala daerah yang merasa dia bakal ditangkap KPK buru-buru daftar jadi anggota Nasdem, karena ada Jaksa Agung disitu. Jadi, kita lihat soal-soal semacam ini yang anda. [Laughing]. Yang dipromosikan | √ |   |   |   | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN | In this situation, Maman successfully interrupts Rocky to show his disagreement about not all politicians who will be arrested by the KPK become members of Nasdem party. |
|     |      | MI: "... The regional head who feels he will be arrested by the KPK, he rushes to become a member of Nasdem, because there is an Attorney General there. So, we see issues like this, you. [Laughing]. The one who is promoted |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | |
|     |      | RG: "Iya, tentu | √ |   |   |   | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN | |
|     |      | MI: "Iya, jadi jangan melihat satu kaset seperti itu. Yeah, so don’t see one cassette like that. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | |
|     |      | RG: "Iya tentu saja, tentu saja mesti ada tukar tambah supaya nggak terlalu bagaimana you. Kita tahu itu soal [laughing] Yeah, of course, of course there must be trade-offs, so that it is not too bad. You. We know about that [laughing] |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS       | O       | BI       | SI      | AGR | CIA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |
| 35. | 02:09:06 – 02:11:59 | RG: .... Saya, bagaimana mungkin kalian menjadi tim sukses yang nggak yang tidak tidak kompak sebagai tim kalau soal prinsip Hak Asasi Manusia beda, bertiga ni beda beda semua gitu, kan kacau tu | SI  | OI  | BI  | SI  | √   |     |     |     |     |     |     | √   | In this situation, Boni interrupts Rocky to show his disagreement that in this case, Boni asserts that he is no member of any campaign team. However, they share the floor because they talk at the same time. |
|     |      | BH: Ini ini ini Rocky melakukan pencemaran nama baik. Saya tegaskan, bang. Saya bukan tim sukses siapapun. It’s it’s it’s Rocky committing defamation. I tell you, sir. I’m not anyone’s campaign team. | LI  |     |     | SLI |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
|     |      | RG: Ya maksud saya o- |     |     |     | SI  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
|     |      | BH: Kamu cek di KPU, nama saya nggak ada disana |     |     |     | SI  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
|     |      | RG: Memang, tapi otakmu sama dengan otak tim suksesnya |     |     |     | SI  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
|     |      | BH: Sama dengan otak, sama dengan otak kamu. Kamu kan jubirnya oposisi kamu. It’s the same as your, same as your brain. You’re the spokesman for the opposition, aren’t you? |     |     |     | SI  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
|     |      | RG: Ya saya menguji dia tadi. Saya |     |     |     | SI  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
|     |      | BH: Nggak, otak kamu otak oposisi kok |     |     |     | SI  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
|     |      | KI: Oke |     |     |     | SI  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
|     |      | Okay |     |     |     | SI  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
In this situation, Dahnil successfully interrupts Sujiwo to show his disagreement that Mr. Prabowo is actually not funded by any parties.
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | O | BI | SLI | AGR | CLA | ASS | DIS | FT | TC | TAN |          |
| 37. | 02:20:57 – 02:38:38 | RH: ....Kita mau bikin solusi penegakan hukum anti korupsi, lalu kemudian yang akan melaksanakannya termasuk saber pungli ini mohon maaf part of the problem bukan part of the solution, karena barangkali kalau di cek rekeningnya rekeningnya gendut sekali. Transaksi unusual | √ |    |     |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    | In this situation, Karni successfully interrupts Refly to suggest using cut off system to resolve a corruption problem. In this case, Karni needs for clearer explanation from Refly about the implementation of the cut off system. |
|     |      | KI: Bagaimana kalau kita cut off? |
|     |      | RH: That’s yang ingin saya katakan. Jadi, salah satu strategi yang barang kali yang berani disorongkan oleh presiden adalah cut off... That’s what I want to say. So, one of the strategies that probably can be submitted to president is cut off system... |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |          |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
|     |      |              | IS | O | BI | SLI | Cooperative Interruption | Intrusive Interruption | |
| 38. | 02:38:02 – 02:38:53 | RH: ....Setelah cut off, anda harus melaporkan harta kekayaan yang sebenar-benarnya. Maka kemudian nanti kita akan tertawa. Ada | √ |  |  |  |  | √ | In this situation, Sujiwo successfully interrupts Refly to show his disagreement about the implementation of the cut off system because according to Sujiwo, cut off system will make corruption worse. |
|     |      | ST: Cut off atau tahun 0 itu justru rusak loh. Cut off system or zero year will make it worse. |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|     |      | RH: Iya nanti. Makanya saya sendiri tidak yakin dengan pemikiran itu. Tetapi apakah kemudian presiden akan kemudian ada strategi seperti itu. Setelah cut off |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|     |      | Yeah, that’s why I’m not sure about that idea. However, will president use that strategy? After cut off system |  |  |  |  |  | |
| No. | Code | Conversation | Types of Interruption | Functions of Interruption | Explanation |
|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| 39. | 02:38:44 – 02:40:15 | RH: Iya nanti. Makanya saya sendiri tidak yakin dengan pemikiran itu. Tetapi apakah kemudian presiden akan kemudian ada strategi seperti itu. Setelah cut off | | | In this situation, Karni successfully interrupts Refly to show his disagreement about Refly and Sujio’s opinion about cut off system that probably will make the corruption worse by giving an example of the country that successfully implements the cut off system. |