





























of the function of interruptions also. The most highest frequency was a cooperative interruption. Totally, the number of cooperative interruption was 66 uttered by the participants in *Ini Talk Show*. Intrusive interruption 46 uttered by the participants.

The most highest frequency from the subcategories of the function of interruptions were clarification. It appeared 29 times in two episodes of *Ini Talk Show* in NET TV. The second position was an agreement which appeared 26 times in two episodes. The third position was floor taking with 21 occurrences. The fourth position was a topic change which occurred 16 times. The fifth position was assistance which appeared 11 times in two episodes. The next position was tangentialization with 7 occurrences. then, the lowest frequency was disagreement occurred 3 times in two episodes of *Ini Talk Show*.

#### **4.1.2 Functions of Interruption**

This section discussed the function of interruptions in *Ini Talk Show* on NET TV. This section presented to answer the second research question in chapter 1 with detailed explanation. There are two function of interruptions in this research. These were cooperative interruption and intrusive interruption. Both the function of interruptions has subcategories. These are agreement, assistance, and clarification include cooperative interruption, then disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangentialization for intrusive interruption. The researcher explained each functions with the subcategories included the examples also for each subcategories.

#### **4.1.2.1 Cooperative Interruption**

In the conversation, interruption could be cooperative but depended on the function. Cooperative interruption included the use of interruption in positive case, because interruptions were other oriented such helping a partner along more than self-oriented like sizing a chance to talk (Han Z. Li, 2001: 262). In this case, cooperative interruption happened when the speaker disrupted with coordinating on the process in conversation. Cooperative interruption intended to show the attention toward the current speaker utterance. The interrupter disrupted to help the current speaker needed. The interrupter gave the opinion or idea still in the topic of the conversation that the current speaker brought. Cooperative interruption divided into three subcategories with the different frequency. They are agreement, assistance, and clarification.

##### **4.1.2.1.1 Agreement**

Agreement interruption happened when the interrupter took the floor the current speaker to give the respond about the explanation. The interrupter wanted to show the agreement, support, or the understanding toward the current speaker utterance. Besides, the interrupter may interest with the topic of the conversation that the current speaker has been explained. Sometimes, the interrupter wanted to develop the current speaker idea or the topic of conversation. Agreement interruption occurred in twenty seven (27) times in two episodes in this research. Three examples of twenty seven agreement interruptions were explained below.





































After analyzing and classifying the data analysis of the use of interruption, the researcher discussed the finding that has been described before. It aimed to answer the research problems which were formulating in chapter I. This part explained about the finding of the research that has been described in previous part above. Based on the finding, the researcher found that the interruption often happened in conversation, especially in talk show as the subject of this research. This case, interruption was the phenomenon when the second speaker cut the first speaker utterance in the middle of word without exchange the turn (Zimmerman and West, as cited in Tannen, 1990:191).

First of all, the researcher discussed about the type of interruptions. After analyzing and classifying the data analysis, the researcher found that overlapping interruption have the most frequently from fourth type of interruptions. Overlap interruption appeared 70 times in two episodes of *Ini Talk Show*. As the comedy talk show, *Ini Talk Show* was a talk show which was present interview programs with. By the comedy and conversation, easily to the participants uses a lot of overlaps interruption because they could not wait the speaker to stop the talk and to give the opinion. Although, overlap interruption happened not only as disruption but also usually to show the respond and said the positive or negative opinion. This case caused the participants could not wait the speaker stop and finish the utterance, they were immediately wanted to say the opinion. In addition, overlap interruption included successful interruption.

Conversely, the researcher found the low frequency was butting-in interruption. It appeared 7 times occurances in two episodes of *Ini Talk Show* on



NET TV. Butting-in interruption included a violation or disruption because happened to interrupt the speaker's talk until could not finish the word. It happened because the interrupter interrupted the current speaker to show his or her opinion but could not finish it, then the current speaker could take her or his turn back. So, butting-in interruption included unsuccessful interruption.

The researcher found there were two function of interruptions, but each functions has subcategories itself. Both of the two functions are cooperative interruption and intrusive interruption. Cooperative interruption has three subcategories, these are agreement, assistance, and clarification. Furthermore, intrusive interruption has four subcategories, these are disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangentialization. The researcher found that the function of interruptions often used by the participants in *Ini Talk Show* is cooperative interruption with the totally 66 times occurrances, and clarification was the most frequency of subcategories of function of interruptions. Clarification interruption which appeared 29 times in two episode of *Ini Talk Show*. This case showed that clarification was not disruption because interruption happened to intend in clarifying the words which was not enough to understand for the listener. It could produce by the participants to prevent the miss understanding occured in the conversation.

Furthermore, the researcher also found the low frequency of the function of interruptions. It was disagreement occured in 3 times during direct in two episodes. This case causes the participants have the same idea with the current speaker. Disagreement interruption showed disruption because the participants

wanted to show disagreement about the statement or opinion that utterance by the speaker. In addition, they have different idea or opinion to conveys about the topic that said.

Following this view, the study of interruption has been found in some focused of group discussion and gender, they are (Pitaramita, 2009; Cecilia Berek Lawe, 2011; Olva Lita Uli Tadoe, 2012). The research conducted by Yessica Hartono (2013) was closely related to the present research. She discusses interruption and overlaps occur by host and guests in an Indonesian television talk show Indonesia Lawyer Club – TV One. Meanwhile, the present study focusses on interruption used by the participants in *Ini Talk Show* on NET TV. This research different with the previous research, because this research investigation about types and functions of interruption used by the participants in *Ini Talk Show* based on Ferguson, Murata, Chamden and Kennedy, Han Z. Li theories. The types of interruption based on Ferguson theory, are simple interruption, overlaps interruption, butting-in interruption, and silent interruption. Then, the function of interruption based on Murata, Chamden and Kennedy, and Han Z. Li, are cooperative interruption; agreement, assistance, and clarification. Intrusive interruption; disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangentialization. The finding in the present research is different with the previous researches.

In addition, the writer get some points after analyzing the finding. The writer found that the use of interruption not only negative case but sometimes can be positive case. That way depended on the function used by participants. In the finding, the researcher found that the most type appeared by the



Al-Jauzaa' (2009), among the case that should be considered by the speaker is someone to let him or her keep the honor, and did not speak to give the opinion or the story to those who do not want it. In this case, as for the wisdom is that he or she did not speak except on a suitable place and at a good time to give the opinion or story. If the conditions and the situation is not appropriate or the listeners move to him or her and did not want to speak, it would be better to keep silent. Meanwhile, if the condition of the place and the situation allows and listeners ready to listen the opinion or story, so he or she gave it although a part of their busy with the others things.

From the hadith above that interruption is being impoliteness in a conversation. Thus, keep your verbal because a person's behavior can be judged from the way he or she spoke, then as a good people and religion obedient would be better in order to keep the verbal and does not interrupt people while they are talking that will cause people to be bored.

The writer concluded that in conversation, the people may could give an argument or opinion toward the topic that the speaker brought. Whilst, the people usually produce interruption to convey the argument or opinion. This case happened because the people bored with what your talk, and sometimes people could be angry to you because talk without permission while the speaker talk. In this case, the good manner to convey own opinion must be know how do interruption to right obligation and when the situation to do it. But, the better way is be patient and waiting for your turn to talk or the speaker stop the utterance.