THE REALIZATION OF TURN TAKING SYSTEM IN LAWAN BICARA DEBATE (A METRO TV PROGRAM BROADCASTED ON 13TH JANUARY 2014)

Written by Fitri Amalia Shinta Siwi
Thesis Advisor: Nurhayati
English Department, Faculty of Humanies, Diponegoro University

ABSTRAK

Dalam percakapan di suatu acara debat terdapat beberapa aturan yang harus diperhatikan oleh para penuturnya, baik pembawa acara maupun narasumber. Sistem alih wicara adalah salah satu aturan yang penting dalam mengatur jalannya pendistribusian giliran bicara dari satu orang ke orang lainnya. Dalam penelitian ini, penulis tertarik untuk meneliti pola sistem alih wicara oleh peserta, fenomena pengambilan giliran bicara dan implikasi sosial yang mempengaruhinya dalam salah satu episode di acara debat *Lawan Bicara*. Tujuan penulisan penelitian ini adalah untuk menjelaskan kecenderungan gaya percakapan dalam acara debat *Lawan Bicara* dan mengetahui implikasi sosial sebagai akibat adanya pendistribusian giliran bicara. Data yang digunakan berupa semua ujaran peserta dari sesi pertama sampai sesi keempat dalam satu episode. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Metode simak bebas libat cakap digunakan dalam pengumpulan data. Dalam menganalisis data, penulis menggunakan metode padan (metode pragmatik dan inferensial) dan agih. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat tiga jenis strategi, yaitu *select next speaker*, *self-selection* dan *continuation*, dan empat pola yang digunakan oleh pembawa acara dan narasumber dalam sistem alih wicara. Selain itu terjadinya interupsi dan tumpang tindih dilakukan karena tujuan tertentu, yaitu menunjukkan persetujuan atau pertentangan pendapat, membantu penutur lain, klarifikasi, mengambil giliran bicara penutur lain dan mengubah topik pembicaraan. Konteks sosial yaitu formalitas dan kekuasaan juga berpengaruh dalam terjadinya pendistribusian giliran bicara.

Kata kunci : *sistem alih wicara*, *tumpang tindih, interupsi, debat, konteks*

1. PENDAHULUAN

1.1. Background of the Study

Conversation has an important role in the daily life because it is an activity representing a human's way to interact. Conversation can involve at least two participants. Thus, talk which is used to deliver messages or information has a special role in communication. It uses a language as a verbal tool. Participants have similar rights to speak if they have no different status in the conversation, so they can take their turns to run the conversation orderly.

There is a branch of linguistics which discusses the phenomenon, namely conversation analysis (CA). However, the distribution and the rules of conversational turns particularly are explained specifically in a basic finding, namely turn taking system. Turn taking system provides some basic rules to avoid interruption and overlaps in the conversation. A simple explanation is when person talks, the others should wait until the speaker has finished his/her turn. Otherwise, it is possible to take other people's turn in the daily conversation.

A kind of conversation can be seen on television. Because television is one of popular mass media nowadays, it can influence many people easily through language represented in sounds and pictures. There are some interesting programs in the television which can be

observed based on the turn taking system study, for example interview, forum, debate, talk show, etc. In fact, the conversation in the television programs, especially in the forum and debate, is different from daily life conversation because there are some restrictions and topic control. Furthermore, debate and forum have special characteristics. First, there are unequal turns among participants in those programs. It means that every participant has different conversational turn and a role in the conversation. Second, the programs are usually led by at least one person as a host or a presenter, so the host will open and close the show. He also has a power to arrange the distribution of conversational turns in the conversation. Finally, the topic of the show is limited due to the specific events, especially politics.

Lawan Bicara is one of television programs in Indonesia. It is categorized as a debate program which had been broadcasted before the presidential election was on going in 2014. The participants are two hosts, some guest speakers and audiences. The hosts collaborate each other to introduce a controversial or popular topic in the debate. Besides, both hosts have a duty to lead this debate. It means that the hosts actually have an important role in beginning, giving floors to other participants and finishing the debate. The guest speakers are divided into two groups, which are pro-group and contra-group. The pro-group and contra-group have to give their opinion related to the topic. The writer finds out an interesting thing concerning with the distribution of turn taking mechanism among participants in the debate. The writer also finds different distribution of turn-taking for each session or segment in *Lawan Bicara* debate*,* so it encourages the writer to observe this deeply. This is due to the fact that the hosts have a right to give floors for the guest speakers in the debate, but they cannot lead the debate orderly because the guest speakers do not obey the rules. They do not consider their rights and obligations in the conversation. As a result of this, there are many overlaps and interruptions. The reason why there are many overlaps and interruption as a result of the way participants take their floors in the debate can be answered by conducting research. Thus, based on the background above, the research is entitled "The Realization Of Turn Taking Mechanism in *Lawan Bicara* Debate" (A METRO TV Program Broadcasted on 13th January 2014).

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to give an explanation about the tendency of conversational style in political debate in a television program. *Lawan Bicara* debate as an object in this research represents other debate programs in television because most of them usually have the similar form. In addition, the explanation of the social implication of such turn taking phenomena in *Lawan Bicara* debate as a result of the grabbing of floors is also important concerning with the overlaps and interruptions in the debate program.

2.   CONTENT
2.1. Method of Analyzing Data

In analyzing the data, the writer used descriptive qualitative method in order to find the types of turn taking system, namely selecting next speaker, self-selection and continuation, and their functions in *Lawan Bicara* debate. The writer analyzed how the hosts distribute the floors in turn taking mechanism by presenting some examples based on certain characteristics. In addition, it is also used to explain the phenomena of interruptions and overlaps in the debate show. Similarly, in analyzing the phenomena of overlaps and interruptions, the writer also categorized the data based on the similar characteristics and afterwards, she picked some examples as representation.

Moreover, the writer also used two methods, namely identity method and distributional method. Identity method is a method used to identify the features or aspects that are

investigated (Sudaryanto:1993,13). First, the writer used pragmatic identity method and inreferential method, that is inductive method. The pragmatic identity method can help the writer to explain the way participants (hosts and guest speakers) occupy themselves in the debate and the pragmatic aspects that influence the participants. Then, the inferential method will help to analyze the turn taking concept related to its context briefly related to the data, that is social factors (Krippendorff:2004,58). Furthermore, this method also helps the writer to decide the social implication of the results in *Lawan Bicara* debate. Together with identity method, distributional method is also used in analyzing this research. This method is used to explain the various functions of the kinds of turn taking system and the phenomena of grabbing floors properly.

2.2.Discussion

In this chapter, the writer discusses the way hosts distribute turn taking system in *Lawan Bicara* debate, so it will show the patterns of turn taking mechanism. In addition, the writer also analyzes the phenomena of grabbing of floors (interruptions and overlaps) and the social implication of the such turn taking phenomena in the debate briefly.

A.   The Distribution of Turn Taking System in *Lawan Bicara* Debate

To answer the first research question concerning how the hosts distribute turn taking mechanism in *Lawan Bicara* debate, the writer classified the data based on theory. The hosts actually have an important role to open, to give floors or turns to other participants and to close the debate. As mentioned before, according to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:703), there are three procedures for determining the allocation of turns, namely current speaker selects who next speaker is, the next speaker may select himself (self-selection) and current speaker continues his talk. Moreover, there are special rules for continuation based on TRP (Transition Relevance Place). Table 2 shows classification of those rules from the first session to fourth session.

Table 2
TRP Classification in *Lawan Bicara* Debate

Session	Current speaker selects who next speaker is (%)	Self-selection (%)	Continuation (%)
1	51,7%	41,3%	7%
2	73,5%	8,8%	17,7%
3	61,1%	33,3%	5,6%
4	77,8,%	11,1%	11,1%

a.   Current speaker selects who next speaker is

The first strategy used by hosts to run the conversation among guest speakers in the debate is that current speaker selects next speaker. It reflects that the hosts have to give floors to the guest speakers or audiences through asking question, giving statement, inviting them to talk, and expressing non verbal signs (gaze, gesture, etc.). Then, after analyzing the whole data, the writer found four patterns of the distribution of turn taking system in *Lawan Bicara* debate.

a) Host → Guest Speaker

    The first pattern is called normative pattern because it shows the basic distribution of turn taking mechanism from the host to the guest speaker. The host places herself as a controller in distributing the floor in the debate show, so she can choose who the next speaker is based on the certain question related to the topic. In fact, the writer has found twenty four occurences of the first pattern, but she just describes an example briefly.

Example 1

1 PS1 : Ya saya langsung saja ke Bang Fadly Zon sebagai partai pendukung Jokowi-Ahok (.) .... , silahkan bang 2 IN1 : Terimakasih (batuk) (0.3) .... gitu ya= 3 PS1 : =tapi tidak cukup untuk setaun ini saja kan ?= 4 IN1 : =ya tentu↑ .... gitu ya ::

    In example 1, the first host (PS1) said *Ya saya langsung saja ke Bang Fadly Zon* to indicate that the host selects who the next speaker is by referring name. The host also said *silahkan bang* to invite Mr. Fadli Zon (IN1) as the first guest speaker to give his assessment concerning about Jokowi's work as a governor in Jakarta. Then, the speaker (IN1) received the floor by telling *terimakasih*. After he gave his opinion using a positive statement, he closed his floor by saying *gitu ya* in the end of his utterances. In line (3) the host tried to get more information through question. The sentence *tapi tidak cukup untuk setaun ini saja kan?* showed that the host wanted to explore more opinion from the guest speaker. It was also supported by the host's gesture. The host pointed IN1 to select IN1 through her hand and gaze. Besides, the host also used a question tag *kan?* to clarify the guest speaker's statement. It also gave a sign of turn-taking from host to the guest speaker, so the guest speaker had to take his duty to answer the question. Therefore, IN1 received the floor through phrase *ya tentu* in the beggining of his utterances. According to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:704), if the current speaker had selected the next speaker, the selected speaker had the right and must take the next turn and others cannot take those turn (rule 1a). Based on Levinson (1983:296), the distribution of conversational turns above is A-B-A-B. It occurs in the conversation between two participants, namely the host (PS1) and the guest speaker (IN1). Overall, this pattern can be found quite a few in the debate show from the first session to fourth session.

b) Host → Guest Speaker→ Host

    The second pattern is different from the first one because it does not reflect that the hosts have a role to distribute the flow of turn taking system in the debate show. Initially, the host as the current speaker gives her floor to the guest speaker in order to select the next speaker, but the guest returns the floor to the host instead by asking question. The writer presents the examples and explanation below.

Example 2

9 PS2 : //kalo nanti kan jadi calon presiden supaya bisa (.) ....   [bukan begitu ya?] 10 IN1 :[ya, setiap::   ] 11 PS2 : //Ya Bang Arar, silahkan ((tepuk tangan)) 16 IN2 : =Saya mau bertanya (.) Mbak Andini dulu pendukungnya Mas Jokowi ya↑ waktu gubernur?= 17 PS1 : =Iya 18 IN2 : Putaran pertama atau putaran kedua ?= 19 PS1 : (tertawa) =dua putaran=

As can be seen in example 2, the second host (PS2) gave opportunity to the second speaker (IN2), Mr. Arar, to respond his statement previously in line (9). In addition, the host said *silahkan* to choose the speaker to take the floor as soon as possible before another guest grabs the floor. In addition, the host (PS2) also selected IN2 by referring name *Ya Bang Arar*. However, before he gave his opinion related to the authority of the central government if Jokowi will be the next president, the speaker tended to change the topic by asking a question to another host (PS1). Thus, the first host (PS1) had to run his duty to answer the question even though the speaker did not have a right to select other participants. In line (16), the speaker asked her concerning her choice when the election of governor in Jakarta and the host answered him in a concise reply. The speaker used addresse form to choose the next speaker by calling name, that was *Saya mau bertanya (.) Mbak Andini dulu pendukungnya Mas Jokowi ya waktu gubernur?* After that, the speaker asked how many rounds that the host chose Jokowi as a governor. This indirectly may imply that the speaker wants to show that Jokowi is a good figure because the host actually also supported him in the governor election in the past.

c)   Host → Guest Speaker(1) → Guest Speaker(2)
Next, the third pattern involves three participants, namely the host and two guest speakers. The host as the current speaker selects one of the guest speakers to give his opinion. Otherwise, the speaker selects who the next speaker is by asking a question to another speaker from his opposite group. Consequently, the host cannot arrange the distribution of floors properly because the guest speaker takes the host's right. Therefore, the writer tries to describe this phenomenon by giving two examples.

Example 4

```
159 PS2  : = Ya Bang Arar=
160 IN2  : (0.3) =saya rasa 2014 ini harus berakhir era politik
                 pencitraan (.) .... setuju ya prof ↑?=
161 IN4  : =setuju setuju=
```

Based on the part of conversation above in example 4, there is an uncommon pattern of the turn taking mechanism in *Lawan Bicara* debate. First, in line (159), the second host (PS2) invited Mr. Arar as the guest speaker (IN2) to respond the previous opinion from the opposite group. The host selected him by calling his name, namely *Ya Bang Arar*. Then, there was a short pause before he answered and took the floor. He argued that the fake politics era must be over and it will change into the politics that concerns in public interest, so many people can believe in the former government. Involving another speaker from the opposite group (IN4), the speaker asked another's speaker agreement to strengthen his opinion. It can be shown in line (160), that was *setuju ya, prof* ?. In short, the speaker (IN2) took the host's role to select who next speaker is by giving floor to
another guest (IN4).

d)   Host(1) → Host(2) → Host(1)
Finally, the fourth pattern is used by both the first and second host in order to close the session in *Lawan Bicara* debate. This is due to the fact that there are two hosts who lead the debate show, so both hosts have to open and close the conversation together. For instance, example 6 shows that the first hosts (PS1) wanted to close the first session of the debate using jargon. The jargon of *Lawan Bicara* debate was *ajang debat adu argumen yang bermanfaat*. Therefore, the first host (PS1) did not say whole sentence, but he selected another host to complete the jargon correctly. In this case, in line (50), the first host used gaze to sign that the second host had to take the floor quickly. After the second host finished his speaking, he

returned the floor to the first host. Then, the first host told the viewer to stay tuned for the next session.

Example 6

50 PS1	: //Oke baik kita teruskan lagi setelah jeda pariwara berikut tetap di lawan bicara ajang debat ::
51 PS2	: =adu argument yang bermanfaat dan bermartabat=
52 PS1	: =tetaplah bersama kami

b.   Self-selection

The second strategy used by hosts in *Lawan Bicara* debate is self-selection. It deals with the rules technique of TRP. It will occur if the current speaker has not selected the next speaker, so any potential next speaker may do self selection technique. However, it does not depend on the first speaker who has the right to the turn. Therefore, it is possible for another speaker to take the floor after the current speaker finishes his talking.

Self-selection used by the hosts has a similar function in the conversation. Generally, self-selection technique is usually used by the hosts to gain more information towards the guest speakers in the conversation. Otherwise, the writer found a different function of self-selection used by the hosts to manage floors in the debate show.

Example 7

27 IN1	: //[Enggak gini (.) siapapun↑ siapapun dia (.) . karena] //
28 IN2	: // [kalo gitu dukung lagi aja sekarang]
29 IN1	: [kita mendukung yang terbaik]
30 IN2	: ((tertawa)) (0.3)
31 PS1	: Oke mungin mas Agung atau mas Hamdi silahkan menambahkan apakah benar-benar Jokowi harus menyelesaikan tanggung jawabnya dulu=

In example 7, in line (31) the first host (PS1) tended to select herself to take the floor after a short pause (marked with a dash). In fact, the current speaker was Mr. Fadli Zon (IN1), but another speaker (IN2) tried to grab his floor by overlapping. As a result of this, the first host (PS1) initiated to take the floor to avoid short pause and gap in order to run the conversation smoothly after both speakers stop talking. She gave floor to another speaker through question by saying *Oke mungin mas Agung atau mas Hamdi silahkan mendambahkan apakah benar-benar Jokowi harus menyelesaikan tanggung jawabnya dulu*?. This is due to the fact that if the host did not do self-selection technique, both guest speakers might continue their competition in grabbing the floor. In addition, the host also gave opportunity for another participant to speak.

c) Continuation

Continuation is the third strategy used by guest speakers to answer the host's question in order to take the given floor in the *Lawan Bicara* debate. This occurs when the current speaker has not selected the next speaker, he may continue his turn if there are no other speakers doing self-selection technique. The writer found two types of continuation based on when the continuation occurs in the conversation.

Example 9

79 PS2	: //sudah clear ?=
80 IN6	: =itu tidak bisa memerintah tempat lain (.) .... nah ↑ ini menarik =
((tertawa)) ((tepuk tangan)) (0.3)	
81 IN6	: =menjadi persoalan (.) .... yang menentukan adalah figure siapa yang memimpin gitu //

First, it can be shown in the part of conversation above, the continuation occurs when there is a short pause. In line (79), the first host (PS1) asked a question to Mr. Yayat Supriyatna (IN6), so the guest had to answer the question. He clarified that Jokowi as a symbol is a brave leader to make change in Jakarta. However, before he finished his opinion compeletely, the audiences gave applause to him because they thought that his statement was true and interesting. Therefore, in line (81), he spontaneously continued his talking after a short pause (marked with a dash) since he did not want another speaker or host to take the floor. In addition, because Mr. Yayat Supriyatna as the current speaker thought that he had not finished his floor yet, so he had an initiative to continue giving his ideas which support his previous statement.

B. **The Phenomena of Grabbing Floors (Overlaps And Interruptions) Related to Social Context.**

As explained previously, the hosts have an important role in *Lawan Bicara* debate to give other participants or guest speakers their floors. They also can arrange the flow of turn-taking mechanism among participants. Nevertheless, the writer finds some interesting phenomena of overlaps and interruptions. At the beginning of each session, the guest speakers get floors from the hosts and the conversation runs orderly. Then, interruptions and overlaps occur in the middle and the end of each session. In fact, overlaps and interruptions are the violation of TRP rules in the conversation. Table 3 shows the classification of overlaps and interruptions in the first session of *Lawan Bicara* debate.

Table 3
The Classification of Overlaps and Interruptions in *Lawan Bicara* Debate

Session	Interruption		Overlap	
	Intrusive	Cooperative	Problematic	Non problematic
1	75%	25%	100%	0%
2	69%	31%	72,7%	27,3%
3	95,2%	4,8%	75%	25%
4	92,3%	7,7%	67%	33%

a) Interruption

Conversation cannot simply run orderly based on the TRP rules by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson theory. It frequently can be found that a speaker wants to speak when another speaker is still talking. He also does not wait until his partner finishes speaking. As a result of this, it causes interruption in the conversation. Interruption is marked by double slash (//). In other words, interruption occurs when a speaker takes a floor or cut another speaker's talk. After analyzing whole example, the writer found two types of interruption used by both hosts and guest speakers according to their function in *Lawan Bicara* debate, namely cooperative and intrusive interruptions.

1) Cooperative interruption

The first type of interruption does not intend to compete other speakers' talk. The interruptor wants to help the current speaker by coordinating on the process or content in the conversation. Therefore, this process can be identified when the speaker shows his agreement before the current speaker finishes his talk completely. The part of conversation below shows an example of this case in *Lawan Bicara* debate.

Example 11

170 PS1	: = kalo begitu Bu Mega aja dong ya Pak ya :: yang jadi capres::
171 IN1	: //ya saya dalam beberapa hal itu sependapat ya dengan mas Arar (.) kita memang sebetulnya harus berorientasi kepada program (0.1) .... program (0.2) Obama care, masalah kesehatan masalah pendidikan masalah ekonomi::
172 IN2	: //saya setuju itu=

From example 11, the second speaker (IN2) showed his agreement towards the previous statement said by another speaker (IN1). The first speaker (IN1) said that the most important thing for the next leadership in Indonesia is oriented in work program, so the next election should concern the programs rather than the figures. Therefore, this statement urged another speaker to show his response through *saya setuju itu* through interruption. It means that the second speaker (IN2) shared his personal agreement. However, the second speaker (IN2) broke TRP rules (1a) based on Sack, Schegloff, Jefferson. In spite of the fact that he wanted to agree with the first speaker (IN1), he had to wait until the first speaker finished his utterances because he took the first speaker'right in the conversation.

In addition, it is possible that the interruptor wants to provide a word, a phrase, a sentence or idea because he perceives that the current speaker needs help. Thus, the writer presents an example of the second case as can be seen in example 12.

Example 12

205 IN3	: =kan begini pak, ... dia kan bisa seperti itu ::
206 IN1	: =nah ini saya perlu waktu satu menit menjelaskan (.) .... Karena berani ya, kemudian bagaimana sebagai kader partai (.) kemudian aturan partai keputusan partai:: (0.2) diabaikan
207 PS2	://diabaikan

From example 12, the second host (PS2) gave a word *diabaikan* because he already understood the topic and context that the speaker was talking about, so he interrupted the speaker (IN1) to help the speaker finding an appropriate word to complete the speaker's utterances in the conversation. The speaker wanted to clarify that if a candidate is brave, he can ignore his party which supports him in the election. Beside the host (PS2) knew the topic, he cut the speaker's talk since the speaker stopped talking for a moment to think. Thus, it made the host did interruption in order to continue the speaker's talk. However, the host (PS2) broke TRP rules (Sack, Schegloff, Jefferson) because of interruption. Although there was a short pause, it did not mean that the speaker gave his floor to another speaker, so the host cannot take the floor. This is due to the fact that the speaker needed more time to think.

2)   . Intrusive interruption

To compare with collaborative interruption, intrusive interruption is used to threat other speakers' face by disrupting on the process or content in the conversation. The writer found that the interruptor wants to cut the current speaker's talk to show his disagreement. One of the examples will be described below.

Example 14

85 IN1	: bukan hanya untuk periode lima tahun (.) tetapi kalo kita lihat cara berfikir mas Yayat .... saya kira nanti 34 gubernur pengen jadi presiden semua=
86 IN6	: =bukan itu juga masalahnya↑ //
87 IN1	: //dan itu tidak ada masalah//
88 IN6	: //dan itu ada persoalan besar bahwa di DKI itu :: bukan figure gubernur saja↑.... mencari symbol symbol tokoh tokoh utama yang menjadi menarik adalah =

In example 14, there are two interruptions occured between two guest speakers in the conversation. In line (86), IN6 did self-selection. Before he tried to give more explanation, IN1 had interrupted, so he said *dan itu tidak ada masalah*. This situation was brought about the fact that IN1 rejected another speaker utterances. It was strategy used by the guest speaker (IN1) to show that he was true and another speaker (IN6) was wrong. After that, because IN6 had a different opinion, he cut IN1's utterances. This was due to the fact that he might think that IN1 did not know what exactly the problem was. He argued that there was a big problem in Jakarta concerning in a good figure and strong actor to lead Jakarta in the future. Therefore, both guest speakers (IN1 and IN6) showed a violation of TRP rules (1a). They should talk after the current speaker finished his utterances completely, so they can take the floor well. According to TRP rules (Sack, Schegloff, Jefferson, 1974), although this aims to refute that the current speaker did not tell the fact or the truth, the interruptor should follow the rule in a proper way.

To take another case, the writer also found that intrusive interruption as a device in taking the floors. The interruptor does not intend to change the topic that the current speaker discussed, but he just wants to develop the topic and to give
his opinion by taking the current speaker's floor in the conversation.
Example 15

250 PS1	: =baik terimakasih artinya dari masyarakat di luar Jakarta (0.3) juga ingin melihat buktinya yang akan dilakukan oleh Pak Jokowi di Jakarta=
251 IN5	: =masalahnya rakyat Indonesia sudah tidak sabar (0.2) tidak cukup waktu untuk menunggu 5 tahun lagi
252 PS2	: //oke ya baik siapa disini yang tidak sabar untuk melihat Jokowi menjadi presiden? silahkan ibu [silahkan ibu berdiri]
253 IN5	: [Jakarta] entah ( ) kenapa tapi Indonesia mendapat apa :
254 PS2	: //oke sebentar mas Roy (.) silahkan=

As can be seen in example 15, there were two intrusive interruptions used by the second hosts to manage the floor in the conversation. The guest speaker (IN5) tried to share his ideas, but the second host invited another participant, that was an audience, to give her opinion concerning in the current topic. The interruption occured when the host wanted to change the topic because he had to keep the time. However, the speaker (IN5) kept talking and he did not care about the audience. Then, in line (254), the second host interrupted him through a sentence *oke sebentar mas Roy* to take the floor and gave an opportunity to the audience for expressing her ideas. It means that the second host selected the audience as a next speaker. The interruption was marked by a word *sebentar,* so it forced the current speaker to stop talking. Concequently, the second host broke TRP rules 1(a) based on (Sack, Schegloff, Jefferson) in order to cut off the current speaker's utterances.

b)   Overlap

If there are more than two speakers involved in the conversation, it will be found many phenomena of overlapping. Overlaps occur when there are two or more speakers talking at the same time, so all utterances produced by those speakers cannot be delivered well. Overlaps are marked by two square brackets "[]" in the conversational transcision. The phenomena of overlaps occurring in *Lawan Bicara* debate have various and intended meaning. This is also a strategy used by the hosts and guest speakers to grab the floor. Thus, the writer tries to classify those meaning. It can be classified as problematic and non problematic overlaps.

1)   Non problematic overlap

The first classification is non problematic or non competitive overlap. This overlap is used by the participants in the conversation in order to support another speaker. In *Lawan Bicara* debate, the writer found different form of non competitive overlaps used by both guest speakers and hosts. First, this overlap shows an acknowledgement token. Acknowledgement token is a short listener response occured during extended floor and claims that understanding and agreement come from the previous utterances by the current speaker. It is also known as backchannel. An example will be presented in example 17.

Example 17

239 PS1	: ya tapi sebagai parpol tetap mendukung secara ()
240 IN1	: // tapi kami (.) tapi kami sudah bersikap bahwa .... ya jadi kalau memilih partai Gerindra nah nanti calonnya [Pak Prabowo]::
241 PS1	: // [yak baik]
242 PS2	: [baik]

In line (241) and (242), the first and second hosts (PS1 and PS2) used acknowledgement token to express that they really understood what the guest speaker (IN1) just told them about the current speaker's statement. The hosts said *yak baik* and *baik* with a flat intonation and the utterances were also accompanied by nodding, but they said that words at the same time when the guest speaker said *Pak Prabowo*. However, it did not intend to compete the current speaker because the acknowledgement token and the resulting overlaps were short, so it cannot be used to take or to disrupt the current speaker's right in the conversation.

Moreover, non competitive overlaps also occured when the listener says some particular words or question tags, such as *oh , really, didn't they,* etc. before the current speaker finishes his talking. It is used to indicate that what had been received by the listener is newsworthy or interesting. It also shows that the listener supports the current speaker utterance directly. Then, the writer will be describe an example in example 18.

Example 18

95 IN6	: =dan pertanyaan yang paling menarik adalah (.) satu hal pak Jokowi adalah hasil proses seleksi//
96 PS2	: //dan apalagi pak ahok sudah mempersilahkan monggo pak jokowi untuk maju lagi [yak kan↑ ?]
97 IN6	:[nah yak kan]

Based on example 18, the guest speaker (IN6) used question tag to show that he agreed in the second host (PS2). Initially, the guest speaker argued that Jokowi was a result of the selection process. Then, the second host added his opinion that Mr. Ahok as the vice governor also gave a positive response if Jokowi became a president in the next election. At the end of his utterances, the host said *yak kan ?* to encourage the previous statement by the speaker (IN5), and the speaker also repeated the host utterances at the same time through a question tag, that is *nah yak kan?*. Therefore, it indicated that the guest speaker showed his assessment to prove that his statement was correct due to the host's approval.

b)   Problematic overlap

The second classification is problematic or competitive overlap. It occurs when another speaker intends to grab the current speaker's floor in order to compete him in a purpose. It is used to cut off or to stop the current speaker's talk to give response based on the current speaker utterances. Thus, it just has a function to create competiveness between guest speakers in the debate show. Furthermore, competitive overlap is also used by the hosts to give another question to the guest speaker in the debate show. It occurs when the current

speaker has not finished his talk completely, but the host gives a new question to him, so they talk at the same time. The writer provides the example below.

Example 19

235 PS2	: Silahkan Mas Fadli tadi sedikit terpotong=
236 IN1	: =apa yang tadi sikap dari bung Arar tadi (.) .... itu akan menjadi satu competitor yang hebat [yang baik] ::
237 PS2	: [termasuk]konfigurasinya untuk mengulang 2009 maju bersama lagi [di pemilu presiden?]

As can be seen in example 19, the second host (PS2) took the current speaker utterances by overlapping. It began when the second host selected Mr.Fadli Zon as a speaker to continue his explanation because previously it hardly was stopped by the advertisement. In line (236) and (237), when the current speaker said *yang baik*, the host also began his new question *termasuk konfigurasinya untuk mengulang 2009 maju bersama lagi di pemilu presiden?*. In this example, overlaps was used as a strategy by the host to seek clarification from the guest speaker and he cut the speaker utterances in order to get to the point directly. Besides, it was also used to gain more information toward the current speaker.

In addition, overlap has a purpose to deny the current speaker utterances, so he talks when the current speaker is still speaking at the same time. An example can be shown in example 20 below.

Example 20

151 PS2	: //Permasalahnnya prof -- permasalahannya Prof adalah sosok Jokowi ini yang muncul dengan meroket elektabilitasnya dan menjawab::
152 IN4	: //sehingga maksud saya kasihan juga Pak Jokowi dia disuruh jadi gubernur juga merangkap presiden juga gitu kan ((laugh))
153 IN6	: [sedehana saja persoalannya kan]
154 IN4	: [seolah –olah kan begitu]

The part of conversation above shows overlapping between the guest speaker from the opposite group (IN6 and IN4). To answer a question asked by the second host concerning about Jokowi who had a good fame in the society, IN4 argued that he disagreed if Jokowi will be both president and governor in Jakarta. However, another guest speaker (IN6) who supported Jokowi wanted to clarify the problem properly, but IN4 shared his denial through overlap. In line (154), IN4 seemed thinking that his previous statement was true, so he talked at the same time when IN6 gave clarification based on the current topic. Thus, overlap occurred when IN6 says *sederhana saja persoalannya kan* and IN4 also said *seolah-olah kan begitu* to show his refusal towards another speaker utterances.

C.   Conversational Style

After analyzing the whole data in *Lawan Bicara* debate, the writer can imply that the conversation includes a high involvement style. This is because there are many overlaps and interruptions among participants, either used by the hosts or the guest speakers, during the conversation. Those phenomena occur simultaneously and non simultaneously based on the functions. The participants grab other floors by interrupting and overlapping each other because they try to argue their opinion based on their own perspective. In other words, they seem to force other participants to believe that their opinion is right.

D.   Social Implication Based on the Result

Taking all analysis into account, the writer tries to explain why there are various patterns of turn taking and why those participants do overlaps and interruptions. This is due to the fact that participants are influenced by social context when they produce utterances or

talk in the conversation. Therefore, the hosts, the guest speakers and the audiences who involve in *Lawan Bicara* debate have different roles.

Formality and power are considered as important factors when the speaker talks to another speaker in the conversation. In other words, when the speakers want to produce utterances, they have to pay attention in the context, such as situation, time, topic, interlocutors, etc. In this research, the writer uses *Lawan Bicara* debate as the main data, so it is different from the daily conversation. In the debate, host or presenter has an important role to manage the floors orderly and both guest speakers and audiences can speak if the host gives them the floor. It means that the host is a superior in the formal conversation in order to control the floor, and the guest speakers and audiences are subordinate because they cannot take floors freely.

After analyzing whole data, the writer found the various patterns of turn taking system based on the allocation of turns in the conversation, namely selecting next speaker, self-selection and continuation. However, the interesting thing is that there are four patterns used by the the current speaker in selecting who the next speaker is. Normally, the first and second hosts are the only one of the participants in the debate show who have a right to point the next speaker. It occurs in almost the data. However, there are three other patterns which are astonishing because those patterns have different pattens. After the the host gives floor to the guest speaker through statement, question or interruption, the guest speaker talks and answers it, but afterwards, the guest speaker selects the next speaker to complete the floor. He choose either the host or another guest speaker. Based on theory, it is the host who has a right to distribute the floor or to select who the next speaker is. Therefore, the guest speaker breaks the flow. For this reason, the writer tries to explain what situations which influence that case.

As can be seen in the case above, the first pattern is the normal distribution of turn taking from the host to the guest speaker. It occurs in all session from the debate show, from the first session to the fourth session. This pattern shows that the hosts have a high position to lead and to run the conversation well. The hosts usually select the next speaker because of some reasons. First, at the beginning of each session, the host provides a question to a guest speaker for introducing a topic that they want to discuss. They selects one of the speaker, either from the pro group or the contra group in the debate show. They sometimes directly invite the speaker by calling the guest speaker's name clearly. Besides, the first pattern also can be found after the guest speaker answers the question asked by the host. In this case, the host wants to clarify the preceding statement said by the guest speaker because the host thinks that the guest speaker does not answer properly. Consequently, the host tends to repeat the guest speaker utterances. Additionally, it is also used to invite another guest speaker to show his personal opinion and to respond the previous guest speaker utterances. Thus, the distribution of turn taking mechanism is well-arranged and A-B-A-B pattern based on Levinson is valid.

To differ from the first normal pattern, the other patterns have some situations when the guest speaker takes host's right in controlling the distribution of turn taking mechanism in *Lawan Bicara* debate. The guest speaker who becomes the current speaker selects the host intentionally in order to take advantage from the host. In short, the speaker wants the host to support his preceding statement through a question. This question is deliberately created to force the host answering it as soon as possible even though the host knows that his right is taken by the guest speaker. Furthermore, the guest speaker also can invite another guest speaker from the opponent group when selecting who the next speaker is. It occurs usually when the host asks him a difficult question or statement to answer. He seems to turn over the question by selecting another speaker to participate expressing opinion. It also has a function to threat the opponent group, so the the main focus is moved from the guest speaker to another speaker. Finally, it is possible to the host to give the floor for another host in the

debate show. It usually occurs in the end of each session due to the fact that both hosts must close the session together, so the role of both hosts is balanced or equal.

Additionally, the writer also analyzes the phenomena of grabbing floors in *Lawan Bicara* debate. This is because of the related topic, namely *Jokowi Milik Siapa? PDIP vs Gerindra*. This topic includes political domain, so it is different from other topics in the conversation. The guest speakers who are politicians may express their own ideas and opinions without considering another speakers, especially their opponent. Otherwise, the guest speakers always support their partner in the same group. In order to compete their opponent, the guest speakers are supposed to use interruptions and overlaps although it can break the rules techniques of TRP (Transition Relevance Place) based on Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:702-704). Overlaps and interruptions are strategies used by politicians to deny another speaker's utterances by directing a particular topic toward another topic. It reflects that the politicians show their unwillingness to talk in the particular topic when the hosts give them floors. It usually occurs when the guest speakers are threaten by another guest speaker. As a result of this, the guest speakers have to save their 'face' to show their good and to mitigate their bad to the public's assumption. They tend to use a manipulative language through interruption and overlap in order to hide their meaning and the truth in the debate, so they can achieve their personal goal as a representation of their parties. Moreover, other guest speakers will also agree with their opinion. In practice, the manipulative language can be shown in the various distribution of turn taking system and the phenomena of grabbing floors, and it is not based on the content of utterances produced by the guest speakers.

Overlaps and interruptions are also used by the hosts in *Lawan Bicara* debate. In this case, the hosts do not intend to compete another guest speaker utterances, but they just want to manage the distribution of turn taking system orderly. The hosts interrupt the guest speaker utterances in order to grab the floor back and to control the flow of turn taking system. In this research, the writer found that the hosts may stop the current speaker if there are complex interruptions and overlaps among guest speakers. If the hosts do not cut the speakers utterances, the conversation will not run properly because the guest speakers want to share their own perspective. In addition, the hosts interrupt the current speaker to give floor for another guest speaker. Due to the facts that there are six guest speakers involved in this debate, the hosts have to make sure that all guest speakers have similar floors in speaking. Besides, the hosts as the leader in the debate show can take the floor to change the topic. The debate will be monotonous and boring if they just discuss one or two topics, so the hosts can apply the strategy of topic shift in *Lawan Bicara* debate.

3.   Conclusion

To sum up, the writer concludes that the flow of turn taking mechanism is necessary in the debate show in order to run the conversation smoothly. Because the hosts have a duty to arrange the turn taking system, they must distribute those floors to guest speakers orderly. Therefore, the hosts use such strategies, such as selecting next speaker, doing self selection and continuing their utterances. Based on the results, the first strategy, "current speaker selects who next speaker is", used by the hosts has the biggest number in the debate show, that is approximately 66%. On the contrary, the number of the second and third strategies are about 24% and 10%. In distributing the floors, the hosts use linguistics expressions and gestures to show that they finish their utterances and choose the next speaker, that is the guests speaker. As a result of this, the guest speaker can know when the hosts close their turn completely and afterwards, he can begin their utterances.

However, the conversation in *Lawan Bicara* debate does not totally obey the rules of TRP (Transitional Relevance Place) according to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:704).

There are some phenomena occured in the debate show, such as interruptions and overlaps. Those phenomena are used in order to grab another speaker's floor in some occassions. Based on the results, the writer found some reasons why the hosts and guest speakers do such overlapping and interruptions. First, the participants want to show their agreement, assertives and clarification in one hand. On the other hand, the participants, either the hosts or the participants grab other floors due to the fact that they want to share disagreement, to take other floor, to compete other speakers and to change the topic. Consequently, the conversation in *Lawan Bicara* debate is classified as a high involvement style.

Finally, the phenomena of turn taking system in *Lawan Bicara* debate is influenced by its context. In other words, there are some social implications involved when the hosts and guest speakers were talking. The first point is that the debate is categorized as formal situation because it is different from daily conversation. Moreover, the power of hosts in Lawan Bicara debate is also considered in analyzing the phenomena of turn taking system. Second, the topic includes the political domain, so the guest speakers have some strategies and utterances in expressing their opinion and ideas.

4.   REFERENCES

Chaily, Dhera Evita. "Phenomena Of Turn Taking System in Kindergarten Student's Conversation". Unpublished Final Project. Diponegoro University, 2012.

Dewi, Citra Karnia. "The Turn Taking System Of Berkah Obrolan Sahur Ramadhan September 24th 2008 Edition". Unpublished Final Project. Diponegoro University, 2009.

Eggins, Suzanne and Diana Slade. *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell, 1997.

Fairclough, Norman. *Language And Power*. New York: Longman Inc., 1989.

Krippendorff, Klaus. *Content Analysis.* London: SAGE Publications, 2004.

Levinson, Stephen C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Manisha, Indri. "The Turn – Taking System Used In Today's Debate Broadcast On Metro Tv March 8th 2011". Unpublished Final Project. Diponegoro University, 2011.

Modern Language Association of America. *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*, 7th edition. New York: n.p., 2009.

Murata, K. "Intrusive or cooperative? A cross-cultural study of interruption". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21 (1994) : 385-400.

Renkema, Jan. *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin B.V., 1993.

Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation". *Language*, 50.4 (1974) : 696-735.

Sacks, Harvey. *Lectures On Conversation.* Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher, 1992.

Schegloff, Emanuel. "Overlapping Talk and The Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation". *Language in Society* 29:1 (2000).

Schriffin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton. *The Hanbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001.

Schriffrin, Deborah. *Approaches to Discourse.* Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1994.

Sudaryanto. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press, 1993.

Wooffitt, Robin. *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publication Ltd, 2005.

Yule, George. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.