



**THE REALIZATION OF TURN TAKING  
SYSTEM IN *LAWAN BICARA DEBATE*  
A METRO TV PROGRAM BROADCASTED ON  
13<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2014**

**A THESIS**

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
The Sarjana Degree Majoring Linguistics in English Department  
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

Submitted by:

Fitri Amalia Shinta Siwi  
NIM : 13020111140117

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY  
SEMARANG  
2015**

## **PRONOUNCEMENT**

The writer honestly states that she arranges this thesis by herself and without taking any works from other writers in S-1, S-2, S-3 degrees and in diploma degree of any university. The writer ascertains also that she does not take and quote any material from other works except from the references mentioned.

Semarang, May 2015

Fitri Amalia Shinta Siwi

## MOTTO AND DEDICATION

*“Peoples that great in any new work because they are not inspired, but they become inspired because they prefer to work. They do not waste time to wait for inspiration ”*

**(Ernest Newman)**

*“Whether you think you can, or you think you can't – you're right”*

**(Henry Ford)**

*“Sesungguhnya bersama kesukaran itu ada keringanan. Karena itu bila kau sudah selesai (mengerjakan yang lain). Dan berharaplah kepada Tuhanmu”*

**(Q.S Al -Insyirah : 6-8)**

*“Learn from the past, live for today and plan for tomorrow. Life isn't about finding yourself, but creating yourself. ”*

**(Fitri Amalia Shinta Siwi)**

*The writer dedicates this thesis to  
her parents, Prof. Dr. Wasino, M.Hum and Dra. Endah Sri Hartatik, M.Hum,  
her beloved sisters Scientia and Devi,  
to everyone who helped her accomplished this thesis  
“Thank you for all the support, contribution, inspiration, pray and love”*

## **APPROVAL**

Approved by,  
Thesis Advisor

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum.  
NIP. 19661004 199001 2 001

# VALIDATION

Approved by  
Strata I Thesis Examination Committee  
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University  
on May 2015

Chair Person

Dr. Deli Nirmala, M. Hum  
NIP. 19611109 198703 2 001

Second Member

Ayu Ida Savitri, S.S., M.Hum  
NIP. 19790822 200801 2 013

First Member

Dwi Wulandari, S.S., M.A.  
NIP. 19761004 200112 2 001

Third Member

Dr. I.M. Hendrarti, M.A.  
NIP. 19530728 198012 2 001

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise is merely to the Almighty Allah SWT, for the gracious mercy and tremendous blessings, so I could accomplish this thesis entitled “The Realization of Turn Taking System in *Lawan Bicara* Debate (A METRO TV Program Broadcasted on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2014)”. This thesis was arranged in order to fulfill S1 Degree Requirement of the Faculty of Humanities of Diponegoro University Semarang.

On this occasion, I would like to thank all those people who have supported and contributed to the completion of this thesis. Additionally, I also would like to extend my deepest gratitude and appreciation to the following people.

1. Dr. Rediyanto M. Noor, M.Hum, as the Dean of Faculty of Humanities of Diponegoro University Semarang.
2. Sukarni Suryaningsih, S.S., M.Hum., the Head of English Department, Diponegoro University.
3. Dra. Astri A. Allien, M.Hum, the writer’s academic supervisor;
4. Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum., the writer’s thesis advisor who had given her guidance, helpful corrections, moral, advices, and support to me in arranging this thesis. Without those, it is doubtful that this thesis came into completion.
5. All English Department’s lecturers who had shared and given their knowledge, experience, and dedication to me and all of academic staff of the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University in managing all formal needs at university.
6. My parents, Prof. Dr. Wasino, M.Hum and Dra. Endah Sri Hartatik, M.Hum, for their pray, endless love, great support, and care along the time. I am proud to be your daughter.

7. My beloved sisters, Scientia Inu Kirana Enwa Siwi and Fortuna Devi Putri Sina. Thank you so much for my deepest heart to you all.
8. All 2011 English Department Students (especially SASING D) and EDSA, nice to know you.
9. BEM FIB UNDIP 2012/2013, especially PSDM CERIA that helps me to increase my leadership and responsibility.
10. My beloved bestfriends in English Department (Lisa, Wuri, Nofi, Dea, Vinda) who share our moments together, both in happiness and sadness. Thank you so much for being such a great companion during our togetherness at campus.
11. My highschool mates (Maya, Sina and Farah) for always reminding me to finish my thesis as soon as possible.
12. TIM II KKN Undip 2014 Desa Purwodadi Kecamatan Margoyoso Pati for the wonderful experiences and unforgettable moments.

I realize that this thesis is still far from perfect. I, therefore will be glad to receive any constructive criticism, recommendation, and suggestions to make this thesis better.

Finally, I hope that this thesis will be useful to the reader who wishes to learn something about turn taking system related to the context and the phenomena of overlaps and interruption in the conversation.

Semarang, May 2015

Fitri Amalia Shinta Siwi

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE .....	i
PRONOUNCEMENT.....	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION.....	iii
APPROVAL.....	iv
VALIDATION .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATION .....	x
LIST OF TABLES AND EXAMPLES .....	xi
ABSTRACT .....	xii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Research Problems .....	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	3
1.4 Previous Study.....	4
1.5 Writing Online.....	6
CHAPTER II THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK.....	7
2.1 The Definition of Conversation Analysis (CA) .....	7
2.2 Turn-taking.....	8
2.3 Features of talk .....	9
2.4 Conversational style.....	10
2.5 Social Context .....	11
2.6 Political discourse.....	11
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODS .....	13



3.1	Research Types.....	13
3.2	Population and Data.....	13
3.3	Method of Collecting Data.....	14
3.4	Methods of Analyzing Data .....	17
CHAPTER IV ANALYSIS.....		20
4.1	The Distribution of Turn Taking System in Lawan Bicara Debate.....	20
4.2	The Phenomena of Grabbing Floors (Overlaps And Interruptions) Related to Social Context. ....	35
4.3	Conversational Style .....	49
4.4	Social Implication Based on the Result .....	49
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION .....		55
5.1	Conclusion.....	55
5.2	Suggestion .....	56
REFERENCES .....		58
APPENDIXES		

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

PS	: Presenter/ Host
IN	: Interviewee / Guest speaker
TCU	: Turn Constructional Unit
TRP	: Transitional Relevance Place

## LIST OF TABLES AND EXAMPLES

Table 1. Table of Jefferson's transcript notation's symbol .....	16
Table 2. Table of TRP classification.....	21
Table 3. Table of overlaps and interruption classification.....	35
Example 1. Current speaker selects next speaker.....	23
Example 2. Current speaker selects next speaker.....	25
Example 3. Current speaker selects next speaker.....	26
Example 4. Current speaker selects next speaker.....	27
Example 5. Current speaker selects next speaker.....	28
Example 6. Current speaker selects next speaker.....	29
Example 7. Self selection strategy.....	30
Example 8. Self selection strategy.....	31
Example 9. Continuation strategy.....	32
Example 10. Continuation strategy.....	34
Example 11. Cooperative interruption.....	37
Example 12. Cooperative interruption.....	38
Example 13. Cooperative interruption.....	39
Example 14. Intrusive interruption.....	41
Example 15. Intrusive interruption.....	42
Example 16. Intrusive interruption.....	43
Example 17. Non problematic overlap.....	45
Example 18. Non problematic overlap.....	46
Example 19. Problematic overlap.....	47
Example 20. Problematic overlap.....	48

## 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*

# **CHAPTER I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### 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 13<sup>th</sup> January 2014).

## 1.2 Research Problems

There are two problems related to the realization of turn taking system in *Lawan Bicara* debate on Metro TV. The first problem is how the hosts distribute turn taking because they have a duty to control floors in the debate show. Meanwhile, based on the first observation, those guest speakers do not usually obey those rules and they tend to grab floors from others. Therefore, it will arouse a question, that is in what situations they obey the rules. In addition, the second problem is what social implication of the such turn taking phenomena occurs in the debate show when both hosts and guest speakers speak in the conversation.

## 1.3 Objectives 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.

#### 1.4 Previous Study

In this study, the writer reviews three related studies written as final assignments in Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University. They are “The Turn – Taking System Used in Today’s Debate Broadcast on Metro Tv March 8th 2011” by Indri Manisha; “The Turn Taking System of Berkah Obrolan Sahur Ramadhan September 24th 2008 Edition” by Citra Karnia Dewi; and “Phenomena of Turn Taking System in Kindergarten Student’s Conversation” by Dhera Evita Chaily. Generally, the three studies only discuss the kinds of turn taking system, topic shift, adjacency pairs and some phenomena occurred in the conversation.

Meanwhile, those three studies leave behind many gaps to be completed. First, the reasons why the participants use such strategies of turn taking system do not occur briefly, whereas in fact analysis related to those reasons is important in conducting the study of turn taking system. For instance, the study of turn taking system in kindergarten student’s conversation does not provide the reason why the phenomena of turn taking occurred between teachers and students in the classroom, so it cannot show the turn taking pattern which reflects the relationship between power and formality. Second, the three previous studies do not consider



that conversation is classified as a text. Thus, they do not analyze the phenomenon of turn taking system related to social implications which influence overlaps and interruptions in the conversation. Third, there are unrelated topics which are combined in conducting those studies. Therefore, those studies of turn taking become less focused. For example, the study does not just explain the categorization of turn taking in general, but it also analyzes the phenomena of implicatures.

After finding the gaps, the writer tries to fill them by conducting this research. The writer will use Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson's theory (1974) as the main theory because of its relevance. This theory describes how the turns are distributed among participants because there are some basic rules of turn taking system. It is also helpful to identify some kinds of markers applied in turn taking strategies using TCU device, especially linguistic expression through word, phrase, sentence, etc. In addition, since participants are influenced by social context when they are talking in the conversation, the writer explains why there are various patterns of turn taking and why those participants do overlaps and interruption. Furthermore, the writer confirms that analyzing whole data can be used to show the tendency of conversational style in the conversation. As a result of this, the writer completes her research by using a simple statistical analysis.

## 1.5 Writing Online

### CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes background of the study, research problems, objectives of the study, previous studies and writing online.

### CHAPTER II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter deals with the main and supporting theories used in analyzing data in this study briefly.

### CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents type of the study, method and techniques of collecting data and analyzing data. It is also provides data, sample and population.

### CHAPTER IV DATA ANALYSIS

The writer analyzes the data in order to achieve the purpose of the study. Those analysis includes the phenomena of turn taking system and its pattern, interruption, overlaps, conversational style and social implication based on the result.

### CHAPTER V CONCLUSION

The last chapter reaches conclusion and suggestion after conducting the study.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The writer uses six theories to support and analyze the data related to the topic in the research properly. This research focuses on turn taking system and features of talk, especially the phenomena of overlaps and interruptions in the conversation. Besides, it is also connected to conversational style. In addition, the theories of social implication and political discourse are also presented in this chapter. All of the theories will be provided systematically below based on appropriate resources. The writer will start explaining the concept of conversation analysis (CA).

#### 2.1 The Definition of Conversation Analysis (CA)

Conversation analysis investigates the structure and process of social interaction. It focuses on talk related to meaning and social context in the sequential organization (Schiffrin, 1994:233). According to Levinson (1983:294-296), data of CA come from the transcription of tape recording based on the actual conversation among human in social life. There are some basic findings in CA including turn taking, adjacency pairs and overall organization. However, in this chapter, the writer only explains the concept of turn taking system, interruption and overlap.

## 2.2 Turn-taking

According to Renkema (1993:109), turn taking is various realizations of verbal interaction, so there is no limitation concerning with the length of a speaker's turn in the conversation. Based on Levinson (1983:296), the distribution of conversational turn between two participants in conversation is "when one participant, A, talks, stops; another, B, starts, talks, stops; and so we obtain an A-B-A-B-A-B distribution".

The writer decides to choose Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's theory related to the turn taking system mechanism. Based on Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:702-703), turn taking system for conversation has two components, namely turn constructional unit (TCU) and turn allocational component. First, TCU is a way used by a speaker to construct a turn. The grammatical or syntactical units of language include a sentence, a phrase, a word, and lexical construction. Secondly, there are three procedures for determining the allocation of turns, those are current speaker selects who next speaker is, the next speaker may select himself ( self-selection) and continuation.

In addition, there are two rules for governing turn construction based on Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:704) for avoiding interruption and overlap in conversation. Those rules are known as TRP (Transition Relevance Place).

*Rule 1* : For any turn, at the initial TRP of an initial TCU :

- a. If the current speaker has selected the next speaker, the selected speaker has the right and must take the next turn and others cannot take those turns.

b. If the current speaker has not selected the next speaker, any potential next speaker may do self selection technique, but it does not depend on the first speaker who has the right to the turn.

c. If the current speaker has not selected the next speaker, he may continue his turn if there are no other speakers doing self-selection technique.

*Rule 2* : If neither rule a) nor b) occurs and rule c) has been required the current speaker has continued, so the rule set a) – c) applies again for each next transition-relevance place until transfer occurs.

### 2.3 Features of talk

In the conversation, there are some features used for overwhelming interaction. It also reflects a violation of those rules in conversation. According to Yule (1996:72), features of talk in the conversation can be divided into six categories, those are overlap, interruption, backchannel, pause, silence and gap. Otherwise, as the writer mentioned above, the explanation of features of talk just focuses on interruption and overlap. This is due to the fact that the style of debate show only concerns in interruptions and overlaps as a result of the phenomena of grabbing floors, so the writer does not explain all concepts of features of talk briefly.

Overlap is defined as two or more participants talking at the same time in the conversation. According to Schegloff (2000:7), overlap and simultaneous talk are equivalent terms that refer to talk by more than one speaker at a time. Based on him (2000:4-6), he classified overlap into two groups, namely problematic/

competitive overlap and non problematic/non competitive overlap. Competitive overlap occurs when a current speaker has not finished his turn yet and its purpose is to compete for a turn at talk or for the right to grab the floor by that moment whereas non competitive overlap is not. Non competitive overlap is categorized as continuers, choral and collaborative productions and terminal overlaps.

Interruption is a violation of turn-taking rules in conversation. It indicates that next speaker begins to speak simultaneously while the current speaker is still speaking. On the other words, the next speaker takes the current speaker's floor before he finishes his talk. Based on Murata (1994:385-400), interruption can be categorized as intrusive interruption and cooperative interruption. Murata (1994 : 385) argues that "intrusive interruption usually poses a threat to current speaker's territory by disrupting the process and/or ongoing conversation". Intrusive interruption includes disagreement, floor-taking and topic-change. On the other hand, according to her (1994:390), "cooperative interruption intends to help the current speaker coordinating on the process and/ or on the content of ongoing conversation". Cooperative interruption includes agreement, assistance and clarification.

#### 2.4 Conversational style

Participation in the turn-taking system of conversation has various styles causing different interpretation of meaning (Yule, 1996:76). It is called conversational style which is divided into two styles, namely a high involvement style and a high considerateness style. First, a high involvement style occurs when

there are many overlaps and interruptions (taking other turns) to increase the active participation in the conversation. In addition, there are no longer pauses between turns. Secondly, a high considerateness style occurs when every speaker respects to other participants by avoiding interruption and overlapping and using slower rate of speaking in the conversation

## 2.5 Social Context

The writer adds theories to support the analysis since the object of this study is categorized as a text. A text, both written and spoken, is a product of language. According to Fairclough (1989:22), language is a form as social practice, so it implies three important things, namely language is a social process, language is a part of society and language is a socially conditioned process (non-linguistic part). Thus, when people produce and interpret a text, they have to consider the social conditions in their interaction as a context.

## 2.6 Political Discourse

The topic of the debate is politics, so the writer completes the theory of language in political domain. Politicians tend to hide the negative side of themselves, so other people may not see the truth or the horror before them (Wilson in Schriffin, 2001:400). The strategy used by those politicians involves manipulating application of the language. Therefore, Fairclough (1989:6) argued that “linguistics manipulation is the conscious use of language in a devious way to

control the others.” It reflects that the politicians use various kinds of such turn taking phenomena to manipulate their language, so it can influence the distribution of turn taking mechanism and the phenomena of grabbing floors in conversation.



## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODS**

In this chapter, the writer describes research methods used in this study. First, the writer provides the types of research. Second, she also explains method of collecting data including technique in deciding data, kinds of data, population, samples, and technique sampling. Furthermore, the writer also describes the method of analyzing data in this study briefly.

#### 3.1 Research Types

This research is classified as descriptive qualitative research. This is because the purpose of the study is to describe the phenomenon of the distribution of turn taking mechanism among participants and to explain the reasons why the distribution of taking floors occurs among participants in *Lawan Bicara* debate on Metro TV. Furthermore, based on the analysis that the writer has done, this research is categorized as qualitative and explanatory research because the writer explains ‘How’ and ‘Why’ questions. However, the writer also quantifies the occurrences of data to show the tendency of data and dominant system in the debate show.

#### 3.2 Population and Data

The data used in this research come from an interesting program on television, namely *Lawan Bicara* debate. The writer decides to choose the

recording of *Lawan Bicara* debate on METRO TV broadcasted on 13 January 2014. Therefore, all utterances produced by the presenters, the interviewees and the audiences in this conversation are the main data in this research. The writer takes all of the utterances produced by the participants in *Lawan Bicara* debate and they are combined with their context because the representation of the utterances may be in the forms of words, phrases, clauses, sentences, or sequence of sentences. The context is social context related to the phenomena of overlaps and interruptions.

Population is the whole research data. Then, the population of this research is all utterances of the conversation between hosts and guest speakers from the first session to the fourth session in *Lawan Bicara* debate. However, the writer does not take samples of the data because the data are all utterances produced by participants in the debate program.

### 3.3 Method of Collecting Data

In conducting this research, the writer uses an observation method especially non-participant observation method (Sudaryanto, 1993:134) It is because the writer just pays her attention to the debate through the recorded television program and she is not involved or takes part in the conversation. Moreover, to apply the method, the observation is continued with the three techniques of collecting the data, such as downloading, note taking and transcribing.

The first technique is downloading technique. It is used to take the debate video downloaded from *YouTube* because it helps the writer to get significant and accurate data. Therefore, not only does the writer show the verbal utterances but also does the writer show non verbal signals from the participants in the debate show, namely expression, body language, gaze, gesture, etc. It is necessary because the writer can easily understand when the hosts or guest speakers finish and start their utterances without using linguistic expression. Moreover, it is also important in helping the writer to analyze the flow of floor movement in *Lawan Bicara* debate.

Secondly, after downloading the appropriate video, namely *Lawan Bicara* debate on METRO TV broadcasted on 13 January 2014 *Jokowi Milik Siapa? PDIP vs Gerindra* episode, the writer applied note taking technique to write all conversation from the first session to the fourth session of *Lawan Bicara* debate show. In addition, this technique helps the writer to select and to make some classification based on the appropriate data that the writer looks for.

Finally, transcribing the debate is the last technique in collecting the data by using Jefferson's transcript notation which is a simple phonological transcription. This shows the symbols and other forms used in transcribing conversation into writing form. However, the transcription just focuses on information, whether they use statement or question for raising information in the debate show. The symbols of Jefferson's transcript notation will be explained in the table below.

Table 1  
Jefferson's transcript notation's symbol

Sign	Name	Function
//	double obliques	indicates at which a current speaker's talk is interrupted or overlapped by the talk of another.
=	equal signs	indicate no break or gap
[ ]	brackets	indicate overlapping
(0.0)	numbers in parentheses	indicate elapsed time by tenth of seconds
(.)	dot in parentheses	indicates a brief interval ( $\pm$ a tenth of second) within or between utterances
↑↓	arrows	indicate into especially high or low pitch
-	a dash	indicates a cut off
()	empty parentheses	indicate that the transcriber was unable to get what is said
(( ))	double parentheses	contain transcriber's description
::	colons	indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound

#### Example of transcribing

- 6 IN1 : ya saya mengatakan(.) ya (.) sebagai gubernur ketika dipilih masyarakat kan seperti itu↓ kalo ada kejadian politik lain ya kita liat nanti//
- 7 IN2 : //kejadian politiknya di taun ini nanti ya=
- 8 IN1 : ya misalnya :: kalo misalnya :: ada pilpres-pilpres kan masih jauh belum ada yang namanya calon presiden lho (.) sekarang ini masih

- rencana bakal calon↓ (0.1) baru kemudian nanti bakal calon (.)  
 baru kemudian setelah ditetapkan KPU jadi calon presiden//  
 9 PS2 : //kalo nanti kan jadi calon presiden supaya bisa (.) emm  
 memberikan kewenangan yang lebih besar lagi dan juga Jakarta  
 menjadi tanggung jawab pemerintah pusat kan juga menjadi lebih  
 baik lagi [bukan begitu ya?]  
 10 IN1 : [ya setiap :: ]//

### 3.4 Methods 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 inferential 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.

Example of applying the methods

53 PS1	: Langsung saja dari bapak Hamdi Muluk (.) .... Nah bagaimana mas Hamdi melihatnya? =
54 IN4	: = Ini (.) seiring survey yang kemaren baru keluar ya
55 IN2	: //Oh iya ya pilihan live=
56 IN4	: =ini metro nih sengaja nih sebenarnya(.) apa :: ngadu-ngaduin gitu kita ya=
57 PS2	: =Silahkan=

53 PS1	: Let's go on into Mr. Hamdi Muluk (.) .... So, how you see it? =
54 IN4	: = This is (.) together with the previous survey which just came out
55 IN2	: //Oh right, a live selection=
56 IN4	: =metro does it on purpose, actually(.) or :: opposing us against others=
57 PS2	: =Please=

The writer wants to explain the way she applies those methods in analyzing the data in this research. For instance, the writer provides an example, that is a part of conversation in *Lawan Bicara* debate. First, the pragmatic identity method can be identified in the interlocutors' reaction. The guest speaker (IN4) gave his response to take the floor because of the question. IN4 quickly took the floor after the host selected him as the next speaker through referring name, namely *mas Hamdi*, and afterwards the guest speaker asked another guest speaker using his gesture in order to seek a clarification. Second, the inferential method

(inductive) is used to connect the phenomenon of turn taking with their context. After classifying and describing the data, the writer can infer that social context and the political domain influence some phenomena in the debate show. Because the guest speakers are educated and famous politicians, so the host uses *silahkan* to invite the next speaker. Finally, the application of the distributional method can be seen in the phenomena of grabbing floor. In line (55), interruption occurs because of some reasons, such as showing agreement. It does not intend to compete another speaker because IN4 does not threat IN2's face although they are in different group.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS

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.

#### **4.1 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%

The table above shows that the number of “current speaker who selects next speaker is” has the biggest number in the debate. This is due to the fact that the hosts who lead the debate show have to select the guest speakers by inviting and giving questions directly. Those phenomena are marked by linguistic expressions, namely the rules of TRP, addressee forms and non linguistics aspects (gaze and gesture). The interesting thing is that the self-selection technique has enough number in the debate show. It reflects that there are some violations of the rules and it also shows the phenomena of interruptions and overlaps among participants. Therefore, it will cause the different distribution of turn taking system in the *Lawan Bicara* debate.

There are some participants in the debate show, such as hosts, guest speakers and audiences. The hosts in *Lawan Bicara* debate are Ms. Andini Effendi as the first host (PS1) and Mr. Wahyu Wiwoho as the second host (PS2). In addition, the debate show also invites six guest speakers, namely Mr. Fadli Zon

(IN1), Mr. Maruarar Sirait (IN2), Mr. Agung Suprio (IN3), Mr. Hamdi Muluk (IN4), Mr. Roy Marten (IN5) and Mr. Yayat Supriyana (IN6).

The flow of turn taking system in the *Lawan Bicara* debate can be described as a simple mechanism. At the beginning, there is a prologue which introduces a theme, that is *Jokowi Milik Siapa? PDIP VS GERINDRA*, so both hosts (PS1) and (PS2) have to open the debate. Next, the first host (PS1) invited one of the guest speakers from the pro-group to give his opinion, then the second host (PS2) asks one of the guest speakers from the contra-group to give response well. After both guest speakers take their turns, the first host (PS1) invites the third speaker from the pro-group and she also gives floor to the fourth speaker from the contra-group. This flow was repeated up to the session was over. Then, the hosts also invite audiences to ask a question or give their opinion. Finally, the first host (PS1) and the second host (PS2) also have a right for closing the conversation.

As can be seen in the flow above, the role of hosts here is to lead the debate by giving turns to the guest speakers. There are some strategies used by the hosts to give turns for the guest speakers, namely selecting who the next speaker is and selecting himself (self-selection). The explanation of those strategies can be explained as follows.

#### 4.1.1. 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 occurrences 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 ::

1 PS1	: Well, I go ahead to Mr.Fadli Zon as the supporting party of Jokowi-Ahok (.) .... , please
2 IN1	: Thank you (cough) (0.3) .... that is=
3 PS1	: =but it is not enough for a year, isn't it ?=
4 IN1	: =yes, sure↑ ....that is::

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 beginning 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=

  

9 PS2	: //if he will be a president candidate, so that (.) .... [won't he? ]
10 IN1	: [yeah, every:: ]
11 PS2	: //Well, Mr. Arar, please ((applause))
16 IN2	: =I want to ask (.) Ms. Andini, did you a Jokowi supporter when the governor election occured?= 17 PS1 : =Yes
18 IN2	: The first round or second round?= 19 PS1 : (laugh) =both rounds=

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 address 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.

### Example 3

57 PS2	: =Silahkan=
58 IN4	: =saya inget itu lho lagu Michael Jackson tu lho =
59 PS2	: =Apa ya? =
60 IN4	: =the girl is mine (.) .... kalo presiden gimana ? merdeka utara ?=

57 PS2	: =Please=
58 IN4	: =I remember Michael Jackson's song =
59 PS2	: =What is it? =
60 IN4	: =the girl is mine (.) .... how is president, <i>merdeka utara</i> ?=

To take another example, the writer provides example 3. In line (57), it can be seen that the second host (PS2) invited the fourth speaker (IN4) to speak. The host used *silahkan* to select who the next speaker is because the host was standing in front of IN4. However, the speaker returned the floor to the host through his statement. The speaker said that he remembered a song sung by Michael Jackson, but his statement will encourage the host giving her response to ask what the title was. He said *tu lho* to indicate that he finished his floor. In other words, it showed the sign of turn taking from the guest speaker to the host, so the host had to give

response *Apa ya?* to avoid silence and pause. Generally, the speaker had no intended meaning in taking the host's right, and he just wanted to break the ice in order to decrease the strained situation in the debate show.

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=

159 PS2	: = Yeah Mr. Arar=
160 IN2	: (0.3) =I think in 2014, the fake politic era should be over(.) .... agree ↑?=
161 IN4	: =agree=

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).

#### Example 5

220 PS1	: 10 detik sebelum kita break=
221 IN1	: =Saya tanya dulu bang Arar (.) ini bang Ara mendukung Pak jokowi jadi capres atau mendukung bu Mega jadi capres ?
222 PS1	: Nah
223 IN2	: kami memutuskan partai (.) Bang Fadly yah tadi anda bicara::

220 PS1	: 10 seconds before we break=
221 IN1	: =I want to ask Mr. Arar (.) so, you support Jokowi as president candidate or Megawati ?
222 PS1	: Nah
223 IN2	: We decide party (.) Mr. Fadly, weyou said that::

In another case, as shown in the second example above, the guest speaker, Mr. Fadli Zon, (IN1) selected another guest (IN2) before sharing his argument. The host gave him ten seconds to talk, but he gave his right to another speaker by asking him a question. He directly referred the question to the specific guest, that is Mr. Arar (IN2). It can be seen in the sentence *Saya tanya dulu bang Arar*. It means that he chose Mr. Arar to take his floor given by the host. He asked who he will support in the next president election, either Jokowi or Megawati. Then, the second speaker (IN2) had to take the floor as soon as possible to make clear that



his party will decide who will be the next candidate for the presidential election. He cannot give his personal point of view to save his party's image.

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 pariwisata berikut tetap di lawan bicara ajang debat ::
51 PS2	: =adu argument yang bermanfaat dan bermartabat=
52 PS1	: =tetaplah bersama kami

50 PS1	: //Well, we will continue again after the following advertisements, stay tune in <i>lawan bicara</i> , debate show ::
51 PS2	: =compete arguments which are dignified and useful=
52 PS1	: =stay tune

#### 4.1.2. 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	: //[Eggak 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 mungkin mas Agung atau mas Hamdi silahkan menambahkan apakah benar-benar Jokowi harus menyelesaikan tanggung jawabnya dulu=

27 IN1	: //[No (.) whoever↑ whoever he is (.) .... because] //
28 IN2	: // [so, let's support again now]
29 IN1	: [we support the best one ]
30 IN2	: ((laugh)) (0.3)
31 PS1	: Ok, maybe Mr. Agung or Mr. Hamdi please add, is it true that Jokowi must finisge their responsibility first=

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 mungkin 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.

Meanwhile, beside being used by the hosts, self-selection strategy can be found in the guest speakers' utterances in the debate show. It usually occurs because there are six guest speakers who are involved in the conversation, and those speakers want to express their opinion or to support the current speaker utterances. In addition, the guest speakers also select themselves to respond other's statement. Thus, the writer tries to analyze one of those phenomena below.

#### Example 8

39 IN3	: †tidak (.) tidak (.) .... Partainya Fadly Zon bisa mendukung dia=
40 PS1	: =Baik
41 IN2	: =Baik (0.0) ini adalah problem yang sangat penting dijawab ya↓ Saya rasa::

39 IN3	: †No (.) no (.) .... Fadly Zon's party can support him=
40 PS1	: =Right
41 IN2	: =Right (0.0) this is very important problem to answer↓ I think::

In line (41), the guest speaker (IN2), Mr. Arar, showed his awareness to the current speaker (IN3). Although the current speaker did not point the certain speaker after he finishes his speaking, Mr. Arar began to take the floor. He said *Baik, ini adalah problem yang sangat penting dijawab ya, saya rasa::* It indicated that he used pre-starters *baik* to begin his speaking. Then, he gave response to the current speaker's utterances by explaining the main problem why Jokowi cannot become an independent candidate for next presidential election. Besides, it also indicated that the speaker (IN2) paid his attention to the topic raised by the current speaker in order to avoid pause in the conversation, so the turn taking mechanism can run well.

#### 4.1.3. 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 =
	<b>((tertawa)) ((tepuk tangan )) (0.3)</b>
81 IN6	: =menjadi persoalan (.) .... yang menentukan adalah figure siapa yang memimpin gitu //

79 PS2 : //is it clear ?=  
 80 IN6 : =it can't govern another place (.) .... so ↑ it is interesting =  
**((laugh)) ((applause )) (0.3)**  
 81 IN6 : =become a problem (.) .... which decides that the figure who  
 lead //

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 completely, 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.

In another case, the continuation can also occur when another speaker gives his response for the current speaker's talk through backchannel. Backchannel is one of features of talk in the conversation, and it is usually used by the speakers to show their agreement and to indicate that they are listening when the current speaker is talking. For example, the writer presents the part of conversation below to show the second type of continuation in the debate show.

## Example 10

96 PS2	: //dan apalagi pak ahok sudah mempersilahkan monggo pak jokowi untuk maju lagi [yak kan ↑ ?]
97 IN6	: [nah yak kan]
98 IN1	: begini (.) .... bukan hanya seorang diri::=
99 IN6	: =betul=
100 IN1	: =itu adalah pasangan (.) ..... dan partai Gerindra ↑ //

96 PS2	: //and even Mr. Ahok has allowed <i>monggo</i> Mr. Jokowi to go [hasn't it ↑ ?]
97 IN6	: [hasn't it]
98 IN1	: thus (.) .... it's not alone::=
99 IN6	: =right=
100 IN1	: =it's a pair (.) ..... and Gerindra party ↑ //

In line (96), the second host (PS2) gave his statement that Ahok showed his agreement if Jokowi wants to be a next president, and it indicated that the host wanted to give floor to Mr. Fadli Zon as the speaker (IN1). This situation was brought about by the fact that PS2 raised conclusion from the previous utterances said by the speaker (IN1). Thus, it indirectly was still referred to IN1. The host wanted the speaker to clarify his previous statement clearly, so he will be the next speaker. The speaker said that Jokowi and Ahok had succeeded becoming the governor and vice governor in Jakarta due to other sides support, especially certain parties. As soon as the current speaker (IN1) closed his talk, another speaker (IN6) showed his agreement through backchannel, *betul*. Then, in line (100), the current speaker (IN1) continued his talking to specify that PDI P and Gerindra were the parties which supports them in the governor election in the

past. In brief, the current speaker still used his previous right to talk given by the host although another speaker was overlapping his talking through backchannel.

#### 4.2 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%

Based on table above, there is different number of interruptions and overlaps from the first session to the fourth session. The table describes that the guest speakers tend to use more intrusive interruptions than cooperative interruptions for grabbing floors from others eventhough they apply both types of interruptions in the debate show. They use intrusive interruption to grab other floors and to show their disagreement, but they use cooperative interruption to support other opinions and to show their agreement concerning with related topic. Furthermore, the guest speakers also use overlaps, either problematic or non problematic overlaps. The table describes that guest speakers tend to use problematic floors in the debate show.

#### 4.2.1. 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.



#### 4.2.1.1. 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=

  

170 PS1	: =so, Mrs. Mega exactly becomes the presidential candidate, doesn't she?::
171 IN1	: //well, I agree with Mr. Arar in some cases(.) we actually should be oriented to program (0.1) .... Obama care (0.2) program, health problem, educational problem, economic problem::
172 IN2	: //I agree=

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's 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

205 IN3	: = thus, .... he he can be like that::
206 IN1	: =so, I need a minute to explain (.) .... because he brave, then how he is as party cadres(.) then the rules of party, the party decision:: (0.2) are ignored
207 PS2	: //are ignored

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



Example 13 shows the part of conversation between a guest speaker (IN6) and the second host (PS2). Initially, the host asked a question to Mr. Yayat Supriyatna as the the speaker concerning Jakarta if Jokowi will resign as a governor. After the speaker answered the question, the host felt dissastified in the speaker's utterances. Therefore, the host interrupted the speaker before the speaker had finished his explanation through additional questions, namely *jadi semua sudah disiapkan pak Jokowi gitu ?* and *sudah clear?*. It can be seen in line (77) and (79). Besides, based on TRP rules (Sack, Schegloff, Jefferson), the host (PS1) had chosen the speaker (IN6) to talk. He broke rule 1(a) because he took the speaker's floor through interruption. According to rule 1(a), he had to wait until the speaker finished his talk first, so he can take the floor and start talking. Even though he wanted to gain more information, he had to obey the rule correctly.

#### 4.2.1.2. 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 =

85 IN1	: It is not for 5 years period(.) but if we look at the way of thinking by Mr. Yayat .... I think all governor in 34 provinces want to be a president=
86 IN6	: =it is not the problem↑ //
87 IN1	: //and it is no problem//
88 IN6	: //and there is a big problem that DKI is:: not only a figure of its governor↑ .... search for symbols of the main character which are interesting=

In example 14, there are two interruptions occurred 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=

250 PS1	: =well, thankyou, it means that non Jakarta society (0.3) also want the prove who will be done by Mr. Jokowi in Jakarta=
251 IN5	: =the problem is that Indonesian people are not patient (0.2) there is no time to wait for next 5 years
252 PS2	: //ok, who is not patient to see Mr. Jokowi becoming a president? please, Mam [stand up please ]
253 IN5	: [Jakarta ] don't knoe ( ) why but Indonesia take a :
254 PS2	: //well, wait a moment Mr. Roy (.) please=

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 occurred 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 *sebenstar*, so it forced the current speaker to stop talking. Consequently, the second host broke TRP rules 1(a) based on (Sack, Schegloff, Jefferson) in order to cut off the current speaker's utterances.

Furthermore, the intrusive interruption also can be used to change one topic to another topic. In this situation, the interruptor tends to be more aggressive to cut the current speaker's talk because he must make sure that the new topic should be run in the conversation.

#### Example 16

136 IN5	: =hari ini se – (.) rakyat memilih jokowi itu suara Tuhan juga sori↑ =
137 PS1	: =oke oke, jadi =
138 IN4	: =Lho mas belum (.) Jadi gini mas Roy belum belum↑ (.) Itu berdasarkan jejak pendapat belum sesungguhnya = ((laugh))
139 IN5	: =kalo kita↑ tidak percaya pada jejak pendapat percaya pada siapa lagi? Pada partai?↑kita sangat tidak percaya pada partai ::
140 PS1	: //Bapak bapak disini ada survey dari lab psikologi politi UI ....

136 IN5	: = Today a – (.) people choose Jokowi it'salso a God voice sorry↑ =
137 PS1	: =well, so=
138 IN4	: =Not yet (.) so, it's not over yet Mr Roy↑ (.) this is based on a poll not a real one= ((laugh))
139 IN5	: = if we ↑ don't believe in the poll, whoelse? parties?↑we don't really believe in parties ::
140 PS1	: //Gentlemen here is a survey from psychology politics lab in UI ....

Example 16 describes that the first host (PS1) tried to change a topic in the conversation. Initially, the participants, both guest speakers and host, discussed that there was a poll shown that Jokowi was an intended figure in the society, so they shared their arguments. However, the first host (PS1) provided a new interesting case to the guest speakers in order to change the current topic. This was used to take control of the floor distribution in the conversation. She took the guest speaker's floor before the speaker had finished his utterances, so it reflected that the first host (PS1) broke the rule of TRP 1(a), namely *If the current speaker has selected the next speaker, the selected speaker has the right and must take the next turn and others cannot take those turns.*

#### 4.2.2. 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 transcription. 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.



## 4.2.2.1. 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 occurred 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 ]

239 PS1	:	well, but as a political party we still support in ()
240 IN1	:	//but we (.) but we have behaved .... so if we want to choose Gerindra party, the candidate is [Mr. Prabowo]::
241 PS1	:	// [yeah, well ]
242 PS2	:	[well ]

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 occurred 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 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]

95 IN6	: =and the most interesting question is (.) one thing that Mr. Jokowi is the result of selection process//
96 PS2	: //and even Mr. Ahok has allowed <i>monggo</i> Mr. Jokowi to go [hasn’t it↑?]
97 IN6	: [hasn’t it]

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.

#### 4.2.2.2. 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 competitiveness 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? ]

235 PS2	: Please Mr. Fadli, it was slightly cut off=
236 IN1	: =what was the attitude of Mr. Arar previously(.) .... it will become a great competitor [a good ] ::
237 PS2	: [include] the configuration to repeat 2009 standing together [in the presidential election? ]

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	: //Permasalahannya 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 ]

151 PS2	: //The problem prof – the problem Prof, is Jokowi figure who appear with skyrocketing in its electibility and answer::
152 IN4	: //so I mean that I'm sorry for Mr. Jokowi he is told to be a governor and president ((laugh))
153 IN6	: [simple, the problem is]
154 IN4	: [as though so ]

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.

### **4.3 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.

### **4.4 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.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION**

In this chapter, the writer reaches conclusion based on the results that she found in conducting the study of turn taking system in *Lawan Bicara* debate. Furthermore, the writer also presents some suggestions which are useful for other researchers and the readers.

#### 5.1 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 occurred in the debate show,

such as interruptions and overlaps. Those phenomena are used in order to grab another speaker's floor in some occasions. 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.

## 5.2 Suggestion

The study of turn taking system, especially in debate show, still needs various kinds of different discussion because the writer just focuses in the realization of turn taking system including the patterns, phenomena of grabbing floors and the social implications. There are many thing that the next researchers

do in conducting research related to the turn taking system in order to understand the process of floor distribution in the conversation by the participants clearly. In addition, the writer also suggests that the next researcher can use her data to conduct other studies in the different topics.

## 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.
- Eggs, 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).

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

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

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

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

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

## APPENDIXES

### TRANSCRIPT NOTATION

LAWAN BICARA DEBATE : JOKOWI MILIK SIAPA? PDIP VS

GERINDRA

13 JANUARI 2014 JAM 8 P.M

<p><b>PS1: Presenter 1 (Andini Effendi)</b></p> <p><b>PS2 : Presenter 2 (Wahyu Wiwoho)</b></p> <p><b>IN1: Interviewee 1 (Fadli Zon)</b></p> <p><b>IN2: Interviewee 2 (Maruarar Sirait)</b></p> <p><b>IN3: Interviewee 3 (Agung Suprio)</b></p> <p><b>IN4: Interviewee 4 (Hamdi Muluk)</b></p> <p><b>IN5: Interviewee 5 (Roy Marten)</b></p> <p><b>IN6: Interviewee 6 (Yayat Supriatna)</b></p> <p><b>AU1: Audience 1</b></p> <p><b>AU2: Audience 2</b></p>
--

#### (1<sup>st</sup> SESSION)

- 1 PS1 :Ya saya langsung saja ke Bang Fadly Zon sebagai partai pendukung Jokowi-Ahok (.) ini sudah puas mengenai kinerja Jokowi terutama↑ mengurus masalah banjir yang menurut jokowi sendiri sudah jauh lebih baik dibandingkan taun-taun sebelumnya, silahkan bang
- 2 IN1 :Terimakasih (batuk) (0.3) pertama tentu (.) sebagai pendukung Pak Jokowi dan Pak Basuki pada (.) PILKADA DKI yang lalu (0.1) kami melihat bahwa kinerja pasangan ini sejauh ini on the right track sangat bagus dan sejauh ini berhasil (.) meskipun seperti yang dikatakan Pak jokowi tadi ini belum rampung (.) Nah memang ini belum rampung karena :: mereka berdua:: sebagai pasangan baru memulai↑ satu tahun lebih dan untuk itu kita memang memerlukan kinerja yang lebih besar lagi ke depan



terutama mengatasi persoalan-persoalan di Jakarta↑, baik persoalan macet, banjir dan persoalan-persoalan lain↑. Di beberapa bidang saya pikir sudah banyak kemajuan-kemajuan itu misalnya semakin hijau:: kemudian waduk dikuras kemudian yang lain-lain itu aa suatu hal yang menunjukkan kemajuan dan relatif cukup cepat gitu ya=

- 3 PS1 : =tapi tidak cukup untuk setaun ini saja kan=  
4 IN1 : =ya tentu↑ karena memang oleh karena itu kan (.) seorang pemimpin pejabat itu dikasih amanah itu dengan suatu durasi (.) nah dalam durasinya itulah↑ kemudian diharapkan bisa mengatasi beberapa persoalan, gitu ya :://  
5 PS1 : //jadi harus lima tahun ya pak ya tidak boleh hanya cukup setahun saja ya ::  
(laugh))  
6 IN1 : ya saya mengatakan(.) ya (.) sebagai gubernur ketika dipilih masyarakat kan seperti itu↓ kalo ada kejadian politik lain ya kita liat nanti//  
7 IN2 : //kejadian politiknya di taun ini nanti ya=  
8 IN1 : ya misalnya :: kalo misalnya :: ada pilpres-pilpres kan masih jauh belum ada yang namanya calon presiden lho (.) sekarang ini masih rencana bakal calon↓ (0.1) baru kemudian nanti bakal calon (.) baru kemudian setelah ditetapkan KPU jadi calon presiden//  
9 PS2 : //kalo nanti kan jadi calon presiden supaya bisa (.) emm memberikan kewenangan yang lebih besar lagi dan juga Jakarta menjadi tanggung jawab pemerintah pusat kan juga menjadi lebih baik lagi [bukan begitu ya?]  
10 IN1 : [ya setiap :: ]//  
11 PS2 : //Ya Bang Arar, silahkan  
12 IN1 : °Boleh duduk ya=  
13 PS1 : °Boleh(.)

((applause))

- 14 IN2 : Adep-adeapan aja :: biar lebih enak=  
15 PS2 : =Oke silahkan kalo mau berdiri = ((laugh))  
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 : (laugh) =dua putaran=  
20 IN2 : =wah, berarti visioner nih Andini nih (0.1) Jadi begini (.) kalo mas Fadly kan seorang negarawan(.) tapi juga politisi juga (.) tentu eeemm (0.2) sebagai partai yang akan menjadi competitor PDI Perjuangan kalau Mas Jokowi jadi calon Presiden PDI Perjuangan itu berat lawannya kan begitu (.) Itu begitulah (.) sebenarnya bahasa terangnya begitu (.) Tapi tenang saja Mas Fadly, PDI

perjuangan belum memutuskan siapa calon presidennya kita serahkan pada Mbak Mega. tapi saya ngerti kalo orang politik itu musti lihat apa yang tersurat jangan hanya apa yang tersirat gitu kira kira=

- 21 PS2 : //Oke//
- 22 PS1 : Itu itu tuh pak=
- 23 IN1 : =Oke (.) jadi gini kalo mengenai siapapun yang menjadi bakal calon presiden atau calon presiden itu hak dari setiap warga negara dan semakin↑ banyak calon bagi kami partai gerindra itu semakin bagus dan semua↑ yang nanti menjadi calon presiden pasti akan menjadi competitor yang hebat ibaratnya mereka ini sudah masuk grand final (.) kan begitu (.) jadi pasti mereka adalah orang-orang yang terpilih meskipun sekarang ini terpilih hanya oleh (.) 20% president hit result sebetulnya kami ingin lebih banyak↑ lagi jadi semakin banyak pilihan menu sajiannya juga lebih banyak tapi kita lihat realitas ke depan(.) Nah untuk sekarang berbicara sekarang ini (.) ya kita berharap orang orang seperti pak Jokowi, Pak Basuki, orang-orang yang terpilih di Jakarta dan diharapkan↑ membentuk Jakarta yang baru ya kita harapkan bisa↑ dirasakan Jakarta baru itu (0.2) Sekarang ini ya transisi dari Jakarta lama ke Jakarta baru :: belum menjadi Jakarta baru=
- 24 PS2 : =oke (.) jadi selesaikan dulu sehingga Jakarta nanti menjadi Jakarta baru selama lima tahun pertama jadi kalau mau maju capres ya tahun 2019 //
- 25 IN1 : //soalnya begini ::
- 26 PS2 : =walaupun nanti suara atau apa emm apa grace result di Gerindra jangan jangan juga ingin [bersuara di Pak Jokowi maju jadi capres]
- 27 IN1 : // [Enggak gini (.) siapapun↑ siapapun dia] (.) oleh karena itu kan yang pertama kali waktu itu sebetulnya yang mendukung Pak Jokowi (.) ya kalo boleh sedikit claim ya itu dari kami duluan gitu ya karena] //
- 28 IN2 : // [kalo gitu dukung lagi aja sekarang]
- 29 IN1 : [kita mendukung yang terbaik ]
- 30 IN2 : ((laugh)) (0.3)
- 31 PS1 : Oke mungkin mas Agung atau mas Hamdi silahkan mendambahkan apakah benar-benar Jokowi harus menyelesaikan tanggung jawabnya dulu=
- 32 IN3 : Ya (.) saya kira ini bukan masalah pantas dan tidak pantas seorang Jokowi menjadi capres (0.2) eem saya ingin Tanya ke Bang Ara ya :: (0.3) apakah nasib Jokowi untuk menjadi capres seribu persen di tangan megawati? =
- 33 IN2 : =Begini mas (0.1) kalo kita bicara soal partai (.) partai itu punya ideology sendiri PDIP mempunyai ideology (Pancasila) (.) Kongres adalah forum tertinggi partai dimana 500 pengurus PDI perjuangan dari Sabang sampai Merauke berkumpul (.) Kongres pertama kedua yang menyangkut presiden (.) ketua kongres kami

adalah ketua umum terpilih yaitu mbak Mega adalah otomatis calon presiden (.) kongres ketiga terakhir bulan April taun 2010 di Bali yang terakhir yang lalu yang menyangkut calon presiden keputusannya saja begini (.) ketua umum terpilih yaitu mbak mega itu diberikan kewenangan menentukan calon presiden PDI Perjuangan (.) Mbak mega↑ tentunya seorang pemimpin yang sangat visioner ya :: seperti tadi saya Tanya :: kamu Andini pilihnya putaran pertama atau enggak karena waktu ditentukan itu surveinya masih 6.5 % (.) ganjar waktu di Jawa tengah juga surveinya masih rendah (.) tentu kita tidak memilih berdasarkan survey saja↑ (.) Kalo berdasarkan survey harusnya ganjar dan jokowi hal ini tidak jadi gubernur di Jawa tengah dan di Jakarta (.) Nah tentu kita adalah organisasi yang taat asas dan kita percaya pada Mbak Mega dia bisa memutuskan keputusan yang tepat buktinya tadi dia memutuskan Jokowi dan Ganjar pada saat surveinya masih rendah (.) dan terbukti sesudah menjadi gubernur, saya rasa hari ini dua gubernur atau yang banyak menginspirasi anak-anak muda bahkan orang Indonesia adalah diantaranya adalah Mas Jokowi=

- 34 PS2 : =sudah jadi role model begitu ya dan ditiru oleh kepala daerah kepala daerah lain tentunya mas Agung=  
 35 IN3 : =Tentunya 10% di tangan Megawati nasib Jokowi untuk jadi capres=  
 36 IN2 : =Apa yang salah dengan hal itu?=  
 37 IN3 : Ya nggak ada yang salah (.) Cuman yang ingin saya katakan bahwa//  
 38 IN2 : // ↑apa, ada masalah dengan hal itu ?

((laugh))

- 39 IN3 :↑tidak (.) tidak (.) Seorang pemimpin salah satu indicator pemimpin yang baik ya itu adalah berani (.) Saya mengatakan bahwa 90% nasib Jokowi tidak di tangan Megawati (.) tapi saya kira di tangan Jokowi sendiri (0.2) Artinya sekalipun megawati tidak ingin :: misalnya Jokowi menjadi capres PDI P toh dia bisa mendeklarasikan dirinya sendiri menjadi capres dan ↑mungkin partai partai lain seperti Partainya Fadly Zon bisa mendukung dia=  
 40 PS1 : =Baik  
 41 IN2 : =Baik (.0 ini adalah problem yang sangat penting dijawab ya↓ Saya rasa:: //  
 42 PS2 : //Dikit aja ya bang=  
 43 IN2 : =Nggak bisa sedikit, di break aja dulu =  
 44 PS1 : ((laugh)) =Oke=  
 45 IN2 : =Ini jawaban tentang bagaimana soal integritas (.) soal loyalitas di tengah pragmatisme partai politik saya kasih contoh kalo Fadly Zon surveinya lebih tinggi dari mas Prabowo, ya (.) Misalnya

- contohnya seperti itu (.) Hari ini↑ surveinya mas Jokowi lebih tinggi dari mbak mega=
- 46 PS1 : =Ya=
- 47 IN2 : =tapi Mas Jokowi mengatakan saya kader PDI Perjuangan↑ (.) dia hanya mau maju dari PDI Perjuangan artinya di tengah pragmatis partai politik//
- 48PS2 : //Ok, baik
- 49 IN2 : //ada juga orang yang loyal terhadap//
- 50 PS1 : //Oke baik kita teruskan lagi setelah jeda pariwisata berikut tetap di lawan bicara ajang debat ::
- 51 PS2 : =adu argument yang bermanfaat dan bermartabat=
- 52 PS1 : =tetaplah bersama kami

((applause))

(pause)

## (2<sup>nd</sup> SESSION)

- 53 PS1 :Langsung saja dari bapak Hamdi Muluk (.) pakar psikologi politik dari Universitas Indonesia (.) mas Hamdi kalo kita melihat↑ tadi dengan gaya bicaranya jokowi :: yang menyelesaikan masalah-masalah di Jakarta seakan memang sangat bertanggung jawab (.) bagi gubernur DKI sangat bertanggung jawab bagi masalah banjir nih↑ tadi ngurusin banjir nah (.) tapi kalo diujung sana↑ mas Yayat bilang kalo misalnya masalah DKI ujung-ujungnya juga pemerintah pusat↑ sebenarnya mampu seorang jokowi untuk memimpin Indonesia (.) Nah bagaimana mas Hamdi melihatnya? =
- 54 IN4 := Ini (.) seiring survey yang kemaren baru keluar ya//
- 55 IN2 : //Oh iya ya pilihan live=
- 56 IN4 : =ini metro nih sengaja nih sebenarnya(.) apa :: ngadu-ngaduin gitu kita ya=
- 57 PS2 : =Silahkan=
- 58 IN4 : =saya inget itu lho lagu bu Michael Jackson tu lho =
- 59 PS2 : =Apa ya? =
- 60 IN4 : =the girl is mine (.) rebutan cewek ya Michael Jackson sama Paul Mc. Cartner (.) Enggak (0.1) saya kira begini ya (0.2) posisi seorang gubernur (0.1) itu di merdeka selatan ya↓ kalo presiden gimana ? merdeka utara ?=
- 61 IN2 : Berseberangan(.) Merdeka selatan=
- 62 IN4 : =Berseberangan ya (.) Saya kira (0.1) posisi di merdeka selatan itu juga mulia (.) ya tidak kalah mulianya dibanding yang merdeka utara. Jadi :: //
- 63 PS2 : //Cuma beda utara dan selatan ya ?=
- 64 IN4 : =Iya↑ jadi tipis lah begitu ya (.) Jadi (.) kalo saya melihat ya jadi memang, em, untuk ajang kontestasi presiden kalo platform saya adalah memang kita cari:: apa:: terbaik daripada yang terbaik gitu=

- 65 PS1 : = ehem=  
66 IN4 : =jadi posisi saat ini saya ingin mengatakan bahwa (.) menjadi posisi di merdeka selatan itu juga tidak kalah mulianya(.) gitu=  
67 PS2 : =ehem=  
68 PS1 :=baik=  
69 IN4 :=jadi sekarang tergantung pak jokowi sebenarnya(.) apakah beliau melihat yang mana yang lebih mulia↓ kalo bagi saya bertahan di merdeka selatan juga mulia gitu=  
70 PS1 : =padahal kan tadi disebutkan juga apapun masalah yang di DKI Jakarta (.) ini↑ kan bisa menjadi PR atau juga bisa menjadikan tantangan untuk menjadi seorang presiden (.) artinya Jakarta ni bisa menjadi latihan lah -- ajang latihan untuk menjadi capres (.) Nah itu melihatnya gimana dong mas Hamdi ?=  
71 IN4 := Jadi (.) maksudnya begini nanti kan :: kalo kita mempunyai presiden yang betul-betul negarawan ya (.) artinya kan kalo dia melihat bahwa masalah Jakarta itu memang harus Presiden juga harus bekerja sama yang bagus dengan gubernur Jakarta (.) sebenarnya kan juga tidak harus yang dari merdeka Selatan juga harus pindah juga ke merdeka utara (0.1) begitu (.) jadi:: //  
72 PS2 : //Karena masalahnya ada taun politik yang bisa dimanfaatkan (0.2) Nah sudah ada calon tim suksesnya nih [dari mas Roy Marten]  
73 IN 5 : [ya ya harusnya saya nggak perlu bicara (0.3)] Karena dari tiga pembicara kita tadi dari mas Fadly, dari mas Hamdi, dari mas Agung seluruhnya memuji Jokowi (.) Seluruhnya mengatakan bahwa Jokowi capable (0.2)  
((applause))  
74 IN5 : kalo hari ini :: Jokowi masih memerintah Jakarta (.) tapi seluruh rakyat Indonesia menginginkan Jokowi sebagai gubernur daerah masing-masing artinya rakyat :: ingin sekali :: jokowi sebagai Presiden=  
75 PS2 : =Pertanyaannya adalah Mas Roy dan juga Prof. Hamdi Muluk (.) eem ini juga harus diukur dari kinerja kemu-- kebetulan memang momentnya ini taun politik yang juga dapat dimanfaatkan dan peluangnya juga cukup besar melihat elektabilitas Pak Jokowi ini juga sangat bagus, melesat. Saya ingin sedikit gambaran (.) disini sudah ada Kang Yayat sebagai pengamat tata kota untuk mereview sedikit apa kira-kira gambaran yang sudah dihasilkan Pak Jokowi dan Pak Basuki selama satu tahun:: lebih memimpin Jakarta (.) Kalo ditinggalkan masalah nggak↑ ini soal perkotaan ?=  
76 IN6 : = siapapun yang menjadi gubernur Jakarta nggak perlu pusing (.) sederhana saja (0.2) gubernur Jakarta itu sudah punya rencana kota untuk 20 tahun rencana pembangunannya 20 tahun emm

panjangnya sudah ada pendeknya sudah ada (.) setumpuk rencana sudah ada yang dibutuhkan adalah eksekutor yang menjalankannya↑ :://

- 77 PS2 : //jadi semua sudah disiapkan pak Jokowi gitu ?=  
78 IN6 : =nah jadi siapapun mau pak Jokowi :: mau pak Ahok :: mau mas Wahyu ::bisa jadi gubernur Jakarta (.) tinggal keberanian saja yang menjadi persoalan saat ini adalah kita butuh figur bahwa masalah Jakarta tidak bisa diselesaikan dalam lingkup wilayah Jakarta (.) Kita tau sekarang ini kan (.) untuk mengurus wilayah Jakarta sama Depok :: Jakarta sama Bogor :: Jakarta sama sebelahnya :: //
- 79 PS2 : //sudah clear ?=  
80 IN6 : =itu tidak bisa memerintah tempat lain (.) nah↑ disitu mungkin otoritasnya lebih ditinggikan (.) Nah↑ yang menarik lagi adalah kita butuh Jokowi untuk menjadi sebuah symbol bagi sebuah perubahan menarik contoh (.) waktu Pilkada↑ wilayah Jakarta pak Jokowi pakai baju kotak-kotak di tempat lain orang pakai baju kotak-kotak tapi nggak dipilih tuh (.) nah ↑ ini menarik=

((laugh)) ((applause)) (0.3)

- 81 IN6 : =menjadi persoalan (.) symbol↑ symbol menggunakan Jokowi itu baju kotak-kotak tidak akan menarik orang mau pakai symbol muka topeng mau Jokowi kw 1:: kw 2 ::kw 3 :: nggak ada masalah (.) yang menentukan adalah figure siapa yang memimpin gitu //
- 82 PS1 : //ya jadi siapapun gubernurnya ada sudah ada rencana hingga 20 tahun kedepan yang artinya tetap akan dijalankan oleh siapaapun nanti gubernurnya memang ditinggalkan oleh pak Jokowi? =
- 83 IN1 : =ya dalam -- ya di satu sisi saya kira itu benar (.) bahwa pasti ada rencana-rencana yang dibuat
- 84 IN6 : // ya //betul
- 85 IN1 :bukan hanya untuk periode lima tahun (.) tetapi kalo kita lihat cara berfikir mas yayat tadi ini kalo ada masalah yang tidak terselesaikan langsung ke pusat :: 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↑ yang menyelesaikan ada DPR nya (.) Kekuatan gubernur kan↑ namanya kekuatan pemerintah daerah kan gitu (.) Nah sekarang sekarang begini↓, yang punya kekuatan mengawal Jakarta itu adalah warga Jakarta cuman membutuhkan aktornya :: actor yang kuat (.) Nah sekarang pertanyaannya (.) sekarang kan juga dari Gerindra ada pak Ahok :: cukup kuat :: mencari symbol symbol tokoh tokoh utama yang menjadi menarik adalah =
- 89 IN1 : // ya

90 IN 6 : =jika warga Jakarta mau↑ mencari calon seperti Pak Jokowi cari walikota –walikota terbaik//

91 IN1 : [harus begini begini harus ::]

92 PS1 : [Pak Ahok Pak Fauzi Bowo ? ]

93 IN6 : =kan mudah . cari yang terbaik cari yang terbagus//

94 IN1 : //dan itu hmm

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]

98 IN1 : // begini (.) harus dicatat bahwa keberhasilan sejauh ini atau saya katakan on the right track itu (.) bukan hanya seorang diri ::=

99 IN6 : =betul=

100 IN1 : =itu adalah pasangan (.) dan pasangan itu yang membentuk adalah usulan dari partai politik (.) yaitu adalah dari PDI Perjuangan↓ dan partai gerindra↑ //

101 PS1 : //Artinya jangan dipisah dulu dong yaa =

102 IN1 : =jangan dulu dipisah ini dwi tunggal(.) gitu ya //

103 IN6 : [yak↑ tapi sekali lagi pertanyaan paling menarik menurut saya adalah bahwa] persoalan persoalan↑ apakah masyarakat masih percaya sama partai↑ (0.1) nah itu pertanyaan paling besar↑ karena kekuatan figure jokowi itulah menjadi kekuatan penarik bagi orang (.) sekarang yang jadi pertanyaan bagi kita adalah replikasi mencari orang sekuat jokowi untuk Jakarta:://

104 IN1 : [di Jakarta , jadi kalo kita lihat]

105 PS1 : //tapi kan tidak hanya Jokowi aja lho disini, ada Pak Ahok tadi [kan ada Pak Ahok juga ya]

106 IN6 : betul↑ [cuman ini masalah] terjadi di kita↑ kita rindu figure↑ figure yang mumpuni(.) yang ngewongke↑ yang memperhatikan :: //itu yang menjadi pertanyaannya :://

107 IN1 : //begini saya kira anda tepat pointnya (.) tetapi Jakarta (.) agak berbeda dengan Indonesia=

108 IN6 : //ya //ehem

109 IN1 : =satu hal //

120 IN6 : //justru↑ Jakarta representasi Indonesia↑ (.) begitu lebih beragam↑ Jakarta ini=

121 IN1 : =Jakarta kan ibukota (.) kita masalahnya banyak :: sekarang saya tanya apakah masalah di=

122 IN6 : //betul

123 IN1 : =Jakarta sudah selesai ?

124 IN6 : ya sekarang kan begini (.) emm Jakarta- sebetulnya persoalan Jakarta kan tanggung jawab rentang semua gubernur yang pernah menduduki posisi (.) sebagai//

125 IN1 : //ya ketika [pemerintah pusat juga punya tanggung jawab] :://

126 PS2 : [pemerintah pusat ]

127 IN6 : //pemerintah↑ pusat ada disini juga =

128 IN1 : //ya kalo semua diserahkan pada pemerintah pusat ya kita nggak perlu divensif kita =

129 IN6 : //ya //ya

130 IN1 :=serahkan saja kalo kita tidak bisa menyelesaikan (.) oh ini pemerintah pusat ↓ saya kira bukan begitu cara berfikirnya kalo mau menyelesaikan persoalan dan saya kira Pak Jokowi maupun saudara Basuki Ahok tidak mau begitu (.) Tetapi memang kecuali ada rentang kendali koordinasi yang kurang (.) ya sekarang ini yang paling penting adalah :: kita bicara mari kita wujudkan Jakarta baru seperti yang diharapkan masyarakat Jakarta ::

131 PS1 :=[Mas Hamdy silahkan Mas Hamdi Apakah kita hanya cuman satu pemimpin jokowi disini ] padahal kita masih butuh nih↑ buat jadi gubernur ?

132 IN6 :[permasalahannya sederhana saja proses transisi ini. nah ini menarik ini :: ]

133 IN4 : ((laugh)) nggak (.) nggak begini ya↓ jadi sebenarnya ketika kita sudah menemukan figure yang tepat untuk Jakarta itu (.) kita sudah semua sepakat bahwa jokowi orang yang tepat gitu ya↑ dan kita sudah menumbuhkan itu (.) Ya :: jadi :: kalo menurut saya pilihan-pilihan presiden kan masih ada selain Jokowi sebenarnya (.) Jadi maksud saya kita jangan hanya bertumpu pada Jokowi (.) seolah-olah Indonesia ini hanya ada satu Jokowi (.) untuk Jakarta // [Jokowi juga untuk Indonesia Jokowi juga untuk presiden]

134 IN5 ://[ada (pakar):: mengatakan :: bahwa suara rakyat suara Tuhan] mas tolong↑ (.) suara rakyat :: suara tuhan=

135 IN4 : =ya betul

136 IN5 : =hari ini se- (.) rakyat memilih jokowi itu suara Tuhan juga sori↑=

137 PS1 : =oke oke, jadi =

138 IN4 : =Lho mas belum (.) Jadi gini mas Roy belum belum↑ (.) Itu berdasarkan jejak pendapat belum sesungguhnya = ((laugh))

139 IN5 : =kalo kita↑ tidak percaya pada jejak pendapat percaya pada siapa lagi? Pada partai? ↑ [ kita sangat tidak percaya pada partai:]

140 PS1 : // [Bapak bapak disini ada survey dari lab psikologi politi UI ] ternyata selain Jokowi masih banyak lagi lho↑ yang dipercaya figure figure yang tadi dipercaya untuk memimpin negeri ini ya (.) ada Bu Risma dari Surabaya kemudian pak Ahok sendiri//

141 IN5 : // ya tapi berapa Jokowi nya ? ::

142 PS1 : = nah kan kita melihat alternative ini disini pak Roy//

143 IN5 : // lho iya↓ ::

144 IN4 : //(jadi ) dulu adalah kita bikin adalah ::

145 IN5 : //Prof, masih ada 100 orang lagi disitu (.) cuman angkanya kecil mungkin=



- 146 IN4 : =enggak enggak ini bukan presentase mas (.) ini adalah metode sebenarnya minta pendapat dari pakar pakar ::
- 147 IN5 : =opini leader ?
- 148 IN6 : =opini leader siapa kira-kira //
- 149 IN5 : // alternative kan ↑? Iyaa ::
- 150 IN6 : =tokoh-tokoh yang bisa kita munculkan lagi :: selain jokowi begitu jadi jangan kita berpikir ↑ bahwa seolah-olah Indonesia ini hanya satu ↑ orang penting pak Jokowi gitu ya //
- 151 PS2 : //Permasalahannya prof -- permasalahannya prof adalah sosok Jokowi ini yang muncul dengan meroket elektabilitasnya // dan menjawab
- 152 IN4 : //sehingga maksud saya kasian juga Pak Jokowi dia disuruh jadi gubernur juga merangkap presiden juga gitu kan ((laugh))
- 153 IN6 : [sederhana saja persoalannya kan]
- 154 IN4 : [seolah –olah kan begitu ]
- 155 IN6 ://sederhana saja, (.) sederhana saja menurut saya bahwa kecerdasan masyarakat kita kan sudah bisa memposisikan diri siapa yang paling baik untuk mereka (.) nah pertanyaannya kan kita banyak calon-calon (.) Jadi menurut saya ↑ ada baiknya kan mendorong perubahan itu penting dan saya kira kan ini moment terbaik Kita kita bukan apa-apa ini efaria tentang jokowi karena kita melihat ada kekosongan ↑ kekuasaan // sudah masa transisi kepresidenan ini ::
- 156 PS2 : //ya ada kekosongan kekuasaan. [Ini saya pertanyakan juga pada Prof hamdi sendiri] sebagai pakar psikologi Prof (.) kalo ini memang Jokowi memang merepresentasikan bahwa memang ini mengisi kekosongan kepemimpinan kemudian juga menjawab kerinduan masyarakat akan adanya sosok pemimpin yang bisa mengayomi kemudian menjadi antitesa pemimpin-pemimpin sebelumnya dari kacamata psikologi politik ini bakal apakah memang ya ini harus di akomodir dong ini ?=
- 157 PS1 : [betul tidak ada kekosongan kekosongan kekuasaan, Prof ?]
- 158 IN4 : =nggak maksud saya tuh begini (.) jangan sampai kita juga terjebak kepada :: sebuah psikologi katakanlah seperti apa keputusan atau sebuah psikologi emm kalo orang (terbagi) bilang Psikologi ratu adil ya seolah satu orang menyelesaikan semua persoalan kita begitu ya ↓ Jadi kalo saya mengatakan kenapa enggak kita coba mencari ↑ anak-anak terbaik bangsa ini yang punya kapabilitas kita dorong untuk maju ke sector public mau jadi gubernur, calon capres ↑ cawapres ↑ sebenarnya itu misi saya Pak gitu=
- 159 PS2 : =Ya Bang Ara=
- 160 IN2 : (0.3) =saya rasa 2014 ini harus berakhir era politik pencitraan (.) 2014 ini harus selamat datang politik kinerja politik pelayanan public dan politik prestasi (.) ya feodalisme harus berhenti taun 2014 (.) meritokrasi harus datang di taun 2014 (.) setuju ya prof ↑?=

161 IN4 : =setuju setuju=  
 162 IN2 : nah↑ kalo begitu (.) biarkan rakyat yang memilih (.) jangan elit-  
 elit yang memilih Kalau kita memang melakukan perubahan, ya  
 saya rasa perubahan itu harus mohon rakyat dan kalau kita  
 mengatakan bahwa ada opinion leader dan sebagainya jujur saja  
 lah opini leader juga banyak kepentingan Prof. yak kan↑ ?=  
 163 IN4 : =[ya tapi kan terbagi dalam 61 orang, nggak papa]  
 164 IN2 : [ya tapi kan rakyat pasti lebih jujur ] ya lebih jujur untuk  
 mengatakan harapannya::  
 165 PS1 : //emm tapi bapak bapak begini kita juga pernah merindukan  
 sebuah figure yang akhirnya menjadi presiden kita dua periode tapi  
 ternyata akhirnya kita tidak puas (.) nah↑ apakah jika nantinya ini  
 gubernur jokowi ini akhirnya menjadi calon presiden↑ dan  
 akhirnya menjadi presiden eh↑ ternyata kita juga enggak puas juga  
 (.) Tapi jangan dijawab dulu setelah jeda pariwisata berikut ini =  
 165 PS2 : =tetap di lawan bicara

((applause ))  
 (pause)

### (3<sup>rd</sup> SESSION)

(Opini Masyarakat)  
 ((applause))

166 PS2 : oke, baik kembali di lawan bicara (.) Serem juga tadi ya yang  
 dukung Pak Jokowi ya dengan pake pakaian dan bonekanya itu ya  
 ((laugh)) (.) Tapi barang Arar tadi ada sedikit pertanyaan yang tadi  
 sedikit eemm (0.1) dipertanyakan oleh Andini sebelum di segmen  
 kedua tadi adalah kekhawatiran kalau ternyata Andini dan juga  
 bapak-bapak yang ada disana itu kekhawatirannya ini adalah nanti  
 (0.2) ini akan anti klimaks begitu misalnya Pak Jokowi sudah  
 digadang-gadang ternyata tidak sesuai ekspektasi↓ tinggi  
 melambung sendirian↓ dan gambar dijegal begitu=  
 167 IN2 : =Begini (.) mas Jokowi kan awalnya memimpin di Solo (0.2)  
 kemudian (0.2) bisa  
 168 PS2 : //ehem//  
 169 IN2 : dikatakan milik rakyat Solo (.) kemudian (0.1) dipercaya di  
 Jakarta menjadi milik rakyat jakarta (.) Hari ini PDI Perjuangan  
 (0.1) tadi saya belum menyelesaikan penjelasan Andini supaya  
 agak sedikit jelas begitu ee:: tentunya kita sangat meyakini taun  
 2014 ini adalah waktunya PDI Perjuangan bisa mendapatkan  
 kesempatan (0.1) kalo kita memilih presiden yang tepat, calon  
 presiden yang tepat untuk memberikan kesempatan kepada rakyat  
 Indonesia (0.4) dan kita juga tau (0.1) misalnya saya berkompetisi  
 pasti dengan Partainya mas Fadly, kan begitu (.) Tentu kita punya

dua kepentingan yang berbeda, dua cara pandang yang berbeda strategi yang berbeda (0.1) dan pasti calonnya juga berbeda, kan begitu (.). Nah tentunya juga pemimpin di Indonesia, presiden Indonesia ini (0.1) harus mampu menyelesaikan masalah bangsa (.). buat apa pergantian pemerintah, pergantian presiden, tapi pemerataan ekonomi tidak terjadi. Kesenjangan makin meningkat seperti sekarang (.). ((applause)) Buat apa :: buat apa :: pergantian presiden tapi masalah korupsi merajalela (0.1) buat apa pergantian presiden tapi pluralisme kekerasan bernuansa SARA dan agama masih banyak (.). Nah tentunya, Indonesia sebagai negara besar yah (0.1) 250 juta penduduk Indonesia berhak mendapatkan Presiden yang benar sesuai harapan rakyat yang bisa menjadi penyelesaian masalah tadi (0.1) bukan mengeluh dari masalah tadi (.). Kita harus mendapat presiden seperti itu dan tentunya ini waktunya taun 2014 rakyat bisa mendapatkan pemimpin yang membawa Indonesia jadi bangkit lebih baik lagi =

((applause))

- 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) What is to be done ? Apa yang harus kita kerjakan, kalo kita semua membicarakan figur-figur- figur tetapi kita tidak tau track record dan sebagainya kebelakang, kinerja dan lain-lain ini juga nanti akan menjadi masalah (.). apasih visinya ke depan programnya apa itu menjadi sangat penting (.). Menurut saya↑ kita berkali kali di dalam pemilihan umum sangat tergantung pada figur tetapi↑ tidak pernah membicarakan program misalnya seperti memang kalo di Amerika perdebatannya itu pada program (0.2) Obama care, masalah kesehatan masalah pendidikan masalah ekonomi ::
- 172 IN2 : //saya setuju itu=  
173 IN1 : =Ya kan (.). nah ini yang menurut saya mungkin ke depan ya dalam beberapa bulan ke depan setelah pemilu legislatif karena pada akhirnya↑ yang menentukan adalah rakyat (0.1) Ya survei hanya sekedar indikator rakyat yang akan menentukan (.). Nah rakyat nanti↑ akan ditentukan juga konfigurasinya oleh partai politik dan gabungan partai politik yang menentukan calon presidennya (.). Sekarang tidak tau siapa yang dicalonkan oleh PDI Perjuangan, kalau dari Gerindra kami mencalonkan Pak Prabowo Subiyanto, dari Golkar sudah ada, dari Hanura sudah ada (.). Nah ini nanti konfigurasinya↑ yang akan menentukan siapa yang masuk gelanggang (.). Sekarang kita tidak tau↑ siapa yang masuk gelanggang, ya ini nanti ditentukan tiga bulan lagi ::

174 IN2 : =saya rasa begini ya Andini kalo tadi bicara program tadi saya katakan ini

175 PS1 : //ya

176 IN2 : waktunya berakhirnya politik pencitraan (0.1) politik kinerja (.) Apa↑ kinerja calon presiden misalnya Mas Prabowo, Mas Jokowi ya (0.2) soal pluralisme apa kerjanya apakah prestasinya soal pluralisme apa yang sudah dibuat ? apa↑ yang dibuat soal pemberantasan korupsi? Apa yang dibuat untuk pelayanan publik ? Jadi saya rasa setuju sekali kalau itu dilakukan (.) Jadi berbasis juga pada kinerja dan prestasi tetapi tidak bisa dipungkiri↑ rakyat memang melihat figur, kepribadian (.) Bagaimana kepribadiannya, sederhana↑ atau arogan ? Kan begitu [merakyat atau you know:: ]

177 PS1 : //[bener Mas Fadly pasti rakyat ] melihat kepribadian? Silahkan=

178 IN2 : Ya itu pilihan pilihan juga buat rakyat untuk memilih=

179 IN3 : = ya saya sependapat juga dengan mas Ara dan Mas Fadly (.) Cuma saya mungkin mengatakan bahwa kita jangan terjebak pada figur (.) Itu yang sering terjadi pada negara kita (.) Contoh orang memilih SBY, karena ganteng karena gagah seperti itu dan ::

180 IN2 : // mas pilih SBY kemaren ?=

181 IN4 : =Oh tidak↑ ::

182 IN2 : Oh bagus=

183 IN3 : =seperti itu, jadi tertipu, karena yang dipilih oleh rakyat ::

184 IN5 : // tokoh jokowi adalah tokoh antitesis dari tokoh SBY ::

185 IN3 : =sebelumnya :: OKE↑

186 IN5 : =baik penampilan baik cara bicara (0.2) satunya baru akan satunya bertindak memang dia antitesis itu tokoh yang sangat baru dirindukan oleh masyarakat Indonesia=

187 IN5 : =gini bang Roy gini ::

188 PS1 : //tapi apakah yang dirindukan itu adalah Jokowi untuk calon Presiden?=

189 IN3 : =nah survei (0.1) tadi Bang Arar menyatakan bahwa rakyat 43% mendukung Jokowi menjadi presiden dan saya kira itu bukan juga di PDIP (.) Nah sayangnya masyarakat kita (0.1) atau mungkin bang Arar sendiri nanti bisa klarifikasi itu menyempitkan pilihan (.) jadi Jokowi Cuma milik PDIP padahal saya kira di Gerindra juga ada yang diam diam setia pada::

190 IN6 : Ya ya :: nah jadi gini gini, mengingatkan aja bahwa //

191 IN3 : //bang Arar bang Arar ::

192 IN6 : di masyarakat itu kan ada kekuatan struktur kekuatan masyarakat atau ide atau kekuatan aktor (0.1) bagaimana kekuatan aktor pun membuat orang bergairah dan kita belajar dari pilkada DKI (0.1) ketika Jokowi naik itu psst aaa :: golputnya menurun terjadi peningkatan partisipasi ↑ nah sekarang menjadi pertanyaan jika Jokowi maju. Nah yang kedua diingatkan hati hati dengan hati

nurani rakyat dalam konteks begini ↑ sekali-kali sekarang partai ngakalin↑ masyarakat mungkin partai akan ditinggalkan ::

193 PS2 : =jadi figur tidak bisa diabaikan juga ya ?=  
194 IN6 : =tidak bisa diabaikan juga  
195 PS2 : tidak bisa diabaikan juga//  
196 IN6 : //jadi figur sangat penting  
197 IN3 : //begini begini :: jadi pesan yang sangat kuat bahwa rakyat itu menghendaki figur seperti Jokowi (0.1) sedehana kemudian tegas (.) yang jelas nah cuma problemnya kan begini ::  
198 IN2 : //ya saya jawab dikit tentang partai sedikit aja[jadi kalau soal partai]  
199 IN3 : //sebentar pak [saya melihat ada indikator] yang perlu kita ungkap masalah keberanian ya ini saya bandingkan dengan Ahoknya (.) misalnya kalo ahok tidak berani mungkin sampai sekarang belum tentu jadi wagub DKI=  
200 PS1 : =dan kalo kita berbicara Jokowi kita juga berbicara Ahok↑ kan artinya dalam satu tim begitu kan=  
201 IN3 : =yak, saya melihat bahwa Jokowi harus mempunyai sikap jadi saya tidak setuju kalau 10% nasib jokowi di tangan megawati (.) ((applause)) Nah ini yang saya liat bahwa faktor keberanian (0.1) ini mesti ada Bang Ara , bang Roy, Faktor keberanian mesti ada↑ dalam Jokowi::  
201 PS1 : //Jadi kenapa capresnya nggak Megawati aja dong ya ::  
202 IN2 : // maksudnya berani bagaimana ?=  
203 IN3 : =begini mestinya Jokowi sudah harus menunjukkan bahwa dia memang capres yang didukung oleh banyak orang↑ dan harus di clear seperti itu (.) Entah waktunya setelah pileg atau sebelum pileg=  
204 IN2 : =yang declear siapa ?=  
205 IN3 : =kan begini pak, ini masalah keberanian. Ini kan, misalnya kalo Jokowi mendeclare mungkin PDIP menolak tapi partai lain menampung dia kan bisa seperti itu ::  
206 IN1 : =nah ini saya perlu waktu satu menit menjelaskan (.) justru politik yah ada Marchatelli menghalalkam segala cara untuk mencapai tujuan ini caranya begini (0.1) Karena berani ya, kemudian bagaimana sebagai kader partai (.) kemudian aturan partai keputusan partai [diabaikan]::  
207 PS2 : [diabaikan]  
208 IN3 : //ini dari tadi ini pro rakyat↑ [ini pro rakyat↑]  
209 IN1 : //loh (.) [begini ini :: ini]  
210 IN3 : tidak mencalonkan PDI tidak mencalonkan Jokowi (.) misalnya kita membicarakan RAS politis maka mungkin banyak orang yang golput pak ::  
211 PS2 : // nah oke, nah gini, balik lagi etika politik pak=  
212 IN2 : justru itu saya katakan contohnya saya mau menjelaskan hubungan mbak Mega dan Mas Jokowi (.) ya , mbak Mega dua kali

mencalonkan Mas Jokowi menjadi walikota dari 10 tahun yang lalu dan 4 tahun yang lalu kemudian menjadi calon gubernur (.) Hari ini surveinya mas Jokowi jauh lebih tinggi daripada Mbak Mega (0.1) tapi Mbak Mega tidak cemburu tidak iri (.) Karena beliau juga mempunyai jiwa kenegarawanan, saya kasih contoh tadi kalo Fadly Zon lebih tinggi daripada Mas Prabowo saya rasa situasinya juga bisa berbeda kan begitu (.) Tapi sudah dibuktikan bahwa hubungannya sangat baik (.) Mas Jokowi hari ini surveinya jauh lebih tinggi dari Mbak Mega [ itu satu, yang kedua↑ ]=

213 PS1 : //Yak Silahkan Bang Fadly [untuk menjelaskan silahkan]

214 IN2 :belum ada kepastian dari PDI Perjuangan untuk mencalonkan dia (.) yang ketiga↑ begitu banyak partai dan calon presiden yang mau merangkul untuk memasangkan dirinya dengan Mas Jokowi (.)betul kan ↑? betul nggak ↑? ada tiga fakta tadi, bahkan di tengah pragmatisme partai politik [banyak orang tadi= ]

215 IN1 :// [Oke pertanyaan saya::]

216 IN2 :=menghalalkan segala cara untuk mencapai tujuan (.) Disini Jokowi menunjukkan tidak semua kader seperti itu=

217 IN1 : //sekarang,bang Ara::

218 IN2 :=semua kader politik menurut saya harus belajar sesuai↑ dengan ideologi dan partai politiknya masing masing=

219 PS1&PS2 : Baik

220 PS1 : 10 detik sebelum kita break=

221 IN1 : =Saya tanya dulu bang Ara (.) ini bang Ara mendukung Pak Jokowi jadi capres atau mendukung bu Mega jadi capres ?

222 PS1 : Nah

223 IN2 : kami memutuskan partai (.) Bang Fadly yah tadi anda bicara ::

224 IN1 : // nah nggak nggak pribadi pribadi ?

225 IN2 : Oh Nggak ada↑

226 IN1 : oh↑ nggak ada=

227 IN2 : tadi kami bicara soal tidak figur (.) kita bicara tentang sistem (.) PDI Perjuangan itu sistem (.) kita memutuskan memberikan kewenangan pada mbak Mega(.)

[pendapat pribadi ]

228 IN1 : // nah ini artinya :: [artinya pendapat pribadi] sebagai seorang politisi ya=

229 IN2 : =saya rasa begini Mas Fadly ya (.) jadi apa bedanya partai kami dengan partai anda. Kami memiliki partai yang kuat, punya pemimpin yang kuat dan juga punya tokoh yang kuat nah itu kan kita tau ada sistem=

230 IN1 : [nah itu kan kita tahu mekanisme dan sistem kita]

231 IN2 : [ya begini kita kita :: tapi :: ]

232 PS1 : //kita masih tergabung kok dalam Pemilu Presiden sebelumnya=

233 PS2 : =tetap di lawan bicara=

234 PS1 : =Kita kembali sesaat lagi tetaplah dalam Lawan Bicara

((applause))

(pause)

**(4<sup>th</sup> SESSION)**

- 235 PS2 : Silahkan Mas Fadli tadi sedikit terpotong=  
236 IN1 : =apa yang tadi sikap dari bung Arar tadi (.) saya kira itu sikap sebagai seorang politisi partai politik kan (0.2) memang ada mekanisme dan di PDI Perjuangan sudah ada mekanismenya (.) nanti pada saat setelah 9 April kita hargai itu (.) Oleh karena itu sekarang ini supaya diskusi kita itu produktif kalau kita bicara hasil-hasil survey lebih bagus apa yang digerakkan apa yang akan dikerjakan kedepan bagi Indonesia dan itu nanti konfigurasi calon ya kita berharap siapapun bagai partai gerinda siapapun yang dicalonkan oleh partai manapun itu akan menjadi satu competitor yang hebat [yang baik] ::
- 237 PS2 : // [termasuk] konfigurasinya untuk mengulang 2009 maju bersama lagi [di pemilu presiden ]  
238 IN1 : // [ya siapa tau ] kan misalnya (.) keputusan sekarang ada di tangan Bu Mega nah kita ga tau keputusan Bu Mega itu apa ya kita akan tunggu itu=  
239 PS1 : ya tapi sebagai parpol tetap mendukung secara ()  
24 IN1 : // tapi kami (.) tapi kami sudah bersikap bahwa yang akan kami calonkan adalah Bapak Haji Prabowo Subianto (.) nah itu yang menjadi sikap politik kami dari awal supaya tidak beli kucing dalam karung, ya jadi kalau memilih partai Gerindra nah nanti calonnya Pak Prabowo::
- 241 PS1 : // [yak baik]  
242 PS2 : [baik ]  
243 PS1 : =yak ada suara dari calon pemilih silahkan calon pemilih  
244 IN4 : //nah bagi saya penting satu hal saya tambahkan::  
245 PS2 : //singkat saja=  
246 IN4 : =PDIP belum kita dengar apa yang dia lakukan kalau dia mengambil peran presiden ini (0.1) entah siapapun↑ ataupun Megawati Pak Jokowi Indonesia perlu mendengar kalau hari ini Pak Jokowi kan cuma mau bicara Jakarta (.) nah kalau Pak Jokowi mau jadi presiden kan kita juga perlu dengar apa yang akan dilakukan Pak Jokowi kalau jadi presiden ::
- 247 PS2 : //oke  
248 PS1 : =oke sekarang kita dengarkan dulu dari suara calon pemilih (.) silahkan mbak  
249 AU1 : =ya saya Riski Putri dari jurusan manajemen falkutas ekonomi universitas Andalas Padang (.) Saya memang bukan orang Jakarta tapi kalo untuk nyapres itu masalah Indonesia ya (.) Kalo menurut saya alangkah lebih baiknya (0.3) Jokowi ini diamanahkan sesuai dengan sumpah jabatannya untuk menjadi Gubernur DKI Jakarta

- dengan periode tertentu (.) nah untuk pada saat ini masa jabatannya itu belum berakhir jadi alangkah lebih baiknya kalau Jokowi focus terhadap program programnya (0.2) terkontrol dan konsisten lalu bersabar untuk pemilu di tahun 2019 nanti=
- 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=
- 255 AU2 : =baik terima kasih nama saya yanti saya warga dari ciputat mewakili pkk (.) kebetulan saya ini adalah orang yang selalu beraktivitas di DKI Jakarta setiap hari (0.2) nah saya melihat perubahan yang signifikan setelah selama satu tahun Pak Jokowi memimpin disini karna ada suatu perubahan nah saya hanya sebagai warga Negara biasa saya saya sederhana saja kenapa kita tidak beriklan kesempatan kepada beliau untuk maju sebagai presiden karena↑ kalau kita lihat bahwa survey sudah melihat beliau duduk di tempat yang tertinggi kemudian eee kemudian ::
- 256 AU2 : =survei (0.3) apa program yang dia apa yang beliau sampaikan itu sudah kelihatan sudah kita ( ) ::
- 257 PS1 : //oke=
- 258 PS2 : =oke baik terimakasih ibu
- 259 PS1 : [terimakasih ibu] ya baik silahkan mas agung tadi sudah ingin menambahkan sudah cukup 1 tahun katanya dan menurut kita belum cukup=
- 260 IN3 : //ya memang belum cukup karena belum menunjukkan platform (.) nah saya melihat begini ini kan soal rakyat bang Roy berulang kali bicara soal rakyat itu juga ibu itu juga sura rakyat (0.1) cuma sayang sekali kalau kemudian Bu mega tidak memilih Jokowi sebagai capres artinya saya↑ di sisi lain menganggapp begini Bung Jokowi memang kurang berani pak::
- 261 PS1 : //ya kita [tutup acaranya ]
- 262 PS2 : [waktu kita singkat]
- 263 IN1 : //saya kira saya kira gini::
- 264 PS2 : //10 detik
- 265 IN1 : Jokowi adalah orang yang tepat dengan pak Basuki menjadi pemimpin di Jakarta untuk menuju↑ Jakarta baru=
- 266 PS2 : //oke
- 267 IN1 : =pak Prabowo bisa untuk Indonesia baru
- 268 PS2 : =oke pak Arar 10 detik



- 269 IN2 :kita akan bersaing mas Fadli (.) biar rakyat Indonesia yang memilih siapa yang memimpin Indonesia baru=
- 270 IN4 : =saya ingin mengatakan untuk presiden Indonesia itu masih banyak tidak hanya bertumpu pada satu orang Pak Jokowi misalkan kita buka alternative lainnya
- 271 PS2 : //oke baik 10 detik
- 272 IN6 :=yang paling penting adalah aspirasi rakyat itu penting untuk siapapun perhatikan itu jangan↑ sekali kali rakyat ditinggalkan oleh para politisi
- 273 PS2 : //oke bung roy 10 detik(.) singkat
- 274 IN5 :Jokowi harga mati
- ((laugh))
- 275 PS1 : [terimakasih bapak bapak]
- 276 IN2 : [terakhir ya ]
- 277 PS1 :sayang sekali waktu kita sudah habis [terimakasih atas]
- 278 IN2 : [2014 2015 ]
- 279 PS1 :kehadirannya pada malam hari ini Jokowi gurbener atau calon presiden kita [lihat pada ]
- 280 PS2 : [masih ada waktunya]
- 281 PS1 :tahun 2014 ini (.) Akhir saya atas nama kerabat kerja yang bertugas (.) saya Andini Effendi undur diri tetap pada lawan bicara ajang debat=
- 282 PS2 : =adu argument yang bermartabat sampa jumpa (.)

**Source of the data :**

*Debat Jokowi Milik Siapa PDIP vs Gerindra Lawan Bicara Metro TV.* Available

from:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2NkjinPXIJ8M&spfreload=10> [Accessed

13th September 2014]