

Interruption in Turn-Taking Irregularities at Speaking for Conversation Class

Ikke Lusi Ani

University of Bengkulu

ikelusiani172@gmail.com

Indah Damayanti

University of Bengkulu

indahd@unib.ac.id

Syafrizal Sabarudin

University of Bengkulu

Syafrizal_sabaruddin@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research is aimed at finding types of interruption in turn taking irregularities at Speaking for Conversation Class and dominant type of interruption in turn taking irregularities at Speaking for Conversation Class. This research employed descriptive quantitative research. The subjects of this research were 2nd semester students of class A and C. The total subject was 80 students. This research used simple statistical (percentage) to analyze the data. The interruption in turn taking irregularities at Speaking for Conversation Class were classified using an instrument following Zimmerman & West theory and classified by Murata theory. The first finding showed seven types of interruption in turn taking irregularities at Speaking for Conversation Class, namely agreement, clarification, assistance, disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangentialization. Meanwhile, the dominant type of interruption in turn taking irregularities was clarification types. These, the students didn't like being interrupted in Speaking for Conversation Class either positive interruptions or negative interruptions. In conclusion, there were two types of interruption namely, cooperative and intrusive interruption. The cooperative interruption consists of agreement, clarification, and assistance. Then, the intrusive interruption consists of disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangentialization. Then the dominant type of interruption was clarification types. It was suggested further researchers to use observation or recording instrument. More importantly, for further researchers also pay attention to the context and conditions of students.

Keywords: *interruption, turn taking irregularities, speaking for conversation class.*

Introduction

The conversation is the interchange of ideas. It is the willingness to communicate thought on all subjects, personal and universal, and in turn to listen to the sentiments of others regarding the ideas advanced. According to Mazeland (2006) conversation maybe a talk between two or more people during which thoughts, feelings, and concepts are expressed, questions are asked and answered, or news and information are exchanged. According to Conklin (2009), the

conversation is the give and take the talk, utterances spoken by the hearer should be understood by both of them because the conversation is not a monolog but dialogue. Besides, Paltridge (2006) mentions the aspect of conversational interactions is conversation's opening and closing, turn-taking, adjacency pairs, preference organization, feedback, and conversational 'repair'.

The main goal of a conversation is commonly purposed to take a turn to speak. Moreover, the conversation allows people to communicate by giving and taking information or for certain purposes through verbal communication. It can be concluded that the speaker and the hearer should balance each other to reach the goals in a conversation.

The study of talk in interactions was studied in Conversation Analysis which generally attempts to describe the orderliness, structure, and sequential patterns of interaction. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) also confirm that Conversation analysis is more concerned with verbal interaction as instances of the situated social order. It is also supported by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) who stated that conversation analysis is to discover how participants understand and respond alternately as they speak, and action is produced. According to Cutting (2002), Conversation Analysis is studying the way that what speakers say dictates the type of answer expected and those speakers take the turn when they interact.

Turn taking was considered to play an important role in structuring people's social interactions in terms of control and regulation of conversation. According to Yule (1996) explains that there is a scarce commodity called the ground which may be defined because of the right to talk. Having control of this scarce commodity at any time is named a turn. Wardhaugh (1985) states that the most general principle governing turn-taking in a conversation is that one and only one person speaks at a time. According to Zimmerman and West's (as cited in Coates 2015) divided the kinds of turn-taking irregularities during a conversation into "interruption and overlap" . Interruption happens when a speaker cuts the word of the previous speaker, and therefore the previous speaker's words could not be defined because of the last word. According to Murata (1994) interruption divide two types of interruption, there are cooperative and intrusive.

There are some previous studies that also explore about interruption in turn taking irregularities, for example several studies have similar topic to this research. The first study was conducted by Hidayati (2014) entitled "A Pragmatic Analysis Of Turn-

Taking Irregularities Reflected in The Last Song Movie". The second study was conducted by Larasati (2014) entitled "A Conversation Analysis of Interruptions in Modern Family Season 1 Series". The third study was conducted by Dewi (2018) entitled Turn-Taking Strategies and Its Relations to EFL Learners' Personality and Power in The Interaction Of English Conversation Class. The fourth study was conducted by Tiono and Ansori (2005) entitled, Turn-Taking Irregularities by African American Characters in the Movie "Why Do Fools Fall in Love". The fifth study was conducted by Sapabsri (2018) entitled "An Analysis Of Gender And Status Affecting Conversational Interruptions". Based on these previous studies, the researchs were conducted in movie, song lyrics, talk show and the conversation arranged well. Meanwhile, the present study conducted in Speaking for Conversation Class, and the present study more natural conversation. The different can be seen through the way of collecting the data, the researcherrs used questionnaire, meanwhile the previous studies of collecting the data used data sheet.

Thus, the researchers were interested in analyzing the language used in Speaking for Conversation class at the 2nd semester of English Department Study Program at the University of Bengkulu, especially in the term of interruption in the turn-taking irregularities. Turn-taking is very essential to be analyzed since it can be used to look at how the participants manage and take to exchange speaking turns in interaction. Moreover, the participants in a conversation class used turn-taking strategies to achieve their conversational goals. Therefore, the theory proposed by Zimmerman and West (1975) was used to analyze the interruption in turn-taking irregularities. Furthermore, the theory of interruption classification proposed by Murata (1994) was used to analyze the type of interruption including cooperative interruption (an agreement, assistance, and clarification) and intrusive interruption (disagreement, floor-taking, topic-change, and tangentialization).

Research Methodology

This research used a descriptive quantitative design. The subject of the study was the 2nd semester students of the English Department Study Program at the University of Bengkulu in Speaking for Conversation Class. The researchers theory by Zimmerman & West 1975 and classified by Murata (1994). In collecting the data of this research, the researchers had used a questionnaire in the form of Google Form as the instrument to help the researchers categorized data. The grid of the questionnaire was

based on the theory used by the researchers as a researchers instrument consist of 21 statements which participant needs to choose 1 out of 21 from the attached statement which applied their condition. Every statement and option is adapted by the researchers according to the theory. The form of this questionnaire was a checklist type, where in which the participant needs to choose a strongly favorable, favorable, unfavorable, and strongly unfavorable questionnaire adapted by the researchers according to the theory, the type of interruption was following the theory from Zimmerman and West (1975) because this theory commonly used by another researchers. Technique of collecting data the researchers used google form as a media, then provides link questionnaire, then classified the interruption in turn taking irregularities, and calculating the result. Afterwards the researchers analyzing the data, interpreting the data, calculating the data, and describing the data. Calculating percentage and make a mean of the result, the formula as follows:

- $\bar{x} = \frac{x}{n}$

\bar{x} : mean (average respondent score)

x : the total score of the respondent's answer

n : number of respondents

The quantitative technique (percentage), the formula as follows:

- $P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$

P= Percentage

F= Frequency of the answer

N= Number of sample

Based on the choices, this research adapted by Likert Scale; therefore, each frequency had its point. Here are the details:

Categories	Scala
Strongly favorable	4
Favorable	3
Unfavorable	2
Strongly unfavorable	1
Other	0

Findings and Discussion

Findings

1. The types of interruption in turn taking irregularities in Speaking for Conversation class by Zimmerman and West

The first objective of this research was to found out the types of interruption in turn-taking irregularities in Speaking for Conversation class. The categories of interruption in turn taking, meanly cooperative, and intrusive consist of 7 types (agreement, assistance, clarification, disagreement, floor-taking, topic change, and tangelization). The result of the interruption, in turn taking irregularities from the questionnaire in Speaking for Conversation class in the table below.

Table 1. Types of interruption in turn taking irregularities.

No	Statement	Opinion					Total
		Strongly favorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	Strongly unfavorable	Alternative (other)	
1.	Agreement	4,9%	31,7%	54,1%	8,3%	1 %	100%
2.	Clarification	12,1%	46,3%	36,2%	4,1%	1,3 %	100%
3.	Assistance	4,5%	33,9%	52,5%	8,7%	0,4 %	100%
4.	Disagreement	3,3%	34,2%	56,2%	5,4%	0,9%	100%
5.	Floor taking	7,1%	50,4%	38,7%	3,8%	0	100%
6.	Topic change	2,0%	12,5%	57,1%	27,1%	1,3 %	100%
7.	Tangelization	2,4%	20,8 %	36,6%	39,6%	0,6%	100%

The explanation of the type interruption in turn taking irregularities will be explained in the chart below.

The agreement type includes 3 statements that consist of statement 1, 3 chose strongly favorable as much (3,7 %), then 14 chose favorable as much (17,5 %), while 53 chose unfavorable as much (66,3 %). The remaining chose are 10 chose strongly unfavorable as much (12,5%). Statement 2, 4 choose strongly favorable as much (5 %), then 29 chose favorable as much (36,3%), while 41 chose unfavorable as much (51,2%). The remaining choices are 5 chose strongly unfavorable as much (6,3%). But there is one choice that "depends on the topic being discussed" much (1,2%). Statement 3, 5 respondents chosen strongly favorable as much (6,2%), then there are 33 chose favorable as much (41,3%), 36 chose unfavorable as much (45%), and 5 chose strongly favorable as much (6,3%). It means that turn taking in interruption might happen because students do not like agreement statement in turn taking, and also happens frequently in daily conversation or classroom.

The type of clarification consists of 3 statements that consists of statement 4, 5 chose strongly favorable as much (6,3 %), then 51 chose favorable as much (63,8%),

22 chose unfavorable as much (27,5%). This statement that 2 respondents who have to own chosen that is one respondent choose "ordinary" (1,2%) and another person chose "depend" (1,2%). Statement 5, 21 chose strongly favorable as much (26,2%), then 43 chose favorable as much (53,8%), 15 chose unfavorable as much (18,8%) and 1 chose strongly unfavorable as much (1,2%). Statement 6, 3 chose strongly favorable as much (3,8%), 17 chose favorable as much (21,3%), then 50 chose unfavorable as much (62,5%), and 8 chose strongly unfavorable as much (10%). In this statement, there are 2 chose other opinions, which is 1 chose "ordinary" (1,2%) and 1 chose "when the lecturer interrupted the conversation with the aim of clarifying or adding, of course, I did" (1,2%). As seen from the respondents' answers the respondents probably prefer this type of turn taking because this type can be used in daily conversation.

The next type is assistance consists of 3 statements that consist of statement 7, 2 chose strongly favorable as much (2,4%), then 6 chose favorable as much (7,5%), 55 chose unfavorable as much (68,8%), and then 17 chose strongly unfavorable as much (21,3%). Statement 8, this type is 5 chose strongly favorable as much (6,3%), 29 chose favorable as much (36,3%), then 44 chose unfavorable (55%), 1 chose strongly unfavorable as much (1,2%), but 1 chose other answers, "if the interruption given is clear I would certainly agree but if not then I strongly disagree" as much (1,2%). Statement 9, this type there are 4 chose strongly favorable as much (5%), 46 chose favorable as much (57,7%), then 27 chose unfavorable as much (33,8%), the last, 3 respondents chose strongly unfavorable as much (3,7%).

The disagreement type consists of 3 statements that consist of statement 10, 1 chose strongly favorable as much (1,2%), then 11 chose favorable as much (13,8%), the next 63 chose unfavorable as much (78,8%), 4 chose strongly unfavorable as much (5%). The remaining is 1 has owned the other answer "usual" (1,2%). Statement 11, 5 chose strongly favorable as much (6,3%), 32 chose favorable as much (40%), then 34 chose unfavorable as much (42,5%), and 8 chose strongly unfavorable as much (10%), and 1 chose another option is "depends on the topic" as much (1,2%). Statement 12, 2 chose strongly favorable as much (2,5%), afterward, 39 chose favorable as much (48,8%), then 38 chose unfavorable as much (47,5%), and 1 chose strongly unfavorable as much (1,2%). It means, based on the above disagreement type that the respondents choose not to like the type, probably because this type is not good for the kind of interruptions that occur frequently.

The floor taking type consists of 3 statements. Statement 13, 3 chose strongly favorable as much (3,8%), 36 respondents chose favorable (45%), then 39 chose unfavorable as much (48,7%), and 2 chose strongly unfavorable as much (2,5%). Statement 14, 10 chose strongly favorable (12,5%), then 46 chose favorable as much (57,5%), next 21 chose unfavorable as much (26,3%), and 3 chose strongly unfavorable as much (3,7%). Statement 15, 4 chose strongly favorable as much (5%), then 39 chose favorable (48,7%), the next 33 chose unfavorable as much (41,3%), and the remaining 4 chose strongly unfavorable as much (5%). So, in this type, many respondents prefer to favorable.

The other chart about topic change type consists of 3 statements. Statement 16, 3 chosen strongly favorable as much (3,7%), 7 chose favorable as much (8,8%), then 47 chose unfavorable as much (58,8%), next 22 chose strongly favorable as much (27,5%), and the remaining 1 chose the answer "*less comfortable*" as much (1,2%). Statement 17, 1 chose strongly favorable as much (1,2%), then 8 chose favorable as much (10%), next 49 chose unfavorable as much (61,3%), 21 chose strongly unfavorable as much (26,3%), and 1 chose the answer "*depends on the topic being discussed*" as much (1,2%). The last statement in this type are 1 chose strongly favorable as much (1,2%), 15 chose favorable as much (18,9%), then 41 chose unfavorable as much (51,2%), then 22 chose strongly unfavorable as much (27,5%), and 1 chose the answer "*usual*" as much (1,2%). So, in this type many respondents prefer to unfavorable, it is believed that this happened because in this type it is unapologizing at interrupting someone, especially in changing the topic being a conversation.

The last tangelization type is consist statements. Statement 19, 1 chose strongly favorable as much (1,2%), then 10 chose favorable as much (12,5%), next 20 chose unfavorable as much (25%), and 49 chose strongly unfavorable (61,3%). Statement 20, 1 chose strongly favorable as much (1,2%), then 12 chose favorable as much (15%), next 35 chose unfavorable as much (43,8%), and 32 chose strongly unfavorable as much (40%). Statements 21, 4 chose strongly favorable as much (5%), 28 chose favorable as much (35%), then 33 chose unfavorable as much (41,2%), next 14 chose strongly unfavorable as much (17,5%). The remaining 1 choose the answer "*depends on the situation, whether you like or don't like*" as much (1,2%). It means, in interrupting a conversation it is better if it is done politely and can respect other people's opinions even though we disagree with their opinions.

2. The dominant type of interruption in turn-taking irregularities by Zimmerman and West

The second objective of this research was to find out the dominant type of interruption in turn taking irregularities in Speaking for Conversation class. The most dominant in turn taking irregularities was clarification type (58,5%). This type was mostly chosen by respondents. The options they choose the most were "sangat suka" or strongly favorable as much (12,1%) and "suka" or favorable as much (46,3%), in which the meaning of clarification usually initiated by the listener, with the intention was to understand the message being sent by the speaker, it means when the first speaker speaks while the second speaker cut in the middle of a word to get understand about the word that speaker said. This is probably happening because the type of clarification can help the first speaker.

Example 1

"Saat berlangsungnya percakapan sering terjadi pemotongan pembicaraan, dimana si pembicara pertama membutuhkan bantuan pembicara kedua, Saya merasa..."

"When a conversation is talking place, interruption often happen, in which the first speaker needs a help of the second speaker. I feel..."

(appendix, questionnaire clarification type, statement 4)

Statement 4 in the option "sangat suka" or strongly favorable was chosen by 5 respondents (6,3%); option "suka" or favorable was chosen by 51 respondents (63,8%); option "tidak suka" or unfavorable was chosen by 22 respondents (27,5%), but no one seems to choose "sangat tidak suka" or strongly unfavorable. The chosen "ordinary" was chosen by 1 respondent (1,2%), and choose other option "depend" was chosen by 1 respondent (1,2%). This is probably because this statement can help the first speaker in conveying ideas.

Example 2

"Saat terjadi pemotongan di suatu pembicaraan itu artinya terjadi pemotongan dalam berbicara, hal tersebut tidaklah bagus. Namun, jika si pembicara kedua berfungsi membantu si pembicara pertama karena lupa kalimat yang akan dibicarakannya. Saya merasa..."

"An interruption occur as in a conversation is not good. However, if the second speaker function to help the first speaker who forgets what he/she will talk about, I feel..."

(appendix, questionnaire clarification type, statement 5)

Statement 5 in the option "sangat suka" or strongly favorable was chosen by 21 respondents (26,2%); option "suka" or favorable was chosen by 43 respondents (53,8%); option "tidak suka" or unfavorable was chosen by 15 respondents (18,8%);

option “*sangat tidak suka*” or strongly unfavorable was chosen by 1 (1,2%). This is probably because the statement had a point to help the first speaker, even if the interrupter cuts in on a conversation. Example 2, where there is the sentence “the interrupter will help an opinion/idea related to the topic” means the interrupter was helped the first speaker

Example 3

“Saat belajar English Conversation di kelas, jika ada dosen memotong saat mahasiswa berbicara, saya merasa...”

“When learning English for conversation class, if the lecturer interrupts the student when they are talking, I feel ...”

(appendix, questionnaire clarification type, statement 6)

Statement 6 in the option “*sangat suka*” or strongly favorable was chosen by 3 respondents (3,8%); option “*suka*” or favorable was chosen by 17 respondents (21,3%); option “*tidak suka*” or unfavorable was chosen by 50 respondents (62,5%); option “*sangat tidak suka*” or strongly unfavorable was chosen by 8 respondents (10%); option “*ordinary*” was chosen by 1 respondent (1,2%); and, another option says “when the lecturer interrupted the conversation with the aim of clarifying or adding, of course, I did..” was chosen by 1 respondent (1,2%). This is probably happening because, at this statement, the respondent thinks that this type of clarification assists by clarifying the understood of the other listener in a conversation in the speaking for conversation, in the group discussion, or the class discussion. Turn to speak in clarification when the second speaker assists the first speaker in explaining the ideas conveyed by the first speaker.

Discussion

The first objective of this research was to find out the types of interruption in turn taking irregularities in speaking for conversation class used by questionnaire. There are seven types of interruption in turn taking irregularities which are agreement, clarification, assistance, disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangelization.

Regarding the first research question, the researchers found the seven types of interruption including agreement, clarification, assistance, disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangelization. This result seems to be similar to Hidayati's (2014) study who aimed at finding the identifying types of turn taking irregularities and reasons for doing turn taking in a movie entitled *The Last Song*. In the previous study, the researchers showed that two types of interruption namely cooperative and

intrusive. The previous study showed that the findings consist of 7 types of interruptions, including agreement, clarification, assistance, disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangentialization in *The Last Song* movie. This is because characters usually interrupt each other to convey their negative intentions. They usually do irregularities to prevent other speakers from conveying unwanted information or topic, dominate the conversation, show deviation or strong desire in showing negative feelings. It can be concluded that the previous study and the present study have similarities to perform types of interruption in turn taking irregularities.

In case of the instrument of the present study, this study used a questionnaire. This study was different from the previous research instruments. This study used a questionnaire as a data collection tool, so in the questionnaire there are options available in the questionnaire. This instrument was considered to be used in examining turn taking phenomenon which was experienced by the students who studied Speaking for Conversation Class. Whereas all previous studies examined turn taking found in movies, talk shows and others. In previous research observations and used data sheet as the instrument.

Regarding the theory of interruption types, this study took the types of interruptions from Zimmerman & West (1975) classified by Murata (1994). On the other hand, the study from Sambas (2017) took the theory of Ferguson (1977) which divided the types of interruption into simple interruption, overlap interruption, butting-in interruption, and silent interruption. Therefore, the results of Sambas's (2017) study were different from the present study. Similarly, the study from Jakob & Pratiwi (2019) took the theory of Ferguson (1977) cited by Beattie (1981) which divided the types of interruption into simple interruption, silent interruption, and butting interruption. Therefore, the results of Jakob & Pratiwi's (2019) study were different from the present study. Additionally, the results of this study are also in contrast with the previous study from Tiono & Ansori (2005) entitled "*Turn taking Irregularities by African American Characters in the movie 'Why Do Fools Fall in Love'*". This previous study used the theory from Zimmerman & West (1975) in Coates (2004) and found only four types of interruption found from the total of seven interruptions, including clarification, rejection, completion, and showing annoyance. It might happen because this study examines the turn taking phenomenon employed by actors in a movie.

The second objective of this research is to find out the dominant type of interruption in turn taking irregularities in speaking for conversation class. There were

all of the seven types of interruption namely agreement, clarification, assistance, disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangelization. In fact, the clarification type of interruptions occurred more frequently than the other types. This is probably because of the statement that the clarification type was positive, even though the interruption actually interrupts the conversation of other people.

This finding is in contrast with the previous study from Sapabsri (2018). The previous study was aimed at analyzing conversational interruption between Thai genders with different social statuses. The results showed that in the context of women having higher or equal status as a man, the male interrupted the conversation more often than his conversation partner. So, this previous study different from present study. The previous study found most dominant was woman interruption in conversation, while present study found clarification type Interruption in Turn taking Irregularities at Speaking for Conversation class. This type of interruption was taken from the theory of Zimmerman & West (1975) classified Murata (1994). On the other hand, the study from Hartono & Gunawan (2013) took the theory of Wardaugh (1985) which divided interruption into seeking clarification, completing, break up, and concluding, the highest number of occurrences as the reasons of the host and the guest in interrupting each other. Therefore, the results of Hatono & Gunawan's (2013) study were different from the present study.

On the other hand, the results of the present study revealed that the dominant type of interruption is similar to the previous study from Tiono and Ansori (2005). This study was aimed at finding the kinds of Turn taking Irregularities in the conversation among the four main African American characters in the movie "Why Do Falls in Love". This study found cooperative dominantly occurred the most frequently in the conversation in the movie was a clarification. The present study has also found the dominant type of cooperative interruption was a clarification. The type of clarification in the Interruption was found to be the most dominant or the highest, perhaps because clarification is very influential on a conversation, which helps more clearly a topic in the utterance. It can be concluded that the previous study and this research have similar to perform types of interruption in turn taking irregularities.

According to the results and discussion of this study, this research shows interesting results which indicated that all types of interruption occurred, including agreement, clarification, assistance, disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangelization. These results might be affected by the different contexts of the research

subject. The context of the present, researchers were the classroom interaction context while the context of the previous research was the movie interaction, classroom interaction, and different genders contexts. In relation to these contexts, the present study referred to perception turn taking since the researchers asked the participants about their opinion about the types of turn taking happen in the classroom. Meanwhile, the previous study referred to action turn taking since the researchers checked and listed the types of turn taking that occurred in the research subjects.

The significance of the result is expected to help English learners to understand more about turn-taking strategies and it can be applied in daily conversation. The result shows that types of Interruption in Turn taking Irregularities at Speaking for Conversation Class, consists of agreement, clarification, assistance, disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangelization. Then the dominant Interruption in Turn taking irregularities was the clarification type of Interruption in Turn taking Irregularities. Basically, interruptions might happen in any situation of interaction. In the case of classroom interaction, it is expected that both students and lecturers interrupt in polite manners, as well as what has been discussed in politeness strategies in the pragmatics field. This is in line with the study conducted by Ayuningrum, Pulungan, & Sabaruddin (2018) who examined that politeness strategies were also used in debate interaction. More importantly, a polite interruption might occur in different results if happen in different contexts. For example, the interruption that occurs in classroom interaction might be different from debate interaction, in which the polite manner of interruption in classroom interaction would not appear as much as the polite manner of interruption in debate interaction. However, this research only used an instrument by the questionnaire. It is expected for the further researchers to used observation or recording instruments.

Conclusion and Suggestion

Conclusion

From the research results and discussion, there were several conclusions that can be concluded regarding the research problems. Firstly, there were two types of interruption namely, cooperative and intrusive interruption. The cooperative interruption consists of agreement, clarification, and assistance. Then, the intrusive interruption consists of disagreement, floor taking, topic change, and tangelization.

Secondly, the dominant interruption type was a cooperative interruption in turn taking namely clarification from the results of the select data by the respondents.

This research was conducted to introduce the type of interruptions that often occur in everyday conversation. interruptions often occur something people don't realize the importance of getting to know interruptions. This research helps to determine the type of interruption that is good in used, especially in speaking for conversation class or speaking for discussion class in English Education.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusion above, the researchers delivered some suggestions. Other researchers are suggested to conduct further about types of interruption in turn taking irregularities and about dominant types of interruption in turn taking irregularities. Further researchers to used observation or recording instrument. More importantly, for further researchers also pay attention to the context and conditions of students. The findings of this research are expected as learning sources for speaking or discussion class. English teachers are suggested to learn about interruption type in English class. There are still many learners who underestimate turn taking.

References

- Ayuningrum, A., Pulungan, R., & Syafrizal, S. (2018). An Analysis of politeness Strategies applied by The Members of UKM Debat, The University of Bengkulu. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 2(4), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.2.4.1-8>
- Coates, J. (2015). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. Routledge.
- Conklin, G. (2009). *Conversational: What to say and How to Say it*. Massachusetts the Floating Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*. Routledge
- Dewi, R. F., Suharsono, S., & Munir, A. (2018). Turn Taking Strategies and Its Relations to Efl Learners' personality and Power in The Interaction of English Conversation Class. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 4(2), 288-305. <https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V42.2018.A12>
- Hartono, J., & Gunawan, S. (2013). Interruptions And Overlaps Occuring In An Indonesian Television Talk Show Indonesia Lawyers Club–Tv One. *Kata Kita*, 1(1), 223-229. <https://doi.org/10.9744/katakita.1.1.223-229>
- Hidayati, K. (2014). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Turn-Taking Irregularities Reflected in The Last Song Movie*. Thesis. Published. Yogyakarta University.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Polity Press.
- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Polity Press

- Jakob, J. C., & Pertiwi, S. A. (2019). An analysis of interruption in seminar setting. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, 2(1), 1-14. [10.33603/rill.v2i1.1131](https://doi.org/10.33603/rill.v2i1.1131)
- Larasati, C. K. (2014). *A Conversation Analysis of Interruptions in Modern Family Season 1 Series*. Thesis. Published. Yogyakarta University.
- Mazeland, H. (2006). Conversation analysis. *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 3, 153-162. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.40>
- Murata, K. (1994). Intrusive or co-operative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21(4), 385-400. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)90011-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90011-6)
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*, London. Continuum.
- Sambas, R. A. (2017). *Interruption in The Ellen Show*. Dissertation. Published. UMSU
- Sapabsri, O., Dhanesschaiyakupta, U., & Thep-Ackrapong, T. (2018). An analysis of gender and status affecting conversational interruptions. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 257-271. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2018.41.257271>
- Tiono, N. I., & Ansori, J. (2005). Turn-Taking Irregularities by African American Characters in the Movie "Why Do Fools Fall in Love". *Kata lama*, 7(2), 104-115. [10.9744/kata.7.2.104-115](https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.7.2.104-115)
- Wardhaugh, R. (1985). *How conversation works*. B. Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York.
- Zimmerman, D. H., & West. C. 1975. "Sex roles, interruption, and silence in conversations." In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. <https://web.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/zimmermanwest1975.pdf>