INTERRUPTIONS PRODUCED BY THE MOLLUCAN STUDENTS IN THE FELLOWSHIP MEETING

Silalebit, M. A.[1] **and Wijaya, H. P. S.**[2]

[1,2] English Department, Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University, Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya 60236, East Java, INDONESIA

E-mails: mercy_silalebit@yahoo.co.id; hennypsw@petra.ac.id

Abstract

This thesis is about a study of the interruptions produced by the Moluccan students in a fellowship meeting, consisting of fifteen students as the respondents, who are divided into two: the chairperson and the members. The purposes of the study are to know the tokens and the functions of interruptions used by the chairperson and the members of the meeting by considering social role as the social factor. The writer applies the theory of interruptions by Tannen (1990) and Wardhaugh (1985) as the main theories. Besides, the writer also uses the theory of social role by Johnstone (2008) and the theory of discourse markers by Schiffrin (2003) as the supporting theories. The writer used qualitative approach to conduct this research. The writer discovered that the chairperson produced more tokens (19) than the members (13). Moreover, the writer found that the respondents produced Ambonese tokens, such as "Hiii", "Weee", "Seng", "Eee", and Suroboyoan tokens, such as "Lho" and "Itulho". Both the chairperson and the members produced "other" functions the most with 58.75% and 63.81%. In conclusion, social role influenced the interruptions and their functions, and the number of tokens produced by the participants.

Keywords: Interruptions, Mollucan, Meeting, Social role

Conversation is "a social activity, one that always involves two or more people" (Wardhaugh, 1985, p.49). Conversation is therefore a cooperative endeavor. "Each time someone gets involved with another person, someone must consider him or her" (p.2). To be cooperative, someone must know the basic principle of turn-taking. The basic principle of turn-taking in a conversation is that one person speaks at a time (p.148). However, sometimes someone interrupts what others are saying. Tannen (1990, p.192) stated that "interruption is a violation in showing no consideration for someone else's right to talk and is an effort to dominate the conversation". To interrupt other speakers, some expressions are produced by someone, such as *Excuse me!, Pardon me!, Hold on!,* etc. These expressions indicate that someone has some reasons why he or she interrupts the first speaker (Wardhaugh, 1985, pp.151-152). Moreover, discourse markers as "sequentially dependent elements that brackets units of talk" such as *I mean*, *y'know*, *oh*, *like*, and others (Schiffrin, 2003, p.57) are very important as contextualization cues (Johnstone, 2008, p.238) to aid the speaker in holding the floor or to preface a response or a reaction (Muller, 2005, p.9).

Regarding the theories above, the writer is interested in studying about interruptions and tokens which occur in the meeting of Mollucan Students Fellowship in Petra Christian University because the writer wants to know how those Mollucans interrupt one another by using Ambonese as their language in the meeting since in the meeting the participants tend to compete with others to give their opinions. The writer is triggered to know whether the participants might produce their typical tokens in doing interruptions. There are fifteen students as the participants who study Petra Christian University from various batches. The chairperson is from batch 2009, and most of the members are from batch 2008-2012. In addition, it challenges the writer to focus on social roles as the participants are expected to know what roles they should adopt themselves. The situation may affect the language they should use as the participants need to consider their social roles in a meeting, especially when they want to interrupt others.

This study has four purposes. The first purpose is to know what are the tokens used by the chairperson of Mollucan Students Fellowship to interrupt the members in the meeting. The second is to investigate the functions of the interruptions used by the chairperson ofMollucan Students

Fellowship. The third is the tokens used by the members of Mollucan Students Fellowship to interrupt the chairperson in the meeting. The last purpose is to know the functions of the interruptions used by the the members of Mollucan Students Fellowship.

Interruption

"Interruption is an intrusion, a trampling on someone else's right to the floor, an attempt to dominate" (Tannen, 1990, p.189).Tannen also stated that "interruption is a violation of someone's speaking rights" (p.192). In other words, "Interruption is a violation that happens in conversation as a way of someone to dominate it. Interruption can be determined by knowing what the interrupter is trying to do" (p.190). Here is the example of an interruption:

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

In the next section, the writer will explain the functions of interruptions according to the theory of Wardhaugh (1985).

Functions of Interruptions

There are several functions of interruptions. First of all, someone interrupts other to "seek clarification concerning something that is being said" (Wardhaugh, 1985, p.151). This interruption happens because the interrupter sometimes gets lost or does not understand the conversation, or the interrupter is distracted by a noise.

Secondly, interruption is done in order to correct what the first speaker is saying. Correcting is considered "as a kind of challenge" because it "seems to question both the speaker's veracity and his or her very right to speak" (p.152). Another function of interruption is disagreeing, which is "to deny or reject some point that the speaker made" (p.152). Moreover, an interruption happens in order to complete what someone is saying (p.154). This interruption can be done by finishing the sentence.

The last function of interruption is ending a conversation (p.156). The interrupter pretends the signal that the previous speaker gives, which is usually a silence, but the interrupter ignores it.

Discourse Markers

To interrupt other speakers, the interrupter might directly cut the conversation by producing tokens or markers as the cues for the interlocutor. Discourse markers could be considered as "a set of linguistic expressions comprised of members of world classes as varied as conjunction (and, but, or), interjections (oh), adverbs (now, then), and lexicalized phrases (y'know, I mean) (Schiffrin, 2003, p.57). Schiffrin (p.36) also stated that "discourse markers have functions in cognitive (ability to represent concept and idea), expressive (to display personal identities, to convey attitude and perform an action), social (to display social identities, to negotiate relationship between self and other) and textual domains (to organize forms and convey meaning)". Marker *well* can be used to give response to anything in talk. *Or* and *so* are turn-transition devices to mark potential participation transitions. (p.316). According to Stenstrom (1994, p.63), discourse markers are used "to organize the turn, hold the turn, and to mark boundaries in discourse". Moreover, discourse markers are used to aid the speaker in holding the floor (Muller, 2005, p.9).

There are several discouse markers in Ambonese according to Tjia (1992). "*Seng*" and "*Tar*" are negative markers which are usually used to deny something (p.48). Conjunctions in Ambonese are "*abis itu*" (after that), "*deng*" (and, with), "*tarus*" and "*lantas*" which have similar meaning with "and then", "*tagalitu*" (therefore), "*lastelaste*" (finally), "*jadi*" (so), and "*adaharos*" (no wonder) (pp.58-59). Markers "*mar*" (p.51) is also a conjunction in Ambonese, taken from Dutch language "*maar*", which has same meaning with "but". "Or" in Ambonese is "*atau/atou*" or "*ka*". There are also phatic markers (Kridalaksana, 1986 in Tjia, 1992, pp.54-57) in Ambonese whose functions are to start, hold, and stress the conversation between the speaker and the participants, such as "*to*" which is similar with "*kan?*" in Bahasa Indonesia or "right?" in English. "*La*" in the beginning or the middle of a sentence means "whereas", while "*la*" in the last of the

sentence has the closest meaning to "*ya?*" or "right". "*Ee*" in Ambonese is used to show the intensity in the sentence, such as "*Paleng manis ee"* or "It is <u>really</u> sweet".

Social Role

  The relationships which people have with each other when they are interacting are actually negotiable, and they will create roles as the situation or the discourse make claim to equality, inequality, solidarity, or detachment (Johnstone, 2008, p.139). People create roles for one another and reinforce the difference between roles as they speak in ways their roles require (p.141). In some situations, a person finds his or herself in more than one role which means that he or she will have to negotiate about the language he or she has to use (p.140). For example, a mother who works as a teacher will have to negotiate her language by considering her role since she has to teach her daughter who is also one of her students. Thus, speakers assign roles to other participants, or "position" through the way they talk and the way they categorize their audiences.

METHODS

  In this research, the writer used qualitative approach. The key instrument of this research was the writer herself. The source of data of this study was all the dialogue lines spoken by all of the participants in the meeting. The data of this research were the interruptions and the tokens which were produced by all of the participants in the meeting of Mollucan Students Fellowship in Petra Christian University. The writer applied several steps in collecting the data. First, the writer recorded the meeting once, which was on September 10th, 2012 in order to get the data. Second, the writer watched the recording in order to understand the plot of the meeting. Next, she transcribed the dialogue lines which occurred in the meeting. Then, the writer gave the numbering system of the data since she would differentiate the interruptions spoken by the chairperson and the members. Therefore, she applied two digits numbering system: 1.1, it indicates that the data was spoken by the chairperson and the first interruption. At last, the writer began analyzing the data.

  The writer used three tables (Table 1., Table 2., and Table 3.). Table 1. illustrated the interruptions spoken by each participant.

Table 1. The Analysis of Interruptions Produced by the Chairperson/Members*

No.	Interruption	Translation	Tokens	The Functions of Interruption						Analysis
				SC	Comp	D	EC	CR	Others	

Note:

Comp. : Completing   SC   : Seeking Clarification
D   : Disagreeing   EC   : Ending Conversation
CR   : Correcting

  The writer classified and analyzed the functions of interruption based on the theory proposed by Wardhaugh (1985), and mentioned the tokens which occurred in the meeting based on the supporting theory proposed by Tjia (1992). The table would be applied for the interruptions produced by the chairperson and the members. Table 2. consists of the percentage of occurrences of the functions of interruptions:

Table 2. The Percentage of the Functions of Interruptions Produced by the
Chairperson/Members

No.	The Function of Interruption	Percentage of Occurrences (%)
1.	Seeking Clarification	
2.	Correcting	
3.	Completing	
4.	Disagreeing	
5.	Ending Conversation	
6.	Others	
Total percentage		

To calculate the percentage of each function of interruption, the writer applied the formula as follows:

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{\text{The frequency of each function of interruption}}{\text{Total frequency of interruption done by the chairperson}} \times 100\%$$

Table 3. to summarize the percentage of tokens produced by the chairperson or the members.

Table 3. The Percentage of Tokens Produced by the Chairperson/Members

No.	Token	Percentage of Occurrences (%)
Total percentage		

In calculating the percentage of each token, the writers also applied the same formula as calculating the percentage of each interruption.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
The Tokens Used by the Chairperson to Interrupt the Members

The writer found out that there were 19 (nineteen) kinds of tokens which were produced by the chairperson in the meeting. The details of the findings about the tokens could be seen in the following table:

Table 4. The Percentage of Tokens Produced by the Chairperson

No.	Token	Percentage of Occurrences (%)
1	Hiii	17.3%
2	Iyo/Iya	15.4%
3	Seng	11.53%

4	Jang/Jangan	5.8%
5	Oh	5.8%
6	Tapi	5.8%
7	Yang	3.8%
8	Sssst!	3.8%
9	Sabar/Sabar dolo	3.8%
10	Ha!	3.8%
11	Jadi	1.92%
12	Weee	1.92%
13	Kayaknya	1.92%
14	Lalu	1.92%
15	Kalo	1.92%
16	Eee	1.92%
17	Apa ni	1.92%
18	Lho	1.92%
19	Kan	1.92%
Total frequency		100 %

The findings showed that the tokens used the most by the chairperson are "Hiii" with the total frequencies 17.3%. "Iyo/Iya" is the second most popular tokens produced by the chairperson with the total frequencies 15,4%, and the third is "Seng" with 11.53%. The least used tokens are "Jang/Jangan", "Oh", and "Tapi" which have the same percentages, 5.8%. The second least are "Yang", "Sssst!", "Sabar/Sabar dolo", and "Ha!" with 3.8%, and "Jadi", "Weee", "Kayaknya", "Lalu", "Kalo", "Eee", "Apa ni", "Lho", and "Kan" are tokens used by the chairperson with the lowest frequencies, 1.92%.

The Functions of the Interruptions Used by the Chairperson of Mollucan Students Fellowship

There were the interruptions produced by the chairperson in which mostly are "other functions" with 58.75%, and the least are "seeking clarification" and "correcting" with 5% each. The details of the findings about the functions of the interruption and the percentage could be seen in the following table:

Table 5. The Percentage of the Functions of Interruptions Produced by the Chairperson

No.	The Function of Interruption	Percentage of Occurrences (%)
1.	Others	58.75%
2.	Completing	15%
3.	Disagreeing	8.75%
4.	Seeking Clarification	6.25%
5.	Correcting	6.25%
6.	Ending Conversation	5%
Total percentage		100%

"Other" functions of interruptions consist of "Making conclusion", "Making decision", "Giving information", "Taking the floor", "Giving comment", and "Agreeing". The token which was used by the chairperson in "Making Conclusion" was "*Jadi*". There were three tokens which were produced by the chairperson in interruption to make decision, such as "*Oh*", "*Kalo*", "*Seng*", and "*Lalu*", and "*Ha!*". The chairperson produced tokens such as "*Hiii*", "*Weee*", "*Kayaknya*", "*Kan*", and "*Lho*" to interrupt the members in giving information. The tokens which occurred in taking the floor were "*Sabar dolo*", "*Hiii*", and "*Eee*". To interrupt the member(s) in giving comment, the chairperson produced the tokens, such as "*Hiii*".

In interrupting the member(s) in agreeing, the chairperson produced only two tokens but it had similar meaning, which were "*Iyo*" and "*Iya*" ("Yes"). Morever, when the chairperson interrupted the member(s) to complete what member(s)' saying, she only produced one token, "*Tapi*" or "But". The tokens which were produced to interrupt the member(s) when the chairperson disagreed were "*Seng*", "*Jangan*", and "*Tapi*". Also, the chairperson interrupted the member(s) using token "*yang*" and "*Hiii*" to seek clarification. In correcting the member(s), the chairperson produced tokens, such as "*Maksudnya*" and "*Tapi*". Two tokens were usually produced by the chairperson in interrupting the member(s) to end conversation, such as "*Sssst!*" and "*Heee!*".

The Tokens Used by the Members to Interrupt the Chairperson
The writer found out that there were thirteen kinds of tokens which were produced by the members in the meeting. The details of the findings about the tokens could be seen in the following table:

Table 6. The Percentage of Tokens Produced by the Members

No.	Token	Percentage of Occurrences (%)
1	Seng	17.9%
2	Hiii	14.3%
3	Oh	14.3%
4	Yang	10.7%
5	Iya/Iyo	10.7%
6	Wee	7.14%
7	Berarti	3.6%
8	Lalu	3.6%
9	Itu lho	3.6%
10	Jadi	3.6%
11	Tapi	3.6%
12	Maksudnya	3.6%
13	Eee	3.6%
Total Percentage		100 %

The findings showed that the token used the most by the members is "Seng" with the total frequencies 17.9%. "Hiii" and "Oh" are the second most popular token produced by the members with the total frequencies 14.3%, and the third are "Yang" and "Iya/Iyo" with 10.7%. The least used token are "Berarti", "Lalu", "Itu lho", "Jadi", "Tapi", "Maksudnya", and "Eee" with 3.6%.

The Functions of the Interruptions Used by the Members of Mollucan Students Fellowship
The interruption mostly used by the member(s) is "Other" functions with 63.81%, and the least is "Disagreeing" with percentage 3.44%. "Ending Conversation" did not happen in the interruptions produced by the member (s). The details of the findings about the functions of the interruption and the percentage could be seen in the following table:

Table 7. The Percentage of the Functions of Interruptions Produced by the Members

No.	The Function of Interruption	Percentage of Occurrences (%)
1.	Others	63.81%
2.	Completing	15.51%
3.	Seeking Clarification	8.62%
4.	Correcting	8.62%
5.	Diagreeing	3.44%
Total Percentage		100%

Other functions of interruptions produced by the member(s) are giving information, joking, giving comment, giving suggestion, and agreeing. When the member(s) interrupted the chairperson to give information, he/she produced tokens, such as "*Oh*", "*Lalu*", and "*Hiii*". When joking, the member(s) produced token, such as "*Seng*". The token which was produced by the member(s) to give comment was "*Iyo*". In addition, the tokens which were produced by the member(s) to give suggestion were "*Hiii*", "*Tapi*", and "*Maksudnya*". The tokens which were occurred in the meeting to agree with the chairperson were "*Iyo*", "*Jadi*", and "*Oh*".

In completing the utterances of the chairperson, the member(s) used token "*Weee*". Meanwhile, "*Berarti*", "*Eee*", "*Yang*" were the tokens which were produced by the member(s) in seeking clarification. The member(s) produced tokens, such as "*Seng*" and "*Iyo*" to interrupt the chairperson to correct what she said previously. The member(s) produced only one token, which was "*Seng*" to show his/her disagreement toward the chairperson's statement.

Interpretation of Overall Findings

The tokens which were produced by the chairperson were more various than the member(s). It can be interpreted that these different numbers and various tokens occurred because it was affected by the social role which the chairperson has. The chairperson was the one who controlled the turn-taking in the meetings because her role was higher than the members. It means that she had more power to talk, especially to interrupt the members. She had more power to talk or interrupt; therefore, she produced more various tokens compared to the members.

The variety of tokens and language (Ambonese) which were produced by both the chairperson and the members because both parties were in less formal group discussion and they have the same ethnicity which made the mother tongue (Ambonese as the main language) come up in the discussion. However, tokens such as "*Lho*" and "*Itu lho*" are actually not typical Ambonese tokens but they occurred in the meeting. It might happen because that the participants are influenced by the language where they are living now, Surabaya.

In addition, the findings showed that one token could be used to interrupt in any function. Token "*Oh*" could be used to make decision, give information, correct the previous utterance, and agree with what the previous speaker said. Token "*Hiii*" could be used in some functions, such as giving information, giving comments, and seeking clarification. "*Jangan*" or "*Jang*" were tokens used to interrupt other participants in order to show disagreement and give comments.

The writer interpreted that the "Other" functions of interruption done by the chairperson were different from the member(s) because it was also influenced by the different social roles between two of them. The chairperson produced "Making decision", "Making conclusion", "Taking the floor", even "Ending Conversation" as the functions of the interruptions because the chairperson had more power than the member(s) in the meeting. On the other hand, the member(s) produced "Giving suggestion" and "Joking". Also, they did not produce "ending conversation" when interrupting the chairperson. It can be because their roles as members influenced them to

have less control than the chairperson. Instead of taking the floor or ending the conversation, the member(s) interrupted the chairperson to give suggestion which means that the member(s) was being supportive or cooperative toward the chairperson. Both parties mostly produced supportive interruptions, apart from "taking the floor" and "ending conversation" produced by the chairperson. It might happen because the majority of the participants in the meeting are females. According to Coates (1996) cited in Ersoy (2008, p.21), female speakers "generally tend to want connection with others, and to feel close through getting and giving information, emphaty, and support in conversation". Since most of the participants are females, they tend to be supportive by showing their agreements and elaborating the conversation in the meeting which is in line with the theory of Coates (1996).

CONCLUSION

From the explanation above, the writer concludes that social role influences the chairperson to produce more various tokens to use in interrupting in order to hold the floor while the members had fewer tokens to use in interrupting the chairperson. From the three highest functions of interruptions produced by the chairperson and the members, both parties showed the attitude of being supportive when interrupting each others as it is in line with the theory of Coates (1996) cited in Ersoy (2008, p.21). The writer suggests that other students can conduct a similar research with different object of investigation as the comparison for this study. The writer suggests a research on a study of discourse markers in interruptions with different social group and gender. In this case, there will be a finding about which gender with what discourse markers and functions will be used in doing interruption.

Hopefully, this research will give another contribution for readers in understanding the functions of interruptions which were produced by the Mollucan students in the fellowship meeting. The writer also hopes that this research would be useful for further research in the different contexts and situations.

REFERENCES
Ersoy, S. (2008).*Men compete, women collaborate*. Kristianstad: Kristianstad University
Heritage, J. and Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing
Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing
Muller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co
Schiffrin, D. (2003). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Stenstrom, A. (1994). *An introduction to spoken interaction*. London: Longman
Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand*. New York: Quill
Tjia, J. (1992). *Cakalele: Maluku Research Journal Vol. 3*. Manoa: University of Hawaii
Wardhaugh, R. (1985). *How conversation works*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell