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ABSTRACT

Yussie Septiany. Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Political Interview between President Donald Trump and John Dickerson on Face the Nation, CBS NEWS. Thesis. Jakarta: English Letters Department, Letters and Humanities Faculty, State Islamic University (UIN) Syarif Hidayatullah, November 2018.

This research aims to identify the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption in political interview and why it occurs. The writer is interested in observing interruption in President Donald Trump's interview with “Face the Nation” because in political interview the change of interruption occurs is high as the interviewer tried to expose the thorny, and often hidden, side affairs, which is not commonly explained by politicians unless it favors their party’s image to detriment of other parties. There are two parties in this dialogue, John Dickerson as the host and President Donald Trump as the politician guest. The writer analyzed the type of interruptions from the conversation which occurred in the show used Murata’s theory and classified the reason used Wardhaugh’s theory. This study focused on the types and the common reason of cooperative and intrusive interruption in political interview. To decide the type and reason of interruption the writer looked at the context of the discussion between the host and the guest. The writer found twenty-two intrusive interruptions and one cooperative interruption from the data. The type of cooperative interruption is clarification and the types of intrusive interruption are floor taking, tangentialization and disagreement. The writer found four reasons of interruption which are breaking up, correcting, disagreeing, and seeking clarification.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Interruption is considered as something that disturbs the flow of conversation. Some previous researchers had done political interview research with several results. Geoffrey W. Beattie with his research titled *Turn-taking and interruption in political interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan compared and contrasted* in 1982 presented some analyses of the speech and conversational styles of two Britain’s Leading political figures. Those two political figures were Margaret Thatcher, previous Prime Minister, and Jim Callaghan, the leader of the Opposition. The corpus on which the analysis is based consists of two televised interviews shown on British television in April 1979. The analysis focuses on conversational turn-taking and interruptions. The result of the study suggests that the form of interruption acts as a subtle reflection of dominance relationships in conversation. Conversely, interruption is not only defined as a matter of violation in conversation, but also can build up the relationship for both speaker and listener. This is all happened because interruption has other function not only to dominate, but also to cooperate.

Interruption could be appeared in every kind of conversations; one of them is in political interview. Political interview refer to a type of formal interview with major political representatives, often constituting a program on its own, and staged either in an official room or in a television studio without any audience present. The roles of interviewer and interviewee are played by a journalist and a
politician appearing in his/her professional political role. The encounter is staged for the benefit of the general public, who is absent and passive, and is constructed as a mass audience. The ultimate addressee of the communicative event is not the interviewer but the audience (Martinez 20). Fetzer and Bull (73) interpreted political interview as kind of interview where there is the journalist as interviewer, who asks political questions, and the politician as interviewee, who answers political question by giving political answers.

Nowadays, political interview appears in television programs. One of them is *Face the Nation*. *Face the Nation* is America’s premier Sunday morning public affairs program. The broadcast is one of the longest-running news programs in the history of television, having debuted November 7, 1954 on CBS. The program’s moderator interviews newsmakers on the latest political and socioeconomic issues, and delivers a short topical commentary at the end of the broadcast. The program guests include government leaders, politicians, and international figures in the news (CBS NEWS).

This study aims to identify the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption in *President Donald Trump’s interview with “Face the Nation”* on CBS NEWS as the source of data. This episode discussed about President Donald Trump’s accomplishments at the traditional milestone and beyond on his 100th day in office as the new president of United States. The reason why the writer picks this data is because in political interview the change of interruption occurs is high as the interviewer tried to expose the thorny, and often hidden, side affairs, which is not commonly explained by politicians unless it favors their party’s
image to detriment of other parties. In order to analyze and assess the result of the data, this research use Murata’s theory to identify the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption and Wardhaugh’s theory to explain the reason why the speakers interrupted. The result of the research is expected to have some benefits for the writer and the readers. For the writer, this research benefits to enrich the writer’s knowledge about conversation analysis and interruption talk. Hopefully, this research could be one of the useful references in conversation analysis, especially for student who are interested in studying conversation interruption for various discourse.

B. Focus of the Study

According to the background of the study, this research focuses on the types of cooperative and intrusive interruptions, and what kind of reasons the speakers interrupt between John Dickerson and President Donald Trump in political interview *Face the Nation* on CBS NEWS, which aired at April 30, 2017.

C. Research Questions

The question of the research which the writer wants to analyze:

1. What types of cooperative interruptions occurred in the conversation based on Murata’s theory?

2. What types of intrusive interruptions occurred in the conversation based on Murata’s theory?

3. What are the most frequent reasons of interruption uttered by the speakers in the conversation based on Wardhaugh’s theory?
D. **Significance of the Study**

Basically, the writer has two significances of the study, which are in practically and theoretically:

1. **Practical**

   This research is expected to provide knowledge to the reader and next researcher as a reference, especially about interruption talk in political interview. The results of this study can be used as an input for language users to implement conversation analysis of interruption talk that correspond to violence the turn-taking system.

2. **Theoretical**

   From theoretical significance, the writer hoped this research could be an insight for pragmatic science, especially in the field of Conversational Analysis about interruption talk, and to enrich the previous researches.

E. **Research Methodology**

1. **The Objectives of Research**

   Based on the research question above, the objectives of the research are:

   1.1. To analyze the types of cooperative interruptions occurred in the conversation based on Murata’s theory.

   1.2. To analyze the types of intrusive interruptions occurred in the conversation based on Murata’s theory.

   1.3. To analyze the most frequent reasons of interruption uttered by the speakers in the conversation based on Wardhaugh’s theory.
2. The Method of Research

According to Hammersley (12), qualitative research is a method that tends to adopt data-driven research design, to use relatively unstructured data, to emphasize the essential role of subjectivity in the research process tends studying a small number of cases and usually used verbal rather than statistical forms of analysis. On the other hand, Holloway (2) said that qualitative research is a form of social inquiry that focuses on the way people interpret and make sense of their experiences and the world in the world they live. Denzin and Lincoln (3) said that Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. To sum up, qualitative research is a type of social science research that uses non-numerical data to interpret the meaning by using some theories on interpretation and human experience. This research used qualitative research because the writer used a transcript data from an interview’s dialogue which is a verbal data and the analysis will focus on the state of mind and ideas of the speakers.

3. The Instrument of the Research

Instrument of the research is researcher herself as the main instrument for obtaining qualitative data in political interview between President Donald Trump and John Dickerson. After the writer watched and listened carefully to the conversation in the video, she justified and reduced the data which is not related
in interruption talk. After required the selected data, the writer analyzed the data findings one by one that occurred in President Donald Trump’s interview with “Face the Nation.”

4. The Unit of Data Analysis

The unit of analysis in this research consisted of a video from an interview on CBS NEWS which titled President Donald Trump’s interview with “Face the Nation.” The interview aired at April 30, 2017 and led by the interviewer, John Dickerson. The source of the video was taken from www.youtube.com with durations 23:15 minutes.

5. The Technique of Data Analysis

In this study, there are some steps in analyzing the data as follows:

5.1. Justifying the main problem of the research which is assumed containing interruption talk in a video President Donald Trump’s interview with “Face the Nation.”

5.2. Reducing the dialogue that is not in accordance with the research problem.

5.3. Coding the dialogues which contain interruption talk by numbering and giving symbols in the transcription by using Gail Jefferson transcription symbols.

5.4. Classifying the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption contained in transcript using Murata’s theory.

5.5. Analyzing and explaining the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption in data card using Murata’s theory.
5.6. Analyzing and explaining the reasons of interruption talk in data card using Wardhaugh’s theory.

5.7. Draw a conclusion about the cooperative and intrusive interruption based on the data that has been analyzed.

6. Research Design

According to Flick (119), he described research design as a systematic plan for a research project, including who to integrate in the research (sampling), who or what to compare for which dimensions, etc. Additionally, Hammersley and Atkinson (In Flick 37) argue that research design should be a reflexive process which operates throughout every stage of a project. In conclusion, research design is a blueprint that explains a brief description about the process of research operates step by step.

The data of the research is from dialogue in President Donald Trump’s interview with “Face the Nation” aired at April 30, 2017, which contain interruption talk. Next, the data processed by classifying the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption between the interrupter and interruptee. After the data already classified, the next step is analyzing the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption using Murata’s theory and the reason of interruption using Wardhaugh’s theory. The output of this research is to explain the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption also the reasons why the speakers interrupted.
The dialogue in *President Donald Trump’s interview with “Face the Nation”* aired in April 30, 2017 which contains interruption talk.

Classifying cooperative and intrusive interruption of the speakers based on the types.

The results of types of cooperative and intrusive interruption used by President Donald Trump and John Dickerson and the reasons why they interrupted.

Analyzing the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption using Murata’s theory and the reasons of interrupting using Wardhaugh’s theory.

Diagram 1.1. Research Design
CHAPTER II
THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Previous Research

After searching for a wide range of literature as reference material studies, the writer found some previous researches. Review of some literatures is necessary to distinguish while emphasizing the special characteristics of this study from some previous existing works.

The first previous research was a thesis by Annisa Hafsa Ayu Anindya from English Letters Department, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta, titled Conversational Interruption in Oprah Winfrey Show Will Smith and Family Interview Episode. This thesis concerns about how interruption occurs, the types and the reasons of using interruption in Oprah Winfrey Show; Will Smith and Family Interview Episode. The result of her thesis showed the types of interruption which divided by successful and unsuccessful interruption and five reasons of interruption (breaking up, complementing, seeking clarification, agreement and rejecting some point.

The second previous research also a thesis by Utari Tri Siswi.D from Bina Nusantara University, titled Interruptions in The Interview Between Larry King and The Stars of The Walking Dead TV Series on Larry King Now Talk Show: A Conversation Analysis. This thesis concerned to overcome the functions, the reasons and the relation of the reasons with the functions of the interruption. The results showed that the functions of the interruptions that occur are supportive, neutral, and disruptive. The reasons are correcting the utterance, showing
agreement or disagreement, clarifying, and changing the topics. In this thesis proved that the reasons supported the functions of the interruption.

The last previous research from Yogyakarta State University by Chera Kurnia Larasati entitled *A Conversation Analysis of Interruptions in Modern Family Season 1 Series* published in 2014. In this research, it concerned about the types and functions of interruptions spoken by the characters in the series. She used Ferguson’s theory to identify the types of interruptions. The findings found four types of interruption occur in the characters’ utterances are simple, overlap, butting-in and silent interruption and three functions of interruptions: cooperative, intrusive and neutral interruption. Moreover, three functions of interruptions also found in the series, those are cooperative, intrusive and neutral interruption.

Conversely to the previous researchers above, the current research focuses on the types of cooperative and intrusive interruption in political interview. Applying a qualitative method study by selecting the conversation from the video of *President Donald Trump’s interview with “Face the Nation”* on CBS NEWS.

The aims of the research are to find out what types of cooperative and intrusive interruption and the reason why the speakers interrupt in political interview.

B. Theoretical Review

1. Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is required to identify the structure and rules in a conversation by observing the methods used by speakers to use efficient conversation structure. Harvey Sacks derived from UCLA in 1963 known as the inventor of conversation analysis. From his previous works which he had done,
Sacks had two rules, namely: that the process was not random conversation/not consecutive, but depending on the specific commands and each part has the ability to determine the meaning contained in the conversation (Bublitz 265). In every conversation each speaker has his share in the spoken word so that no simultaneous talk in the delivery of information.

Conversation analysis (CA) studies the methods participants orient to when they organize social through talk. It investigates rules and practices from an interactional perspective and studies them by examining recordings of real-life interactions. Although the foundational work in conversational analysis focuses on talk in conversations, the framework has gradually been extended to research of other types of talk such as medical and clinical interaction, lessons, or news interviews. This is why the more general characterization ‘talk in interaction’ nowadays is often preferred over ‘conversation’ (Mazeland 132).

According to Goodwin (289), Conversation analysis is led by concentrate the cooperation that individuals do in regular activities. Regardless of whether it happens in real-life context or through media, for example television program, the research using conversation analysis basically focuses around the interactional procedure.

2. Turn-taking

According to Harvey Sacks, the founder of the conversation analytic method, the basic unit of the conversation is the ‘turn’ a shift in the direction of the speaking ‘flow’ which is characteristic of normal conversation (Mey 139). Additionally, Cutting (29) explained that cooperation in conversation is managed
by all participants through turn-taking. In most cultures only one person speaks at a time: speakers take turns, first one talking and then another. All cultures have their own preferences as to how long a speaker should hold the floor, how they indicate that they have finished and another can overlap and interrupt, when speakers can pause and for how long.

Sacks et al. (696) stated that turn-taking is used for the ordering of moves in games, for allocating political office, for regulating traffic at intersections, for serving customers business establishments, and for talking in interviews, meetings, debates, ceremonies, conversation etc.

According to Sacks et al. (700) turn-taking is a basic form of organization for conversation that it would be invariant to parties, such that whatever variations the parties brought it bear in the conversation would accommodated without change in the system, and such that it could be selectively and locally affected by social aspects of context.

A point in a conversation where a change of turn is possible is called a Transition Relevance Place or TRP. Next speakers cannot be sure that the current speaker’s turn is complete, but they will usually take the end of a sentence to indicate that the turn is possibly complete. Cutting (29) had explained the differences between interruption and overlap. Interruption occurs when speakers do not want to wait until the TRP. Overlap occurs when hearers predict that the turn is about to be completed and they come in before it is. In other words, turn taking is when someone talked, he/she cannot always speak all the time. He/she
13

has to give a change to other participants to have their turn in order the conversation run smoothly.

3. **Interruption Talk**

Most linguists agree that interruption is a violation in conversation. Sacks et al. holds that interruption is a deep intrusion of the rights of the current speaker, as well as a severe disruption of a flow of the ongoing conversation. From this point of view equates interruption with power, the more powerful party interrupting the less powerful interlocutor (Li et al. 234). On the other hand, there are some linguists who hold that some type of interruption can serve as a way of getting involved, showing support and solidarity.

The present study proposes the types of cooperative and intrusive interruptions in political interview. Murata (101) define the cooperative and intrusive interruption as the function of interruption. Cooperative interruptions include those showing agreement or support, helping finish the current speaker’s thought, or asking for clarification and elaboration. These types of interruptions wither facilitate the carrying on of the present topic, or indicate rapid return of the floor to the interpersonal relationship between speakers. Disruptive interruptions, on the other hand, include those showing disagreement, rejection, or simply disinterest and those geared toward subject change. Zhao et al. (350) explained these types of interruptions often serve as indications of a struggle for control over the communication, thus they have the potential to bear negatively on the interpersonal relationship between speakers. In conclusion, interruption talk is
defined as an act in which a new speaker starts a turn while the current speaker has not yet reached a possible point of completion in his/her turn.

4. Cooperative Interruption

According to Murata (101), cooperative interruptions intend to help the current speaker by coordinating on the process and content of the ongoing conversation. Cooperative interruption contains three subcategories from Kennedy and Camden for Agreement and Clarification, and Li for Assistance.

4.1. Agreement

Agreement interruption, according to Kennedy and Camden (45-58), is an interruption which empowers the interrupter to appear concurrence, compliance, understanding or support. The purpose of an agreement interruption often takes the form of overlapping, showing interest or enthusiasm and involvement in the ongoing conversation (Li et al. 146).

(1) Physician: like m-i-l-d, lik/e mild pain
Patient : //Ya, mild and moderate pain. (Li et al. 252)

From the dialogue above, the Physician said if the patient felt a pain like a mild pain. Then, the patient answered quickly by interrupted the physician and showed an agreement to him by said “Ya, mild and moderate pain”.

(2) Mary : How is your experience after seeing Bromo Mountain?
Benn : I love it, the scenery from Bromo Mountain is amazing and//
Mary : //Yeah, you’re right. It’s amazing and beautiful.
Other example of agreement also showed in the dialogue above between Mary and Benn. They were talking about their experience in Bromo Mountain. From the dialogue above, Benn’s utterance is interrupted by Mary when he expressed his experience after seeing Bromo Mountain. Mary interrupted Benn and showed her agreement towards Benn’s utterance if the scenery was amazing and beautiful.

4.2. Assistance

Li (269) explained in the case of assistance interruption, the interrupter perceives that the speaker needs help. In order to rescue the current speaker, the interrupter provides a word, a phrase, or a sentence.

(3) Physician: ...affecting you like in four or five days, I would say give my office a call and I will see you again. But, other than that, I would say just don’t go to the swimming pool and see if it, if it/

Patient: //dispels

Physician: //Yah, dispels, exactly. (Li et al. 252)

From the dialogue above, the physician gave the patient a suggestion to not go to the swimming pool for about four or five days. The physician told him to do so in order to see the recovery of the patient condition. However, the patient had little bit troubled when he wanted to say the word. Then, the patient helped the physician by interrupted him and said dispels.
The second example was also the conversation between a Patient and a Physician. From the dialogue below, the patient explained his problem but he had a trouble to explain it. Therefore, the physician interrupted him and helped by provided a sentence to the patient.

(4) Patient : it// felt like// …
   Physician: //felt like// a stone sitting there, //yeah//?
   Patient : ye//ah ju//st pushing me. (Li et al. 153)

4.3. Clarification

Kennedy and Camden (45-58) identify clarification interruption to encourage the speaker to clarify or to explain the previous information in order to establishing common ground for further communication. When the listener is unclear about a piece of information the current speaker has just elicited, the listener interrupts the speaker to request clarification.

(5) Patient : He gave me these //new type of pills// to try…
   Physician: //the one you ment/ioned last time…
   Patient : //yes. the one//… (Li et al. 154)

From the dialogue above, the patient told the physician if he was took a new type of pills. Then, the physician interrupted in the middle of his explanation if the new pill was the one which he had mentioned last time in order to prevent misunderstanding.
(6) Macy : I tried Indonesian food and I think it was delicious. It was rice with eggs on the top and//

Tony : //You mean Nasi Goreng?

Macy : Yeah, that’s it.

The second examples showed in the dialogue above between Macy and Tony. They were talking about Indonesian food but Macy forgot the name and just described it. Macy had a difficult time to mention what kind of food she wanted to refer. Therefore, Tony interrupted her to help if she referred to Nasi Goreng.

5. Intrusive Interruption

Intrusive interruption usually poses a threat to the current speaker’s territory by disrupting the process and content of the ongoing conversation. Intrusive interruptions divided into four subcategories. Murata (105) divided intrusive interruptions into disagreement, floor taking and topic change. Then, Kennedy and Camden (45-58) explained that intrusive interruption was categorized as tangentialization.

5.1. Disagreement

According to Murata (106) disagreement interruption occurs when the speaker is trying to voice his/her opposing opinion immediately.

(7) Physician: You have asth//ma and you//…

Patient : //No, arthritis//. (Li et al. 253)
From the dialogue above, the physician said to the patient if he had an asthma. However, the patient denied it by interrupted the physician and said if he had arthritis not asthma.

(8) Tony : I think this movie is really good. The story, cinematography, and the///

Anna : //I don’t think so. This movie is so boring that I sleep while watched it. The plot is flat and there is not any suspense in the story.

In the dialogue above, Tony and Anna were talking about a movie that they watched. Anna interrupted Tony because she was not feeling the same way as Tony said. Therefore, she voiced her opposing opinion immediately when Tony gave a comment on the movie that they just watched.

5.2. Floor taking

Murata (105) explained that the interrupter takes over the floor from the speaker. However, they do not intend to change the topic of the current speaker. Instead, the interrupter usually develops the topic of the current speaker.

(9) Patient : ...So sta/'ring... //I...

Physician: //so then it, its/ just sounds like it might be from swimming, and its kind of like the whole chest, I don’t know it, it really hurts? (Li et al. 253)

The dialogue above showed the patient who wanted to utter his current conditions about the disease he had. However, the physician interrupted him by took over the patient floor.
Mavis: Because of the singing, presumably you did meet along the way?

Henry: Yeah, we did work together, I/

Karen: //Yeah, We did all the music together because Henry is the executive producer of the soundtrack!

In the dialogue above, Mavis asked Henry and Karen if they met because they worked together in a movie soundtrack production. Henry wanted to answer Mavis’s question and said if they did work together. However, he did not have a chance to finish his utterance because Karen took Henry’s floor.

5.3. Topic change

For the topic change interruption, Murata (105) explained that the interrupter is free to change the topic once he or she successfully takes over the floor. The differences between floor-taking interruption and topic change interruption laid in initial purpose to change the topic.

Patient: then I start working out and //then it’s like//…

Physician: //how are you/r bowels doing lately?

(Li et al. 154)

From the dialogue above, the patient tried to explain his problem to the physician. However, the physician took the patient’s floor and changed the subject of their topic by asking the conditions of his bowel.
(12) Janet : I think I will start a new hobby with this/

Zoey : //How about your

injury? Are you feeling better?

Janet : Yeah, more than before.

The other example about topic change also showed in the dialogue above. Zoey interrupted Janet’s utterance by asking her condition. In this situation, Zoey simply changed the topic from their conversation and asked about Janet’s condition from an accident.

5.4. Tangentialization

A tangentialization interruption explained by Kennedy and Camden (45-58) as an interruption occurs when the listener thinks that the information being presented is already known to the listener. By interrupting, the listener prevents himself or herself from listening to an unwanted piece of information.

(13) Patient : well, doc I’ll stay with this medication three ti//mes a day two

at a//…

Physician: //that’ll do, that’ll
do.// Now, you go and take this prescription to the Phoenix

Center.

(Li et al. 154)

From the dialogue above, the patient wanted to inform the physician about how many times he would took medication. However, the physician interrupted him in the middle of his explanation. The physician felt he does not need to listen any further and told the patient to take his prescription.
In the dialogue above, Liam interrogated Olive about the culprit in the crime scene. Olive answered if she was hiding and only heard a gunshot during the incident. Before Olive had finished her explanations, Liam interrupted her because he seemed to already understand of what she wanted to say.

6. Reason of Interruption

Most of the previous researches used Wardaugh’s theory (151-153) to identify the reason of interruptions. This research also used this theory as follow:

6.1. Asking for Help

This situation of interruption occurs when the speakers are doing something, and it includes interrupting their activity.

In the dialogue above, Marie was having a trouble in searching for her flash disk. Then, Billy interrupted Marie’s utterances and actions when she was trying to find her flash disk by asking her for help.
6.2. Breaking up

Breaking up occurs when the speaker used topic change or shift unpredictably in the middle of the conversation.

(16) Gisele: The scenery from the top was amazing right? I can’t wait to try!//

Henry: //about that, did you bring the equipments for our camp?

Gisele: Oh! I left it in the car.

In the dialogue above, Henry and Gisele were hiking in a Mountain and already on the top of it. When they got there, Gisele asked about the scenery from the top of the Mountain to Henry. However, before Gisele had finished her utterance Henry suddenly disturbed her when she was expressing her feelings. Then, Henry asked her if she brought the equipment for their camp. Unfortunately, she forgot it as she said those equipments was left in their car.

6.3. Completing

Reason of completing is one way of interrupting and taking over a turn which is less offensive than attempting to drown out the speaker by trying to complete something he/she is saying. The speaker can use words such as: and, but, however, and consequently (Wardaugh 153).

(17) Sarah: I’ve been taking the pills for about two months, and//

Doctor: //and then, the red spot constantly appeared. Okay, I see.

In the dialogue above, Sarah was explaining her problem when she took the pills that she received from the Doctor for about two months ago. The Doctor
listened to Sarah explanation, but he saw the red spots appeared on her skin. Then, the Doctor interrupted Sarah because he is trying to complete Sarah utterance.

6.4. Correcting

Reason of interruption by correcting the interviewee for the sake to seeking clarification is a much more delicate matter. Interruption in order to correcting the other is rather more intrusive than just seeking clarification. Self correction is always permissible, but too much is likely to reduce the speaker credibility with their listener (Wardaugh 152).

(18) Nikki :  So, this movie is one of your new fantasy genre right? I see you using a sword/

Rian :  //Yeah, It’s called Keris.

In the dialogue above, Nikki and Rian were talking about Rian’s new role in a movie. Nikki said to Rian if he used a sword in his new fantasy movie. Then, in the middle of Nikki’s turn, Rian interrupted her because he wanted to correct her utterance that the sword was called a Keris.

6.5. Disagreeing

Reason of disagreeing occurs when you hear something with which you sharply disagree or you consider that the speaker is badly misinformed. Some of words that indicates disagreeing; Wait a minutes!, hold on!, that’s not right!, I don’t agree!, or you’ve got. (Wardaugh 152).
(19) Fiona: I believe this movie is a musical as well, seeing/

Harris: //No, no, that’s not right. Haha. This movie is a drama romance with tragic situations. There’s no musical in it.

In the dialogue above, Fiona was asking about Harris' new movie. She wondered if his new movie was a musical as well. Harris interrupted Fiona because of what she said was not right. Therefore, he disagreed Fiona’s information by saying *No, no, that’s not right.*

6.6. Seeking Clarification

The last reason of interrupting by Wardaugh (151-152) is seeking clarification. This reason is trying to help the speaker communicate what he or she wants to get across to the speaker to the extent that they are willing to point out where the attempt is failing. It means that the speaker does seeking clarification to make it clear what the first speaker said. There are many words which can be used to request a repetition or clarification in the conversation, such as *excuse me, pardon me,* or *I beg your pardon.* However, once having stopped the speakers, the interrupter must explain why they did so. Such expressions as *Did you say X?, Do you mind repeating X?, What did you say?, Sorry I missed that, I didn’t catch that* will indicate that the interrupter motive is clarification.

(20) Graham: But these are just slightly, for instance, there isn’t a big hole right here/

Anna: //Excuse me?
Graham: Trolls always had a big hole so could stick them on a pencil.

Anna: Well, the pencil toppers ones, yes, Graham.

In the dialogue above, Graham and Anna were talking about a new movie “Trolls”. Then, they talked about kinds of merchandise that had been popular before such as a pencil topper of trolls. After hearing this, Graham asked Anna if the Trolls have not a big hole right in the bottom of the trolls, referred to the pencil topper. However, Anna did not refer to the pencil topper and felt confused with Graham’s question which makes Anna interrupted him. Then, Anna asked for clarification by saying excuse me?
CHAPTER III
DATA ANALYSIS

A. The Data Description

The data of this research are collected from an interview between John Dickerson and President Donald Trump in “Face the Nation” on NBC NEWS by some steps which were mentioned in the previous chapter. Some dialogues on the interview are taken in this research with duration length 23:15 minutes. The discussion focused on the issue of one-hundred days Presidency of the new President, Donald Trump. The writer selects some conversations that contain the interruption talk. The limitation of data is the cooperative and intrusive interruption that occurs in the interview. This study obtained twenty-three data which contains cooperative and intrusive interruptions also with the reasons of interruption occurs in the interview.

Table 3.1.
Types of Cooperative and Intrusive Interruption in corpus data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Types of interruption</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cooperative Interruption</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intrusive Interruption</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floor taking</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topic Change</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tangentialization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2.
Reasons of interruption in corpus data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reasons of Interruption</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Asking for Help</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Breaking up</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Completing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Disagreeing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Seeking Clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the data are analyzed more deeply in the data analysis. In the data analysis the speakers name would use a code to simplify the reader. The interviewer, John Dickerson would be coded as (J) and the interviewee, President Donald Trump would be coded as (T).

B. The Data Analysis

In this section, the analysis will be explained in three processes. First, explain the context in the dialogue which supported the analysis. Second, identify and explain the type of cooperative or intrusive interruption in the dialogue. Third, identify and explain the reason why the speaker interrupted.

1. Cooperative Interruption

   a. Clarification

Dialogue 1

Datum 1

19:12 J: You first said that you were under audit, were going to wait till that was done, about 14 months ago. That seems like a long time. When do you think this might happen? Are you asking them?
19:19 T: It could happen soon. I don't know. I mean, I think/

19:21 J: //When? Give me a sense of

In dialogue 1, John asked President Donald Trump that he had been under audit since fourteen months ago, and he saw it took a long time until it done. Then, John asked again when the audit would be done. However, President Trump did not know for sure and said that it could happen soon. John interrupted President Trump in the middle of his utterances to give him a specific answer.

The interruption from the dialogue above is cooperative interruption because John did not try to destruct President Trump’s utterance, but to request a clarification. Then, the type of cooperative interruption is clarification. The type is clarification because John felt unclear with President Trump’s answers and request clarification by saying “When? Give me a sense of” in minutes 19:21.

The reason why John interrupted President Trump is seeking clarification. Previously, John asked President Trump, “When do you think this might happen? Are you asking them?”, but President Trump did not give the exact answer that John wanted. Therefore, John interrupted Trump and repeated his question in order to get a clear answer by saying, “When? Give me a sense of...”

2. Intrusive Interruption
   a. Disagreement

Dialogue 2

Datum 2

07:07 J: What do you know now on day 100 that you wish you knew on
day one of the presidency?

07:13 T: Well, one of the things that I've learned is how dishonest the media is, really. I've done things that are I think very good. I've set great foundations with foreign leaders. We have you know NAFTA, as you know, I was going to terminate it, but I got a very nice call from a man I like, the president of Mexico. I got a very nice call from Justin Trudeau, the prime minister of Canada. And they said please would you rather than terminating NAFTA I was all set to do it. In fact, I was going to do it today. I was going to do as we're sitting here. I would've had to delay you. I was going to do it today. I was going to terminate NAFTA. But they called up and they said, "Would you negotiate?" And I said, "Yes, I will negotiate."

07:59 J: That's all you've learned, about the media? You knew from the campaign about the media.

You said it all the time/

08:02 T: //No, no, but the media didn't cover it that way. The media said, oh, I didn't terminate NAFTA.

In the dialogue above, John asked about what did President Donald Trump knew in his first day of presidencies. Then, President Donald Trump said about his disappointment for the media who dishonest to public. Trump had been thought that he was doing his job just fine until now. He stated that he made a great relationship with other foreign leaders in NAFTA, where he planned to terminate it. However, he did not terminate NAFTA after he got a call from President Mexico and the Prime Minister of Canada, Justin Trudeau. They asked President Trump if they want to negotiate. Then, President Trump replied with agreement. John responded with disappointment if President Donald Trump only
learned that from the media. When John wanted to continue his utterances, President Donald Trump interrupted him that he did not find the media was trying to cover just like he explained before.

The way President Donald Trump interrupted John in minutes 08:02 is intrusive interruption because in the dialogue above he tried to take control over the conversation. The type of intrusive interruption from the dialogue above is disagreement because when John had not finished his utterances, Trump interrupted John to give his opposed opinion by said “No, no, but the media didn’t cover it that way.”

The reason of interruption was similar with the types of interruption which is disagreeing. From the dialogue above, President Donald Trump gave his answer about his one-hundred presidencies. Then he uttered his opinion about the way the media did not giving the positive side that Trump had been done as the president. This statement made John thought if President Trump only saw the negative side of the media. This outcome obviously clear that they had a different point of view which made President Trump sharply disagreeed with John.

Dialogue 3
Datum 3

09:49  J: Let me ask you about health care (1.0) Tucker Carlson interviewed you about six weeks ago when you were in the middle of health care negotiations. And you agreed with him that the health care bill wasn’t going to help your supporters. That those who lived in rural areas, the older, were going to get hurt by that bill. And you told him//
In datum 3, John asked President Donald Trump about health care and his interview before with Tucker Carlson six months ago when Trump was in the middle of health care negotiations. John said if President Donald Trump agreed that the health care bill was not going to help his supporters. Moreover, John added if the elderly who lived in rural areas might get hurt by that bill. However, before John finished his question, Trump cut up his utterances in lines 202 showing his disagreements by saying “Excuse me, the health care bill is going to help my supporters.” Then, when John was trying to finish his questions, Trump interrupted him again in minutes 10:05 continued his previous utterances.

The interruption from the dialogue above is intrusive interruption because President Trump took over John’s turn to oppose his statement, not to help him finish it. The type of interruption in the dialogue above is disagreement. The type is disagreement because when John explained his statement about health care bill, President Trump interrupted him by expressed his disagreement in minutes 10:05.

The reason President Trump interrupted John because he was disagreeing. This reason proved when President Trump said the opposite meaning from what John said in the dialogue. In minutes 09:49, John gave a statement if President Trump would not help his supporters about the health care bill. However, President Trump suddenly opposed John’s statement if his health care bill will help his supporters in minutes 10.05. President Trump opposed John’s statement
because he had not finished his utterance and misinformed. Therefore, John took his floor again and asked President Trump to finish it first.

b. Floor taking

Dialogue 4

Datum 4

06:10 J: You're a negotiator. If you need something from somebody, you need China to help you with North Korea, doesn't that send a message to China, "We're not going to bug you about human rights, about intellectual property. In the South China Sea we're not going to put too much heat on you"? Aren't you breaking one of your own negotiating rules?

06:26 T: No. I think that, frankly, North Korea is maybe more important than trade. Trade is very important. But massive warfare with millions, potentially millions of people being killed? That, as we would say, trumps trade.

06:40 J: Let me ask you/

06:41 T: //Okay? You understand what I'm saying. And if I can use trade as a method to get China, because I happen to think that China does have reasonably good powers over North Korea.

From the dialogue above John asked President Donald Trump if he is a negotiator. John continued if Trump needed something he could just point China to give a hand to North Korea. John thought that acted would give a massage to China if President Donald Trump broke one of his negotiating rules. On the other hand, President Donald Trump did not think that way. He frankly thought negotiating with North Korea was more important than a trade because massive
warfare could possibly killed millions people and that is what he would do with the trumps trade.

The interruption from the dialogue above is intrusive interruption and the type is floor taking. The type is floor taking because Trump just took the floor without listen to what John wanted to ask about. Then, Trump continued his explanation if he, possibly, could used trade as a method to get China because they were one of powerful countries towards North Korea.

The reason President Trump interrupted John classified as breaking up. John took his floor by saying, ”Let me ask you...” in minutes 06:40 and tried to ask President Trump. However, President Trump shift John’s utterances unpredictably as he did not want to being question about that topic by said, ”Okay? You understand what I’m saying. And if I can use trade as a method to get China, because I happen to think that China does have reasonably good powers over North Korea” in minutes 06:41.

Dialogue 5

Datum 5

10:25 T: Pre-existing conditions are in the bill. And I just watched another network than yours, and they were saying, ”Pre-existing is not covered.” Pre-existing conditions are in the bill. And I mandate it. I said, ”Has to be.”

10:39 J: So/

10:39 T: //We have, we're going to have lower premiums. And before you start there, let me just tell you something. Obamacare is dead. Obamacare right now, all the insurance companies are fleeing.
In datum 5, President Donald Trump explained about pre-existing conditions in the health care bill. He assured John that pre-existing conditions were in the bill because he mandated it. However, John said that pre-existing conditions were not in the bill. This situation was contrast from what President Trump said in his previous statement. John wanted to get more explanation about it, but President Trump interrupted him in minutes 10:39 as he tried to complete his statement.

The interruption in datum 5 is **intrusive interruption** because President Trump did not intent to help John finished his utterances instead he tried to take over John’s floor. Therefore, the type of interruption in datum 5 is **floor taking**. The type is floor taking because President Trump just took over John’s floor without changed the topic in minutes 10:39.

The reason why President Trump interrupted John is **breaking up**. President Trump interrupted because in minutes 10:39 President Trump shifted John’s turn unpredictably even before he gave any opinions. Then, President Trump just continued his explanation that he planned to have lower premiums because he thought Obamacare were not helping the health care bill.

**Dialogue 6**

Datum 6  
10:39 T: We have, we're going to have lower premiums. And before you start there, let me just tell you something. Obamacare is dead. Obamacare right now, all the insurance companies are fleeing. Places like Tennessee have already lost half of their state with the insurance companies. They're all going. Obamacare, John, is dead.
Okay, because we're being(,) we're being compared to Obamacare. Just, so. Obamacare doesn't work//

11:03 J: //I just want to compare you to your own.

11:04 T: One thing. No, no, it's important. I've got to compare it.

11:06 J: No, no, but I want//

11:07 T: //But you were saying about Obamacare.

In dialogue 6, the context is still talking about health care bill in dialogue 6, but in this situation the one who interrupted was President Trump toward John. President Trump felt that it was important to compare his health care bill with Obamacare. However, John still wanted another answer which is not compared his health care bill with Obamacare. John wanted an answer about what President Trump would do to help his supporters in medical health care. Then, President Trump interrupted John; assumed if John’s question was about how he would run his medical health care compared with the previous medical health care “Obamacare”. President Trump’s assumption clearly said in the dialogue minutes 11:07, when he interrupted John’s floor and said “But you were saying about Obamacare.”

The interruption in datum 6 is intrusive interruption because he intentionally took over John’s utterances. The type of interruption is floor taking because President Trump shifted John’s utterances intentionally in minutes 11:07 without changed the topic. President Trump thought John was pointed to Obamacare indirectly in his previous statement which made him to compare his medical health care with it. Therefore, Trump interrupted John and said if John was saying Obamacare.
The reason why President Trump interrupted John is breaking up. This happened because President Trump just cut up John’s turn before he got his point. In minutes 11:06, John did not intend to compare President Trump health care bill with Obamacare. However, President Trump did not want to wait John’s turn and took over his floor.

Dialogue 7
Datum 7

11:40 T:  This bill is much different than it was a little while ago, okay? This bill has evolved. And we didn't have a failure on the bill. You know, it was reported like a failure. Now, the one thing I wouldn't have done again is put a timeline. That's why on the second iteration, I didn't put a timeline.

But we have now pre-existing conditions in the bill. We have (.) we've set up a pool for the pre-existing conditions so that the premiums can be allowed to fall. We're taking across all of the borders or the lines so that insurance companies can compete[...

12:09 J:  [But that's not in this bill.]

12:09 T:  [nationwide.]

12:10 J:  The borders are not in[...]

12:11 T:  [Of course, it's in.

12:11 J:  [this bill.]

It's in that third bill, right, because//

12:12 T:  //It's in the second phase.

12:14 J:  Okay.
In dialogue 7, President Trump explained about his premiums health care bill to John. He said that this bill has evolved and much different than it was a little while ago. Additionally, Trump said that there were no failures in the bill but he felt sad that he find out the bill were reported failures. Then, he explained that he would not put any timeline rather pre-existing conditions in the bill so that the premiums could be allowed to fall. He added that they (Trump Campaign) were taking across the borders or of the lines so that insurance companies could compete nationwide. However, John thought that borders were not in the bill until they started an argument. President Trump argued if the borders were in the health care bill, but John insisted if the borders were not in the health care bill otherwise in the third bill. Then, President Trump interrupted John’s utterances by giving his clarification in minutes 12:12. President Trump stated that the borders were in the second phase as it ended their argument.

The interruption in datum 7 is intrusive interruption because President Trump interrupted John with purpose to damage John’s turn. The type of intrusive interruption is floor taking because in minutes 12:12 President Trump took John’s floor intentionally as he clarified their arguments. John thought if the borders were in third bill. However, President Trump did not divide the health care bill into three sections but in two phases. Trump said in minutes 12:12 that the borders were in second phase.

The reason why President Trump interrupted John is correcting because he tried to clarify John’s statements when John said if the borders is in third bill.
Trump interrupted him and corrected John’s statement that it was in the second phase, not in the third bill.

**Dialogue 8**

Datum 8

12:15 T: It's called phase one, phase two. And that's, in effect, second phase, which will get approved, which will quickly get approved.

12:21 J: Let me//

12:22 T: //But let me just explain something. There will be such competition. Right now, there's no competition. There will be such competition by insurance companies so that they can get health care and the people taking care of health care.

In dialogue 8, President Trump explained about health care bill which had two phases. He called it phase one and phase two. On the other hand, John tried to give his opinion about President Trump’s statement. However, before John’s utterances got any points, President Trump interrupted him in minutes 12:22. President Trump took John’s floor and continued his explanation. He said there would be such competitions among insurance companies to get health care bill in order to take care the people who used their services.

The interruption in datum 8 is **intrusive interruption** because President Trump interrupted John to take over his floor. The type of intrusive interruption is **floor taking** because President Trump took over John’s floor before he uttered his opinion about two phases of health care bill. In minutes 12:22, President Trump did not give a change to John to give his turn. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is **breaking up** because he cut up John’s utterances. Then,
Trump continued his explanation about how people would get the health care bill through insurance companies.

**Dialogue 9**

Datum 9

12:22  T: But let me just explain something. There will be such competition. Right now, there's no competition. There will be such competition by insurance companies so that they can get health care and the people taking care of health care.

12:34  J: \//

12:35  T: //The other thing we're going to have is groups. Groups of people can negotiate. What's going to happen is the competition is going to drive down the premiums. In my opinion, much, much more than people understand.

In dialogue 9, President Trump explained that there would be such competition among insurance companies so that they could earned health care bill and maintained the health care of their customers. However, when John wanted to start his floor, President Trump interrupted him in minutes 12:35 and continued his explanation. John did not get any chance to utter his opinion. President Trump said if they (Trump Campaign) planned to form some groups of people who could negotiate the health care bill. He stated if this plan purposed for the competition to drive down the premiums.

The interruption in datum 9 is **intrusive interruption** because President Trump did not intend to help John utterances. The type of intrusive interruption is **floor taking** because President Trump took over John’s floor before he got any point in his utterances. In minutes 12:35, President Trump interrupted John and
started explain about his health care bill plan. The reason why president Trump interrupted John is breaking up because he cut up John’s utterance intentionally. President Trump just continued his explanation about his plan over the health care bill because he did not finished explaining beforehand.

**Dialogue 10**

Datum 10

12:59  T:  But when I watch some of the news reports, which are so unfair, and they say we don’t cover pre-existing conditions, we cover it beautifully.

13:08 J:  Although//


In dialogue 10, President Trump expressed his unsatisfied toward the media. He said that when he watched some of the news reports, he found out that the media did not cover pre-existing conditions which is different from what he had done. President Trump stated if they (Trump Campaign) had cover pre-existing conditions beautifully. Then, John tried to speak up his opinion about President Trump statement. However, President Trump interrupted him in minutes 13:08. He interrupted John and stated that Obamacare was the one who did not cover pre-existing conditions.

The interruption in datum 10 is intrusive interruption and the type is floor taking because when John wanted to speak up his opinion, President Trump took over John’s floor intentionally. President Trump explained if Obamacare was the one who did not cover pre-existing conditions. The reason why President Trump


interrupted John is breaking up because he just cut up John’s turn before he got any point to share. President Trump felt unhappy with the news report if he did not cover pre-existing condition. Therefore, he interrupted John and blamed Obamacare.

Dialogue 11

Datum 11

13:13  J:  In one of the fixes that was//
13:14  T:  //It's not going to be here.
13:15  J:  In one of the fixes it was discussed pre-existing was optional for the states//
13:18  T:  //Sure, in one of the fixes. And they’re changing it[
13:21  T:  

From the dialogue above, John tried to give his opinion about pre-existing conditions who already fixed. However, President Trump interrupted John’s utterances over and over in minutes 13:13 and 13:15. President Trump interrupted John by saying, “It’s not going to be here” in minutes 13:14. John repeated his utterance in minutes 13:15 when he said, “In one of the fixes it was discussed pre-existing was optional for the states...” However, before John finished his utterances, President Trump interrupted him again and said that pre-existing conditions changed every single time in minutes 13:18, “Sure, in one of the fixes. And they’re changing it and changing.”

The interruption in datum 11 is intrusive interruption and the type is floor taking because President Trump took over John’s utterances in minutes 13:14.
Then, Trump interrupted John again in 13:18. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is classified into breaking up in Wardhaugh’s theory because he cut up John’s utterance intentionally and took over John’s floor. President Trump interrupted John twice and developed the topic without changing it.

Dialogue 12

Datum 12

13:26 T: John, this has evolved over a period of three or four weeks. Now, we really have a good bill. I think they could have voted on Friday. I said, "Just relax. Don't worry about this phony 100 day thing. Just relax. Take it easy. Take your time. Get the good vote and make it perfect."

13:41 J: Just to//

13:42 T: //Most importantly, we're going to drive down premiums. We're going to drive down deductibles because right now, deductibles are so high, you never (.) unless you're going to die a long, hard death,

In the dialogue 12, President Trump stated his opinions that they had a really pretty good bill, about the medical health care. Therefore, he said to John for did not feel anxious about his 100 days presidency. Trump suggested John and other people who saw his interview to get a good vote for medical health care bill and made it perfect. Then, when John wanted to utter his opinion, President Trump interrupted him in minutes 13:42 and spoke up his opinion instead.

The interruption in datum 12 is intrusive interruption because President Trump took John’s floor intentionally. The type is floor taking because when John wanted to utter his opinion, President Trump took over his floor. Trump
developed more explanations about the medical health care bill that they (Trump Campaign) planned to drive down the premiums and deductibles because deductibles were too high. The reason why President Trump interrupts John is breaking up because in lines 322 President Trump just cut up John’s utterance before getting any point. President Trump did not interrupt John to change the topic but he developed the current topic because he did not finish explaining his program.

Datum 13

15:17  J:  Tax plan came out this week. It's got some big deficit numbers. You've said that's going to be made up by growth.
Congressional//

15:24  T:  //Well, not only growth. It's going to be made up by better trade deals.

In dialogue 13, John asked about tax plan that President Trump and his Campaign developed. John said if President Trump tax plan already came out and it got some big deficit numbers. John continued if President Trump had said that the tax plan was going to be made by growth. However, before John explained any further, President Trump interrupted him and correcting John’s statements in minutes 15:24.

The interruption in datum 13 is intrusive interruption and the type is floor taking because President Trump took John’s floor in the middle of his explanation. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is correcting because he tried to correct John’s statement about the truth in his tax plan. Trump
explained that the tax plan was not only made up by growth but also with better trade deals.

**Dialogue 14**

Datum 14

15:47  J:  Look/
15:47  T:  //We're going to come up with reciprocal taxes and lots of other things on those countries. But I view that more in trade. We're also going to fix all of our trade deals. We're going to have a very wealthy country again.

In datum 14, John and President Trump talked about tax plan. Previously, John asked if the tax plan was only made up by growth. However, President Trump denied John’s statement and said if the tax plan was going to be made up by growth, trade deals and many different reciprocal taxes. Then, John was trying to get his floor in minutes 15:47, but President Trump did not give him a chance to speak and interrupted him. Then, President Trump continued his explanation that he had a plan with reciprocal taxes and lots of other things on other countries. However, President Trump not only saw the reciprocal tax plan on other countries as a trade, he saw that more than it in order to make America as a wealthy country again.

The interruption in datum 14 is intrusive interruption and the type is floor taking because President Trump took John’s floor before he got any points of his opinion in minutes 15:47. President Trump took John’s floor and developed his explanation about his tax plan. The reason why President Trump interrupted John
is **breaking up** because he cut up John’s utterance unpredictably, even when John did not have a chance to speak up his opinion.

**Dialogue 15**

Datum 15

15:58  J: Let me ask you this, Mr. President. Congress may not go along with (1.0)
16:01  T: Always.
16:02  J: So they're going to try and find some spending. Let me ask you about the question of Medicare. They're going to want, in Congress, to make up on the spending side, to change Medicare. Will you allow that?
16:11  T: You're not going to have to do it.
16:12  J: But, sir, will you allow it?
16:13  T: You're not going to have to do it.
16:15  J: I'm just telling you we are //
16:15  T: //Does President Donald Trump want them not to do that?
16:17  T: I would much prefer them not to do that, that's right.

In datum 15, John and President Trump were talking about Medicare. John asked President Trump about the Congress who may not always go along with Trump’s plan. Then, if the Congress did so, they were going to try and find some spending side to change Medicare. John asked President Trump would he allow them to do that if it was happening. However, President Trump answered his question with an uncertain answered, “You're not going to have to do it” in minutes 16:11. John asked the same question in minutes 16:12, but Trump still gave the same answer in minutes 16:13. Consequently, John interrupted President
Trump and emphasized his question toward President Trump when he said “Does President Donald Trump want them not to do that?” in minutes 16:15.

The interruption in datum 15 is intrusive interruption and the type is floor taking because John took President Trump’s floor intentionally. The reason why John interrupted President Trump is breaking up. John interrupted President Trump because he shifted unpredictably in the middle of President Trump’s utterance and emphasized his questions to get the answer he wanted.

Dialogue 16

Datum 16

16:20 J: It sounds as if, having covered you in the campaign, it sounds like you’re leaving the door open. On the campaign, you were quite clear. You said, "I'm the guy who's not going to touch Medicare."

16:27 T: Okay, then let me more clear. I'm not going to touch it, because I said it. Now, waste, fraud and abuse, I'm going to touch. If there's something in Medicare that's been abused, I will touch that. There are certain things, as you know, that have been absolutely abused. There are certain provisions in Medicare that are horrible and abusive and there's been terrible things happening. So that kind of stuff, I will absolutely touch.

16:50 J: So if I//

16:51 T: //But the concept of Medicare, I'm not touching.

In the dialogue 16, John felt President Trump was inconsistent about his statements on the campaign that he was not going to touch the Medicare but he seemed he did. Heard that question, President Trump explained that he would not touch the Medicare rather than waste, fraud and abuse. He explained if there was something in Medicare that has been abused, then he would touch it. When John
wanted to speak up his opinions, President Trump interrupted him in minutes 16:51 emphasized his statement that he was not going to touch the concept of Medicare, but if the Medicare had been abused he would touch it.

The interruption in datum 16 is **intrusive interruption** and the type is **floor taking** because President Trump took John’s floor before his opinions delivered. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is **breaking up** because he cut up John’s utterance and clarified his statement from his explanation that he would not touched the concept of Medicare.

**Dialogue 17**

18:54 T: And I think it's a very unfair thing because I have been under audit almost, like, since I became famous, okay?
19:00 J: Have you/
19:01 T: // Not just political. I mean, I have been under audit, I'll bet you 12 or 13 or 14 years in a row. Now, I have friends that are wealthy people.
19:08 J: Let me ask you/
19:09 T: // They've never been audited.
19:10 J: You/
19:10 T: // And I think it's very unfair.

In the dialogue 17, President Trump expressed his disappointment that he had been under audit. Then, Trump compared his situations with his friends, who are also wealthy people, did not under routine audit just like him. In the middle of their conversation, every time John wanted to speak up his opinion President Trump kept interrupting him three times. The first was in minutes 19:01, when
John wanted to speak up his opinion, President Trump interrupted him and explained more about his routine audit for about fourteen years in a row. The second interruption was in minutes 19:09, President Trump took John’s floor and said that his friends, who are wealthy people, had never been audited. The last interruption is in minutes 19:10, President Trump interrupted John and expressed his disappointment.

The interruption in datum 17 is intrusive interruption and the type is floor taking because President Trump kept interrupting John consistently. President Trump did not give John a chance to get his floor. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is breaking up because every time John wanted to speak up his opinions, President Trump always cut up John’s utterances.

**Dialogue 18**

Datum 18

20:22  J: You said yesterday on FOX that Russia is a phony story. Which part of it is phony?

20:27  T: The concept of Russia with respect to us is a total phony story.

20:32  J: Meaning the Trump campaign?

20:33  T: Of course, it's a total phony story. In fact, I just heard where General Flynn got his clearance from the Obama administration.

20:40  J: But you don't mean/

20:41  T: //Excuse me. I didn't realize this, when he went to Russia, it was 2015 and he was on the Obama clearance. When General Flynn came to us, as you now know, he already had the highest clearance you can have. I think the same clearance as the president of the United States would have. He had this really high clearance. And, by the way, they're so devastated because this only
came up two days ago.

In the dialogue 18, John asked President Trump which part is phony when he said on FOX that Russia was a phony story. Then, President Trump answered if the concept of Russia with respect to them was a total phony story. However, John did not understand about “us” which President Trump refer to and asked him again if that was the Trump Campaign that he was talking about. However, President Trump did not answer if it was Trump Campaign or not. He spoke up his opinions about General Flynn who got his clearance from Obama Administration. When John wanted to took his turn, President Trump suddenly interrupted him in minutes 20:41 and uttered his opinions about General Flynn again.

The interruption in datum 18 is intrusive interruption and the type is floor taking because President Trump took John’s floor. President Trump started explaining his opinion about General Flynn who already had the highest clearance. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is breaking up because he cut up John’s utterances intentionally and took his floor to utter his mind. In minutes 20:41, President Trump just realized something about General Flynn and made him took over John’s utterances.

Dialogue 19

Datum 19

20:33  T:  Of course, it's a total phony story. In fact, I just heard where General Flynn got his clearance from the Obama administration.

20:40  J:  But you don't mean//
20:41  T: //Excuse me. I didn't realize this, when he went to Russia, it was 2015 and he was on the Obama clearance. When General Flynn came to us, as you now know, he already had the highest clearance you can have. I think the same clearance as the president of the United States would have. He had this really high clearance. And, by the way, they're so devastated because this only came up two days ago.

21:06  J: Let me ask you this, sir.

21:07  T: Why wasn't this reported months ago?

21:09  J: I/

21:09  T: //But I watched one of your other competitors, and they were devastated[

21:12  J: [Look]

21:12  T: [by this] news, because you know what? That kills them. That's the end of that subject.

In dialogue 19, John and President Trump were talking about why Trump said Russia is a phony story in his previous interview. President Trump answered if the concept of Russia with respect to him is a phony story. Trump gave his opinion about General Flynn when he was went to Russia and was on the Obama clearance in 2015. Then, Trump realized when General Flynn came to them (Trump Campaign), he already had the highest clearance. Even Trump thought General Flynn’s clearances was the same with the President of United States. John tried to asking a question but President Trump did not want to be asked any further and interrupted him in minutes 21:09.

The interruption in datum 19 is intrusive interruption because President Trump did not interrupt John to help or assistance. He did it because he wanted to take over John’s turn. Therefore the type of intrusive interruption in this dialogue
was floor taking. President Trump took John’s floor in minutes 21:09 before John got any point to deliver. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is breaking up because he cut up John’s utterance in order to end that topic. This reason could be seen in minutes 21:12 when President Trump tried to end the conversation.

Dialogue 20

Datum 20

22:08  J:  But you don’t think it’s the Russians//
22:09  T:  //I can tell you one thing. Had nothing to do with us. Had nothing to do with this, and everyone knows it. And by the way, even my enemies on your show said, "We haven’t found anything that the Trump campaign did wrong."

22:22  J:  But//
22:22  T:  //Do you agree with that?
22:23  J:  But there is agreement in the intelligence communities and other places and investigative communities on the Hill that Russia was [ involved in the ] election.

22:29  T:  [I’m okay with it.]

In dialogue 20, President Trump said that his campaign did not do anything wrong about the election. However, John seemed did not satisfy with the answer and kept pushing Trump if Russia had something to do with the election. John was trying to take his floor, but Trump interrupted him. He gave John a signal to end the topic in minutes 22:22 by saying, “Do you agree with that?” Then, John took his floor and asked President Trump again about the agreement in the
intelligence and investigative communities on the Hill if Russia was involved in
the election. However, President Trump overlapped John’s utterances and said
that he was okay with it.

The interruption in datum 20 is intrusive interruption and the type is floor
taking because President Trump took John’s floor before giving any points in his
minds. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is breaking up. From
the dialogue above President Trump cut up John’s utterances intentionally in
order to end the discussion by saying “Do you agree with that?” in minutes
22:22.

c. Tangentialization

Dialogue 21

Datum 21

10:39 T: We have, we’re going to have lower premiums. And before
you start there, let me just tell you something. Obamacare is dead.
Obamacare right now, all the insurance companies are fleeing.
Places like Tennessee have already lost half of their state with the
insurance companies. They're all going. Obamacare, John, is dead.

Okay, because we're being (.). we're being compared to
Obamacare. Just, so. Obamacare doesn't work//

11:03 J: //I just want to

compare you to your own.

In dialogue above, President Trump gave his answers about medical health
care which is going to have lower premiums. Then, he compared his medical
health care with Obamacare. He stated that Obamacare was not helping people
such as places like Tennessee who already lost of their state with the insurance
companies. However, the answer that John wanted was not about the comparison between President Trump’s medical health care with Obamacare.

The interruption in datum 21 is **intrusive interruption** and the type is **tangentialization**. The type is tangentialization because from the dialogue, John seemed to understand about what President Trump said but the answer that President Trump uttered did not get to the point John asked for. The reason why John interrupted President Trump is **breaking up** because John just cut up President Trump’s explanation about the comparison between his medical health care and Obamacare.

**Dialogue 22**

Datum 22

11:16 J: So but in the bill, as it was analyzed, there were two problems. One, and you talked about this with Congressman Robert Aderholt, who brought you the example of the 64-year-old who under Obamacare the premiums/

11:26 T: //But that was a long time ago, John.

In dialogue 22, John explained about the problems inside President Trump’s medical health care bill. John stated one of those problems was when President Trump talked with Congressman Robert Aderholt who brought the example of the 64-year-old person under Obamacare. However, before John explained further, President Trump interrupted him in minutes 11:26 and stated that it already happened a long time ago. In this situation, President Trump stated if that problem already fixed.
The interruption in datum 22 is **intrusive interruption** and the type is **tangentialization** because President Trump thought the problem that John’s asked already solved. Trump felt he did not need any further explanation about it and interrupted John. The reason why President Trump interrupted is **breaking up** because he cut up John’s turn before he got his point.

### Dialogue 23

Datum 23

22:06  T:  No. We have to find out what happened. I’d love to find out what happened.

22:08  J:  But you don’t think it’s the Russians...?

22:09  T:  //I can tell you one thing. Had nothing to do with us. Had nothing to do with this, and everyone knows it. And by the way, even my enemies on your show said, "We haven’t found anything that the Trump campaign did wrong."

In dialogue 23, John and President Trump were talking about the problem who tried to meddle in the election. However, Trump did not want to suspect anyone until he found out what happened. John took President Trump’s floor and kept asking if the Russians had something to do with the election. Then, President Trump interrupted John’s floor and gave a statement to clarify that there was nothing wrong with the Trump Campaign and the election. Trump added if the other media had not found anything false in the Trump campaign.

The interruption in datum 23 is **intrusive interruption** and the type is **tangentialization**. Because in minutes 22:09 when John said, “*But you don’t think it’s the Russians...*”, President Trump understood about what he said and did not
wanted to hear any further. The reason why President Trump interrupted John is correcting because he was trying to clarify that the Trump Campaign did not do anything wrong.

From the data analysis above, the writer found one cooperative interruption and twenty-two intrusive interruptions. The type of cooperative interruption found in the data was clarification and the types of intrusive interruption found in the data were disagreement, floor taking and tangentialization. The table below displays the chosen data and short explanations which had been found and collected.

**Table 3.3. Collected data of Cooperative Interruption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J: You first said that you were under audit, were going to wait till that was done, about 14 months ago. That seems like a long time. When do you think this might happen? Are you asking them? T: It could happen soon. I don’t know. I mean, I think//</td>
<td>19:21</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Seeking Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: //When? Give a sense of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3.4. Collected data of Intrusive Interruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J: What do you know now on day 100 that you wish you knew on day one of the presidency? T: Well, one of the things that I've learned is how dishonest the media is, really. I've done things that are I think very good. I've set great foundations with foreign leaders. We have you know (...) NAFTA, as you know, I was going to terminate it, but I got a very nice call from a man I like, the president of Mexico. I got a very nice call from Justin Trudeau, the prime minister of Canada. And they said please would you rather than terminating NAFTA (...) I was all set to do it. In fact, I was going to do it today. I was going to do as we're sitting here. I would've had to delay you. I was going to do it today. I was going to terminate NAFTA. But they called up and they said, &quot;Would you negotiate?&quot; And I, said, &quot;Yes, I will negotiate.&quot; J: That's all you've learned, about the media? You knew from the campaign about the media. You said it all the time// T: //No, no, but the media didn't cover it</td>
<td>08:02</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Disagreeing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that way. The media said, oh, I didn't terminate NAFTA.

J: Let me ask you about health care (1.0) Tucker Carlson interviewed you about six weeks ago when you were in the middle of health care negotiations. And you agreed with him that the health care bill wasn't going to help your supporters. That those who lived in rural areas, the older, were going to get hurt by that bill. And you told him/

T: //Excuse me, the health care bill is going to help my supporters.

J: Well, hold on. Let me just finish the question

J: You're a negotiator. Of you need something from somebody, you need China to help you with North Korea, doesn't that send a message to China, "We're not going to bug you about human rights, about intellectual property. In the South China Sea we're not going to put too much heat on you"? Aren't you breaking one of your own negotiating rules?

T: No. I think that, frankly, North Korea is maybe more important than trade. Trade is very important. But
massive warfare with millions, potentially millions of people being killed? That, as we would say, trumps trade.

J: Let me ask you//

T: //Okay? You understand what I'm saying. And if I can use trade as a method to get China, because I happen to think that China does have reasonably good powers over North Korea.

T: Pre-existing conditions are in the bill. And I just watched another network than yours, and they were saying, "Pre-existing is not covered." Pre-existing conditions are in the bill. And I mandate it. I said, "Has to be."

J: So//

T: //We have, we're going to have lower premiums. And before you start there, let me just tell you something. Obamacare is dead.

T: We have, we're going to have lower premiums. And before you start there, let me just tell you something. Obamacare is dead. Obamacare right now, all the insurance companies are fleeing. Places like Tennessee have already lost half of their state with the
insurance companies. They're all going. Obamacare, John, is dead. Okay, because we're being (.) we're being compared to Obamacare. Just, so. Obamacare doesn't work//

J:  //I just want to compare you to your own.

T: One thing. No, no, it's important. I've got to compare it.

J: No, no, but I wa/nt

T:  //But you were saying about Obamacare.

T: This bill is much different than it was a little while ago, okay? This bill has evolved. And we didn't have a failure on the bill. You know, it was reported like a failure. Now, the one thing I wouldn't have done again is put a timeline. That's why on the second iteration, I didn't put a timeline. But we have now pre-existing conditions in the bill. We have (.) we've set up a pool for the pre-existing conditions so that the premiums can be allowed to fall. We're taking across all of the borders or the lines so that insurance companies can compete]

J:  [But that's not in

T:
|   | [nationwide.  
J: this bill. The borders are not in]  
T: [Of course, it's in.  
J: [this bill. It's in that third bill, right, becau//se  
T: //It's in the second phase.  
J: Okay.  
T: It's called phase one, phase two. And that's, in effect, second phase, which will get approved, which will quickly get approved.  
J: Let me//  
T: //But let me just explain something. There will be such competition. Right now, there's no competition. There will be such competition by insurance companies so that they can get health care and the people taking care of health care.  
J: So//  
T:    | 12:22 Floor taking    | Breaking up |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12:35 Floor taking</td>
<td>Breaking up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T: //The other thing we're going to have is groups. Groups of people can negotiate. What's going to happen is the competition is going to drive down the premiums. In my opinion, much, much more than people understand.

T: But when I watch some of the news reports, which are so unfair, and they say we don't cover pre-existing conditions, we cover it beautifully.

J: Although//

T: //I'll tell you who doesn't cover pre-existing conditions. Obamacare. You know why? It's dead.

J: In one of the fixes that was//

T: //It's not going to be here.

J: In one of the fixes it was discussed pre-existing was optional for the states

T: Sure, in one of the fixes. And they're changing it.

J: [oh, okay.]

T: and changing.

T: John, this has evolved over a period of three or four weeks. Now, we really have a good bill. I think they could have voted on Friday. I said, "Just relax. Don't
worry about this phony 100 day thing. Just relax. Take it easy. Take your time. Get the good vote and make it perfect."

J: Just to/

T: //Most importantly, we're going to drive down premiums. We're going to drive down deductibles because right now, deductibles are so high, you never (.) unless you're going to die a long, hard death.

13 J: Tax plan came out this week. It's got some big deficit numbers. You've said that's going to be made up by growth. Congressional//

15:24 Floor taking Correcting

T: //Well, not only growth. It's going to be made up by better trade deals.

14 J: Look//

15:47 Floor taking Breaking up

T: //We're going to come up with reciprocal taxes and lots of other things on those countries. But I view that more in trade. We're also going to fix all of our trade deals. We're going to have a very wealthy country again.

J: Let me ask you this, Mr. President. Congress may not go along with (1.0)

T: Always.

J: So they're going to try and find some spending. Let me ask you about the question

16:15 Floor taking Breaking up
of Medicare. They're going to want, in Congress, to make up on the spending side, to change Medicare. Will you allow that?

T: You're not going to have to do it.

J: But, sir, will you allow it?

T: You're not going to have to do it. I'm just telling you we are//

J: //Does President Donald Trump want them not to do that?

T: I would much prefer them not to do that, that's right.

J: It sounds as if, having covered you in the campaign, it sounds like you're leaving the door open. On the campaign, you were quite clear. You said, "I'm the guy who's not going to touch Medicare."

T: Okay, then let me more clear. I'm not going to touch it, because I said it. Now, waste, fraud and abuse, I'm going to touch. If there's something in Medicare that's been abused, I will touch that. There are certain things, as you know, that have been absolutely abused. There are certain provisions in Medicare that are horrible and abusive and there's been terrible things happening. So that kind of
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stuff, I will absolutely touch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: So if I/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:   //But the concept of Medicare, I'm not touching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: And I think it's a very unfair thing because I have been under audit almost, like, since I became famous, okay?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Have you/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:   //Not just political. I mean, I have been under audit, I'll bet you 12 or 13 or 14 years in a row. Now, I have friends that are wealthy people.</td>
<td>19:01; 19:09; 19:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Let me ask you/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:   //They've never been audited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: You/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:   //And I think it's very unfair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: You said yesterday on FOX that Russia is a phony story. Which part of it is phony?</td>
<td>20:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: The concept of Russia with respect to us is a total phony story.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Meaning the Trump campaign?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Of course, it's a total phony story. In fact, I just heard where General Flynn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
got his clearance from the Obama administration.

J: But you don't mean//

T: //Excuse me. I didn't realize this, when he went to Russia, it was 2015 and he was on the Obama clearance. When General Flynn came to us, as you now know, he already had the highest clearance you can have. I think the same clearance as the president of the United States would have. He had this really high clearance. And, by the way, they're so devastated because this only came up two days ago.

J: Let me ask you this, sir.

T: Why wasn't this reported months ago?

J: I//

T: Excuse me. I didn't realize this, when he went to Russia, it was 2015 and he was on the Obama clearance. When General Flynn came to us, as you now know, he already had the highest clearance you can have. I think the same clearance as the president of the United States would have. He had this really high clearance. And, by the way, they're so devastated because this only came up two days ago.

J: Let me ask you this, sir.

T: Why wasn't this reported months ago?

J: I//
| T: But I watched one of your other competitors, and they were devastated |
| J: [Look |
| T: [by this news, because you know what? That kills them. That's the end of that subject. |

| T: I can tell you one thing. Had nothing to do with us. Had nothing to do with this, and everyone knows it. And by the way, even my enemies on your show said, "We haven't found anything that the Trump campaign did wrong." |
| J: But/ |
| T: //Do you agree with that? |

| T: We have, we're going to have lower premiums. And before you start there, let me just tell you something. Obamacare is dead. Obamacare right now, all the insurance companies are fleeing. Places like Tennessee have already lost half of their state with the insurance companies. They're all going. Obamacare, John, is dead. Okay, because we're being (...) we're being compared to Obamacare. Just, so. Obamacare doesn't work/ |
| J: //I just want to compare you to your own. |

| Floor taking |
| Breaking up |

<p>| Breaking up |
| Tangentialization |
| Breaking up |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>J:</td>
<td></td>
<td>So but in the bill, as it was analyzed, there were two problems. One, and you talked about this with Congressman Robert Aderholt, who brought you the example of the 64-year-old who under Obamacare the premiums//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:26</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Tangentialization</td>
<td>But that was a long time ago, John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Tangentialization</td>
<td>No. We have to find out what happened. I'd love to find out what happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:09</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td>But you don't think it's the Russians//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J:</td>
<td></td>
<td>I can tell you one thing. Had nothing to do with us. Had nothing to do with this, and everyone knows it. And by the way, even my enemies on your show said, &quot;We haven't found anything that the Trump campaign did wrong.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusions

Based on the analysis, the writer can draw some conclusions that answer all the research questions as follows: First, there were found twenty-three interruptions from the data with one cooperative interruption and twenty-two intrusive interruptions. The types of cooperative and intrusive interruptions were classified into subcategories. Second, the types of cooperative interruptions which occurred in the conversation between President Donald Trump and John Dickerson were only appeared once in the dialogue as clarification. Third, the types of intrusive interruption which occurred in the conversation between President Donald Trump and John Dickerson were counted twenty-two interruptions with seventeen data of floor taking, three data of tangentialization and two data of disagreements. The last, the writer found three reasons appeared in the data based on Wardhaugh’s theory which is breaking up, correcting, disagreeing and seeking clarification. The most frequent reasons of interruption uttered by the speakers in the data is breaking up which is counted seventeen times, followed by correcting three times, disagreeing two times and seeking clarification once.

B. Suggestions

The writer would like to suggest the readers or the future researchers, who also in Linguistic major, to explore interruption talk in political interview with other theories on pragmatics field. The other researchers could conduct research...
on interruption talk with Face-Threatening Act (FTA). By using the framework of Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory, the other researchers can overlook the frequency of positive and negative face-threatening acts (FTAs). Therefore, they could explore more deeply about interruption talk in political interview.
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PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP’S INTERVIEW

WITH “FACE THE NATION”

APRIL 30, 2017 ON CBS NEWS BY JOHN DICKERSON

00:00 – 00:23 OPENING

00:25 J: Mr. President, you and the administration said to North Korea, "Don't test a missile." They have tested a missile. Is the pressure not working?

00:32 T: Well, I didn't say, "Don't test a missile." He's going to have to do what he has to do. But he understands we're not going to be very happy. And I will tell you, a man that I've gotten to like and respect, the president of China, President Xi, I believe, has been putting pressure on him also. But so far, perhaps nothing's happened and perhaps it has. This was a small missile.
This was not a big missile. This was not a nuclear test, which he was expected to do three days ago. We'll see what happens.

01:00 J: You say, "Not happy." What does that mean?

01:03 T: I would not be happy. If he does a nuclear test, I will not be happy. And I can tell you also, I don't believe that the president of China, who is a very respected man, will be happy either.

01:15 J: Not happy mean military action?

01:16 T: I don't know. I mean, we'll see.

01:18 J: The Chinese, our allies, have been allies with North Korea. How are you sure that they're not using this as a way to test you?

01:23 T: You can never be sure of anything, can you? But I developed a very good relationship. I don't think they want to see a destabilized North Korea. I don't think they want to see it. They certainly don't want to see nuclear on from their neighbor. They haven't liked it for a long time. But we'll have to see what happens.

The relationship I have with China, it's been already acclaimed as being something very special, something very different than we've ever had. But again, you know, we'll find out whether or not President Xi is able to affect change.

01:59 J: [Why do]

01:59 T: [I hope] he is.

02:00 J: Why do these missiles keep blowing up?

02:03 T: Well, I'd rather not discuss it. But perhaps they're just not very good missiles. But eventually, he'll have good missiles.

02:09 J: You don't want to discuss it because maybe we have something to do with it?

02:11 T: I just don't want to discuss it. And I think you know me very well, where you've asked me many times over the last couple of years about military. I said, "We shouldn't be announcing we're going into Mosul." I said, "We shouldn't be announcing all our moves.” It is a chess game. I just don't want people to know what my
thinking is. So eventually, he will have a better delivery system. And if that happens, we can't allow it to happen.

02:36  J: What do you make of the North Korean leader?
02:38  T: I have (.) I really, you know, have no comment on him. People are saying, "Is he sane?" I have no idea. I can tell you this, and a lot of people don't like when I say it, but he was a young man of 26 or 27 when he took over from his father, when his father died. He's dealing with obviously very tough people, in particular the generals and others. And at a very young age, he was able to assume power. A lot of people, I'm sure, tried to take that power away, whether it was his uncle or anybody else. And he was able to do it. So obviously, he's a pretty smart cookie. But we have a situation that we just cannot let (.) we cannot let what's been going on for a long period of years continue. And frankly, this should've been done and taken care of by the Obama administration. Should've been taken care of by the Bush administration. Should've been taken care of by Clinton.

03:35  J: Let me ask you a question about the presidency. George W. Bush said this about being president. He said, "You think one thing going in, and then the pressures of the job or the realities of the world are different than you thought." Do you agree?
03:49  T: I think I can agree with that. I love doing it. I'm, you know, thoroughly enjoying it. It's always a challenge, like life itself is a challenge. But it's something that I really love and I think I've done a very good job at it.

04:03  J: You said in an interview with Reuters that you thought it would be easier. Why?
04:08  T: Well, it's a tough job. But I've had a lot of tough jobs. I've had things that were tougher, although I'll let you know that better at the end of eight years. Perhaps eight years. Hopefully, eight years. But I'll let you know later on. I think we've done very well with
foreign policy. I think we've done very, very well with relationships with other leaders.

I think we're doing great on trade deals. It's set. And I think we're doing well. I mean, our country is being out-traded at every single point. We're losing tremendous amounts of money on trade. And I think actually, I've been very consistent. You know, it's very funny when the fake media goes out, you know, which we call the mainstream media which sometimes, I must say, is you.

04:52 J: You mean me personally or?

04:54 T: Well, your show. I love your show. I call it Deface the Nation.

But, you know, your show is sometimes not exactly correct. But when they talk about currency manipulation, and I did say I would call China, if they were, a currency manipulator, early in my tenure. And then I get there. Number one, they (1.0) as soon as I got elected, they stopped. They're not -- it's not going down anymore, their currency.

05:17 J: But that had been true before.

That had been true [No.

05:18 T: [during the campaign, sir.

05:20 T: No, not true to the extent that we're talking about. Much more important than that, as to when, but, you know, it did stop. And I was talking about it all during the campaign. And I would say that I was the one that got them to stop. But forget that.

05:31 J: You were the one who got China[He is working with us

05:32 T: [to stop manipulating their currency?

05:34 T: I think so, during the campaign I talked about.

05:35 J: Even if they were doing it before?

05:37 T: No, they were doing it before. I mean, there was no question. I
mean, they were absolute currency manipulators before. But somebody said, "Oh, you didn't call him a currency manipulator." Now, you and I are just talking about how he's working. I believe that President Xi is working to try and resolve a very big problem, for China also.

And that's North Korea. Can you imagine if I say, "Hey, by the way, how are you doing with North Korea? Also, we're going to announce that you're a currency manipulator tomorrow." So the mainstream media never talks about that. They never say that. And that's, you know, unfortunate.

It's just [ 06:08 J: ] Let me

[ 06:08 T: ] it's just one of many things, John.

[ 06:10 J: ] You're a negotiator. If you need something from somebody, you need China to help you with North Korea, doesn't that send a message to China, "We're not going to bug you about human rights, about intellectual property. In the South China Sea we're not going to put too much heat on you"? Aren't you breaking one of your own negotiating rules?

[ 06:26 T: ] No. I think that, frankly, North Korea is maybe more important than trade. Trade is very important. But massive warfare with millions, potentially millions of people being killed? That, as we would say, trumps trade.

[ 06:40 J: ] Let me ask you//

[ 06:41 T: ] //Okay? You understand what I'm saying. And if I can use trade as a method to get China, because I happen to think that China does have reasonably good powers over North Korea. Now, maybe not, you know, ultimate, but pretty good powers. Now, if China can help us with North Korea and can solve that problem [ 07:02 J: ] Let me ask
07:02  T:  [that's worth making not as good a trade
deal for the United States, excuse me, right?

07:07  J:  What do you know now on day 100 that you wish you knew on
day one of the presidency?

07:13  T:  Well, one of the things that I've learned is how dishonest the
media is, really. I've done things that are I think very good. I've set
great foundations with foreign leaders. We have you know (.)
NAFTA, as you know, I was going to terminate it, but I got a very
nice call from a man I like, the president of Mexico.
I got a very nice call from Justin Trudeau, the prime minister of
Canada. And they said please would you rather than terminating
NAFTA (.I was all set to do it. In fact, I was going to do it today.
I was going to do as we're sitting here. I would've had to delay
you. I was going to do it today. I was going to terminate NAFTA.
But they called up and they said, "Would you negotiate?" And I
said, "Yes, I will negotiate."

07:59  J:  That's all you've learned, about the media? You knew from the
campaign about the media.
You said it all the time//

08:02  T:  //No, no, but the media didn't cover it that
way. The media said, oh, I didn't terminate NAFTA.

08:05  J:  So//

08:06  T:  //First of all, if you look at my statements,
I said [

08:08  J:  [No, no, I meant

08:08  T:  ["If I'm not able to renegotiate NAFTA,
I will terminate NAFTA." Well, I'll make that statement right now.

08:13  J:  Here's a question.

08:14  T:  If I'm not able to renegotiate NAFTA, we will terminate NAFTA.

08:17  J:  Let's step back a minute.

08:18  T:  Okay.
J: Presidents have to learn how to adapt. Every president comes into the job, it's different than they expect, they must adapt. Surely, you've learned something else other than that the media is dishonest.

T: No, no, I'm just saying [it was one of my disapp]ointments.

J: [And how do you adapt?] Give me another thing you learned that you're going to adapt and change because all presidents have to at this stage.

T: Well, I think things generally tend to go a little bit slower than you'd like them to go.

J: Why?

T: Just a system. It's just a very, very bureaucratic system. I think the rules in Congress and in particular the rules in the Senate are unbelievably archaic and slow moving. And in many cases, unfair. In many cases, you're forced to make deals that are not the deal you'd make. You'd make a much different kind of a deal. You're forced into situations that you hate to be forced into. I also learned, and this is very sad, because we have a country that we have to take care of. The Democrats have been totally obstructionist. Chuck Schumer has turned out to be a bad leader. He's a bad leader for the country. And the Democrats are extremely obstructionist. All they do is obstruct. All they do is delay. Even our Supreme Court justice, as you know, who I think is going to be outstanding, Justice Gorsuch. I think that it was disgraceful the way they handled that. But, you know, I still have people, I'm waiting for them to be approved. Our chief trade negotiator. We can't get these people through.

J: I want to get to//

T: //They are obstructionists. And you know what
that's hurting? It's hurting the country.

09:49 J: Let me ask you about health care (1.0) Tucker Carlson interviewed you about six weeks ago when you were in the middle of health care negotiations. And you agreed with him that the health care bill wasn't going to help your supporters. That those who lived in rural areas, the older, were going to get hurt by that bill. And you told him//

10:05 T: //Excuse me, the health care bill is going to help my supporters.

10:08 J: Well, hold on. Let me just finish the question, if I may, sir//

10:10 T: //Otherwise, I'm not going to sign it. I'm not going to do it.

10:11 J: Well, this is why I wanted to ask you. You said to Tucker, "We will take care of our people, or I am not signing it." You said you were going to negotiate.

10:17 T: Well, that's what I just said.

10:18 J: So tell me what in the bill you've been negotiating to get[ 10:21 T: [But let me]

10:21 J: [in that helps] your supporters. I'm just trying to get the details of how your people [ 10:24 T: [Let me just tell] you.

10:24 J: [will be helped.] 10:25 T: Pre-existing conditions are in the bill. And I just watched another network than yours, and they were saying, "Pre-existing is not covered." Pre-existing conditions are in the bill. And I mandate it. I said, "Has to be."

10:39 J: So// 10:39 T: //We have, we're going to have lower premiums. And before you start there, let me just tell you something. Obamacare is dead. Obamacare right now, all the insurance companies are fleeing.
Places like Tennessee have already lost half of their state with the insurance companies. They're all going. Obamacare, John, is dead.
Okay, because we're being(.) we're being compared to Obamacare.
Just, so. Obamacare doesn't work//

11:03  J: //I just want to compare you to your own.
11:04  T: One thing. No, no, it's important. I've got to compare it.
11:06  J: No, no, but I want//
11:07  T: //But you were saying about Obamacare.
11:08  J: No, but I'm not. I'm asking what]
11:09  T: [With Obamacare]
11:09  J: [you're going to do.]
11:09  T: [the premiums are too high. The deductibles are through the roof, so you never get to use it. But more importantly, it's dead.
11:16  J: So but in the bill, as it was analyzed, there were two problems. One, and you talked about this with Congressman Robert Aderholt, who brought you the example of the 64-year-old who under Obamacare the premi//ums
11:26  T: //But that was a long time ago, John.
11:28  J: But has that been fixed?
11:29  T: Totally fixed.
11:30  J: How?
11:31  T: How? We've made many changes to the bill, You know, this bill is]
11:33  J: [What kind though?
11:33  T: [very much different than it was three weeks ago.
11:36  J: Help us explain because there are people ]
11:37  T: [The bill [out there wondering
what kind of changes.

11:38  T:  Let me explain. Let me explain it to you.


11:40  T:  This bill is much different than it was a little while ago, okay?
       This bill has evolved. And we didn't have a failure on the bill. You
       know, it was reported like a failure. Now, the one thing I wouldn't
       have done again is put a timeline. That's why on the second
       iteration, I didn't put a timeline.
       But we have now pre-existing conditions in the bill. We have (.)
       we've set up a pool for the pre-existing conditions so that the
       premiums can be allowed to fall. We're taking across all of the
       borders or the lines
       so that insurance companies can compete

12:09  J:  [But that's not in]
12:09  T:  nationwide.]
12:10  J:  ]this bill.
       The borders are not in[
12:11  T:  [Of cou]rse, it's in.
12:11  J:  [this bill.]  
       It's in that third bill, right, because//
12:12  T:  //It's in the second phase.
12:14  J:  Okay.
12:15  T:  It's called phase one, phase two. And that's, in effect, second
       phase, which will get approved, which will quickly get approved.
12:21  J:  Let me//
12:22  T:  //But let me just explain something. There will be such
       competition. Right now, there's no competition. There will be such
       competition by insurance companies so that they can get health
       care and the people taking care of health care.
13:34  J:  So//
12:35  T:  //The other thing we're going to have is groups. Groups of people
can negotiate. What's going to happen is the competition is going to drive down the premiums. In my opinion, much, much more than people understand.

12:47 J: So what you've just described is the bill that you previously had said you worried wouldn't help your people. And here's why I ask. You said, "Pre-existing conditions."

12:54 T: No, there were things in the other bill, the first version, which were not as good.


12:59 T: But when I watch some of the news reports, which are so unfair, and they say we don't cover pre-existing conditions, we cover it beautifully.

13:08 J: Although/


13:13 J: In one of the fixes that was/

13:14 T: /It's not going to be here.

13:15 J: In one of the fixes it was discussed pre-existing was optional for the states/

13:18 T: /Sure, in one of the fixes. And they're changing it[

13:21 J: [oh, okay.]

13:21 T: and changing.

13:22 J: So it'll be permanent?

13:22 T: Of course.

13:23 J: Okay. Well, that's a development, sir. So you're saying it's going to be pre-existing to everybody?

13:26 T: John, this has evolved over a period of three or four weeks. Now, we really have a good bill. I think they could have voted on Friday. I said, "Just relax. Don't worry about this phony 100 day thing. Just relax. Take it easy. Take your time. Get the good vote
and make it perfect."

13:41 J: Just to/

13:42 T: //Most importantly, we're going to drive down premiums.

We're going to drive down deductibles because right now, deductibles are so high, you never (.) unless you're going to die a long, hard death, you never can get to use your health [care because the deductibles are so high.

13:59 J: [Let me ask you something Okay. So what I hear you saying is pre-existing is going to be in there for everybody, it's not going to be up to the states?

14:04 T: Pre-existing is going to be in there and we're also[

14:06 J: [And it's not up to the states?

14:06 T: [going to create pools.

14:08 J: Okay.

14:09 T: And pools are going to take care of the pre-existing.

14:11 J: But on that crucial question, it's not going to be left up to the states? Everybody gets pre-existing, no matter where they live?

14:15 T: No, but the states[

14:16 J: [Guaranteed?

14:16 T: [are also going to have a lot to do with it because we ultimately want to get it back down to the states.

14:20 J: Okay. Is it a guarantee?

14:20 T: Look, because if you hurt your knee, honestly, I'd rather have the federal government focused on North Korea, focused on other things, than your knee, okay? Or than your back, as important as your back is. I would much rather see the federal government focused on other things [

14:38 J: [Let me.

14:38 T: [bigger things. Now, the state is going to be in a much better position to take care, because it's smaller.
People out there with pre-existing conditions, they are worried. Are they going to have the guarantee of coverage if they have a pre-existing condition or if they live in a state where the governor decides that's not a part of the health care, or that the prices are going to go up? That's the worry. The American Medical Association says [We actually it could effectively make coverage completely unaffordable for people.]

We actually have, well, forget about unaffordable. What's unaffordable is Obamacare, John.

So I'm not hearing you, Mr. President, say there's a guarantee of pre-existing conditions.

We actually have (. .) we actually have a clause that guarantees.

Okay, excellent. We got there.

We have a specific clause [Let me ask you that guarantees.]

about your tax plan.

Go ahead.

Tax plan came out this week. It's got some big deficit numbers. You've said that's going to be made up by growth.

Well, not only growth. It's going to be made up by better trade deals. It's going to be made up by [by many different, reciprocal tax. As an example, we have countries where if we make a product and we send it to that country, they charge us 100% tax. If they make the same product and send it to us, we charge them nothing. You think that's smart? It's not.
J: Look/

T: //We're going to come up with reciprocal taxes and lots of other things on those countries. But I view that more in trade. We're also going to fix all of our trade deals. We're going to have a very wealthy country again.

J: Let me ask you this, Mr. President.

Congress may not go along with (1.0)

T: Always.

J: So they're going to try and find some spending. Let me ask you about the question of Medicare. They're going to want, in Congress, to make up on the spending side, to change Medicare. Will you allow that?

T: You're not going to have to do it.

J: But, sir, will you allow it?

T: You're not going to have to do it.

J: //Does President Donald Trump want them not to do that?

T: I would much prefer them not to do that, that's right.

J: It sounds as if, having covered you in the campaign, it sounds like you're leaving the door open. On the campaign, you were quite clear. You said, "I'm the guy who's not going to touch Medicare."

T: Okay, then let me more clear. I'm not going to touch it, because I said it. Now, waste, fraud and abuse, I'm going to touch. If there's something in Medicare that's been abused, I will touch that. There are certain things, as you know, that have been absolutely abused. There are certain provisions in Medicare that are horrible and abusive and there's been terrible things happening. So that kind of stuff, I will absolutely touch.

J: So if I/

T: //But the concept of Medicare, I'm not touching.
For me, if I have it now, or if I'm going to have it in the future, it's not getting cut?

Waste, fraud and abuse.

And that's it?

And if there are things within Medicare that are being abused, I will touch that also.

Other than that, it's tightened up?

That's right. That's what it is. But here's what we do. We're going to grow. The numbers just came out for Obama's last year. 1.6 GDP. That means nothing. That's, like, 1% GDP. So I have gotten to know as you know, I really get along with a lot of other countries. So I talk to the heads of countries. "How are you doing?" "Not well, not well." "Why?" "GDP is 8%, GDP is 9%. We are doing poorly." GDP -- Our GDP is, like, 1%.

Let me ask you about your tax returns, sir. When your Treasury secretary was asked about whether you were going to release them, Secretary Mnuchin said, "The president has no intention." Is that right?

Well, I never spoke to him about it. Honestly, he's never asked me about it. I said, number one, I'm under audit. Right now, I'm under audit. After the audit is complete, it's a routine audit, but I have a very big tax return. You've seen the pictures. My tax return is probably higher than that from the floor. When you look at other people's tax return, even other wealthy people, their tax return is this big. My tax return is this high.

I just wanted to make sure
18:53  T: audit.
18:54  T: And I think it's a very unfair thing because I have been under audit almost, like, since I became famous, okay?
19:00  J: Have you/
19:01  T: //Not just political. I mean, I have been under audit, I'll bet you 12 or 13 or 14 years in a row. Now, I have friends that are wealthy people.
19:08  J: Let me ask you/
19:09  T: //They've never been audited.
19:10  J: You/
19:10  T: //And I think it's very unfair.
19:12  J: You first said that you were under audit, were going to wait till that was done, about 14 months ago. That seems like a long time. When do you think this might happen? Are you asking them?
19:19  T: It could happen soon. I don't know. I mean, I think/
19:21  J: //When? Give me a sense of//
19:22  T: //it's pretty routine, to be honest with you. But then I'll make a decision.
19:27  J: A member of Congress suggested that a condition for getting tax reform would be releasing your tax returns. What do you think about that?
19:33  T: Oh, I don't know who did that. I mean, I don't care who did that. These are the people, you know, the great obstructionists.
19:39  J: So you're not buying that deal.
19:40  T: Look where they are. Look where the Democrats have ended up. Hey, John, they had everything going. Now they don't have the presidency, they don't have the House, they don't have the Senate, and Schumer's going around making a fool of himself.

19:54 – 20:21 BREAK
J: You said yesterday on FOX that Russia is a phony story. Which part of it is phony?
T: The concept of Russia with respect to us is a total phony story.
J: Meaning the Trump campaign?
T: Of course, it's a total phony story. In fact, I just heard where General Flynn got his clearance from the Obama administration.
J: But you don't mean //
T: //Excuse me. I didn't realize this, when he went to Russia, it was 2015 and he was on the Obama clearance. When General Flynn came to us, as you now know, he already had the highest clearance you can have. I think the same clearance as the president of the United States would have. He had this really high clearance. And, by the way, they're so devastated because this only came up two days ago.
J: Let me ask you this, sir.
T: Why wasn't this reported months ago?
J: //
T: //But I watched one of your other competitors, and they were devastated]
J: [Look
T: [by this news, because you know what? That kills them. That's the end of that subject.
J: You don't think it's phony that they, the Russians, tried to meddle in the election? You believe that?
T: That, I don't know. I don't know.
J: That you don't know or you do know?
T: Well, I have a problem. You have Podesta, who, by the way, I understand has a company with his brother in Russia. Hillary's husband makes speeches in Russia. Hillary did a uranium deal with Russia. Nobody ever talks about that. But I don't know[}
21:38 J: [You don't]
21:38 T: [because the] F.B.I. was not allowed by Podesta to go in and check all of the records on their servers and everything else that you would normally have to check.
That's number one.
Number two, knowing something about hacking, if you don't catch a hacker, okay, in the act, it's very hard to say who did the hacking. With that being said, I'll go along with Russia. Could've been China, could've been a lot of different groups.

22:02 J: So President Donald Trump is ambivalent [
22:05 T: [But it could've about or not
22:05 J: ambivalent, you're not just not sure?]
22:06 T: No. We have to find out what happened.
I'd love to find out what happened.

22:08 J: But you don't think it's the Russians/
22:09 T: //I can tell you one thing.
Had nothing to do with us. Had nothing to do with this, and everyone knows it. And by the way, even my enemies on your show said, "We haven't found anything that the Trump campaign did wrong."

22:22 J: But//
22:22 T: //Do you agree with that?
22:23 J: But there is agreement in the intelligence communities and other places and investigative communities on the Hill that Russia was[
22:29 T: [I'm okay with it.]
22:30 T: Honestly, John, I'm okay. But why didn't Podesta and the Democrats, why didn't they allow the F.B.I. to eject the server?
They hired some company who somebody said some pretty bad
things about, to go and check their server and give the information. So they were hacked. Why didn't they (.) the Democrats allow the F.B.I.? They told the F.B.I., "We are not going to allow you to do it." Why did they do that? Why did they do that, John? Why wouldn't they let the F.B.I. go in and check? And by the way, why didn't the F.B.I. complain about it?

23:06  J: Mr. President, I think we're going to have to end it there.
23:08  T: Thank you.

23:09 – 23:15 CLOSING