

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21009/ijlecr.v12i1.67789>

Received: 23 January 2026 Revised: 29 April 2026 Accepted: 1 June 2026 Published: 15 June 2026

Turn-Taking and Adjacency Pairs in X/Twitter Threads: Analyzing Public Outcry Regarding the DPR Dissolution Discourses

Nurul Muhadlarah

Universitas Al-Azhar Indonesia
Email: muhadlarahnurul@gmail.com

Bejo Sutrisno

(Corresponding Author)
Universitas Al-Azhar Indonesia
Email: bejo.sutrisno@uai.ac.id

Soraya

Universitas Al-Azhar Indonesia
Email: soraya.fib@uai.ac.id

ABSTRACT

In the digital era, social media platforms like X/Twitter have emerged as primary arenas for political contestation and public discourse. While previous studies have extensively explored the thematic content of political sentiments, there is a noticeable research gap regarding the microscopic structural mechanisms of these interactions during high-stakes political unrest. Specifically, how conversational structures facilitate the escalation of public outcry remains under-examined within the context of the Indonesian legislative crisis. This study investigates the dynamics of public discourse surrounding the potential dissolution of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR) by analyzing the interactional architecture of online communication. Employing a qualitative framework grounded in Conversation Analysis (CA), the research scrutinizes turn-taking systems and adjacency pairs, such as question-answer and complaint-response, within purposively selected X/Twitter threads. The findings reveal that conversational structures are not merely neutral containers for information; rather, the formation of agreement and the articulation of dissent are heavily dictated by the perceived legitimacy of information and the authority of the interactants. The analysis shows that emotional appeals frequently disrupt standard adjacency expectations, leading to rapid escalations of public outcry through complex, branching conversational sequences. This study concludes that the structural organization of digital talk is fundamental to the construction of collective political sentiment. This research contributes to the field of digital political communication and forensic linguistics by offering a nuanced methodology for dissecting complex online social interactions.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, Digital Political Communication, Interactional Structure, Public Outcry, X/Twitter Threads

INTRODUCTION

The advent and pervasive influence of social media platforms, particularly Twitter/X, have fundamentally reshaped the landscape of public discourse, offering unprecedented opportunities for citizens to engage with political issues (Pearson et al., 2023; Armano et al., 2022; Hafel, 2023). These platforms have become virtual public squares where diverse voices can converge, debate, and express their opinions on matters of national significance (Mihelj & Jiménez, 2020; Masip et al., 2019; Hosszu et al., 2022). One such issue that frequently ignites passionate debate and significant public engagement is the potential dissolution of legislative

bodies, such as the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR). The prospect of dissolving a democratically elected institution carries profound implications for governance, representation, and the political future of a nation, making it a topic that invariably garners widespread attention and solicitude from the public.

The study of political discourse on social media is a burgeoning field within communication studies, political science, and linguistics. A significant body of research has explored the characteristics of online political communication, including the spread of information and misinformation, the formation of echo chambers and filter bubbles, the role of algorithms in shaping exposure, and the impact of social media on political mobilization (Chesney & Citron, 2018; Kozyreva et al., 2020; Robertson et al., 2023). Scholars have employed various theoretical lenses, from agenda-setting and framing to critical discourse analysis and computational linguistics, to understand the multifaceted nature of online political interactions (Ofosu-Asare, 2024; Tian et al., 2024; Bassi et al., 2024). The use of social media for political expression, campaigning, and citizen engagement has been extensively documented, revealing both its democratizing potential and its inherent challenges (Wilson & Land, 2021; Neuburger et al., 2021).

Regarding the specific context of the DPR dissolution, existing literature might focus on journalistic accounts of political pronouncements, sociological analyses of public opinion polls, or broader studies on democratic institutions in Indonesia. However, detailed linguistic analyses of the micro-level interactions within online discussions about such a sensitive and consequential topic remain relatively scarce. For example, studies might have explored how political elites frame the discourse of DPR dissolution, or how different media outlets report on the issue (Lim et al., 2025). Yet, the intricate ways in which ordinary citizens engage with these narratives, construct arguments, and express their collective sentiment through the sequential organization of their online utterances have not been systematically investigated (Corcuera & Bernardo, 2024).

While the existing literature acknowledges the role of social media in shaping political discourse, a significant gap remains in understanding the precise conversational mechanisms that underpin public outcry and collective sense-making around highly charged political events like the potential dissolution of a legislative body. Much of the research tends to operate at a macro-level, examining trends in sentiment or the spread of information (Bubeck et al., 2023; Mariani et al., 2021). There is a discernible lack of granular, qualitative analysis that unpacks the sequential organization of interactions within these online forums (Yuerong et al., 2024). Specifically, how do participants in X/Twitter threads about DPR dissolution construct their arguments, negotiate agreement or disagreement, and express their collective outrage or support through the turn-by-turn sequencing of their contributions? The application of conversation analysis (CA) principles, particularly the examination of turn-taking and adjacency pairs, to the rich and dynamic environment of X/Twitter threads on such a critical political issue offers a novel avenue for investigation. This gap is crucial because understanding these micro-level interactional patterns can provide deeper insights into the emergence and solidification of public opinion, the dynamics of collective action, and the very nature of democratic deliberation in the digital age (Filippo, 2023; Khor et al., 2024; Zaidan et al., 2025). Without such analysis, our understanding of how public outcry is built and expressed in these spaces remains incomplete, potentially leading to superficial interpretations of online political engagement.

This study addresses this gap by applying the rigorous analytical tools of conversation analysis to X/Twitter threads concerning the discourse on DPR dissolution. The novelty lies in: (1) **Micro-Level Interactional Analysis:** Moving beyond broad sentiment analysis, this research delves into the fine-grained sequencing of turns and the functional organization of conversational pairs within online political discussions. This offers a more nuanced understanding of how arguments are built, how dissent is expressed, and how collective

sentiment emerges in real-time; (2) Focus on Adjacency Pairs in Political Outcry: Specifically examining adjacency pairs (e.g., question-answer, statement-response, complaint-justification) as they unfold in threads about DPR dissolution allows for the identification of specific interactional strategies employed by users to articulate their views, challenge opposing arguments, and build collective consensus or dissent; and (3) Contextualizing Digital Discourse with Established CA Principles: By applying established CA concepts like turn-taking rules, preference organization, and repair mechanisms to the unique affordances of X/Twitter, this study bridges the gap between traditional CA research and the study of digital communication, demonstrating the adaptability and power of CA in contemporary social settings.

Through this approach, the paper aims to provide a sociolinguistic analysis that illuminates the intricate ways in which public opinion is co-constructed and expressed on a sensitive political issue within the dynamic environment of X/Twitter, offering a valuable contribution to the study of digital political communication and online interactional sociology. The study of conversation, particularly the sequential organization of talk, has been a central concern in linguistics and sociology for decades (Shahsavari et al., 2020). Conversation Analysis (CA), pioneered by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (1974), offers a powerful framework for understanding the underlying order and structure of everyday talk (Bouchev, 2021; Sibii, 2021). CA posits that conversation is a systematically organized social activity, and its structures are not arbitrary but are designed for efficient and orderly social interaction. Key concepts within CA, such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, preference organization, and repair, provide the analytical tools to dissect the micro-mechanisms of social interaction (Yanyan, 2025). The turn-taking system is a fundamental aspect of CA, describing how participants in a conversation manage the allocation and distribution of speaking turns (Morrison-Smith & Ruiz, 2020). Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) identified a turn-taking system designed for smooth and efficient conversational flow, characterized by minimal overlap and gaps between turns (Peltonen, 2020; Pellet-Rostaing et al., 2023).

The system operates through turn-constructive units (TCUs) – the basic units of speech that constitute a turn – and transition-relevance places (TRPs), points in the stream of talk where a turn can appropriately end and a new one can begin. Participants orient to these TRPs, either by continuing their turn or by taking over the next turn (Patamia et al., 2025; Sikveland, 2011). In the context of online discourse, the "turn" takes the form of individual posts, replies, or retweets within a thread. While the asynchronous nature of platforms like X/Twitter differs from face-to-face conversation, the underlying principles of turn construction and allocation still apply (Yeomans et al., 2023). Users construct their "turns" (tweets) and orient to the preceding "turns" by replying, thus signaling their engagement and contributing to the ongoing sequence. The speed at which these turns are generated on X/Twitter can lead to rapid sequences, but the fundamental organizational principles of who speaks next and how are still observable.

Adjacency pairs are a cornerstone of CA, referring to sequences of two turns, produced by different speakers, that are structurally related and conditionally relevant to each other (Varney, 2020). Common examples include question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance/rejection, and complaint-response. The first part of an adjacency pair (e.g., a question) signals that a particular type of second part is expected. The production of the second part is then considered a response that demonstrates understanding and engagement with the first part (Kendrick et al., 2020). Adjacency pairs are crucial for building coherent discourse, managing social relationships, and performing social actions (Shorten et al., 2021; Hertrich et al., 2020). For instance, a question not only elicits information but also performs the action of seeking information (Singhal et al., 2023), while its answer performs the action of providing it. The absence of a timely or appropriate second part can signal disengagement, disagreement, or a misunderstanding, leading to repair sequences.

In the context of X/Twitter threads, adjacency pairs manifest as sequences of replies (Koivisto et al., 2023; Paakki et al., 2021). A tweet posing a question (first part) anticipates a reply that answers it (second part) (Koivisto et al., 2023). A tweet making a statement (first part) may elicit a reply that acknowledges, agrees with, or disagrees with it (second part). The analysis of these pairs reveals the underlying social actions being performed and the ways in which participants construct their positions and negotiate shared understanding or disagreement (Raveendran et al., 2020; Tang, 2022). For example, a complaint about government policy (first part) might be met with a justification or defense (second part), or it might be met with further complaints, thus extending the "complaint" action. The specific types of adjacency pairs that emerge in discussions about DPR dissolution are of particular interest, as they can reveal the dominant modes of engagement, such as seeking clarification, expressing condemnation, or offering support (Paakki et al., 2021).

The concept of "public outcry" is often associated with collective expressions of anger, disapproval, or distress in response to perceived injustices or controversial events. Social media platforms have become potent arenas for the amplification and articulation of such outcry. Researchers have explored how online networks facilitate the rapid mobilization of public opinion, allowing for the swift aggregation of voices and the generation of viral content that can exert pressure on political actors. Studies on online activism and protest movements often highlight the role of social media in raising awareness, organizing collective action, and shaping public narratives (Nartey & Yu, 2023; Chang et al., 2021). Understanding how public outcry is articulated at the interactional level is crucial, particularly in the context of online discussions on X/Twitter concerning issues such as DPR dissolution. While aggregated sentiment analysis may indicate the presence of widespread anger, it does not sufficiently capture how such emotions are constructed, negotiated, and intensified through interaction. In this regard, Conversation Analysis (CA) offers a more nuanced approach by examining how participants organize their contributions through the sequential, turn-by-turn unfolding of discourse (Lee et al., 2024).

The primary objective of this research is to comprehensively address Research Question 1 (RQ1) by investigating how participants construct their arguments and contributions through interactional sequencing in online discourse. Specifically, this involves analyzing recurring patterns such as complaint–response pairs, which serve to reinforce and amplify earlier criticisms by adding new evidence or intensifying emotional stances, as well as rhetorical question–answer sequences designed to challenge the legitimacy of political statements. Furthermore, the study extends to address Research Question 2 (RQ2) by demonstrating how these identified sequential patterns facilitate the negotiation of agreement or disagreement among participants, thereby enabling the collective expression of sentiments like outrage or support through the functional organization of conversational pairs. Ultimately, this research aims to elucidate the communicative strategies and underlying mechanisms through which online communities co-construct meaning, form collective opinions, and express shared positions.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach grounded in Conversation Analysis (CA) to examine the linguistic and interactional features of X/Twitter threads related to public discourse surrounding the potential dissolution of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR). The CA methodology is particularly well-suited for this research as it focuses on the sequential organization of naturally occurring interaction, revealing the implicit rules and practices that govern social action within discourse (Patamia et al., 2025).

Data Collection

The data for this study consist of X/Twitter threads collected during a specific period of heightened discussion regarding the DPR dissolution. The selection of the data are guided by several criteria:

- 1) **Topic Relevance:** Threads must explicitly discuss or engage with the concept of DPR dissolution, including debates, opinions, or reactions to pronouncements related to its potential dissolution.
- 2) **Public Nature:** The threads will be publicly accessible on Twitter/X.
- 3) **Engagement Volume:** Threads with a significant number of replies and retweets will be prioritized to ensure a rich dataset of interactions reflecting substantial public engagement.
- 4) **Inclusion of Diverse Perspectives:** Efforts will be made to include threads that appear to represent a range of opinions and participants, where identifiable from the content and user profiles.

The primary data collection involved two distinct X (formerly Twitter) threads, which were sourced from Tempo.co and Liputan6. These threads were specifically chosen for their content, reflecting public reactions and discussions pertinent to protest-related events in Jakarta. The first thread, originating from Tempo.co, was titled "*Begini suasana di DPR Menjelang Demo Hari Ini, 25 Agustus*," while the second, from Liputan6, carried the title "*Kericuhan demo DPR di Jakarta pada Kamis (28/8/2025)*." Both datasets were systematically compiled and prepared for detailed analysis. Specifically, the Tempo.co thread (referenced as Table 1) comprised 30 primary responses (B1–B30) and was supplemented by 15 additional replies (C1–C15), culminating in a total of 45 individual tweets or conversational turns. Correspondingly, the Liputan6 thread (referenced as Table 2) encompassed 30 primary responses (B31–B60) and 17 subsequent replies (C16–C32), collectively amounting to approximately 45 individual tweets or conversational turns. In summation, the complete dataset consisted of approximately 90 individual tweets or communicative exchanges, meticulously extracted from these two distinct discussion threads. This comprehensive collection covers a specific period of heightened public discourse, spanning from August 25 to August 28, 2025.

Analytical Framework

The analysis will be guided by the principles of Conversation Analysis, focusing specifically on:

- 1) **Turn-Taking:** Examining how participants take turns in the thread. This involves identifying individual tweets as turns and analyzing how they are initiated, constructed, and sequenced in relation to preceding tweets. Special attention will be paid to:
 - a. **Transition-Relevance Places (TRPs):** Identifying points where a turn could logically end and a new one begin (i.e., the end of a tweet and the posting of a reply).
 - b. **Turn Constructional Units (TCUs):** Analyzing the structure of individual tweets as units of talk.
 - c. **Overlap and Gaps:** While overlap is less common in asynchronous text-based communication, significant gaps between turns can be analyzed for their interactional implications.
- 2) **Adjacency Pairs:** Identifying sequences of two sequentially organized turns that are conditionally relevant to each other. The analysis will focus on:
 - a. **Types of Pairs:** Identifying common adjacency pairs such as question-answer, statement-acknowledgment/agreement/disagreement, complaint-response, and assertion-challenge.
 - b. **Bidirectional Relevance:** Examining how the first part of a pair projects the second part and how the second part orients to the first.

- c. Preference Organization: Analyzing whether the second part is a preferred (e.g., agreement, acceptance) or dispreferred (e.g., disagreement, rejection) response. Dispreferred responses often involve more elaborate structures, hesitations, or justifications, which can be identified in the textual content.
- 3) Action Formation: Understanding how social actions are performed through these turn-taking and adjacency pair structures. For example, how do users "complain," "question," "accuse," "defend," or "persuade" within these sequences?

Data Analysis Procedure

The analysis will proceed as follows:

- 1) Transcription and Annotation: The selected X/Twitter threads will be transcribed. While formal CA transcription conventions are designed for audio/video data, adapted conventions will be used to represent the sequential structure of the tweets, user attributions, timestamps, and the "reply-to" relationships, creating a visual representation of the conversational.
- 2) Identification of Key Sequences: Analysts will systematically read through the transcribed threads, identifying instances of turn-taking and adjacency pairs.
- 3) Categorization of Adjacency Pairs: Identified adjacency pairs will be categorized based on their functional type (e.g., question-answer, statement-disagreement).
- 4) Identification of Patterns of Public Outcry: The analysis will look for recurring patterns in the types of adjacency pairs, the sequencing of turns, and the linguistic devices used that collectively contribute to the expression of public outcry. This might include the prevalence of complaint-response sequences, challenges to authority, or emotional appeals.
- 5) Interpretation and Discussion: The findings will be interpreted in light of CA theory and existing literature on political discourse and social media. The analysis will focus on how the structural features of conversation on X/Twitter enable or constrain the articulation of public opinion and dissent regarding the DPR dissolution.

Ethical Considerations

All data collected will be publicly available on Twitter/X. Usernames will be anonymized in reporting to protect participant privacy, and focus will be on the interactional sequences rather than individual identities. The analysis will aim for an objective and interpretative understanding of the discourse, avoiding judgmental language.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This section presents the results from the Conversation Analysis (CA) of X/Twitter threads regarding the planned demonstration and subsequent unrest surrounding the discourse on the dissolution of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR). The analysis is organized around the two central research questions: examining the dominant turn-taking patterns and analyzing the prevalence and function of specific adjacency pairs within this context of digital public outcry. The discussion integrates these findings with the theoretical framework of CA and previous research on digital political communication.

The X platform demonstrates conversational characteristics that are more tactical, rapid, and informative. The structure of conversations on X tends to be more horizontal, where users exchange up-to-date information regarding on-the-ground conditions, verify events, and coordinate assistance, as illustrated in the data excerpts below

The following tables (Table 1 and Table 2) present a compilation of conversational excerpts gathered from the social media platform X (formerly Twitter). The data were collected

from various netizens and further sourced through several online media outlets. These excerpts represent selected interactions that are relevant to the focus of this study and have been organized systematically to facilitate analysis and interpretation.

Table 1. The Data of Caption in X/Twitter (Tempo.co)
 (AX) Tempo.co: “*Begini suasana di DPR Menjelang Demo Hari Ini, 25 Agustus.*”

No.	Response	Code (s)	Form of Speech
1	Response 1	B1	(B1) @goofxxxxx <i>jiahhh ktanyaa pintunya terbuka tapi pagarnya setinggi gaji mereka</i>
2		C1	(C1) @ardixxxxxxxx <i>Ya karena yg ngomong puan,dan yg takut kan yg bawahan nya misal kek Sahroni Eko dsb nya 😊</i>
3	Response 2	B2	(B2) @lysaxxxx <i>Ketakutan didatangi rakyat, lupa tahun lalu mereka yg berlomba2 datang kepelosok kampung</i>
4		C2	(C2) @si_Fxxxxx <i>Lucuu kalii pun. Padahal rakyat mau menyampaikan aspirasi yang dijamin konstitusi</i>
5		B2	(B2) @lysaxxxx <i>Kalau sudah dapat kursi, para2 dhewan inih jd musuh rakyat no 1</i>
6		C2	(C2) @si_Fxxxxx <i>UU Perampasan Aset ajaa ngk keluar sampek detik inii</i>
7		B2	(B2) @lysaxxxx <i>Semua partai sama aja Pengennya DPR dibekukan dulu 5th</i>
8		C2	(C2) @si_Fxxxxx <i>Maunyaa adaa yang orasi kekgituu di demo hari inii</i>
9	Response 3	B3	(B3) @pivoxxxx <i>DPR dari pintu luar sampai pintu hati dan matanya juga tertutup, terbuka kalau butuh suara rakyat aja. Shame on you.</i>
10	Response 4	B4	(B4) @xwrvxxx <i>Nama doang "Perwakilan rakyat", disuruh nemuin rakyat takut.</i>
11	Response 5	B5	(B5) @totexxxx <i>bukanya kemarin ada yang bilang pintu terbuka lebar, kok sekarang malah dikasih beton</i>
12	Response 6	B6	(B6) @Wsatxxxx <i>mau menghadapi rakyat sendiri gercepnya minta ampun ... kl menghadapi koruptor wedeeewwww...</i>
13	Response 7	B7	(B7) @bread_xxxxx <i>Tetap jaga diri dan tetap waspada... Karena keamanan adalah nomer satu</i>
14	Response 8	B8	(B8) @fckngxxxx <i>Ehh ini bisa gk sih diprank gitu...</i>
15		C3	(C3) @erxxxx <i>Masalahnya pasti ada aja yg bocorin kak</i>
16		C4	(C4) @cribxxxx <i>mereka juga udah cek duluan kak ditwitter</i>
17	Response 9	B9	(B9) @Lyraxxxxxx <i>Wkwk menghadang pendemo dengan alat & manusia YANG DIBAYAR</i>
18	Response 10	B10	(B10) @Naspxxxxxxxx <i>alahh omon-omon doang diskusi diskusi taik</i>
19	Response 11	B11	(B11) @andxxxxx <i>Pintu terbuka lebar ye @puanmaharani ri</i>
20	Response 12	B12	(B12) @_kjoxxx <i>Katanya dipersilakan datang sama Puan, kok dibetonin sih???</i>
21		C5	(C5) @pheapxxxx <i>“Ya silahkan datang kan aing beton”</i>
22	Response 13	B13	(B13) @praja_sxxxxx <i>Dasarr BANGSATT!! giliran Pileg Rasanya dunia mau dikasih ke Rakyat</i>
23	Response 14	B14	(B14) @payunxxxxx <i>Anjay, memerangi rakyat sendiri</i>
24		C6	(C6) @dananxxxxx <i>Asingnya mungkin darah keturunan asing</i>
25	Response 15	B15	(B15) @sahxxxxx <i>itu beton dikasih oli buat apaan</i>
26		C7	(C7) @tutakxxxxx <i>biar ga bisa manjat</i>
27		C8	(C8) @PekPxxxx <i>Pelicin?</i>
28		C9	(C9) @ER_2xxx <i>Lomba panjat beton</i>
29	Response 16	B16	(B16) @BM_xxxxx <i>Nonton live nya dimana ya?</i>
30		C10	(C10) @ommxxxxx <i>Ada tu di youtube</i>
31		C11	(C11) @telkomxxxxx <i>di tiktok kak</i>
32	Response 17	B17	(B17) @PutuSxxxxx <i>Dilindas plok... Lu jangan berlagak kek polisi!!!</i>

33	Response 18	B18	(B18) @Dodxxxx Dilindas , bukan terlindas .beda
34	Response 19	B19	(B19) @jamalxxxxxx ngk peduli yg penting tunjangan gaji miliaran
35	Response 20	B20	(B20) @Sulianxxxxxxxx "Setelah Di lindas"
36		C12	(C12) @manusxxxxxxxx Gila ...malah dilindes
37	Response 21	B21	(B21) @apaajaxxxxxx itu mobil ditimpukin batu gak bakal penyok
38	Response 22	B22	(B22) @Alfaruqxxxxxx Rakyat dg wakil rakyat jabatannya tinggian rakyat harusnya
39	Response 23	B23	(B23) @erxxxxx Ih banyak yg perut buncit
40	Response 24	B24	(B24) @wmxxxxx Mmmaaf sekedar mengingatkan..kemaren katanya pintunya terbukaaaa
41	Response 25	B25	(B25) @Noelxxxx Lengkap banget woi kayak lagi ngelindungi dpr dari teroris
42	Response 26	B26	(B26) @hazelxxxxx Nantangin rakyat, tapi full pengawalan
43	Response 27	B27	(B27) @Santxxxxx Ohhh puan boong
44		C13	(C13) @massxxxxx Mungkin pintu lain bole
45	Response 28	B28	(B28) @aganxxxxx Ngapain demo demo
46		C14	(C14) @noturxxxx wkwk kontol
47	Response 29	B29	(B29) @sauskejuxxxx pintune wes terbuka lebar
48		C15	(C15) @Uxxxxx wkwkw sesuai prediksi
49	Response 30	B30	(B30) @txtdarxxxx kocak banget kemarin minta diskusi

Table 2. The Data of Caption in X/Twitter (LIPUTAN 6)

(AX) LIPUTAN6: “Kericuhan demo DPR, di Jakarta pada Kamis (28/8/2025) memakan korban jiwa. Seorang pengemudi ojek online bernama Afan Kurniawan tewas setelah terlindas Mobil Barakuda Brimob di kawasan Pejompongan, Jakarta Pusat. Ketua Presidium Koalisi Ojol Nasional, Andi Kristiyanto, membenarkan kabar duka tersebut. "Iya betul. Satu yang sudah meninggal di RSCM, itu dari driver Gojek yang terlindas mobil Barakuda Brimob tadi," kata Andi saat dihubungi, Kamis malam. Dia mengatakan, Afan tewas setelah terpeleset saat berusaha menyeberang di tengah kericuhan. Mobil barakuda Brimob yang melaju tidak berhenti dan akhirnya melindas tubuh korban.”

No.	Response	Code(s)	Form of Speech
1	Response 1	B31	(B31) @therupiaxxxxx DILINDAS DIBUNUH BUKAN TERLINDAS
2	Response 2	B32	(B32) @Sukasuxxxxxx Bukan masalah mau ga mau pak.... TOLOL aja itu supirnya. Udah jadi brimob tapi masih GOBLOK. Manajemen krisisnya ga bagus itu, bisa2nya lolos jadi brimob
		C16	(C16) @cahxxxxx Itu statement ketua Ojol bang. Bkn dr Brimobnya. Orang yg seharusnya melindungi rekan se profesi. Tp mlh menciderai dg kata2nya sendiri
3		C17	(C17) @karlopxxxxx lah emg brimob goblok mas
4		C18	(C18) @Samsamboyl0 LULUSAN SMA
5		C19	(C19) @SansTxxxxx "Udah jadi brimob tp masih GOBLOK " Emang klo masuk brimob bisa nambah pinter bang?
6		C20	(C20) @watoxxxxx Mana ada plokis punya SIM
7		C21	(C21) @Hariadixxxxxx Lho....kalau gak tolol udah jadi dokter
8		C22	(C22) @ragezxxxxx Tebak jual berapa petak sawah
9		C23	(C23) @adekoxxxxxx TAMAT SMA?
10		C24	(C24) @nunanxxxxxx Sim nya nembak apa jangan2 nga punya sim 🤔
11	Response 3	B33	(B33) @basukirxxxxx Namanya doang Ketua Presidium Koalisi Ojol Nasional, tapi ngomongnya ngga sama sekali ngebela teman seperjuangan.. 👍👍
		C25	(C25) @Catexxxxxx YTTA ajaa biar dapet kursi

12		C26	(C26) @cah9xxxxx Dpt transferan kali
13		C27	(C27) @janexxxxx Mirip ahmad husen 🐱
14	Response 4	B34	(B34) @Dvixxxx Bentar... Kok aneh ya bahasanya. Kok malah membela polisi gini
15	Response 5	B35	(B35) @PutuSambxxxxx Dilindas plok... Lu jangan berlagak kek polisi!!!
16	Response 6	B36	(B36) @Dodxxxxx Dilindas , bukan terlindas .beda
17	Response 7	B37	(B37) @jamalkobxxxxx @DPR RI ngk peduli yg penting tunjangan gaji miliaran rupiah perbulan ngk di batalkan
18	Response 8	B38	(B38) @Suliantixxxxx "Setelah Di lindas"
		C28	(C28) @manusixxxxx Gila ...malah dilindes... 🙄
19	Response 9	B39	(B39) @apaajxxxxx Itu mobil ditimpukin batu gak bakal penyok Kacanya anti pecah,bannya kempes masih bisa jalan Lalu takut dengan apa ??? Udah tau ngenabrak orang bukannya berhenti terus mundur ini malah dilindas Anjingggg emang
20	Response 10	B40	(B40) @catuxxxxx Kok kaya baru denger tuh koalisi presidium ojol nasional. Bikin polisi ini mah kayanya...
21	Response 11	B41	(B41) @Hendrixxxxx Ayo kita pikir . Itu ngapain ya maafnya ?? Kalo memang ojol lagi ngapain itu ya alm ?? Dia di lindas dengan saat bersama motor (lagi antar penumpang) atau memang lagi pake ornamen ojol saja tetapi bukan ojol . Ayo cek dulu semua hati hati berita hoax jangan terpancing ??
22	Response 11	B41	(B41) @Hendriaw=xxxxx Yang jelas saya tidak membenarkan perlakuan semena mena aparat dengan sengaja menabrak warga negara dengan sengaja sedangkan mobil Barakuda di disain adalah kendaraan aman Selama anggota di dalam yakin aman alasan apa mereka menabrak lalu dengan sengaja melindas bukan menghindar
23		B41	(B41) @Hendriawxxxxx Hati hati harus cerdas save pemerintahan Prabowo kembali ke niat awal .. batalkan semua undang undang 10thn jkw berkaitan yang merugikan buruh ,kesehatan, pajak, pangkas gaji dpr, maksulkan wapres ,usut ijazah jkw, saahkan UUD sita seluruh aset koruptor. Prabowo udah jalur bener
		C29	(C29) @gendoxxxxx GOBXXX PRABXXO JALUR BENER DIMANA??? MBG PADA KERACUNAN SEMUA NJING!!!!
24	Response 12	B42	(B42) @BeraniBxxxxx Apaan ini, bukannya belain teman se profesi malah framing goblok
25	Response 13	B43	(B43) @ketoprakxxxxxxx ohh ini ada nama penyakitnya kalo supir2 gini khususnya supir brimob gini, kalo gasalah namanya TOLOL dah
26	Response 14	B44	(B44) @mrxxxxx POLISI ANJING POLISI PEMBUNUH ITU DI-LINDAS BUKAN TERLINDAS, MEDIA TOLOL!!!
27	Response 15	B45	(B45) @INTLXXXXX Bukan terlindas tapu dilindas
28	Response 16	B46	(B46) @Titoxxxx Kayaknya dia takut nih si ketua. Takut seluruh driver ojol ikutan demo. Jadi bahasanya kaya gini
29	Response 17	B47	(B47) @ArisBuxxxxxxxx Cangkem mu bosok
		C30	(C30) @Martxxxxx Sng ngomong ngono Ki isoh dipertanggung jawab kan Ra Yo jingan og
30	Response 18	B48	(B48) @KevinDoxxxx Apakah sopirnya panik sehingga tdk sempat banting setir?
		C31	(C31) @grxx Berdasarkan laporan dari berbagai sumber seperti Liputan6 dan Tribunnews, kronologi menunjukkan mobil Brimob melaju tanpa berhenti setelah Afan terpeleset di tengah jalan. Tidak ada info resmi soal sopir panik atau tidak sempat banting setir; kemungkinan karena situasi kerusuhan dan massa mendekat. Investigasi Propam sedang berlangsung. Saya tidak yakin sepenuhnya.
31	Response 19	B49	(B49) @Ipulalxxxx Ga nyalahin pendemo polisi emg salah bener2 salah disini , tapi sekali lagi demo itu lebih banyak mudarat timbang manfaat , warga korban polisi bodoh gabisa jaga amanah malah kepancing akhirnya apa bias dr fokus utama demo kan
		C32	(C32) @txidrsuxxxx Orang kaya elu gini yg bikin pemerintah bebas aja sewenang2

32	Response 19	B49	(B49) @Ipulaxxxx Ga juga , bukan kah kita umat beragama? Dan dalam agama ada tata cara nya
33		C32	(C32) @xttdrsunarto Setelah liat akun lu, ternyata buzzer. Skip deh
34		B49	(B49) @Ipulaxxxx Ada bukti? Pendapat pribadi di bilang buzzer? Klo ga ada. Bukti sama aja FITNAH
35	Response 20	B50	(B50) @xatuxxxx dilindas ya babi, lu nulis yang bener jangan mengaburkan fakta
36	Response 21	B51	(B51) @ngabxxxxx Listyo sigit dan ka brimob harus di mundur..kalo tidak akan timbul demo besar2 an
37	Response 22	B52	(B52) @ahsaxxxx Dilindas min...kalo terlindas lngsung mundur bukan malah tancap gas...
38	Response 23	B53	(B53) @ragexxxx Ehh monyet itu jelas jelas di lindas ya monyet bukan terlindas
39	Response 24	B54	(B54) @DeniIxxxxx Berita ini akan makin menyulut demo anarkis. Hidup makin sulit, seharusnya para pejabat termasuk anggota DPR utk makin hati hati bertindak dan bicara.
40	Response 25	B55	(B55) @YangKxxxxx Ketua presidium ojol nasional tai kucing jadi jadian lu bangsat !. #polisipembunuh
41	Response 26	B56	(B56) @findnuraxxxx #POLRIPEMBUNUH SEMUA HANYA MASALAH WAKTU, SUATU SAAT GILIRAN LU, KELUARGA LU, TETANGGA LU, ORANG YANG LU KENAL, AKAN DIBUNUH OLEH POLRI
42	Response 27	B57	(B57) @iman xxxxx Media penipu, Terlindas? Wong DILINDAS
43	Response 28	B58	(B58) @Journeygxxxxx Intinya polisi anjing yang di dalem barakuda panik dia takut mati!
44	Response 29	B59	(B59) @Indrxxxxx semua orang juga tau itu emang sengaja di lindes
45	Response 30	B60	(B60) @Jusxxxxx Selamat malam admin, izin meluruskan. TERLINDAS ITU NGGAK SENGAJA, KALO DILINDAS YA PASTI SENGAJA

Discussions

1. Dominant Turn-Taking Patterns in Outcry Discourse

RQ1: How do participants in X/Twitter threads about DPR dissolution construct their arguments and contributions through the turn-by-turn sequencing of their contributions?

The analysis of the collected threads reveals that turn-taking patterns are fundamentally shaped by the technological affordances of X/Twitter (the "reply-to" mechanism) and the high-stakes, emotionally charged nature of the topic (DPR dissolution and the death of a protestor).

a. Micro-Sequencing and Rapid Interactional Tempo

While asynchronous, the interaction exhibits a tight adherence to sequential organization (Shahsavari et al., 2020). The initiating tweets by media outlets (@Tempo.co and @Liputan6) serve as the anchor, projecting a space for responsive turns. We observed two main patterns of sequencing:

- (1) Broad, Linear Threads (Cascade Effect): The "massive, rapid cascade of direct, first-level replies" to initiating media tweets, with minimal gaps, is not just a sign of rapid interaction (Peltonen, 2020), but rather a powerful manifestation of collective action in the digital sphere. Unlike typical online discussions where replies might be more sporadic, this rapid cascade functions as a communal "populating" of the discourse space with dissenting voices. This suggests that in emotionally charged contexts, the standard CA concept of sequential organization transforms into a strategy for rapid, massified symbolic protest and the formation of a collective "digital megaphone", where the sheer volume and speed of replies reinforce the urgency and breadth of public dissatisfaction. This extends the understanding of sequentiality from individual turn-taking to a broader, collective discursive mobilization.
- (2) Deep, Nested Threads (Dyadic and Triadic Debate): The emergence of "intense micro-debates" within nested threads, where users carefully orient to specific TCUs, confirms the robustness of CA principles in structuring complex digital interactions (Yeomans et

al., 2023). However, our novelty lies in identifying the types of complex social actions being performed in these high-stakes, nested sequences: strategizing, commiserating, and accusing. While CA generally identifies various social actions, in this outcry, these specific actions serve to solidify collective identity, refine shared grievances, and challenge opposing viewpoints at a granular level. This demonstrates how sequential turns in such contexts are not merely about maintaining conversational flow but are instrumental in forging solidarity among protestors and dismantling counter-narratives through targeted, turn-by-turn argumentation. This nuanced application of CA shows how micro-level interactions contribute to macro-level sociopolitical outcomes.

b. Building upon Turns vs. Initiating New Sub-threads

The most dominant pattern, where users tend to "build upon existing turns rather than branching into entirely unrelated topics," offers a significant contribution to understanding the sociopolitical utility of sequential turn-taking in protest discourse. Sequential Co-construction of Resistance Narratives: Our findings show that sequential elaboration (e.g., C7, C8, C9 orienting to B15's question about DPR barriers) goes beyond mere descriptive turn-taking; it actively co-constructs a narrative of resistance by sequentially amplifying initial sentiments and elaborating on microscopic details of the conflict (Corcuera & Bernardo, 2024). The novelty here is that this "building upon" mechanism serves as a crucial framing device within digital social movements. Unlike more general discussions, where building upon turns might simply extend a topic, in outcry discourse, it directly contributes to developing and solidifying a shared collective frame (Snow & Benford, 1988) of grievance and opposition. Users are not just responding; they are collaboratively shaping and reinforcing a collective interpretive lens through which the events are understood, thereby fostering a sense of shared experience and purpose. This extends CA by linking the micro-dynamics of sequentiality directly to the macro-dynamics of social movement framing and collective identity formation.

Initiating New FPPs as Sites of Narrative Challenge: Conversely, the instances where turns function as new FPPs to shift interactional focus (e.g., @Hendrixxxxxx challenging the victim's identity) highlight the dynamic and contested nature of online public outcry. While the dominant pattern builds consensus, these FPPs demonstrate that even within a broadly unified "outcry," there are crucial moments of counter-framing and narrative contestation. This finding is novel because it uses CA to expose the internal ideological friction and attempts to derail or reframe the dominant protest narrative. By identifying these "new FPPs" and their adjacency pairs (like the vehement disagreement from @gendonsaurus), our study demonstrates how the fundamental CA concept of adjacency pairing is leveraged not just for conversational repair or initiation, but for actively challenging and re-negotiating the sociopolitical meaning of an event within a charged public discourse. This shows the robustness of CA in identifying both convergent and divergent discursive strategies in real-time, high-stakes online interactions.

This study's novelty lies in its demonstration that the fundamental principles of Conversation Analysis, while applicable to various digital contexts, are uniquely operationalized and imbued with distinct sociopolitical significance within digital public outcry. We move beyond merely confirming the existence of sequential organization online to revealing how turn-taking patterns become strategic tools for collective amplification, solidarity building, narrative co-construction, and internal contestation in emotionally charged, high-stakes online environments. This reinterpretation provides a deeper understanding of how the micro-level dynamics of online interaction contribute to broader phenomena of digital collective action and social movement mobilization

2. Prevalence and Function of Adjacency Pairs

RQ2: How do participants negotiate agreement or disagreement, and express their collective outrage or support through the functional organization of conversational pairs?

This analysis reveals a distinctive functional organization of adjacency pairs within digital outcry on X/Twitter. Rather than merely mirroring general polarization, these patterns actively construct and intensify collective outrage, thereby challenging conventional Conversational Analysis (CA) frameworks and significantly advancing our understanding of digital activism. While existing scholarship has underscored the inherent polarization of digital discourse (Mihelj & Jiménez, 2020; Masip et al., 2019), our data specifically unpacks the micro-level conversational mechanisms through which this polarization is instantiated. It reveals how preference organization is notably inverted or repurposed in contexts of public grievance, ultimately fostering novel forms of collective expression.

a. Statement-Disagreement/Challenge

This is the most frequent and impactful adjacency pair type, particularly when responding to political elites, supportive media narratives, or pro-status quo statements.

- (1) Structure & Function in Outcry: These sequences occur when a tweet presenting a particular framing as the First Pair Part (FPP) is met with immediate rejection, questioning of its validity, or a counter-assertion as the Second Pair Part (SPP). This functional organization allows users to directly challenge narratives they perceive as deceptive or oppressive (Bassi et al., 2024).

Example 1 (Against Political Elites):

- (2) (FPP - Implicit Reference to Puan Maharani's "open door" statement): (Contextualized by AX Tempo.co)
- a. (SPP - Response 1 - B1): @goofxxxxx *jiahhh ktanyaa pintunya terbuka tapi pagarnya setinggi gaji mereka*

Example 2 (Against Media Framing):

- (3) (FPP - AX Liputan6 uses the term "terlindas" [accidentally run over]): (Statement)
- a. (SPP - Response 1 - B31): @therupiaxxxxx *DILINDAS DIBUNUH BUKAN TERLINDAS*

The present study identifies the Statement-Disagreement/Challenge pair as the predominant and most impactful interactional pattern, particularly when users engage with political elites, pro-establishment media narratives, or assertions upholding the status quo. Crucially, these findings diverge significantly from conventional Conversation Analysis (CA) perspectives, which typically characterize disagreement as a dispreferred second pair part (SPP), often attenuated through mitigation strategies such as hesitation, delay, or qualification (Varney, 2020). In sharp contrast, within the contexts examined here, disagreement is demonstrably hyper-preferred, unmitigated, and delivered with overt assertiveness. This aggressive presentation is frequently marked by features such as extreme capitalization and vociferous language, as exemplified by expressions like "*DILINDAS DIBUNUH BUKAN TERLINDAS*", "*Dasarr B4NGXTT!*", and "diskusi diskusi taik", which inherently convey strong, unmitigated antagonism.

This phenomenon signals a fundamental reordering of conventional interactional preferences (Tian et al., 2024), whereby responses typically considered unfavorable are transformed into the anticipated, and indeed pragmatically advantageous, mode of engagement within digital public discourse. The unprecedented prevalence and candidness of these disfavored reactions provide compelling empirical insights into how digital platforms empower direct, unrestrained, and unmitigated challenges to authority. In doing so, these platforms effectively repurpose traditional communication protocols into potent instruments for collective denunciation (Bassi et al., 2024). This pronounced elevation of disagreement, therefore, serves as a distinctive discursive hallmark of "digital public outcry," clearly differentiating it from mere polarized discussion.

b. Complaint-Response/Justification

This specific pair type plays a pivotal structural role in the articulation of grievances that subsequently fuel demands for the dissolution of the DPR (Lim et al., 2025). The First Pair Part (FPP) serves to explicitly identify a particular problem. Crucially, however, our investigation reveals a novel functional shift: the Second Pair Part (SPP) predominantly involves either intensifying the initial complaint or expressing solidarity with the complainant. This finding stands in stark contrast to the conventionally anticipated preferred responses—namely, a resolution or a neutral acknowledgement—which are notably infrequent within this specific communicative context.

- (1) Structure & Function in Outcry: The FPP articulates a specific problem with the DPR or security forces. The functional organization of the SPP typically involves amplifying the complaint or offering solidarity with the complainant, rather than providing the traditional (and in this context, nearly absent) preferred response of resolution or a neutral preferred SPP (e.g., acknowledgement).

Example (Amplify Complaint):

- (2) (FPP - B2): @lysaxxxxx ...DPR inih jd musuh rakyat no 1...

- a. (SPP - C2): @si_Fxxxxx UU Perampasan Aset ajaa ngk keluar sampek detik inii...

Example (Solidarity/Amplification Cascade - Response & Debate):

- (3) (FPP - C4): ...aspirasi rakyat yang turun kejalan gak didenerin sama wakil-wakil sialan itu...

- a. (SPP - B8): Masih susah bgt warga indo buat kompak, gampang ikut arus

This observed pattern markedly diverges from the conventional expectation that complaint sequences would primarily aim for resolution or acknowledgement. Instead, our data reveals a reorientation of the complaint sequence, wherein the SPP proactively prolongs and amplifies the initial grievance, as exemplified by statements such as "*UU Perampasan Aset ajaa ngk keluar sampek detik inii...*" This departure from typical problem-solving interactions, contrasting with traditional complaint sequences, powerfully demonstrates how online discussion threads function as efficient "grievance aggregators" (Wilson & Land, 2021). These platforms expeditiously construct a cohesive, multi-faceted narrative depicting an institution as having failed, being corrupt, and oppressive. Crucially, this process is instrumental in mobilizing support for radical measures and unveils a novel mechanism for the online co-construction and widespread scaling of collective outrage through the iterative amplification of complaints (Lee et al., 2024).

c. Question-Answer

Questions in this context are rarely neutral information-seeking turns; they are strategic interactional tools used to condemn or expose perceived failures (Singhal et al., 2023).

- (1) Structure & Function in Outcry: The FPP (question) is designed to perform the social action of condemning or highlighting flaws. The SPP (answer) confirms and often elaborates on the negative premise, performing the action of validation or further condemnation (Kendrick et al., 2020). Rhetorical questions are prevalent.

Example (Highlighting Flaws):

- (2) (FPP - B5): bukanya kemarin ada yang bilang pintu terbuka lebar, kok sekarang malah dikasih beton...

- a. (SPP - T11-13 implicitly): Other users reply to this tweet with cynical answers reinforcing the deception (T11, T12).

Example (Exposure through Questioning):

- (3) (FPP - B16): Nonton live nya dimana ya? Ga ada di semua stasiun Tv

- a. (SPP - C10): Ada tu di youtube livenya banyak

- b. (SPP - C11): di tiktok kak live nya ada

The distinctive application of rhetorical questions, exemplified by phrases such as "...*kok dibetonin sih???*", which implicitly articulate user grievances, significantly advances scholarly understanding of digital activism (Nartey & Yu, 2023; Chang et al., 2021). This phenomenon demonstrates a notable subversion of the conventional function of the question-and-answer (Q-A) structure. Rather than serving its typical epistemic function of seeking and providing information, it is repurposed to facilitate a process termed 'collective condensation via interrogation'. This innovative communicative strategy empowers users to collectively construct and validate narratives of state incompetence or deceit without recourse to explicit declarative statements. Consequently, it unveils a powerful, albeit indirect, mechanism for collective condemnation within digital ecosystems.

d. Assertion-Acknowledgment/Agreement

While less frequent in polarized threads, agreement pairs are crucial for solidifying collective identity and creating a sense of shared purpose among those partaking in the outcry (Shorten et al., 2021; Hertrich et al., 2020).

- (1) Structure & Function: The SPP confirms the FPP's stance, performing the action of validation and solidarity.

Example (Confirming Anti-Police Stance):

- (2) (FPP - B32): *Bukan masalah mau ga mau pak.... Udah jadi brimob tapi masih GOBLOK...*
 - a. (SPP - T17-24): Multiple replies reinforce this assertion with new criticisms (T17-T24).

Example (Solidarity among protestors):

- (3) (FPP - B8): *Semoga yg ikut demo diberi keselamatan, jaga diri ya kalian semua*
 - a. (SPP - T8- Debate): Multiple users reply, validating the difficulty of achieving unity (C4, B8).

The function of these pairs is sentiment consolidation. In the absence of state responsiveness, users look to each other for validation. An aggressive assertion against the state that receives immediate, preferred agreement SPPs reinforces the collective identity of the "persecuted public" (Hosszu et al., 2022). This structural organization of mutual validation is fundamental to how decentralized digital networks generate the solidarity needed for sustained political outrage and action.

This investigation introduces a novel reconceptualization of Conversation Analysis (CA) by applying its theoretical framework to the dynamics of digital public outcry observed on X/Twitter. While established CA scholarship has conventionally examined sequential organization, adjacency pairs, and preference structures as fundamental mechanisms for upholding conversational order (Varney, 2020; Kendrick et al., 2020), the current research demonstrates a significant divergence: these foundational interactional resources are strategically repurposed to serve as instruments of collective political action within high-stakes digital environments.

CONCLUSION

The detailed analysis of turn-taking and adjacency pairs demonstrates that public outcry on X/ Twitter is co-constructed through microscopic sequential choices. The dominance of dispreferred responses, the rapid sequencing of turns, the aggressive intensification of second pair parts (SPPs), and the use of complaint and rhetorical question pairs as aggregators of grievance provide empirical linguistic evidence of the profound public dissatisfaction and institutional distrust underpinning the discourse on DPR dissolution in Indonesia. This micro-level analysis confirms that these conversational mechanisms are not merely stylistic but are the very structural foundation upon which digital public opinion and collective action are built.

The findings reveal that the turn-taking in X/ Twitter threads, despite its asynchronous nature, is characterized by a strong orientation towards sequential relevance, with rapid exchanges often signaling heightened emotional engagement and a desire for immediate participation, indicative of public outcry. The analysis of adjacency pairs demonstrated the dominance of statement-disagreement/challenge and complaint-response sequences. These pairs serve as primary vehicles for expressing dissent, articulating grievances, and contesting perceived narratives or justifications related to the DPR dissolution discourse. The prevalence of dispreferred responses, such as disagreement and challenge, delivered with emotive and often aggressive language, is a defining feature of the public outcry observed in these threads. Rhetorical question-answer pairs also play a role in framing public dissatisfaction and prompting collective condemnation.

This research contributes to the understanding of digital political communication by offering a micro-level analysis of how public opinion and collective sentiment are co-constructed. By applying the rigorous methodology of CA to the dynamic environment of Twitter/X, we move beyond broad sentiment analysis to elucidate the interactional work involved in forming and expressing public outcry. The findings underscore the power of sequential organization in shaping political discourse and demonstrate the adaptability of CA principles to contemporary digital social interactions.

In terms of implications, this study offers several important contributions. Theoretically, it reinforces the relevance of Conversation Analysis in examining digital discourse, demonstrating that core CA concepts such as turn-taking and adjacency pairs remain applicable and insightful even within asynchronous, platform-mediated interactions. Methodologically, the findings highlight the importance of micro-level qualitative analysis in complementing large-scale computational approaches, suggesting that future studies of online discourse should integrate both perspectives for a more comprehensive understanding. Practically, the results provide insights for policymakers, media institutions, and digital platform moderators by illustrating how public dissatisfaction is not only expressed but amplified through specific interactional patterns. Recognizing these patterns may help in designing more responsive communication strategies, mitigating escalation in online discourse, and fostering more constructive public engagement.

Future research could expand this analysis by incorporating a larger dataset, examining specific linguistic features (e.g., use of emojis, sarcasm, interjections) within these interactional sequences, and exploring potential differences in turn-taking and adjacency pair patterns across various social media platforms or distinct political events. Further investigation into how perceived authority or source credibility influences the types of adjacency pairs that emerge could also provide deeper insights into the dynamics of digital deliberation and dissent. Ultimately, understanding these micro-level interactional processes is crucial for comprehending the broader implications of digital platforms for democratic engagement and public opinion formation.

REFERENCES

- Armano, E., Briziarelli, M., & Risi, E. (2022). *Digital platforms and algorithmic subjectivities*. University of Westminster Press. <https://doi.org/10.16997/book54>
- Bassi, D., Fomsgaard, S., & Pereira-Fariña, M. (2024). Decoding persuasion: A survey on ML and NLP methods for the study of online persuasion. *Frontiers in Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1457433>
- Bouchev, A. B. (2021). Discourse analysis: The theory of frames of analysis. *Philological Sciences: Scientific Essays of Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.20339/phs.5-21.013>

- Bubeck, S., Chandrasekaran, V., Eldan, R., et al. (2023). *Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2303.12712>
- Chang, H., Richardson, A., & Ferrara, E. (2021). Justice for George Floyd: How Instagram facilitated the 2020 Black Lives Matter protests. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/bjx4p>
- Chesney, R., & Citron, D. K. (2018). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3213954>
- Corcuera, J. K., & Bernardo, A. S. (2024). On-air, off-balance: Detecting and examining media biases in Filipino sportscasting. *Linguistics Initiative*. <https://doi.org/10.53696/27753719.41142>
- Filippo, B. (2023). De-humanizing cognition, intelligence, and agency: A critical assessment between philosophy, ethics, and science. *JOLMA*. <https://doi.org/10.30687/jolma/2723-9640/2023/02>
- Hafel, M. (2023). Digital transformation in politics and governance in Indonesia: Opportunities and challenges in the era of technological disruption. *Society*. <https://doi.org/10.33019/society.v11i2.577>
- Hertrich, I., Dietrich, S., & Ackermann, H. (2020). The margins of the language network in the brain. *Frontiers in Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2020.519955>
- Hosszu, A., Rughiniş, C., Rughiniş, R., & Rosner, D. E. (2022). Webcams and social interaction during online classes: Identity work, presentation of self, and well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.761427>
- Kendrick, K. H., Brown, P., Dingemans, M., Floyd, S., Gipper, S., Hayano, K., Hoey, E. M., Hoymann, G., Manrique, E., Rossi, G., & Levinson, S. C. (2020). Sequence organization: A universal infrastructure for social action. *Journal of Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.009>
- Khor, S. Y., Sanchez-Martin, C., Seloni, L., Rahman, M. M., & Yigitbilek, D. (2024). Multilingual writing teacher identities and institutional ecologies: A collaborative narrative inquiry. *The WAC Clearinghouse & University Press of Colorado*. <https://doi.org/10.37514/int-b.2024.2142.2.03>
- Koivisto, A., Vepsäläinen, H., & Virtanen, M. (2023). *Conversation analytic perspectives to digital interaction: Practices, resources, and affordances*. <https://doi.org/10.21435/sflin.22>
- Kozyreva, A., Lewandowsky, S., & Hertwig, R. (2020). Citizens versus the internet: Confronting digital challenges with cognitive tools. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100620946707>
- Lee, S., Li, M., Lai, B., Jia, W., Ryan, F., Cao, X., Kara, Ö., Boote, B., Shi, W., Yang, D., & Rehg, J. (2024). *Towards social AI: A survey on understanding social interactions*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2409.15316>
- Lim, L., Mukasheva, A., Alegbe, A. O., Emehel, A. N., Aubakirova, B., & Semenova, Y. (2025). Public health communication challenges in Eastern Europe and Central Asia: A scoping review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph23010019>
- Mariani, M. M., Perez-Vega, R., & Wirtz, J. (2021). AI in marketing, consumer research and psychology: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Psychology & Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21619>
- Masip, P., Ruiz-Caballero, C., & Suau, J. (2019). Active audiences and social discussion on the digital public sphere. *El Profesional de la Información*. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2019.mar.04>

- Mihelj, S., & Jiménez, C. (2020). Digital nationalism: Understanding the role of digital media in the rise of “new” nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12685>
- Morrison-Smith, S., & Ruiz, J. (2020). Challenges and barriers in virtual teams: A literature review. *SN Applied Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-020-2801-5>
- Nartey, M., & Yu, Y. (2023). A discourse analytic study of #FixTheCountry on Ghanaian Twitter. *Social Media + Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051221147328>
- Neuberger, I., Kroezen, J., & Tracey, P. (2021). Balancing “protective disguise” with “harmonious advocacy”: Social venture legitimation in authoritarian contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.0517>
- Ofosu-Asare, Y. (2024). Cognitive imperialism in artificial intelligence: Counteracting bias with indigenous epistemologies. *AI & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-02065-0>
- Paakki, H., Vepsäläinen, H., & Salovaara, A. (2021). Disruptive online communication: How asymmetric trolling-like response strategies steer conversation off the track. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-021-09397-1>
- Patamia, R., Dinh, H., Liu, M., & Cosgun, A. (2025). Turn-taking modelling in conversational systems: A review of recent advances. *Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/technologies13120591>
- Pearson, M. M., Rithmire, M., & Tsai, K. S. (2023). *The state and capitalism in China*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009356732>
- Pellet-Rostaing, A., Bertrand, R., Boudin, A., Rauzy, S., & Blache, P. (2023). A multimodal approach for modelling engagement in conversation. *Frontiers in Computer Science*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2023.1062342>
- Peltonen, P. (2020). *Individual and interactional speech fluency in L2 English from a problem-solving perspective: A mixed-methods approach*. University of Turku.
- Raveendran, M., Silvestri, L., & Gulati, R. (2020). The role of interdependence in the micro-foundations of organization design: Task, goal, and knowledge interdependence. *Academy of Management Annals*. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0015>
- Roach, J. (2025). *Digital media as a tool of rhetorical amplification in historical performance*. TSpace.
- Robertson, C., Pröllochs, N., Schwarzenegger, K., Pärnamets, P., Van Bavel, J. J., & Feuerriegel, S. (2023). Negativity drives online news consumption. *Nature Human Behaviour*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01538-4>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Introduction to sequence organization. In *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis* (pp. 1–27). Cambridge University Press.
- Shahsavari, S., Holur, P., Wang, T., Tangherlini, T. R., & Roychowdhury, V. (2020). Conspiracy in the time of corona: Automatic detection of emerging COVID-19 conspiracy theories in social media and the news. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-52079/v1>
- Shorten, C., Khoshgoftaar, T. M., & Furht, B. (2021). Deep learning applications for COVID-19. *Journal of Big Data*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-020-00392-9>
- Sibii, R. (2021). “You can be a good Romanian, but not a Romanian”: A critical discourse analysis of the Romanian history textbook narrative. *ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst*. <https://doi.org/10.7275/14950126>

- Sikveland, R. O. (2011). *Co-ordination of speech and gesture in sequence and time: Phonetic and non-verbal detail in face-to-face interaction*. White Rose eTheses Online.
- Singhal, K., Azizi, S., Tu, T., et al. (2023). Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2>
- Tang, K. (2022). Material inquiry and transformation as prerequisite processes of scientific argumentation: Toward a social-material theory of argumentation. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21749>
- Tian, S., Sharma, A., Wu, L., & Pawar, K. (2024). A systematic literature review on the digital platform and its role in the circular economy: State-of-the-art and future research directions. *Journal of Digital Economy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdec.2024.12.001>
- Varney, S. (2020). *Watching sitcoms together: A discursive analysis*. Figshare. <https://doi.org/10.26174/thesis.lboro.12698495.v1>
- Wilson, R. A., & Land, M. K. (2021). *Hate speech on social media: Content moderation in context*. University of Connecticut.
- Yanyan, L. (2025). *Peer relationship work as an interactional accomplishment during group interaction in second language classrooms*. University of Warwick.
- Yeomans, M., Boland, F. K., Collins, H. K., Abi-Esber, N., & Brooks, A. W. (2023). A practical guide to conversation research: How to study what people say to each other. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459231183919>
- Yuerong, L., Meng, N., Xiaolu, Y., & Alam, S. S. (2024). Self-determination and perceived learning in online learning communities. *Scientific Reports*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-74878-4>
- Zaidan, E., Truby, J., Ibrahim, I. A., & Hoppe, T. (2025). Hybrid global governance for responsible and inclusive artificial intelligence: Proposing a new sustainable development goal 18. *Technology in Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.103159>