CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In everyday conversation, sometimes someone makes a mistake. This can be in the form of an error in choosing words, an error in mentioning a person's name, place or time, or even forgetting the name of the person, place or time he wants to talk about, as in the following example.

Extract 1 – An example of repair phenomenon from Schegloff (1977, p.364)

B: → He had dis uh Mistuh W– whatever k– I can't
think of his first name, Watts on, the one thet wrote // that piece,
A: → Dan Watts.

In the example above, the speaker made the mistake of forgetting the name of the person he wanted to talk about in the conversation. This made him stammer in conveying his point. Mistakes like this one can interrupt or even stop a conversation. For that, it is necessary to fix it. The correction of this error is called repair by linguists. The repair can be done by the speaker himself or the other person in the conversation. This phenomenon has been studied by linguists for decades.

Moreover, repair is an interesting language phenomenon to discuss as it often occurs in people's daily interactions. Therefore, the most ideal way to analyze the repair phenomenon is through spontaneous conversation, where the conversation just happens without a script or being planned beforehand. Besides the daily conversations, Another object that can be used for repair investigations is TV Shows. This is because conversations in TV shows occur spontaneously. What distinguishes it from everyday conversation is only that it is aired on television.

In that case, *Caught in Providence* TV Show is chosen as the object of this research. The reason is because this show is unscripted and really presents the atmosphere of a trial in a real courtroom. The importance of choosing this data source is that the repair phenomenon often occurs in courtroom conversations. It is because every word spoken by the defendants is important, so they often felt nervous or burdened when speaking in front of the judge, which made them often

make mistakes in the conversations. The errors will trigger the defendants to spontaneously correct their mistakes or be corrected by the judge. In connection with that, the purpose of this research is to make an identification of the repair phenomenon in American court of law as shown in the *Caught in Providence* TV show.

Repair phenomena in the courtroom are very important to be investigated. This is because of the mistakes of the trial participants, both the judge and the defendant and the reasons why they made the mistake and how they made the repairs can be identified. Furthermore, the linguistic study used to examine the phenomenon of conversation repair in the courtroom is a discourse analysis study with a conversational analysis approach because this research involves oral texts.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

This section describes the theories used in conducting this research. These theories include the basic concepts of conversation analysis, its historical background, its connection with linguistics, its basic principles, and its scopes including the repair strategies.

1.2.1 Conversation Analysis

Repair phenomena are usually studied in the field of Conversation Analysis (Henceforth CA). CA is a method of analyzing oral discourse that examines how humans organize their everyday conversations. (Paltridge, 2012, p. 90). It means that CA examines any action or reaction that occurs as a result of a conversation between people. CA pays attention to detail in activities that occur naturally and analyzes conversation as a systematic and organized phenomenon (Sack, 1992). As a result, it is possible to analyse the phenomenon of repair in a conversation, which is the topic of discussion in this study, using a Conversation Analysis approach. Furthermore, CA deals with issues of social order and how social context creates language (Schegloff, 1985, p. 28). Thus, in short, it can be said that Conversation Analysis is the study of people talking together.

1.2.1.1 Historical Background of Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (hereinafter referred to as CA) was developed in the 1960's in California by graduate students of the Sociology Department. They are Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. They combined the theory of their lecturer, Erving Goffman, called 'the interaction order' with influences from other branches of social science such as linguistics, anthropology, and psychiatry (Have, 2007, p. 5).

Initially, CA arose as a result of Harold Garfinkel's invention of a theory known as ‘ethnomethodology’ (Seedhouse, 2005, p. 251). It is a sociology theory that investigates how humans keep their daily activities orderly and routine. This phenomenon develops in the human brain as they participate in society. Eventually, this theory coincided with Sacks' interest in everyday conversation. Sacks was a member of the Center of Scientific Study of Suicide in LA where he found a collection of recorded phone calls to a suicide prevention center. Those recordings inspired Sacks to develop this theory (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 5). Sacks transcribed the audio recordings in order to analyze the data. The transcription was not as precise as it is now, and it was extremely simple. It was Gail Jefferson who created the transcription symbols used for CA (Psathas, 1994, p. 12). His creation was later adopted as the standard transcription symbols for CA.

1.2.1.2 CA and Linguistics: What is the Connection?

Paltridge (2012) defined CA as a subset of discourse analysis, which is a linguistic approach. He stated that discourse analysis examines language patterns in relation to their social and cultural contexts (p. 1). He explained that CA is one of the sub-fields of discourse analysis that pays attention to spoken language and the aim of this study is to comprehend and to discover the linguistic phenomena that exist in everyday conversation (Paltridge, 2012, p. 90). He added that the everyday conversation is chosen as the subject of CA since the data is natural.

On the other hand, linguistics is the study of language as a science. It investigates the linguistic phenomena that occur in the human environment. This study focuses on grammatical issues in language. Wooffitt (2005, p. 19) stated that Noam Chomsky (1965) distinguishes two aspects of linguistics, those are: linguistic 'competence' and linguistic 'performance'. He explained that Linguistic competence refers to a person's ability to produce a language with proper grammar, whereas linguistic performance is how they use their grammar competence in communication (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 19).

Nevertheless, Wooffitt (2005, p. 19) stated that Sack argued that linguistics focuses more on linguistic competence as it discusses grammatical sentence or syntactic sentence structures, and Sack (1992) recognized that the statement contradicted the CA. As a result, rather than linguistic competence, CA employs the concept of linguistic performance to determine the sequence of everyday conversation (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 19). This is due to the fact that linguistic performance can identify the action that affects the sentence. It can be seen in social phenomena such as turn-taking, overlap, repair, and many others that occur during conversation. As a result, in order to analyze spoken discourse, CA adopts the feature of linguistic performance rather than linguistic competence. This is shown in the following examples.

Extract 2 – The examples of linguistic performance from Wooffitt (2005, p.20)

'I don't think they grow a I don' think they grow a culture to do a biopsy.'
'The school school book store doesn't carry anything anymore.'
'She teaches she teaches a course at City College in needlecrafts.'

According to the example above, the sentence structure is incorrect when viewed through the lens of linguistic competence as stated by Chomsky (1965). However, the repetition is not a grammatical error. This action occurs when someone else speaks at the same time as the speaker and overlaps his/her own speech. As a result, the speaker must repeat his/her own sentence. This situation can only be seen through linguistic performance.

1.2.1.3 Basic Principles of Conversation Analysis

According to Psathas (1995), there are seven assumptions or basic principles in CA:

a. Order is a produced orderliness. Order in a conversation is always structural, beginning with the opening and ending with the closing. In other words, the organization of a conversation that someone begins cannot immediately jump into a specific sequence. The conversation begins with an opening to begin the conversation. There is turn-taking in order to ensure that both speakers have an equal opportunity to speak. Following that, speakers develop a topic that the other speakers in the conversation can understand. In consequence, it generates the adjacency pair, and so on.
b. Order is generated, established, and occasioned. The participants in a conversation create the order. The order is also influenced by the actions of the participants. It means they have complete control over the order. For example, if someone perceives an error in his or her utterance, they will initiate a repair. This also demonstrates that order requires humans to carry it out.
c. The order of a conversation is not predetermined. It means that conversational order comes naturally. People cannot anticipate the number of specific orders that exist in conversation. In other words, people cannot predict where they will overlap or repair in the future. As an example, consider greeting someone. When people meet for the first time, they are naturally led to the first adjacency pair in conversation, which is greeting and introducing themselves. As a result, order cannot be arranged.
d. Order is recurrent and repeatable. It means that the orderliness pattern can be found in any conversation. Order in conversation can also be used multiple times without restriction.

e. Analysts are responsible for everything related to the discovery, description, and analysis of order in conversation.
f. Issues concerning the frequency of specific orderliness in conversation should be separated from the activity of discovering, describing, and analyzing. This means that the number of orders in the conversation should not be specified. As stated in the preceding principle, order can be used repeatedly and without restriction.
g. The sequence structure of a conversation can be formally analyzed in terms such as structural, logical, consistent, and so on. It means that any method can be used to analyze the sequence, whether structural, organizational, logical, or otherwise, as long as it is done in a formal manner.

1.2.1.4 Adjacency Pairs

Conversations are built by many turns that form paired utterances. These paired utterances are called adjacency pairs. An adjacency pair is a situation in which two consecutive speakers converse with each other (Drew, 2005, p. 89). In other words, adjacency pairs are pairs of utterances that are related to each other in a conversation. Adjacency pairs are made up of two turns spoken by different participants in a conversation where the turns are next to each other, sequenced then classified into different pairs. They can be found in greetings, question–answer, thanking and leave-taking. It is in one or each of these adjacency pairs that the repair phenomenon can be found.

There are five fundamental principles of adjacency pairs, according to Schegloff (2007, p. 13). They are as follows:

a. Adjacency pairs are two-turn forms that make up the entirety of a sequence. To create a complete sequence, the forms must be related to each other and understandable to both speakers.
b. Adjacency pair is performed by different speakers. In order to perform a 'two turn' in conversation, adjacent pairs must have at least two speakers.

c. Adjacency pairs are always placed in the correct order, which means that the pair of two turns of conversation is always next to each other.
d. These two turns are always in the correct order. As stated in previous rules, the first speaker is identified as *First Pair Parts* (FPP), and the second speaker is identified as *Second Pair Parts* (SPP). The first pair parts are frequently occurred in conversation in the form of a question, invitation, offer, and so on. The second pair of parts are responses to the actions in the form of answer, accept, refuse, agree/disagree, and so on.
e. The pair-type should be related. It means that the adjacency pairs offered by FPP to SPP should be on pair, such as greeting-greeting, question-answer, offer-accept/decline, and so on. It means that if the first speaker asks a question, the interlocutors must answer it; if the first speaker greets his/her interlocutors, they must return the greeting; and if the first speaker invites the interlocutors, they must respond whether they accept or decline the invitation. As an example of adjacency pairs, consider the following:

Extract 3 – An example of adjacency pairs from Schegloff (2007, p.22)

1		ring
2	Marsha:	Hello:?
3	Tony:	Hi: Marsha?
4	Marsha:	Ye:ah.
5	Tony:	How are you.
6	Marsha:	Fi::ne.
7		(0.2)
8	Mar:	Did Joey get home yet?
9	Ton:	Well I wz wondering when 'e left.

According to the preceding example, there are three adjacency pairs in that conversation. Lines two and three show the first pair. This pair begins with Marsha in line two as the first pair after she says "Hello:?" This pair ends when Tony in line three responds to Marsha's "Hello:?" with "Hi:". Tony in line three has a second pair part (SPP) position, but only until "Hi:". The

second pair can be found in lines three through six. In contrast to the first pair, Tony in the second pair is FPP, while Marsha is SPP. The reason for this is that he introduces a new topic by inquiring about Marsha's health. Tony begins the second pair in "Marsha?".

1.2.1.5 Turn-taking

In spoken interaction, CA also discusses how people manage their speaking and consider giving turns to another speaker (Psathas, 1994, p. 34). According to Psathas (1994, p. 34), every conversation consists of several *Turn Construction Unit* (TCU). It refers to a unit in a conversation that may consist of an entire turn. The space between one TCU and another in a conversation known as the *Transition Relevance Place* (TRP). This is where the current speaker is given the opportunity to be able to continue his turn with another TCU, or the turn can be switched to a different speaker. Psathas (1994, p. 34) also added that the process of managing turns in a conversation is called turn-taking. In other words, turn-taking is a type of conversation organization where the speakers talk one by one in turns. As a consequence, a trouble source may appear between one of these turns and be repaired by the first speaker or the interlocutor. He also stated that it is impossible for someone to speak continuously during a conversation. He also added that there are various ways to signal the end of someone's turn, such as falling intonation followed by a pause, giving a signal such as '*huh*' or *'anyway*,' making eye contact, body gestures, or asking a question.

According to Psathas (1994), there are two techniques that speakers in a conversation typically use to make a sequence happen: (i) the current speaker chooses who will talk next, or (ii) he/she chooses to do an action known as *self-selection* in order to begin the next turn (p. 37). There are a few rules that organize the turn-taking sequence, according to Wooffitt (2005):

1) a. If the *turn-so-far* occurs when the first speaker chooses or selects the next speaker, the person chosen by the first speaker has the authority to speak in the next turn.

b. If the *turn-so-far* occurs when the first speaker does not do "current speaker selects next," or in other words, does not indicate who will get the next turn, the other speakers may initiate to obtain the next turn, provided that whoever starts first has the power to speak first.

c. If the *turn-so-far* appears when the first speaker does not designate someone who will speak in the following turn, the current speaker can continue speaking, or someone else may do 'self-selection' to get the turn.

2) The rules 1(a)-(c) are repeatable. This means that these can be used in the next transition as long as they are in the appropriate position.

In conversation, these rules are always present. These rules do not take effect unless the speakers themselves order them to. According to the statements above, the first speaker choosing the next speaker for the next turn has a higher priority than the next speaker choosing himself/herself for the next turn. The rule (a) is easily found in everyday conversation. This action is determined by calling out the interlocutor's name as a signal from the first speaker to take the next turn. As a result, this is the fundamental rule in turn-taking sequence. Rule (a) is shown by the following example:

Extract 4 – An example of the rule (a) in turn-taking from Wooffitt (2005, p.28)

```
1 S: Oscar, did you work for somebody before you worked
     for Zappa?
2 O: Yeh, many many. (3.0) Canned Heat for a year.
```

It can be seen from the example above that Salma asks a question about Oscar's past employment before joining Zappa's team. Salma's action by calling Oscar's name in the first turn is basically a signal to give the turn to Oscar. As a result, Oscar is given the opportunity to respond to Salma's question in the next turn.

The rule (b) applies when the first speaker does not choose or direct the next turn to a specific addressee. As a result, other speakers may choose themselves as the next speaker. This usually occurs when the first speaker makes an expression or an announcement. This rule is illustrated by the following example:

Extract 5 – An example of the rule (b) in turn-taking from Psathas (1994, p.35)

1 Fern: Well they're not comin',
2 Lana: Who.
3 Fern: Uh Pam, unless they c'n find somebody.

As demonstrated in the preceding example, Fern's first sentence does not indicate that she will take the next turn. She even makes an ambiguous announcement. Therefore, Lana does *self-select* in order to have her turn.

The situation under rule (c) is when the first speaker does not direct the next turn to the interlocutor. Rule (c) differs from rule (b) in that there is a pause in the speaker in rule (c). After that, the speaker may, but is not required, to continue speaking. However, if the second speaker has *self-selected*, the speaker gains an opportunity on the next turn, and the first speaker must disregard his/her turn. Here is an example of rule (c):

Extract 6 – An example of the rule (c) of turn-taking from Wooffitt (2005, p.28)

Ava: He, he 'n Jo were like on the outs, yih know?
(0.7)
Ava: So uh,
Bee: [They always are

As seen in the preceding example, there is a pause after Ava's first turn because the next speaker does not take his turn. As a result, Ava takes the initiative to continue her turn by doing so. Nonetheless, Bee begins to speak at the same time as Ava continues her turn, forcing Ava to give the turn to Bee.

1.2.1.6 Sequence Organization

According to Schegloff (2007), the concept of sequence organization stems from the idea that conversing is a type of activity related to society. He stated that in every social activity, it takes more than one person to carry it out. This can be seen from the function of the TCU in conversation which is an opportunity for speakers to take action through their words. Schegloff (2007) divided sequence organization into two types, which are *pre-sequences* and *insertion sequences*.

a. Pre-sequences

A pre-sequence is a type of sequence that takes place when some initial action is performed before starting the first part of an adjacency pair. In fact, that initial action creates another adjacency pair. For example, before asking for something, it is often a good idea to see if someone else has what one is looking for. This is demonstrated in the following example:

Extract 7 – An example of pre-sequence from Schegloff (1992, p.1321)

Marty:	Loes, do you have a calendar,
Loes:	Yeah ((reaches for her desk calendar))
Marty:	Do you have one that hangs on the wall?
Loes:	Oh, you want one.
Marty:	Yeah

From the example above, it can be seen that Marty's first turn shows a pre-request by asking if Loes has a calendar. This is understandable as leading to a request such as "can I have one?". It could be said to check on the availability of the requested item. Loes clearly anticipates this and makes an offer before the request is made. Turns 1 and 2 are a question-answer adjacency pair prepared for a request-approval/ request-rejection pair starting at the third turn.

b. Insertion Sequences

Before responding with the SPP, there is a possibility that the interlocutor might want to take some initial action. The interlocutor will ask for clarification after the FPP before the SPP. This is known as an insertion sequence. This is shown in the following example:

Extract 8 – An example of insertion sequence from Sidnell (2010, p. 103)

(13) KIDS_11_24_05(2of2)T7.mov @11:33

01	Ann:	Maybe Rebecca, maybe you can move it,
02	Rebecca: →	°Move what.°
03	Ann:	Move that thing that('s in the lock)/(yo- in the door).
04	Rebecca:	Okay.

In the example above, turns 1 and 4 form one adjacency pair, and turns 2 and 3 form a second adjacency pair that is inserted between the two turns of the initial adjacency pair. The sequence inserted within the base sequence is clearly preparatory to what Ann is suggesting, in the sense that Rebecca needs to know what "it" refers to in order to follow that suggestion.

1.2.1.7 Overlap

Overlap refers to a phenomenon in which one speaker talks at the same time with the other speaker in a conversation. This type of activity is referred to as "more than one at a time" by Schegloff (2000, p. 7). Overlapping is a sequence that occurs naturally in the human daily life. It usually occurs when the first speaker pauses too long or makes an error, causing the second speaker to overlap his or her interlocutors in order to speak or to repair the first speaker's previous utterance. The overlap phenomenon is shown by the following example:

Extract 9 – An example of overlap phenomenon from Jefferson (1986, p.157)

→ Jean : So well they won't be here Boxing [Day?
→ Doreen : [Oh ↓well that doesn'mattuh

In this example, the overlap that occurs in the conversation above is the result of the continuation of the turn of the first speaker that is not noticed by the next speaker so that the second speaker starts his turn before the possible completion of the first speaker's turn. As has shown in the example, Doreen as the second speaker does overlap when Jean as the first speaker has not finished her utterance yet. This phenomenon happened because Doreen had understood what Jean meant before she finished speaking.

1.2.1.8 Repair

Repair is an organized collection of procedures that enable participants in a conversation to cope and try to solve problems related to speaking, listening, and comprehending (Sidnell, 2010, p. 110). Emanuel Schegloff, Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks stated that the repair strategy is more than just a technique of changing/substituting the wrong word with the right one (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 363). They asserted that repair is a conversational phenomenon that has a broader nature than just the replacement of errors. Therefore, they use the term *repair* instead of *correction* to indicate the whole phenomenon related to the problem in the conversation as well as to emphasize the broad scope of repair as a conversational phenomenon. Besides that, they also use the term *trouble source* to refer to things in conversation that need reparation (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 363).

At first, Schegloff et al. (1977) differentiated *self* and *other*, i.e. the speaker and the interlocutor in the conversation. Then, they also differentiated repair initiation and repair completion. A repair operation always starts with an initiation followed by a solution. These two components are used to determine the type of repair. Thus, the primary actions in conversational

repair are *self-initiation, other-initiation, self-repair,* and *other-repair*. The combination from these major elements produces four types of repairs.

A. Types of Repairs

Schegloff et al., (1977) divide the type of repair into four types: *self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, other-initiated other-repair,* and *self-initiated other-repair*.

a. Self-initiated Self-repair

Self-initiated self-repair is a type of repair when the one who indicates the problem in the conversation and the one who solves the problem is the speaker of the trouble source (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 364). In this type of repair, the *trouble source* maker realizes that he has made a mistake and then corrects the error by producing the correct one. It is shown in the following example:

Extract 10 – An example of self-initiated self-repair from Schegloff (1977, p.363)

Ken: → **Sure enough ten minutes later the bell r--**
→ **the doorbell rang …**

As can be seen from the preceding example, Ken, the *trouble source* maker, made an error with the word *the bell r-*, then he repaired the trouble source into *the doorbell rang*. In this example, Ken as the *trouble source* maker had taken the initiative to fix his incorrect speech without anyone else's hint. He cut off his utterance to indicate a repair initiation. Then, he initiated a repair and completed the repair at the same time by substituting the trouble source *the bell r-* with the actual word that he wanted to say, *the doorbell rang.* This example is in accordance with Kitzinger's statement (in Sidnell & Stivers, 2012, p. 230), which says that in self-initiated self-repair, to deal with something he says that seems to have an error, the *trouble source* speaker stops his utterance.

b. Self-initiated Other-repair

Self-initiated other-repair is a type of repair phenomenon when the speaker is aware of the existence of a trouble source in the first turn, but someone else fixes it in the next turn (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 364). This type of repair can occur when someone is in the middle of a conversation and forgets to mention something. It can appear as forgetting people's names, forgetting the name of a place, or forgetting the time. Therefore, it can be concluded that in self-initiated other-repair, the person who indicates and initiates to repair the error in the conversation is the error-maker, while the person who solves the problem is the interlocutor. It is shown in the following example:

Extract 11 – An example of self-initiated other-repair from Schegloff (1977, p.364)

B: → He had dis uh Mistuh W- whatever k- I can't think of his first name, Watts on, the one thet wrote // that piece,
A: → Dan Watts.

In the example above, there are two participants involved in a conversation, namely, A and B. B indicates that He spelled someone's first name incorrectly because he forgot who it was in, "*Mistuh w- whatever k- I can't think of his first name,*". After that, B took the initiative to correct his mistake as stated by, "*Watts on, the one that wrote that piece*". This statement is an indirect signal for A to help B finish what he is saying by finding the right reference for what he means. Then, A replied with "*Dan Watts,*" which was a repair of B's trouble source.

c. Other-initiated Self-repair

In this repair type, people often use question words like *what, who, where,* or *when* to get answers from the interlocutor (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 363). Bolden (2011) gives a definition to other-initiated self-

repair as a type of repair that occurs when another person in conversation initiates a repair and gives the trouble source speaker an opportunity to provide a repair completion (Kitzinger in Sidnell & Stivers, 2012, p. 249). In other words, the person who gives clues and the person who provides the solution are not the same person (Kitzinger in Sidnell & Stivers, 2012, p. 231). It can be seen in the following example:

Extract 12 – An example of other-initiated self-repair from Schegloff (1977, p.367)

B: Oh Sibbie's sistuh hadda ba:by bo:way.
A: → Who?
B: Sibbie's sister.

As shown in the preceding example, A tells B that Sibbie's sister had a baby boy. However, B did not hear or did not catch the name that A mentioned. So, B initiates the repair by asking "*Who?*" for A to do the repair. Then A answered question B with the answer "*Sibbie's sister*". In sum, in other-initiated self-repair, another person in the conversation points out the trouble source, which then the trouble source maker solves the error himself.

d. Other-initiated Other-repair

Other-initiated other-repair is a type of repair in which the interlocutor is the one who both indicates and resolves the trouble source in the conversation. (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 365). In short, in this type of repair, the first speaker produces the error, and then the other person in the conversation notices it and fixes it without thinking that the first speaker will resolve the error. As demonstrated in the following example:

Extract 13 – An example of other-initiated other-repair from Schegloff (1977, p.365)

B: Where didju play ba:sk//etbaw.
A: (The) gy:m.
B: In the gy:m?
A: Yea:h. Like grou(h)p therapy. Yuh know=
B: = [Oh:::.
A: [half the group thet we had la:s' term wz there en we jus' playing arou:nd.
B: → Uh- fooling around.
A: Eh- yeah ... [TG:3]

In the preceding example, there is a conversation between two people. The first speaker is B and her interlocutor is A. A becomes the trouble source speaker in this conversation when he uses the phrase '*playing around*'. The phrase was considered wrong by B because the B thinks that the correct phrase should be '*fooling around*'. B indicated this error by saying '*uh-*' and corrected it in his turn.

B. Positions of Repair

Repair positions or repair sequences are certain positions of repair when people make errors in conversation. These repair positions interact with repair initiation to such an extent that each one is customized to allow a certain speaker to initiate the repair. Therefore, *Self-initiation* and *other-initiation* are arranged in accordance with their consecutive sequence. These two types of initiation are positioned to such an extent that *self-initiation* possibilities come first, followed by *other-initiation* possibilities. Schegloff et al., (1977) divides repair positions into five types: *same turn*, *transition space*, *second position*, and *third position.*

a. The Same Turn Repair

Same turn repair position is a repair that occurs in the same turn as the trouble source (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 366). In this position, the speaker utilizes non-lexical perturbations in speech, such as cut-offs, sound stretches, items like *uh* and *uhm*, and pauses. For Example:

Extract 14 – An example of the same turn repair from Schegloff (1977, p.363)

Ken:	**→ Sure enough ten minutes later the bell r–**
	→ the doorbell rang …

As shown in the preceding example, Ken interrupts his utterance of *the bell r-* and replaces it with *the doorbell rang*. In this example, the cut-off function is to delay the ongoing trouble source production. In this case, Ken retreats to his turn to fix the problematic part.

b. The Transition Space Repair

Transition space repair is the repair that occurs on the turn transition and is still performed by the current speaker (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 366). After the turn containing the trouble source is completed, self-repair can be performed in the transition space. To put it another way, it is not impossible for a speaker to begin the repair after the turn has completed its work. For example:

Extract 15 – An example of the transition space repair from Schegloff (1977, p.366)

L:	An' 'en bud all of the doors 'n things were taped up=
L:	→ =I mean y'know they put up y'know that kinda paper 'r stuff,
L:	→ the brown paper.

As shown in the preceding example, it can be seen that L has completed his first turn. However, L realized that there was an item that needed to be repaired in his turn to make what he said clearer. L's attempt to clarify his meaning can be seen from the '=' sign in his turn which indicates that he switched quickly from the first and second turns which were both spoken by him. Therefore, he adds '*the brown paper*' in the transition space before the second speaker starts his turn.

c. The Second Position Repair

A repair that occurs in the second turn after the first speaker finishes their turn is known as a second position repair (Schegloff, 1977, p. 367). Second position repair is initiated by the recipient of the trouble source, the interlocutor of the previous speaker, in the second position . For example:

Extract 16 – An example of the second position repair from Schegloff (1977, p.364)

B: → He had dis uh Mistuh W- whatever k- I can't
think of his first name, Watts on, the one thet wrote // that piece,
A: → Dan Watts.

It can be seen from the example above, in the first turn, B tries to recall the first name of a known person named Watts. Watts' first name, according to B, is '*Mistuh'*. A, on the other hand, knew Watts' first name was Dan. As a result, in the second turn of the conversation, A corrected B by telling him that Watts' first name was Dan.

d. The Third Position Repair

A repair position in the third positioned turn is known as a third position repair (Schegloff, 1977, p. 366). The third position repair can be carried out after the response of the interlocutor in the previous turn, allowing the possibility of fixing problems in understanding the first turn indicated by the response of the interlocutor to it in the second turn. For example:

Extract 17 – An example of the third position repair from Schegloff (1977, p.366)

Annie: Which one::s are closed, an which ones are open.
Zebrach: Most of 'em. This, this, // this, this ((pointing))
Annie: → I 'on't mean on the shelters, I mean on the roads.
Zebrach: Oh:.

As shown in the preceding example, there is a conversation between Annie and Zebrach. In the first turn, Annie asked a question which Zebrach answered in the next turn. The answer in this second turn illustrates how Zebrach interprets Annie's question and she does not show any comprehension problems. In the third turn, Annie realized that Zebrach had misunderstood her question on the first turn. Therefore, the second turn was considered as a trouble source and Annie gave it a repair in the third turn.

C. Patterns of Repair

Conversation repair has piqued the interest of some researchers. Zhang (1998) is enthused about Mandarin Chinese conversation. That study was carried out in order to determine the pattern of repair completion. To classify the pattern of repair operation, Zhang (1998) used the terms *trajectory and outcome* in his dissertation *Repair in Chinese Conversation*. In addition, he proposed four repair completion patterns: *replacement, modification, abandonment,* and *reorganization*.

a. Replacement

By performing repair, the replacement function replaces the incorrect word of the original utterance with another word that is correct.(Zhang, 1998, pp. 69-70). The syntactic structure of the original speech is preserved in this pattern. For example:

Extract 18 – An example of replacement from Zhang (1998, p.74)

```
1 Shen: → uh, the other one is: : : a Lin: : a friend in the
2         audience named Lin he said: ...
```

In the preceding example, Shen in line 1 is attempting to pronounce Lin's full name. However, Shen appears to be having

difficulty producing it. It is because Shen does not remember Lin's full name. As a result, Shen makes a repair to replace ‘Lin’ with a different reference term as ‘a friend in the audience named Lin’.

b. Modification

The modification function is used to improve the accuracy of the speech by modifying it by inserting additional elements into the speech that need to be repaired. (Zhang, 1998, p. 81). For example:

Extract 19 – An example of modification from Zhang (1998, p.81)

```
1 Liu: → ... security check is to pass all the lug- big
2          luggage through that conveyor, and small
3          luggage is all secu- will be checked by the
4          security guards,...
```

In the example above, Liu explains the luggage security check. However, Liu makes an error in line 1 by saying "security check is to pass all the lug-". The problem arises when Liu interrupts himself before completing the word "luggage." Liu is about to inform everyone that all big luggage must be checked through the conveyor. As a result, Liu continues to make repairs by substituting "big" for the word "luggage" in lines 1–2 to make the information more clear.

c. Abandonment

The abandonment function of repair is used to completely abandon the phrase and then resume the speech with a new sentence that has no relation to the previous utterance (Zhang, 1998, p. 86). This kind of pattern leaves the previous utterance to be meaningless. For example:

Extract 20 – An example of abandonment from Zhang (1998, p.86)

```
1 Chen:    you didn't dare to go down for a dive did you
2 Cong: →  How could I dare, I just learned for a few- just
3          the year before last year. I was away last year
           wasn't I.
```

As shown in the preceding example, in line 2, Cong, the person who completes the repair, abandons the unfinished utterance "I just learned for a few-" and begins a completely new utterance "just the year before last year" which is completely different from the former utterance.

d. Reorganization

The reorganization function rearranges a sentence-in-progress by performing self-repair into a new sentence that contains the same discussion as the previous sentence (Zhang, 1998, pp. 89-90). The sentence in progress is interrupted and starts a new sentence by reorganizing the same material and using them into a new structure. For example:

Extract 21 – An example of reorganization from Zhang (1998, p.90)

```
1 Shen:    its telephone number can you tell us
2 Qin:     ah tele(h)phone(h) I (h) can't remem[ber I-
3 You:     [tell you what
4 Qin:     [I because I'm] at work place =
5 You:     [uh::]
6 Qin:     = [making this call
7 Shen:    [oh:
8 You:     oh oh oh
9 Qin: →   uh, my home = the telephone number is left at
10         home
```

Line 9 indicates the function. Shen, Qin, and You are discussing Qin's phone number in this conversation. However, he cannot recall the number because he is still at work. He wants to say in line nine that the phone number is on his house. Nonetheless, for

the first time, he fails to say this to Shen and You. After that, he repairs and reorganizes the sentence without changing its original meaning.

1.3 Review of Previous Studies

In recent decades, linguists have developed a long-standing attention in the analysis of repair phenomena. Some studies of the repair phenomenon have been conducted by English Department students as well as researchers. They differ in terms of data source and research objective. Five of them were reviewed in this section.

Rheisa's (2014) thesis entitled "A Conversation Analysis of Repair in the Oprah Winfrey Show: A Special Episode with Michael Jackson." was the first scientific study that aided in the development of this research. The objective of this research is to identify the repair types and patterns of that talk show. This research uses repair theory based on the book by Liddicoat (2007) to analyze data from Oprah Winfrey's show. The findings of this study include the discovery of the various types of repairs that exist in the talk show.

Rheisa's research introduces various types of repair phenomena that are used in this recent study as one of the theories. However, there are some shortcomings in this study. The fundamental error in data collection and analysis in this study is the selection of the method used in analyzing conversations. Rheisa’s study uses a method that is not suitable for analyzing Conversational Analysis. Instead of using ELAN Software to transcribe videos, this study uses a manual method of transcribing data so that the accuracy of the transcription produced is doubtful. Moreover, this study's data were not generated using transcription symbols. This is a significant infirmity of this thesis in analyzing the CA phenomenon. In fact, transcription symbols must be used to explain conversational analysis data so that the reader can understand it properly. Furthermore, the transcription results are not included on the appendix pages. Thus, the research lack point is that it does not provide transcription symbols based on the data analyzed.

Hidayah (2015) wrote an article titled "An Analysis of Repair on Utterances in the Conversation of the Magic of Belle Isle Movie Manuscript" that supports this

research. The goal of this study is to discover the different types and functions of repair that occur in the subject of this research. The author of this article uses *The Magic of Belle Isle* movie as a data source and analyzes it using Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks' repair theory (1977). According to the findings of this research, there were four types of repair found in the movie. Furthermore, Hidayah's research discovered seven functions that occur in the object of his study.

However, Hidayah's research still has a drawback. The problem is on the research's data object. This study chose film as the object of research. In fact, the naturalness of the data is required for CA. The conversation in the film, on the other hand, is not natural because it is scripted. As a result, the object of data from Hidayah's research is fundamentally opposed to the nature of CA.

The third research that contributes to this study is Baity's (2019) thesis titled "Conversation Repair in Selected Episodes of British Late-Night Show: Graham Norton Show." The goal of this study is to discover the type, pattern, and most repair positions in the object of study. The author of this thesis uses data from the Graham Norton Show to apply the repair theory developed by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) in Liddicoat (2007). According to the findings of this study, there are four types of repairs found in the show. Furthermore, Baity's research discovered that the majority of repair positions in the show were located on the same turn as the source of the problem. He also discovered eight repair patterns used in the talk show.

This study's data presentation is considered inadequate. Some of the research data does not come with a full CA transcription. In fact, as this is a conversation analysis, the research should include a CA transcription consisting of adjacency pairs rather than focusing on a specific part where the problem occurs. As a result, the reader may be unable to understand the context of the conversation. Furthermore, the data in this study are not generated using transcription symbols. In fact, transcription symbols play an important role in CA.

Zhang's (1998) dissertation titled "Repair in Chinese Conversation" is the fourth research that makes a significant contribution to this research. The study's objective is to investigate the organization of repair through Interactional

conversation in Chinese, with an emphasis on describing repair-related daily interactions among Chinese speakers. Zhang gathers the data from thirteen hours of recorded phone calls to radio shows, two and a half hours of face-to-face conversations, and a couple of phone calls among friends. To conduct the research, Zhang uses repair theory by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). According to the result of this research, the repair's organization in Chinese conversation is generally comparable to the repair's organization in English conversation in the technical aspects of initiation and completion of repairs, positions, and trajectories or patterns.

Zhang's research describes various patterns of repair phenomena. This study also includes data translation from Chinese to English. This study does, however, has a deficiency. The inadequacy of transcription symbols is the source of the trouble. In fact, only a few transcription symbols are used in this study to explain the CA data. As a result, the intonation and expression in the conversation are not well recognized by the readers.

Okoye's (2019) article "Other-Initiated Other-Repair: Repair Organization While Playing a Place-Based Augmented-Reality Game" is the fifth research that contributes to this study. The purpose of this article is to identify the repair organization of other-initiated other-repair. Okeye used the theory of repair developed by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) to analyse data from four groups of three people playing ChronoOps, a location-based augmented reality game. Okoye's research discovered a three-step sequence that occurs in other-initiated other-repair. They are the source of the problem in produced, other-initiated other-repair occurs in the following transition (typically, in a single word), and post-expansion occurs.

Okoye's research was useful in understanding other-initiated other-repair. According to Okoye, there are no pauses in other-repair. It means that if the current speaker causes a problem on his or her turn, the second speaker initiates and completes the repair immediately and without pause. After the trouble source appears in the previous turn, the interlocutor repairs immediately in the next turn. Nonetheless, there is a flaw in this article. The limitations of this article include the

fact that it was a small case study of 12 people, and as a result, the phenomenon discovered by Okoye is not generalizable. Following research would benefit from analyzing a larger number of groups and controlling for proficiency in those groups.

An article written by Romaniuk and Ehrlich (2013) entitled "On the Interactional Import of Self-Repair in the Courtroom" is the sixth research that makes a significant contribution to the current research. The purpose of this study was to determine the function of self-initiated, same-turn repair, also known as interactional import of self-repair. The information in this article was obtained from a courtroom during an American rape trial. According to the findings of this article, they were able to identify three functions of self-repair in the courtroom. The first function is to present a preferred version of what happened. This is typically used for someone who wishes to appear innocent in court (usually the defendant). The second function is to limit claims' epistemic status. It means that someone limits their knowledge of the original events by performing self-repair. The final one is conforming to constraints on questioning. It means that when asked a question, someone does self-repair to avoid leading rather than interrogating.

The authors were able to demonstrate in this article that self-repair can be used as an interactional import, particularly in the courtroom. In other words, depending on the person performing the self-repair, the self-repair may give other intentions. This study provides the author with a new perspective on analyzing repair sequences. This article's data was presented immaculately. The data was also accompanied by an easy-to-understand explanation. However, this article still has a shortcoming. The readers have no idea whether the assumptions are correct or not. Readers may expect the person performing self-repair to make a genuine error in delivering the events, or they may do so on purpose to cover the actual events.

Kurniawan's (2021) thesis titled "Repair Sequence in the TV Shows Caught in Providence Season 3 Episode 1" is the last research that contributes to this study. The goal of this study is to discover the types, sequences, as well as functions of repair used by courtroom speakers. This thesis is based on data from *Caught in Providence* TV Show season 3, episode 1. The author employs Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks theory in his research (1977). According to the findings of this study, the

speakers in this episode of *Caught in Providence* TV Show use 17 repairs with the following details: Self-initiated self-repair is the most common type of repair employed by the show's speakers, the same turn as the trouble source position is the most frequently used repair sequence, and abandonment is the most commonly used repair function.

However, Kurniawan's research has a shortage. It only discusses one episode of the TV show. Therefore, a comparison is required to learn more about the different types, positions, and patterns of repair that are commonly used in the courtroom. It is because facts cannot be inferred from a single sample. As a result, more research on other episodes of the Caught in Providence television show is required to compare and conclude this matter.

The studies mentioned above are related to the topic of this research since they also discuss the repair phenomenon. Previous research provided some information and contributions to advance the reader's understanding of the repair phenomenon. However, this study differs from previous studies in some ways. In contrast to Rheisa's research, data in this study are collected through recording and transcription by means of specific transcription convention. In contrast to Hidayah's study, which took a film as the object of her research, this research took a recording of a trial in a courtroom. To be better than Baity's and Zhang's research, this research uses symbols and transcription conventions that are more complete and detailed. This study investigates the types, positions, and patterns of the various repair phenomena of the research. Despite the fact that the object of Kurniawan's research (2021) is similar to this study in that both investigate the repair phenomenon in the same television show, the episodes and seasons discussed are definitely different. Therefore, it can be compared with the episode that has been discussed in the previous study. Thus, this is what distinguishes this research from previous studies.

1.4 Research questions

The purpose of this study is to establish a better knowledge of the repair phenomenon through CA. Therefore, the following questions are addressed in this study:

1. What types of repairs are there in *Caught in Providence TV Show Season 001 Episode 014*?
2. What repair positions are found in *Caught in Providence TV Show Season 001 Episode 014*?
3. What are the repair patterns employed by the participants in *Caught in Providence TV Show Season 001 Episode 014*?

1.5 Objectives of the Research

1. To find out the types of repairs contained in *Caught in Providence TV Show Season 001 Episode 014*.
2. To locate any repair positions found in *Caught in Providence TV Show Season 001 Episode 014*.
3. To identify the repair patterns used by the defendants in *Caught in Providence TV Show Season 001 Episode 014*.

1.6 Scope of the Research

This study is based on the conversation analysis field and focuses on the repair phenomenon. This research is focused on finding and identifying each type, position and function of repair in one episode of Caught in Providence TV Show titled *Caught in Providence: Season 001 Episode 014*. The data is all conversations from each case in the episode. Therefore, this research data is limited by focusing only on investigating the repair phenomenon in conversation based on the type, position, and pattern of repair.