

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

This chapter describes the conclusion of this research. It includes conclusion, limitation of this research, and suggestion for future research related to repair phenomena.

4.1 Conclusion

This study focuses on the repair phenomenon in *Caught in Providence Season 001 Episode 014*. The speakers employ four types of repairs when producing a repair. Self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair are the four types of repairs. The results show that self-initiated self-repair is the most frequently type of repair used by speakers when repairing their errors. Following that, there is other-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and self-initiated other-repair.

When performing a repair, the speakers create four positions: the same turn repair, the transition space repair, the second position repair, and the third position repair. The most frequent repair position used is the same turn repair. It corresponds with the discovery of the most often used type of repair, self-initiated self-repair as the most frequently used type of repair in the conversations. When the speaker performs a repair in the same turn where the trouble source exists, this is referred to as the same turn repair. As a result, the speaker will perform self-initiated self-repair to correct the error. It is followed by second position repair, third position repair, and transition space repair.

The speakers generate four repair patterns. There are: replacement, modification, abandonment, and re-organization. The most frequent pattern of repair discovered in this study is abandonment. The defendant is the most likely to employ this pattern. The reason for this is that the defendant has a tendency to make mistakes when attempting to defend himself/herself. As a result, the defendant abandons the original utterance in favor of a more credible reason or argument. It

is followed by modification, reorganization and replacement. It can be seen that the importance of the repair used based on the results of the analysis of the courtroom conversation taken from the video is to provide correct, appropriate, or clearer answers to the judge's questions or accusations.

4.2 Limitation

The source of this study's interference is the object of this research. The courtroom serves as the research object in this research. Conversations in the courtroom are usually carried out by two people (the judge and the defendant). As a result, courtroom conversations are likely to result in a specific type, sequence, and pattern of repair. In consequence, there is little variation in the types of repair phenomena that can be found in the courtroom. The reason for this is that the defendant is usually the one who makes repairs in the courtroom. When attempting to defend himself/herself, the defendant frequently made mistakes. As a result, the defendants primarily use self-initiated self-repair to correct their mistakes. Furthermore, because the judge occupies a higher position in the courtroom than the defendant, the speaker's position has an effect on repair activities. As a result, when compared to self-initiated self-repair, all other types of repairs are insignificant.

4.3 Suggestion for Future Research

This research strongly recommends that future research should be more focus on specific repair orientations. It could be self-initiated or other-initiated repair. This will result in a thorough examination of the specific type of repair. Furthermore, further researches can select other objects to be analysed. It can take the form of daily conversations in a less formal setting, such as interactions between market participants in traditional markets, conversations with friends, or interactions with partners, and so on. It is because the setting of those conversations allows for a more natural conversation.