

## CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

### 4.1. Conclusion

This research is concerned with preference organization. This research is aimed to identify and classify second pair part as a response toward conversational sequences in *Caught in Providence* show episode one. The result of the research shows that both preferred and dispreferred responses proposed by Sacks (1984) are used in municipal courtroom of Rhode Island between the judge of the court and the defendants across 13 cases. Moreover, all features of dispreferred response such as mitigation, elaboration, default, and positioning are practiced during the conversation in the courtroom. The phenomenon occurs because the judge and the defendants accompany their responses with hedges and elaborated their responses with excuses and accounts when they form the responses that are not aligned with the first pair part of the sequences. Practices of positioning and default are also used when the produced responses are not aligned with the sequence.

On top of that, based on the second research question, it is found that the social solidarity is reflected through the responses of several types of sequences. The most recurring response among preferred response is agreement response toward question sequence with percentage of 14,5%. This shows that there is a significant preference toward agreement responses in question sequences. Furthermore, the most dominant response among dispreferred responses is admission responses toward accusation sequence with percentage of 19,4%. This reveals that admission is a dispreferred response in the accusation sequences. Therefore, throughout the analysis,

it is learned that social solidarity between the judge and the defendants during the trials in the courtroom is constantly perpetuated with the practices of mitigation, elaboration, default, and positioning in producing their responses in the sequences of conversation.

#### **4.2. Limitation**

This research is only focused on responses as the second pair part of a sequence. Thus, the transcription and its symbols are very limited to the essential elements that distinguish preferred and dispreferred response. Due to the time limit, some parts of the transcription still lack few signs such as speed up and intonation signs. The name of some defendants and places that are mentioned during the trials might be inaccurate as the researcher does not have access to their official data and violation record. In addition, some parts of the transcription cannot be transcribed as the researcher is not quite proficient in Spanish.

#### **4.3. Suggestion**

This research provides the first insight of preference organization in a municipal courtroom. Identifying other conversational features in conversation analysis such as repair or turn-taking in this object is expected. Further research of preference organization is inquisitively recommended especially in other institutionalized places such as senate meetings or parliament debates. This research only identifies and explains few of the many language phenomena. In spite of conversation being commonly perceived as mundane social activity, it is consistently practiced and organized in such a systematical way. More researchers are expected to conduct further research in the area of linguistic specifically conversation analysis.