

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter consists of two subchapters: the conclusion and the recommendation. The conclusion sums up the results of the analysis. The recommendation suggests some possible applications for future related research.

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the data analysis in Chapter IV, I provide three points to conclude the discussion as follows:

1. Regarding the types of adjacency pairs, there are nine types of pairs found in the data. I found eight out of eleven types proposed by Paltridge (2000) and one additional type out of the proposal yet discussed by Yule (1996); thanking-acknowledgment. In the analysis, I found a total amount of 102 pairs that are divided into 37 question-answer pairs (36%), 24 warning-acknowledgment pairs (23%), 18 assessment-agreement pairs (18%), 6 offer-acceptance (6%), 4 requesting-agreement (4%), 4 greeting-greeting pairs (4%), 2 compliment-acceptance (2%), 2 leave taking pairs (2%), and 5 thanking-acknowledgment pairs (5%). Therefore, question-answer pairs become the most frequently appearing adjacency pairs, while leave-taking and compliment-acceptance are the least appearing ones. Besides, I found 97 preferred responses (95%) and 5 dispreferred responses (5%) in terms of the second pair parts of the adjacency pairs making the preference organizations primarily preferred. Furthermore, settings affect the variety of AP types that appear during the talk and what type generally dominates the total occurrence such as interview-based sources that have less varied AP types compared to staff-guests conversations. Also, context influences who initiates the pair. For instance, request-agreement pairs in staff-guest conversations taken from a real-life event and a show have different initiators. Staff initiates the pairs in the show, while guest tend to initiate them in real life.

2. Related to the communicative functions, I found four out of six functions proposed by Schifffrin (2006) are conveyed by the adjacency pairs in the analysis, namely referential function, phatic function, emotive function, and conative function. The adjacency pairs carry 267 communicative functions that consist of 113 referential functions (42%), 94 phatic functions (35%), 39 conative functions (15%), and 21 emotive functions (8%). Thus, the referential functions and phatic functions are found to be carried more than the conative functions and emotive functions .

3. In terms of the relationship between adjacency pair types and the communicative functions, target factors of the functions have a significant influence on the possibility of the functions being carried out in specific types of adjacency pairs. According to the findings, I conclude that referential and phatic functions are embedded in more types of AP compared to emotive and conative functions. It is because content and context become the focus of utterances in almost every part of the conversation, so almost all types of adjacency pairs distributed at the beginning, middle, and end of the talk can carry referential and phatic functions. Meanwhile, target factors addressee and addresser tend to be found only in the middle part of the conversation. Thus, the emotive and the conative functions are less carried compared to the other two functions. Moreover, certain types of AP may have the same amount of functions carried in them, but they are different in terms of category. For instance, both offer-acceptance and leave-taking pairs carry three different categories of function, yet offer-acceptance pairs convey referential, phatic, and conative functions, whereas leave-taking pairs carry referential, phatic, and emotive functions. Furthermore, even within the same type of AP, some pairs may carry various distinct combinations of functions such as question-answer pairs that carry only phatic functions, referential-phatic functions, referential-phatic-emotive functions, referential-phatic-conative functions, or even all the four found functions. Besides, one category of function may have several different placements in pairs; first pair part,

second pair parts, or both. In addition, different types of AP may carry the same functions in terms of both number and category. For example, requesting-agreement and offer-acceptance pairs carry referential-phatic-conative functions.

5.2 Recommendation

Based on the results and conclusions of the data analysis, the following suggestions are made to improve future research in the related field.

1. The current research focuses on the adjacency pairs and their preference organizations, whereas there are still some other phenomena that can be analyzed in conversations. Using the same approach (conversation analysis), I suggest future researchers explore other areas in conversations such as feedback, repair, conversational openings and closings, discourse markers, and response tokens. By analyzing different areas, hopefully it can contribute to enhancing and expanding the scope of the study.
2. Regarding the research object, this research studies conversations on a reality show. Therefore, to vary the data source, an exploration toward different discourse genre is needed. Recently, digitally sourced conversations like podcasts are becoming more popular and easily accessible. Besides, the shorter version of it, such as street interviews done by content creators nowadays, has also become more common. Those conversation sources not only offer varied current topics that are appealing for research, but also provide a distinct pattern in the talk that may lead to the newness of the findings. Hence, the use of these variations of data sources may escalate future research.
3. Lastly, I hope this research can give readers a better understanding of patterns that may exist in conversations as well as the communicative functions that they carry. By that, the readers hopefully can be more conscious conversing with others and become better interlocutors by reading how the conversation flows. In other words, I hope the result of

this research can be a preference to be considered by everyone, especially those whose work is to serve people, e.g., hospitality staff, or to lead conversations like hosts in order to give a proper run of the talks.

