CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

This research concludes a Conversation Analysis (CA) of turn-taking mechanisms in 911 murderer confession calls from the *True 911 Calls* YouTube channel, using Stenstrom's (2014) theory. The conclusion addresses the research questions as follows.

1. The findings in this research reveal that speakers in the selected 911 murderer confession call—taken from the *True 911 Calls* YouTube channel—employ various turn-taking strategies outlined in Stenstrom's (2014) framework: taking the turn, holding the turn, and yielding the turn. The most frequently used strategy is taking the turn, followed by yielding the turn, and then holding the turn. Both callers and dispatchers actively manage the conversation using techniques such as uptakes, prompting strategies, filled pauses, and lexical repetition. Each strategy serves different functions—some help initiate or maintain turns, while others facilitate smooth transitions or encourage responses. These findings highlight the dynamic nature of turn-taking in emergency calls, showing how it adapts to the pressure and urgency of the context.

2. Through the CA approach, this research identifies a distinct use of turn-taking strategies that aligns with Stenstrom's (2014) framework. Among these, uptakes and prompting strategies emerge as the two most dominant. Uptakes (31.71%) play a crucial role in maintaining conversational flow

and providing emotional reassurance. Prompting strategies (22.52%) guide the interaction toward obtaining essential information. Other frequently used strategies include filled pauses (13.25%) and lexical repetitions (10.73%), which help sustain turn-taking and prevent conversational breakdowns. Notably, strategies such as meta-comments are absent, and clean starts (0.08%) are rarely seen—indicating that in high-stakes, emotionally intense situations like emergency calls, the focus tends to be on clarity, control, and efficiency, rather than on reflective or polite forms of speech.

5.2 Suggestion

Given that this research used Stenstrom's (2014) framework—primarily suited for everyday conversation—future researches should consider theories more applicable for institutional and emotionally intense settings, such as Clayman and Heritage's (2010) model of institutional talk, which highlights asymmetry and goal orientation in interaction. Researchers are also encouraged to explore how emotional expression and turn-taking vary across cultures by analyzing English-language conversations involving multicultural speakers (e.g., Korean, Indian, or Middle Eastern), to better understand cross-cultural influences on communication in high-stakes contexts. This would enhance both theoretical refinement in Conversation Analysis (CA) and practical insights into intercultural dynamics in institutional interactions.