IDEAS
Journal on Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

Volume 14, Number 1, June 2026
pp. 2010 - 2022

Issued by English study program of UIN Palopo

Repair Strategies in Conversation between Father and Child in The Spilt Milk Podcast

Rifaa Ghassani Rahman[1], Pepen Priyawan[2], Erfan M. Fauzi[3]
[1,2,3]English Literature, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung

Article Info

Received: 2026-04-27
Revised: 2026-05-03
Accepted:2026-05-16

Keywords:
Conversation analysis,
Repair strategies,
Podcast,
The Spilt milk podcast

DOI:
10.24256/ideas. v14i1. 10336

Corresponding Author:
Rifaa Ghassani Rahman
rifaaghassanir@gmail.com
English Literature Department, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung

Abstract

This research investigates the use of repair between father and child in the Spilt Milk Podcast. It classifies the types of repair strategies used by the father and the child in their conversation. Utilizing Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks's (1977) theory of repair organization, a qualitative method was applied. The data were collected through purposive sampling from a total of 178 episodes, which were grouped into three phases based on broadcast order: the early phase (Episodes 1-59), the middle phase (Episodes 60-119), and the final phase (Episodes 120-178). Five episodes were taken from each phase, resulting in Fifteen episodes analyzed in total. From a total of 43 data points found, the analysis focused on the most representative data points with characteristics specific to each type of repair. The most frequently used repair was Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR), followed equally by Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR) and Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR), while the least frequent was Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR). The findings suggest that OIOR was predominantly used by the father as a mechanism for supporting the child's language development through correction, reformulation, and vocabulary provision in naturally occurring daily interactions.

1. Introduction

Podcasts have emerged as one of the most widely consumed digital media platforms, offering an informal yet naturalistic setting that captures spontaneous and authentic conversation. Different from programmed media such as news broadcasts or scripted programs, podcasts capture spontaneous conversations that are not bound by institutional structures, making them a rich source of data for conversation analysis. In this context, Conversation Analysis (CA) finds its relevance as an approach that examines

how participants collaboratively organize interactions through mechanisms such as turn-taking and speech repair. Among the most compelling interactional contexts for CA inquiry is parent-child conversation, where the inherent asymmetry in linguistic competence between participants naturally gives rise to frequent repair practices.

The context of conversation between a father and a child is one of the richest sources for repair analysis. Children still in the language development stage tend to produce various forms of speech errors, such as mispronounced words, conceptual errors, and limited vocabulary. In these interactions, the father, as the dominant speaker, often acts as both the initiator and the implementer of repair, in order to maintain conversational coherence while facilitating the child's language development. Therefore, father-child conversations are not only linguistically relevant but also reflect the practices of socialization and the transmission of values that occur in everyday life.

This study used data from the YouTube channel "Spilt Milk Podcast," which features natural conversations between Andrew Blumer and his three-year-old son, Lincoln. Based on Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks' (1977) theory of repair organization, this study aims to answer two research questions: (1) What types of repair strategies are used in the conversations between father and son in the Spilt Milk Podcast? (2) How does the father implement each type of repair in their conversations?

Previous studies have shown varied patterns depending on the context of the interaction. Hendar and Banafsaj (2024) found that SISR dominated with 81% in the Zendaya and Andrew Garfield talk show, while OIOR appeared only once (3%). Fadilah (2022), who analyzed conversations in YouTube videos, also found SISR to be the most frequent type, with OIOR appearing only four times. Both studies reflect the characteristics of interactions between speakers with relatively equal language competence, where participants tend to correct their own speech without relying on the other speaker's initiation.

A different pattern appeared in the context of asymmetric interaction. Hikmah (2022) found that OISR was the dominant type and appeared 62 times in formal talk shows, with OIOR appearing only eight times. Novitasari and Imperiani (2019) found similar results in EFL classroom interactions at the elementary school level, where OISR dominated at 37.1%, while OIOR appeared 16 times, or 25.8%. Both studies indicate that in asymmetrical contexts, the higher-competence partner is indeed more active as the initiator of repair, yet the execution of repair remains the responsibility of the target speaker.

Although these studies have made significant contributions, there remains an unanswered gap: there are yet to be any studies that specifically examine repair strategies in natural conversations between fathers and children in a podcast format. This contextual difference is analytically significant, as family interactions are intimate, spontaneous, and not institutionally structured, resulting in repair patterns that differ from those found in formal interactions or conversations between adult speakers. This study aims to fill that gap, while also providing a deeper understanding of the role parents take in supporting children's language development through natural daily interactions.

2. Method

This study uses a qualitative approach to examine repair strategies in conversations between fathers and children in the Spilt Milk podcast. The data in this study is sourced from the Spilt Milk Podcast, a YouTube channel that features natural conversations between a father named Andrew Blumer and his three-year-old son, Lincoln. This channel was chosen because it presents family interactions that are spontaneous, sequential, and publicly accessible, thus fulfilling the criteria of naturally occurring conversation data in the framework of Conversation Analysis.

Data collection was carried out using purposive sampling, which is the deliberate selection of data based on its relevance and ability to provide rich information in accordance with the research objectives. From 178 available episodes, the data was divided into three development phases: the early phase (Episodes 1–60), the middle phase (Episodes 61–119), and the final phase (Episodes 120–178). This classification was based on the child's language development perspective, considering Lincoln's significant growth in linguistic competence throughout the podcast. Five episodes were selected from each phase. This number is considered sufficient to capture repeating patterns of interaction within each developmental period, while remaining limited enough to avoid data redundancy caused by repeated topics and similar interaction patterns. The total number of episodes analyzed is 15.

From these 15 episodes, all utterance sequences containing a trouble source and a repair response were comprehensively identified, resulting in 43 repairs. From these 43, the most representative data were selected based on the representation of repair types and patterns, instead of quantity. The priority was given to data that clearly reflect the structural characteristics of each repair type and illustrate variations in interaction patterns that are analytically meaningful.

Data analysis was conducted in two stages in accordance with the two research questions of the study. To answer the first research question, each utterance in the data was identified and classified into four types of repairs based on Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks' (1977) theory of repair organization. The classification was carried out by considering who initiated and who carried out the repair: Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR) occurred when the speaker identified and repaired a problem in their own utterance without encouragement from the interlocutor; Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR) occurred when the interlocutor pointed out a problem, thereby encouraging the initial speaker to make a repair; Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR) occurred when the speaker pointed out a problem in their own utterance, but the repair was carried out by the interlocutor; and Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR) occurs when the interlocutor both initiates and implements the repair.

Meanwhile, to answer the second research question, the analysis was deepened by examining the sequential position of repair in the turn-taking structure, namely by looking at whether repair occurred within the same speaker's turn, at the turn transition, or across turns, so that it could be revealed how the father interactionally implemented each type of repair in his conversation with his child.

3. Result

The analysis across 15 episodes of the Spilt Milk Podcast found 43 repair instances, which cover all four types according to the framework proposed by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). The main finding of this study is the dominance of Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR) with 38 occurrences, or 88.4% of the total data, making it the most characteristic repair strategy in father and child conversations.

Table 1. Types of Repair Strategies

Types of Repairs	Frequently	Percentage
OIOR	38	88.4%
SISR	2	4.7%
OISR	2	4.7%
SIOR	1	2.3%
Total	43	100%

Repair types

The dominance of OIOR reflects the asymmetrical interaction between father and child, as the father, being the higher language-competent partner, consistently serves as both the initiator and the performer of repair. This pattern remains stable across all phases, although its frequency decreases from the early phase (18) to the final phase (8), indicating the child's development of linguistic competence over time.

SISR occurs twice in the early phase and once in the final phase, and takes place when the child notices a mistake in their own speech without any prompting from the father.

Data 1

Dad : "I'm going to teach you how to become a millionaire"
Dad : "Does that sound interesting at all? How does it sound?"
Child : "Um, it sounds great. Actually, it sounds bad."

This data demonstrates Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR) performed spontaneously by the child during his own turn of speech. The conversation begins with the father stating his plan to teach the child how to become a millionaire, followed by questions that function as FPPs: "Does that sound interesting at all? How does it sound?" which invites a response from the child as an SPP. The child then responds with "Um, it sounds great," but immediately realizes that this statement does not reflect what he actually wants to say.

Without any encouragement or initiation from the father, the child immediately repairs his own utterance in the same turn by adding "Actually, it sounds bad." The use of the word "actually" here serves as a repair marker, indicating that the child consciously revised his assessment. This pattern is a characteristic feature of SISR, in which the trouble source and repair are resolved completely in one turn without involving other participants. The appearance of SISR in this early phase is interesting because it shows that even though the child is only three years old, he already has the basic ability to monitor and revise his own utterances spontaneously in interactions.

Data 2

Child : "But i think we're just living in. Hey mom - hey dad"
Dad : "Did you just call me mom?"
Child : "yeah"

This data demonstrates the most common occurrence of Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR) in this study. The trouble appeared when the child accidentally said "Hey mom" in the middle of his utterance, which was a slip of the tongue when the child mistakenly called his father. However, before his turn to speak was over and without any encouragement from his father, the child immediately realized his mistake and spontaneously corrected it in the same turn by saying "hey dad".

This repair pattern occurred entirely within the child's turn, where the trouble source and its resolution were handled by the child without any involvement from the father. This is the main characteristic of SISR that distinguishes it from other types of repair. The father's response, "Did you just call me mom?", is not part of the repair mechanism, but rather the father's reaction to confirm the slip of the tongue that the child had already corrected on their own. The emergence of SISR in this final phase is interesting because it shows the child's increasing linguistic awareness, where the child is able to detect and correct their own mistakes spontaneously without relying on the father's initiation.

OISR was also found twice in the early phase, when the father pointed out problems in the child's speech through questions or challenges, encouraging the child to correct his own speech.

Data 3

Child : "So my robot says we just eat food in Jupiter"
Dad : "What kind of food?"
Child : "umm our food"
Dad : "What do we have to eat?"
Child : "Like all this our snacks and healthy food and our book and our toys"
Dad : "We eat our books and toys?"
Child : "No. No. No"
Dad : "What are we gonna eat?
Child : "We're going to eat our food and we're going play with all our toys and read all our books."

This data demonstrates the occurrence of Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR) that takes place in several turns of speech sequentially. The trouble source arises when the child mentions "our book and our toys" as part of the list of food to bring to Jupiter, which is logically an inappropriate utterance because books and toys are not food. However, the child does not seem to realize that there is a problem with his utterance, so he does not make a spontaneous correction.

The father then took on the role of repair initiator by challenging the child's utterance with the rhetorical question "We eat our books and toys?", which served as a signal that there was a trouble source in the child's utterance that needed to be repaired. Responding to this initiation, the child said "No. No. No," indicating that the child was aware of the error but was not yet able to complete the repair in that turn. Seeing this, the

father initiated the repair a second time by asking a more explicit question, "What are we gonna eat?", to encourage the child to correct his utterance more completely and accurately.

Finally, on the next turn, after two attempts by the father, the child successfully completed the repair on his own with a more structured and appropriate utterance, namely, "We're going to eat our food and we're going to play with all our toys and read all our books." This pattern of reparation that took place over several turns is a characteristic feature of complex OISR, in which the father acts as a persistent initiator while the child acts as the executor of the reparation, needing several prompts before being able to complete the reparation thoroughly.

Data 4

Dad : "have you ever spilled milk before"
Child : "I drink spill milk"
Dad : "you drink spilt milk like off the ground"
Child : "in the cup"
Dad : "oh in a cup okay"

This data demonstrates Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR) occurring briefly but showing a clear repair mechanism. The trouble source arises when the child says "I drink spill milk," an ambiguous utterance because it does not provide sufficient context about how the child consumed the spilled milk. The child does not realize that his statement has the potential to cause misunderstanding, so he does not spontaneously make a correction.

The father then took on the role of repair initiator by offering an interpretation of the child's utterance through "You drink spilt milk like off the ground?". The father's utterance served a dual purpose: first, as a signal that there was a trouble source that needed to be clarified, and second, as a candidate understanding that implicitly encouraged the child to confirm or correct the interpretation. This type of repair initiation strategy in the framework of Conversation Analysis is known as candidate understanding, where the interlocutor offers their own interpretation to elicit clarification from the original speaker.

Responding to the father's initiation, the child immediately made a brief and precise repair by saying "In the cup," clarifying that the milk in question was drunk from a cup, not from the floor. The repair was completed entirely by the child in one brief turn, and the father confirmed his new understanding with "Oh in a cup, okay." Compared to OISR Data 2, which required two initiations before the repair was complete, this data shows that OISR can proceed more efficiently when the initiation strategy used by the father is specific enough to directly guide the child toward the correct repair.

In contrast, SIOR only appeared once in the final phase, when the child himself pointed out difficulties in his speech, as shown by his confusion in choosing words, and the father then completed the correction.

Data 5

Child : "Then some um that um yummy stuff that we put on your yummy but that yummy powder stuff."
Dad : "Powder stuff?"
Child : "No, that yummy powder. "

Dad : "Cocoa. Are you talking about whipped cream?"
Child : "No. Okay. Okay. What's this say? Whipped cream. Then whipped cream on the top then."

This data demonstrates the occurrence of Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR) triggered by the child's limited vocabulary. Trouble sources appear when the child has difficulty finding the right words to refer to the material in question, as reflected in the repeated use of the phrases "um that um yummy stuff" and "yummy powder stuff." The repetition and hesitation in the child's speech is a form of indirect repair initiation, where the child implicitly indicates that there is a problem in their own speech in the form of an inability to find the right word.

Responding to this signal, the father takes on the role of executor of repair by offering two candidate words in sequence, namely "Cocoa" and "Are you talking about whipped cream?". The father's strategy here differs from other types of repair; instead of initiating, the father immediately attempts to resolve the vocabulary problem indicated by the child by offering possible word choices. After declining the first candidate, the child finally confirms the correct word through "Okay. Okay. What's this say? Whipped cream," indicating that the child found the word they were looking for with the father's help.

The limited occurrence of SIOR in this study, only once out of a total of 43 data points, was understandable based on the language development characteristics of three-year-old children. At this age, children generally do not yet have sufficient metalinguistic awareness to consistently recognize and identify the limitations of their own vocabulary. In most cases, when children experience language difficulties, fathers are the first to detect the source of the trouble and immediately take over the repair process, so the interaction more often ends in OIOR. SIOR only emerged in very specific conditions, when the child explicitly showed confusion through verbal signals such as repetition, pauses, and the use of substitute phrases such as "yummy stuff," which indirectly invited the father to complete the repair.

Repair triggers

From 38 cases of OIOR, the two most common triggers were misunderstandings and mispronunciation. A misunderstanding occurs when a child gives a response that is factually or conceptually inaccurate. In this case, the father immediately provides the correct information or explanation without waiting for the child to realize their mistake.

Data 6

Dad : "Is space cold or hot?"
Child : "It's super super hot. Super hot."
Dad : "Yeah, it's actually really cold unless you're near the sun and the sun is really hot."

Data 6 demonstrates an instance of Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR) triggered by the child's factual misunderstanding. The conversation begins with the father asking a question about the temperature of space in his turn: "Is space cold or hot?". This question served as the First Pair Part (FPP), expecting a response from the child as the Second Pair Part (SPP). The child then responded by saying that outer space is very hot: "It's super super hot. Super hot," which is factually incorrect.

In the next turn, the father identified the trouble source in the child's utterance, namely the misunderstanding about the temperature of space. Instead of waiting for the child to realize and correct his mistake himself, the father immediately initiates and completes the repair in the same turn by providing the correct information: "Yeah, it's actually really cold unless you're near the sun, and the sun is really hot." This pattern shows that the repair does not occur across a long turn, but is completed immediately by the father as soon as the trouble source is identified.

This data demonstrates how fathers rephrase their corrections. Fathers do not correct directly, but rather begin their remarks with "Yeah" before introducing the correction with "it's actually really cold." This strategy serves to save face for the child while ensuring that the correct information is conveyed effectively in the conversation.

Data 7

Child : "The moon is off."
Dad : "The moon is off?"
Child : "No, the moon is off."
Dad : "What? Oh, the moon is Earth.
Child : "Yeah"
Dad : "The moon isn't Earth. We're on Earth."

This data demonstrates the occurrence of OIOR triggered by multiple misunderstandings, where two trouble sources appear sequentially in a single conversation. The first trouble source appears when the child says "The moon is off," a statement whose meaning is unclear. The father initiates the first repair by repeating the child's utterance in the form of a confirmatory question, "The moon is off?", which serves as a signal that the child's utterance contains a problem that needs to be clarified. However, instead of correcting his utterance, the child repeats the same statement, "No, the moon is off," indicating that the child feels that his utterance is correct even though its meaning remains unclear.

The father then tried to interpret the child's meaning by offering a candidate understanding, "Oh, the moon is Earth," which was immediately confirmed by the child with "Yeah." This is where the second trouble source is identified: the child has a factual misunderstanding that the moon and the Earth are the same object. Without waiting for the child to realize his mistake, the father immediately initiates and completes the repair by providing a firm but straightforward correction: "The moon isn't Earth. We're on Earth."

From this data, we find that the repair pattern occurs gradually in two levels. At the first level, the father attempts to understand the child's meaning through candidate interpretations, but instead discovers a more fundamental trouble source, specifically a conceptual misunderstanding about the moon and Earth. At the second level, the father immediately takes over and completes the repair completely. This pattern shows that in father-child conversations, the process of identifying the trouble source is not always immediate and complete in one turn, but can develop dynamically as the conversation progresses.

Meanwhile, mispronunciation happens when a child says a word with incorrect pronunciation, either because of limited articulation skills or because the child isn't familiar with the correct pronunciation. This is different from misunderstanding, which is

related to gaps in knowledge and conceptual understanding. Mispronunciation is directly related to the child's phonological abilities, which are still developing. In this pattern, the father acts as both the initiator and executor of repair by repeating the correct word directly, either through simple repetition or through more explicit pronunciation practice.

Data 8

Child : "Here's some rafaoli"
Dad : "Rafaoli? Ravioli."

This data demonstrates the existence of OIOR triggered by mispronunciation in its most concise and direct form. The trouble source appears when the child pronounces the word "rafaoli" instead of "ravioli," which is a mispronunciation due to the child's limited phonological ability to reproduce the correct sequence of sounds. The child does not realize that his pronunciation is incorrect, so he does not spontaneously correct it.

The father immediately identified the mispronunciation and completed the repair in a very concise turn of speech by first repeating the child's pronunciation "Rafaoli," then immediately providing the correct pronunciation "Ravioli." The repair strategy used by the father here is known as recasting, which is repeating the child's incorrect utterance and immediately replacing it with the correct form without providing additional explanations or comments. This type of recasting pattern is an efficient strategy in the context of natural conversation because it does not significantly interrupt the flow of conversation, but still conveys the correction clearly to the child.

Data 9

Child : "Yeah, I'm going to get I'm going to dig all the way to Shina. But how can we get to Shaina?"
Dad : "Before we even worry about getting to China, did you call 811?"

This data demonstrates the occurrence of OIOR caused by the mispronunciation of the word "China," as pronounced by the child as "Shaina." The trouble source appears to be the child's inability to pronounce the consonant sound /tʃ/ in the word "China," which is then substituted with the sound /ʃ/, resulting in the pronunciation "Shaina." Interestingly, the child repeated the same mispronunciation twice in one turn of speech, indicating that the child was completely unaware of the phonological error in his utterance.

The repair strategy used by the father in this data differs from the previous mispronunciation data. Instead of explicitly correcting the child's pronunciation as in the case of "rafaoli→ravioli," the father chose to implicitly embed the correct pronunciation in his own utterance by naturally using the word 'China' in the sentence "Before we even worry about getting to China, did you call 811?". In this way, the father completed the repair without directly highlighting the child's mistake, keeping the conversation flowing naturally without being interrupted by an explicit correction process.

Data 10

Dad : "Can you say the word think again?"
Child : "Sink."
Dad : "You're saying like what's in a bathroom? A sink. Say think."

This data demonstrates the existence of OIOR triggered by the mispronunciation of the word “think” as ‘sink’ by the child. The source of the trouble stems from the child's inability to pronounce the consonant /θ/ in the word “think,” which is one of the most difficult sounds in English and is generally only mastered at a more advanced stage of phonological development. The child substitutes the /θ/ sound with the /s/ sound, resulting in the pronunciation “sink,” which happens to be a real word in English with a completely different meaning.

The father does not immediately correct the child's pronunciation, but first exploits the homonym resulting from the mispronunciation by saying “You're saying like what's in a bathroom? A sink”. This strategy serves a dual purpose: first, as a way for the father to show the child that the word he uttered has a different meaning from what he intended, and second, as an effort to help the child understand the difference between two sounds that are phonologically very similar but produce different meanings. After providing this context, the father then explicitly asks the child to pronounce the word correctly through “Say think.”

Developmental Findings

A comparison of repair frequency across phases reveals a consistent pattern of decrease: the early phase recorded 21 instances, the middle phase 12, and the final phase 10. This decline generally indicates that Lincoln's linguistic competence continued to develop throughout the podcast, resulting in fewer communication disruptions requiring repair.

Middle phase

Dad : “Can you say it again?”
Child : “Plano”
Dad : “Can you say chocolate piano animal?”
Child : “Socolate, plano, aminal.”

Final phase

Dad : “Say chocolate, piano, animal”
Child : “Chocolate, plano, aminal”
Dad : “You still kind of say chocolate like scolate”

The most concrete evidence of this development is found in Lincoln's pronunciation of the word "chocolate." In the middle phase, when the father asked Lincoln to say the sequence "chocolate, piano, animal," Lincoln responded with "socolate, plano, aminal", all three words mispronounced. In the final phase, the father repeated the same request as a kind of developmental check. This time, Lincoln successfully pronounced "chocolate" correctly, although "piano" and "animal" were still produced as "plano" and "aminal." Notably, even after Lincoln pronounced "chocolate" correctly, the father still commented, "You still kind of say chocolate like scolate," indicating that he actively monitored the child's phonological progress even when the repair was nearly successful.

4. Discussion

Repair Dominance

The main finding of this study was dominated by OIOR of 88.4%. These findings reflect the structural characteristics of father-child interactions, which are linguistically asymmetrical. Within the CA framework, interactional asymmetry occurs when one participant possesses significantly higher competence or access to knowledge compared to the other participant (Heritage, 1984). In this context, the father, as an adult interlocutor, acts not only as a conversation partner but also as an expert authority who actively detects and resolves communication disruptions without waiting for the child to initiate.

This pattern differs significantly from previous studies in the context of interactions between adult speakers, with SISR tending to dominate because both participants possess relatively equal linguistic competence (Hendar & Banafsaj, 2024; Fadilah, 2022). The dominance of OIOR in this study is not merely an interactional preference, but a direct result of the language competence gap between the father and his three-year-old child.

Developmental Impact

In addition to its function as a mechanism for maintaining conversational coherence, the consistent use of OIOR patterns in this study reveals a deeper dimension: repair as a form of linguistic scaffolding. The concept of scaffolding in language acquisition refers to the support provided by a more competent speaker to help a developing speaker go beyond their current abilities (Halliday, 1978). In the analyzed interactions, the father consistently provided correct linguistic forms, whether through recasting, reformulation, or lexical corrected, at the moment the child needed them within the natural flow of conversation, consistent with the argument that responsive and contextual feedback is an optimal condition for children's language acquisition (Liddicoat, 2007).

The most concrete evidence of the impact of this scaffolding is shown in Lincoln's phonological development across phases. The decrease in repair frequency from the early to the final phase, as well as Lincoln's successful correct pronunciation of "chocolate" in the final phase after consistently struggling in the middle phase, indicates that repeated exposure to repairs contributes to the internalization of correct linguistic forms. However, this development is not linear; "piano" and "animal" are still pronounced incorrectly in the final phase, indicating that children's phonological competence is selective and depends on the level of difficulty of articulating each word.

Interactional Pattern

This study also reveals consistent interactional patterns in turn-taking structure. Fathers consistently wait for the Transition Relevance Point (TRP) before taking a turn to perform a repair, even when the source of the trouble has been identified before the child finishes speaking. Within the framework of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), respect for the TRP is a fundamental principle of turn-taking organization that ensures the flow of interaction. However, in the context of this study, the father's adherence to TRP has implications that extend beyond mere conversational organization; by allowing his child to finish speaking, the father implicitly creates a safe and supportive communicative space where the child is free to express themselves without pressure. This pattern represents a

form of interactional scaffolding that operates not only at the linguistic level but also at the level of the child's communicative self-confidence.

This study offers two main contributions. Theoretically, these findings open a space for dialogue between CA and language acquisition theory by demonstrating that repair mechanisms in intimate and spontaneous family conversations produce patterns that are distinct from those in formal contexts. Methodologically, this study demonstrates the relevance of podcasts as a valid source of natural conversation data in CA research, while also offering a developmentally-based approach as a model for longitudinal analysis in conversation research.

5. Conclusion

This study found that all four types of repair, Self-Initiated Self-Repair (SISR), Other-Initiated Self-Repair (OISR), Self-Initiated Other-Repair (SIOR), and Other-Initiated Other-Repair (OIOR), appeared in conversations between fathers and children on the Spilt Milk Podcast, with OIOR being the most frequent. This dominance reflects an asymmetrical interactive relationship, in which the father, as the partner with higher language competence, takes an active role in identifying and correcting communication disruptions. The repairs performed are primarily related to two main patterns: misunderstanding and mispronunciation, indicating that repairs not only serve to maintain the flow of conversation but also function as a form of scaffolding in the child's language development. Furthermore, the findings also reveal that children's phonological development is progressive and non-linear. However, the results of this study are limited to a single data source with a relatively small sample size, therefore, generalizing the findings requires careful consideration.

Suggestion

Given these limitations, future research is recommended to utilize broader and more diverse data, both in terms of the number of participants and the contexts of interaction, to ensure the results are more representative. Additionally, comparative studies of parent-child interactions in different contexts, such as between fathers and mothers or in formal versus informal situations, could provide deeper insights into variations in repair strategies. Future research is also encouraged to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives, such as psycholinguistics, to further examine the relationship between repair and children's cognitive and language development, including the long-term impact of exposure to repair strategies on children's linguistic abilities.

6. References

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Cutting, J. (2008). Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students. Routledge

Fadilah, S. (2022, September 13). A conversation analysis of repair on James Charles YouTube video. Digital Library UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. https://digilib.uinsgd.ac.id/56564/

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. Edward Arnold.

Hendar, & Banafsaj, A. H. (2024, December 27). Conversation analysis on repair in Zendaya and Andrew Garfield's talk show in YouTube platform. Atlantis Press. https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/icmssh-24/126007135

Heritage, J. (1984). Garfinkel and ethnomethodology. Polity Press.

Hikmah, M. (2022). Repair analysis of conversation uttered by the guests and the host in The Late Late Show with James Corden [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya]. http://digilib.uinsa.ac.id/55439/2/Maftuhatul%20Hikmah_A73215058.pdf

Horn, L. R., & Ward, G. (Eds.). (2004). The handbook of pragmatics. Blackwell Publishing.

Jefferson, G. (1986). Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset. Human Studies, 9(2–3), 153–183.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). An introduction to conversation analysis. Continuum.

Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An introduction (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Sacks, H. (1992). Lectures on Conversation. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. In Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction. New York: Academic Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis (pp. 57–101). Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The Relevance of Repair for Syntax-for-Conversation. In T. Givón (Ed.), Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax. New York: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language in Society, 29(1), 1–63.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language, 53(2), 361–382.

Tannen, D. (1994). Gender and discourse. Oxford University Press.

Tita Novitasari. (2019). A Conversation Analysis of Repair Strategies in Indonesian Elementary EFL Students. http://repository.upi.edu/45989/1/S_ING_1501334_NONSKRIPSI.pdf

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). An introduction to sociolinguistics (5th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Whalen, J., & Raymond, G. (2000). Conversation Analysis. In Encyclopedia of Sociology. New York: Macmillan.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.