

**TOPIC ORGANISATION
IN JAPANESE CONVERSATION**

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Leicester

by

Midori Kino

Department of Sociology
University of Leicester

2014

ABSTRACT

Topic Organisation in Japanese Conversation

Midori Kino

This study investigates the organisation of topic in Japanese conversation. Using the framework of conversation analysis (CA), it aims to identify the mechanisms of the organisation of topic initiation, maintenance, and shift by investigating the environments where these actions occur and the devices participants use in order to achieve their actions at a particular place.

Through the examination of questions and repair initiation, the organisation of topic initiation is shown as a bounded topical movement in which the closing of one topic is followed by the initiation of another. It is crucially characterised as the recipient design, thereby, participants thoroughly attend to the co-participants' events/experiences. The topic negotiation is illustrated through the examination of devices such as discourse marker *dakara* ('so') and figurative expressions pursuing the recipients' response by means of the upshot and summary assessments. While orienting to the topic closing, participants monitor whether they can move to a next topic or they have something mentionable. The practice of reformulation and the reformulation questions reveal the organisation of topic shift which may enable the participants to manage or control the topical movement by organising their utterances through the initiation of repair. While keeping some connection with the prior or earlier turn(s), participants introduce a new topic.

Participants effectively use repair initiation in implementing topic initiation/topic shift in order to develop the topical talk when they face troubles or fail to make their projections. Participants' management elicits the co-participant's coordination, which is an important social action. The study shows that the ways participants organise their conversation are overwhelmingly similar between Japanese and English, which indicates that conversational structures are in fact somehow primordial and they transcend linguistic and cultural differences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the result of several years' work in which I have been supported and encouraged by many people. It is my pleasure that I now have the opportunity to express my gratitude to them.

Firstly, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my PhD supervisor Professor Ian Hutchby for his valuable suggestions, guidance and encouragement throughout the course of this work, for his generous way of giving me his time, and for his constant willingness to help me with my dissertation. My special thanks also go to my friends and colleagues who have given me unfailing support and encouragement and helped me bring this dissertation to completion. Many thanks also to all those people who happily agreed to help me check the proofs of the final version of my dissertation.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for their support and encouragement. In particular, I would like to thank my daughter for always supporting me over the past several years. Without her unreserved support, completion of this study would not have been possible. Thank you for your patience, love and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Conversation analysis	2
1.1.1 Emergence and interdisciplinarity of conversation analysis.....	2
1.1.2 Basic assumptions of conversation analysis	6
1.1.3 Key concepts of conversation analysis	8
1.1.3.1 Turn-taking system	8
1.1.3.2 Sequences and adjacency pairs	12
1.1.3.3 Preference organisation.....	15
1.1.3.4 Repair organisation	21
1.2 Present study	28
1.3 Chapter organisation	32
Chapter 2: Literature Review	37
2.0 Introduction.....	37
2.1 Cross-cultural communication studies	38
2.2 Topic organisation.....	45
2.2.1 Topic initiation	45

2.2.1.1	Topic initial elicitor sequences.....	46
2.2.1.2	Topic nominations.....	47
2.2.1.3	Various sequential types of topic initiation.....	49
2.2.2	Topic shift	51
2.3	Japanese conversation.....	56
2.3.1	Grammar and interaction in Japanese conversation	57
2.3.2	Repair organisation in Japanese conversation	59
2.3.3	Joint construction in Japanese conversation	65
2.4	Non-English forms of conversation.....	68
Chapter 3: Methodology.....		73
3.0	Introduction.....	73
3.1	Data collection	74
3.2	Recruitment and sampling	77
3.3	Processing and analysing data	78
3.3.1	Transcriptions	79
3.3.2	Translation	81
3.3.3	Data analysis	83
3.4	Japanese language.....	86
3.5	Ethical issues.....	91
Chapter 4: Topic Initiation in Japanese Conversation.....		93
4.0	Introduction.....	93
4.1	Topic initial elicitors	95
4.1.1	Topic initial elicitor~pause~recompletion sequence.....	96

4.1.2	Competition for the floor	99
4.1.3	How are you- type inquiry	102
4.1.4	Marked utterance	106
4.2	Topic nomination: Itemised news inquiries	109
4.3	Topic nomination: News announcements	115
4.3.1	News announcement: Recipient's news or activities	115
4.3.2	News announcement: Speaker's own news	119
4.4	Various sequential types of topic initiation	122
4.4.1	Arrangements	123
4.4.2	Solicitudes	125
4.4.3	Appreciations	129
4.5	Discussion	132
 Chapter 5: <i>Dakara</i> in Japanese Conversation		139
5.0	Introduction	139
5.1	Upshot marker <i>dakara</i> : Speaker's own talk	143
5.1.1	Upshot of the prior or earlier turns of talk	144
5.1.2	Upshot used as a summary assessment	147
5.1.3	Upshot following news receipt	154
5.1.4	Upshot following the third turn in a closing sequence	157
5.2	Upshot marker <i>dakara</i> : Recipient's talk	160
5.2.1	Upshot used as an assessment in the second position	160
5.2.2	Upshot used as a request for confirmation	163
5.3	Other uses of the discourse marker <i>dakara</i>	165
5.3.1	Stand-alone <i>dakara</i> used as a request for further action	166

5.3.2	Stand-alone <i>dakara</i> used as a floor holding.....	169
5.3.3	<i>Dakara</i> -prefaced utterance used as a resumption of pending matters	171
5.3.4	<i>Dakara</i> -prefaced utterance pursuing new matters	173
5.4	Discussion.....	176
 Chapter 6: Figurative Expressions in Japanese Conversation		183
6.0	Introduction.....	183
6.1	Summary assessments as the speaker's talk	187
6.1.1	Completion ~ a new topic emerging sequence	188
6.1.2	Completion ~ a related topic emerging sequence	190
6.1.3	Answer to the other speaker's assessment	192
6.1.4	Answer to the other speaker's inquiry	196
6.2	Summary assessments as the recipient's talk.....	200
6.2.1	Argument sequence.....	200
6.2.2	Recompletion sequence	204
6.2.3	Competitive sequence	207
6.2.4	Asking a question.....	211
6.3	Assessment of the third person	213
6.3.1	Recipient of a figurative expression who does not know the person.....	214
6.3.2	Recipient of a figurative expression who knows the person	219
6.4	Discussion.....	222
 Chapter 7: Topic Shift and Stepwise Topic Shift in Japanese Conversation		227
7.0	Introduction.....	227

7.1	Topic shift	230
7.1.1	Counter-movement: presenting a new question.....	230
7.1.2	Pursuing an active response	233
7.1.3	Pre-emptive movement to termination	235
7.1.4	Proposing a pending matter	237
7.1.5	Restarting the talk	238
7.1.6	Competitive movement.....	241
7.1.7	Inserting a commentary	244
7.2	Stepwise topic shift: Speaker's projection	247
7.2.1	Proposing another point	247
7.2.2	Giving further information.....	250
7.2.3	Continuing the talk by sequence deletion	253
7.3	Stepwise topic shift: Recipient's projection.....	255
7.3.1	Counter-movement: giving an answer	255
7.3.2	Counter-movement: pursuing a definite answer	258
7.4	Discussion.....	260
 Chapter 8: Conclusion		269
8.0	Introduction.....	269
8.1	Findings of the study.....	269
8.2	Implications and contributions of the study.....	275
8.3	Limitations of the study and prospects for future research.....	279

Appendices.....	282
Appendix 1: Transcription conventions	282
Appendix 2: Abbreviations used in the interlinear gloss	284
 References.....	 285

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This study explores the topic organisation in ordinary Japanese conversation. A central activity in social life is conversation and it is commonly observed that ‘talk-in-interaction comes in what might be called *clumps*’ (Schegloff, 1990: 51; emphasis original). In our daily conversation, we may come across experiences where what we wanted to say may not get mentioned due to the shift in the direction of the topic flow. Similarly, we cannot be assured that the topic we intended will be the topic the others will talk to. In other words, in spontaneous conversation, topic is not pre-existent or known to the participants but it is something constructed by the participants through their interactive process and topical talk is achieved by the participants through their mutual negotiation of topic. Therefore, the relationship between the clumps of talk and the notion of topic may not be analysed simply or straightforwardly. The aim of the study is to uncover the way participants display their understanding and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with particular focus on how sequences of actions are generated. Using the framework of conversation analysis (CA), this study also aims to unfold the mechanisms of the topic organisation consisting of three organisations such as (i) topic initiation; (ii) topic discussion/negotiation; and (iii) topic shift through the participants’ management in association with topic talk in the sequence of interaction in Japanese conversation.

In this chapter, the research settings will be set out. We will firstly introduce the

background of CA and describe the framework of CA that governs the present study. Secondly, we will set out the outline of the present study in detail including the rationale for this study, main themes and objectives of this study, research questions and the significance of this study. Lastly, a brief explanation of the chapter organisation of the study will follow at the end of this chapter.

1.1 Conversation analysis

Since this study uses the framework of conversation analysis (CA), we begin with explaining how CA emerged as a matter of research tradition and its interdisciplinarity with sociology and other major disciplines in social sciences. This section also illustrates the assumptions of CA as well as the basic key concepts of CA (i.e., turn-taking system, sequences and adjacency pairs, preference organisation and repair organisation) which will be utilised as the basis of our analysis.

1.1.1 Emergence and interdisciplinarity of conversation analysis

CA emerged in the 1960s as a research tradition that grew out of ethnomethodology, carried out by the sociologist Harvey Sacks, who was inspired by two pivotal works of Harold Garfinkel and Erving Goffman. Garfinkel established and developed ethnomethodology in the 1950s and 1960s. His major concern was to find out the practical reasoning and procedures of human interaction, for example, routines of members of the society who are continuously engaged in making sense of their own actions and the actions of others. Garfinkel (1963: 210-214) observed that participants achieve the 'perceived normality' of their ordinary social environment and developed an

idea of 'commonsense knowledge of social structure' (1967). Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) developed an account of indexical expressions and argued that all natural language is indexical, which means that words and sentences have multiple meanings and whether or not the utterances are understandable depends on the context. In other words, any sentence containing indexical expressions will have different meanings depending on the context (Heritage, 1984a: 142) and their contexts are interpreted in a mutually elaborative process.

Meanwhile, Sacks studied at Berkeley with Goffman (1959) who developed forms of sociology focusing on the presentation of 'self' in various situations of everyday life. Goffman was interested in what he called 'interaction order' (1983) and argued that the normative order of interaction could be conceived as a social institution. Schegloff (1992a) writes (in the introduction of 'Lectures on conversation') that Sacks learned a great deal from Goffman and addressed the themes outlined in Goffman's work although Sacks' work diverges from Goffman's to a large extent in that Sacks had the view that ritual properties are meaningless and not required in talk-in-interaction.

Sacks (1992) argues that contingences in the form of indexicality makes it necessary for the participants to commit themselves to reveal the orders of conversation. To be intelligible, interactional moves may be recognisable as moves of a particular sort. While being influenced by the work of Garfinkel and Goffman, Sacks worked on the development of a distinctive method and pioneered detailed studies of the structural organisation of everyday language use that had not been studied within linguistics or sociology. Sacks, whose main expertise lies in sociology, was the only one who focused on the analysis of conversation systematically.

I figured that sociology could not be an actual science unless it was able to handle the details of actual events, handle them formally, and in the first instance be informative about them in the direct ways in which primitive sciences tend to be informative – that is, that anyone else can go and see whether what was said is so (Sacks, 1984: 26).

It would not be an overstatement to say that CA's methodological practices solved what ethnomethodology had sought, which was to describe people's common sense knowledge through the analysis of recorded data of people's naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. The aim of CA is therefore to uncover the organisation of talk such as the regularity and orderliness of conversation by focusing on the sequential environments, and it does so by taking a rigorously data-driven approach (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Sacks, 1992; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998).

CA's interdisciplinarity is also found in other major disciplines in social sciences such as linguistics and social psychology. In the field of linguistics, CA is relevant in respect of three main areas: (i) ethnography of communication (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972); (ii) pragmatics (Levinson, 1983); and (iii) discourse analysis (Brown and Yule, 1983; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). While each of these perspectives has a slightly different focus and theme, what is common among these perspectives is the belief in the importance of analysing ordinary conversation and CA also shares this understanding. In particular, the significance of CA's contribution in the field of linguistics is that CA puts an emphasis on the methodology: CA stresses the importance of the use of actual, naturally occurring talk for the purpose of analysis as opposed to the invented talk.

This approach has been adopted today in what is called interactional sociolinguistics (see Gumperz, 1982). By referring to a case of interaction between native English

speakers and non-native speakers, Gumperz (1982, 1992a, 1992b) demonstrates that the participant's actions are shaped by the culturally contextualised utterances and shows the relationship between language and cultural order. In other words, interactional sociolinguistics assumes a certain relationship between language and the social contexts in which talk is produced and its approach is mainly concerned with linguistic variations or differences associated with the speaker's identities and other exogenous factors (cf. Drew, 1990: 27). In contrast, CA puts more emphasis on empirical phenomena and seeks to establish the relevance of sociolinguistic variables for the participants through the use of data.

The influence of CA is also found in the approach taken in the area of social psychology known as discursive psychology (Edwards, 1997; Edwards and Potter, 1992) which was developed on the basis of discourse analysis such as Potter and Wetherell (1987), a critical approach in social psychology (see Wooffitt, 2005: 40). In contrast to the traditional approach of psychology which characterises language passively and neutrally as a means of communication and uses data controlled for certain variables for the analysis of interpersonal communication (Hopper, 1989a) or uses data generated in experimental settings, discursive psychology is primarily concerned with describing accounts in talk or texts and construes language actively and asserts that language is a tool through which psychological concepts are constructed. Their approach is also different from CA which focuses on the empirical analysis of the design of talk with an attempt to reveal sequential patterns of interaction and establish how the turns at talk are performed in connection with the prior turns.

The significance of Sacks' approach is far reaching, but more importantly, it is worth

noting that he has developed a generative methodology such that other researchers could successfully develop a new theory based on his methodology, while a vast majority of work has consistently used the same methodology given its general techniques and followed basic procedures in CA. The most distinctive feature of CA is the methodological distinctiveness and its social science applications and it is also relevant to other studies.

1.1.2 Basic assumptions of conversation analysis

This section will illustrate some basic assumptions that conversation analysts make in undertaking conversation analysis. Three fundamental assumptions of CA are described below. At the heart of CA is its structurally organised interaction, in that the most fundamental assumption of conversation is that all aspects of interaction can be found in the participants' orientation to the stable organisational patterns of action and the exhibition of the recurrent structural features (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). That is to say, the turns at talk are sequentially ordered, which can be described in the way that turns are linked into definite sequences. In order to reveal the sequential order of the talk-in-interaction, conversation analysts treat the transition space as a key place where the speakers display in the next turn their understanding of the prior turn's possible completion. Thus, the analysts observe that the next speaker's utterance has been displayed in reference to what the prior speaker has produced. This is termed the 'next-turn proof procedure' (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974).

The speakers' next turn is a display of their analysis and understanding of the action that the prior speaker has designed to do, therefore, it involves inferential work of the

speakers (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). This is the second assumption CA is based on. The speakers' actions performed by the inferential work are contextually oriented (Heritage, 1984a). It is assumed that the speakers' actions can only be understood by reference to the context. The contextualised utterances are a major procedure of the conversation where the next speaker attends to the prior utterance designed by the speaker. Thus, the previous actions are a primary aspect of the context of an action and the meaning of an action is thoroughly shaped by the sequence of previous actions when it emerges. That action is context-shaped. The production of the next action creates a new context by showing understanding. In this sense, each action will operate to renew (i.e., maintain or adjust) the context that is organised by the speakers. Thus, the conversational action is context-renewing and it is context-shaped (Heritage, 1984a). The third assumption is that talk-in-interaction has a temporal order, in that 'talk is produced in time, in a series of "turn-constructual units" out of which turns themselves are constructed' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 42).

Turns at talk work as tools for actions and conversational structures are the central point of this mutual effect between sequential, inferential and temporal orders in talk. Also every detail of the conversation is significant, thereby it cannot be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant (Heritage, 1984a). CA is concerned with how the speakers manage and accomplish the sequential order of talk-in-interaction. Together with these underlying assumptions, analysis is implemented by using naturally occurring data. The basic research orientation is summarised by Schegloff and Sacks as follows:

We have proceeded under the assumption (an assumption borne out by our research) that insofar as the materials we worked with exhibited orderliness, they did so not only for us, indeed not in the first place for us, but for the co-participants who had produced them. If the materials (records of natural conversations) were orderly, they were so because they had been methodically produced by members of the society for one another, and it was a feature of the conversations that we treated as data that they were produced so as to allow the display by the co-participants to each other of their orderliness, and to allow the participants to display to each other their analysis, appreciation, and use of that orderliness. Accordingly, our analysis has sought to explicate the ways in which the materials are produced by members in orderly ways that exhibit their orderliness and have their orderliness appreciated and used, and have that appreciation displayed and treated as the basis for subsequent action (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 290).

Thus, the central resource of CA research is the empirical conduct of speakers in real-time interaction.

1.1.3 Key concepts of conversation analysis

This section aims to introduce the key analytic concepts of CA. We will focus on four conversational organisations: the turn-taking system, sequences and adjacency pairs, preference organisation, and repair organisation.

1.1.3.1 Turn-taking system

The most fundamental level of the organisation of conversation that CA has uncovered is how speakers take turns to speak (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). Sacks published 'A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation' with co-authors Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in 1974. This paper has become a foundational study in CA. Regardless of the number of participants, the length and the

content involved in conversation, the speakers take turns to speak in the way that one speaker speaks at a time with minimal gap and overlap. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) proposed the outline of the organisation of turn-taking which focused on the methods of how the speakers manage to take turns at ongoing talk. The central aim of their study is to provide a specific type of speech exchange system in ordinary conversation.¹ The mechanism of this system is that the turns are distributed in systematic ways among participants. The basic rules of turn allocations are: (i) turn-taking occurs, (ii) one speaker tends to talk at a time, and (iii) turns are taken with minimum gap and overlap. Obviously, there are cases where the next turn does not occur immediately or more than one speaker talks at a time with overlaps, for example, participants may produce extensive stretches of overlapping talk or sometimes they may laugh together. However, these are exceptions and in most cases turn-taking is managed remarkably orderly with a minimum silence between turns and with little overlapping speech.

The turn-taking model has two components: a ‘turn-construction’ component and a ‘turn-distribution’ component. Turns can be seen as constructed out of units, called turn-construction units (TCUs), which include linguistic categories such as sentences, clauses, single words and phrases. These grammatical units can be considered as building blocks since turns may be constructed out of one or multiple units. Each TCU is a coherent utterance in context and it is recognisable as possibly complete (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). Each TCU’s completion establishes a transition

¹ Drew and Heritage (1992b: 21-25) comment that the way the participants manage turn-taking in institutional interaction differs from turn-taking in ordinary conversation. Institutional talk is ‘normally informed by *goal orientations* of a relatively restricted conversational form’ and ‘may be associated with *inferential frameworks* and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts’ (p.22). [Italic characters are based on the original]

relevance place (TRP) where a change of speakership becomes relevant. To manage the transition of speakership, the recipient of a current turn has to assess what to produce as her response in the course of the current turn. Here, TCU is also a key feature in that TCU does not just mark its completion but is also projected by the current speaker in advance so that it will be noticeable/recognisable by the next speaker. The speaker achieves this through various practices (e.g., the convergence of the practice such as syntactic, prosodic, pragmatic and so on as foreshadowing (see Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987; Jefferson, 1973, 1984a, 1986; Local and Kelly, 1986; Schegloff, 1980, 1987a; Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 1996; Selting, 1996, 2000)).

The above features can be found in the following excerpt taken from Jefferson's (1986: 159) study.

(1) [Jefferson, 1986:159]

- 1 N: He's jist a ri:l sweet GU↓:y h t . [hhhh
 2 E: [↑WONder↓ful.
 3→N: ↑So: we w'r [sitting in]
 4→E: [YER LIFE] is CHANG[ing
 5 N: [↑↑EEYE::A:H

Looking at the talk in excerpt (1), there are three overlaps in lines 2, 4, and 5, where the speakers change their turns. They might be characterised as interruptions, but these places are reasonable completion points (Jefferson, 1984c, 1986).² The recipient can

² Jefferson (1984c, 1986) identifies three major categories of overlap onset: (i) transitional onset (when the next speaker orients to a possible TRP); (ii) recognitional onset (when the next speaker recognises that the current speaker projects its completion); and (iii) progressional onset (when there is some disfluency (e.g., troubles or delays) in the current turn and the next speaker proposes a completion so as to move forward the conversation). She argues that even when it is apparently interruptive, these categories may be used to account for the orderly production of overlapping talk. This excerpt illustrates the case of transitional onset.

anticipate the relevance of turn transfer. The crucial point is whether the recipient's overlap violates the turn-taking rules. We can see that the recipient monitors the syntactic, prosodic, and pragmatic features of the current turn to find out where to start her own turn. By the production of the next actions, the speakers show an understanding of a prior action. In the data above, both speakers are producing their assessments in lines 3 and 4 with no gaps and delays. That is to say, they are monitoring talk not only to find possible points of completion but rather the speaker projects to signal the upcoming possible completion place to the next speaker and the next speaker anticipates that the possible completion place is due.

With respect to a turn-distribution component, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 704) proposed a simple set of rules that turns are allocated at TRPs. The rules are: (i) If the current speaker selected a particular next speaker, then that speaker should take a turn at that place; (ii) If no selection has been made, then any next speaker may self-select at that point. If self-selection occurs, then the first speaker has the right to the turn; and (iii) If no next speaker has been selected and no self-selection occurred, then alternatively the current speaker may continue talking with another TCU. Whichever option operates, these rules come into play again at the next TRP.

The ideal mechanism is that one speaker talks at a time with minimum gap and overlap between turns. In order to accomplish such a mechanism, the speakers need to coordinate so as to keep a turn as closely as possible with the completion of a current speaker's TCU. Turn-taking rules display temporal, sequential and inferential order. 'By "inferential order", it will be recalled we mean the sense in which turns are vehicles for doing social actions, actions whose nature and import have to be worked out in the

real-time unfolding of a turn by its recipient' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 52).

1.1.3.2 Sequences and adjacency pairs

Speakers use their turns to perform actions in order to understand each other's conduct in talk-in-interaction. When analysts focus on the ways in which a speaker designs a turn to implement a particular action, they focus on how a speaker designs her turn so that a recipient may easily understand the action to be performed in the next turn. Thus, talk is highly organised and highly ordered. In other words, conversation is to be understood that turns are organised to be fitted to prior turns in the context set up by the turns which precede them. An adjacency pair is a series of two turns produced adjacently and sequentially related to each other. Each of the turns is produced by different speakers and the turns are ordered as the first pair part (FPP) and the second pair part (SPP). The turns can be specifically pair typed so that the first pair part of a particular type requires the second pair part of the same type (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 295-296; Sacks, 1992).

That is to say, a question (FPP) makes relevant an answer (SPP) next. Similarly, an offer makes relevant an acceptance or rejection next so as a greeting and a return greeting. A turn projects a relevant next action (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 296). However, the second pair part of adjacency pairs may not always appear as strictly the next turn. For example, a recipient can follow a question with another question. Thus, an insertion sequence kicks in between the first and second pair parts and the relevant second pair part of such insertion sequence follows in the next turn. The following example

illustrates this.³

(2) [Levinson, 1983:304]

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | A: Can I have a bottle of Mich? | Q1 |
| 2 | B: Are you over twenty-one? | Insertion 1 |
| 3 | A: No. | Insertion 2 |
| 4 | B: No. | A1 |

A question (FPP) occurs in line 1. Given the initial condition of the FPP being uttered, the SPP is then relevant. However, the SPP is absent since another question is displayed, which is the first pair part of another adjacency pair. That is, another question-answer pair sequence is produced as an insertion sequence. The inserted question is produced not to ignore the original question but to defer the answer so as to obtain the relevant information. As we can see above, speaker A gives an answer to the inserted question (line 3) instead of repeating his initial question. When the insertion sequence is completed, speaker B, showing her orientation to the relevance of the original adjacency pair, provides an answer that constitutes the second pair part of the original adjacency pair.

In reference to the participants' orientation to the relevance of adjacency pairs and insertion sequences, Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 44) write that participants 'display to one another their understandings of what each utterance is aiming to accomplish. Thus, the adjacency pair concept is not simply to do with the bare fact that some utterances

³ This is an example of an insertion sequence (Schegloff, 1968). Schegloff (2007: 26) writes that 'a great many sentences involve expansion of this basic unit. Such expansions involve additional participation by the parties through additional turns ... These expansions occur in the three possible places which a two-turn unit permits: before the first pair part, in what we will call pre-expansions; between the first and the projected second pair part, in what we will call insert expansions; and after the second pair part, in what we will call post-expansions.'

come in pairs. Rather, adjacency pairs have a fundamental significance for one of the most basic issues in CA: the question of how mutual understanding is accomplished and displayed in talk.’ The adjacency relationship such as question-answer, greeting-greeting, and request-acceptance or rejection obtains the rules that make a SPP immediately relevant once the production of a FPP is proposed and displays the property of conditional relevance. Thus, a SPP is accountably ‘due’ immediately on completion of the first (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; Schegloff, 1968).

When the absence of an answer occurs, the speaker of a FPP may pursue an answer⁴ in order to account for the absence of an answer. The following examples illustrate this.

(3) [Atkinson and Drew, 1979:5]

- 1 A: Is there something bothering you or not?
- 2 (1.0)
- 3 A: Yes or no
- 4 (1.5)
- 5 A: Eh?
- 6 B: No.

(4) [Atkinson and Drew, 1979:52]

- 1 Ch: Have to cut the:se Mummy
- 2 (1.3)
- 3 Ch: Won’t we Mummy
- 4 (1.5)
- 5 Ch: Won’t we
- 6 M: Yes

⁴ With respect to insert expansions, Schegloff (2007: 97) comments that the first pair part speakers can make another question before the response to the initial question is received in order to pursue a (preferred) response because they can have an opportunity to redesign their utterances by deferring responses of the second pair part speakers.

In each of these cases an initial question (FPP) in line 1 receives the absence of an answer (SPP). Similarly, the second question in line 3 receives the absence of an answer in both cases. The absence of such a second part is a noticeable absence and the speaker of the first part may seek a reason for that absence while monitoring and using inferences to account for the absence of the second pair part. The action of the repetition of FPPs exhibits the understanding of the first speaker in which an answer was due. The construction of SPPs makes their turns fit to the prior turns. The second speaker can select her response from a multitude of options in responding to a prior turn. Thus, she is faced with so many choices at every turn where the turn displays an understanding of the prior turn. Simultaneously, the second speaker's turn may be responded to by the first speaker in the following turn. These understandings are confirmed at the third turn or may become the objects of repair in an ongoing sequence (see Schegloff, 1992b).

1.1.3.3 Preference organisation

We can begin with a reminder that whereas a first pair part makes a second pair part conditionally relevant, a specific second action can usually fill the slot. For example, invitations can be either accepted or rejected properly. Requests can be either granted or refused properly. However, characteristically, these alternative second parts to first parts of adjacency pairs are not equivalent. Rather some second turns are preferred and others are dispreferred (cf Levinson, 1983). For example, an invitation prefers an acceptance and disprefers a rejection. Here, it should be reminded that the concept of preference used in CA is not intended to reveal the psychological motives of persons, but how structural features of the turn design deal with particular activities. Let us consider the following examples:

(5) [Atkinson and Drew, 1979:58]

- 1 A: Why don't you come up and see me some[times
2 B: [I would like to

(6) [Atkinson and Drew, 1979:58]

- 1 A: Uh if you'd care to come over and visit a little while this morning
2 I'll give you a cup of coffee.
3 B: hehh Well that's awfully sweet of you,
4 I don't think I can make it this morning
5 .hh uhm I'm running an ad in the paper and-and
6 uh I have to stay near the phone.

As we can see above, the invitation is accepted simply and it occurs early (with no delay) through an utterance that begins in overlap with the completion of the invitation in excerpt (5). In contrast, the invitation in excerpt (6) is refused, which is accomplished in a distinctly different way from the earlier acceptance. It is argued that whereas most acceptances are simple and delivered with no delay, rejections are routinely designed to include at least some of the following characteristic features: (i) delays; (ii) accompanied prefaces (e.g., markers 'uh' or 'well') and accounts; and (iii) indirect or mitigated expressions (Levinson, 1983: 334-335).

The structural features of the organisation of preference can be the resources for the speaker of a FPP to project or anticipate the response of a SPP and the speaker may prevent a dispreferred response to be produced.

(7) [Levinson, 1983: 320]

- 1 C: So I was wondering would you be in your office
2 on Monday (.) by any chance?

3 (2.0)
4 → Probably not

In excerpt (7) C's talk is apparently some kind of request and the design of the question is constructed in order to prefer an affirmative answer (see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). For example, after coming to possible completion (after 'Monday'), the speaker extends her request with a phrase 'by any chance'. However, having received no immediate response from the recipient (with a 2.0-second pause), the speaker treats this as a signal of a negative answer and withdraws a request by reversing her question 'probably not' (Levinson, 1983: 320-321).

In a similar way, an assessment prefers an agreement over a disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984a). An announcement prefers a response that the recipient of a news announcement treats it as news and disprefers a response that she treats it as already known news. Pomerantz (1984a: 64) proposes that the format for agreement is the preferred-action turn shape and the disagreement format is the dispreferred-action turn shape. An initial assessment provides for the relevance of a recipient's agreement or disagreement or a confirmation or disconfirmation (or elaboration etc). In this regard, the FPP speaker may design her turn in order to receive a preferred response from the SPP speaker, with the use of grammar, prosody, and so on. Whereas the FPP is designed to promote a particular response, e.g., a preferred answer in sequence, the SPP is also designed to align with the FPP.

Sacks (1987[1973]) observes that the phrase 'isn't it?' (that is, an interrogative tag) may be appended to an assessment. It is designed to invite a particular kind of response and

the default response is produced straightaway.⁵

(8) [Pomerantz, 1984a:62]

1 J: T's- it's a beautiful day out isn't it?

2→L: Yeh it's just gorgeous.

(9) [Pomerantz, 1984a:61]

1 P: It's a really clear lake isn't it?

2→L: It's wonderful.

In contrast, (as we discussed above in excerpt (6)), the role of the SPP is to agree with the FPP and it is designed to provide less disagreement (Sacks, 1987[1973]). The following excerpt shows this.

(10) [Sacks, 1987[1973]:58]

1 A: Yuh comin down early?

2→B: Well, I got a lot of things to do before gettin

3 cleared up tomorrow. I don't know. I w- probably

4 won't be too early.

Two characteristic features of dispreferred turn-shape are found: the one feature is, as we discussed above, that the disagreement is not produced immediately by using the dispreferred marker 'well' and it includes an account for the reason (lines 2 and 3). The other feature Sacks notes (1987[1973]: 58) is that the response is designed in a way that the disagreement is produced as weakly as possible. For example, the expression 'I w-'

⁵ Clayman and Heritage (2002) mention that statements accompanied by tag questions (e.g., 'is it?' etc.) in news interviews are designed to invite particular responses. In this format, the tag question invites confirmation of the statement (p.210). They (p.209) write that many news interview questions are designed to facilitate preferable particular responses from the interviewees. For example, negative interrogatives (e.g., 'Isn't this?' etc.) are routinely treated as a strong preference for a 'yes' answer.

indicates that a negative form 'I won't be too early' is anticipated; however, B changed it to take the weaker form 'probably won't be too early'. There are also cases in which the SPP speaker produces hesitations such as 'uh::m' as a dispreferred response. In this case, the FPP speaker revised the original FPP in order to avoid the disagreement of the SPP speaker. In each of FPP and SPP positions, each action is monitored whether it is relevant or not. It can be said that the speakers establish and maintain their actions through mutual understanding, whereas they hold themselves accountable for their actions.

Lastly, it is worth noting that there are also cases where agreements and disagreements are not always displayed as the preferred or dispreferred turn shapes respectively in compliment responses. According to Pomerantz (1978), compliment responses serve complex functions and some responses are not simple acceptances or rejections of compliments, and actions of self-deprecation including avoiding self-praise, downgrading praise, and shifting the referent of the praise are observed. For example, accepting a compliment by saying 'thank you' is simple. However, many English speakers feel that a simple 'thank you' is not appropriate as a response to compliment. Instead, 'self-praise avoidance' is selected as an alternative response to compliment (Pomerantz, 1978: 88-91) and the preference for agreement may be expressed by minimising self-praise.

When a compliment is followed by a rejection, the response will form either disagreement or qualification of the assertion by the prior compliment or if the recipient of the compliment does not reject compliments, different forms of responses may be produced. The following excerpts illustrate this.

(11) [Pomerantz, 1978:85]

- 1 R: You're a good rower, Honey.
2→J: These are very easy to row. Very light.

In excerpt (11), following R's compliment the recipient J shifts the topic of the conversation from himself to the type of boat.

(12) [Pomerantz, 1984a:85]

- 1 A: I mean I feel good when I'm playing with her because
2 I feel like uh her and I play alike hehh
3→B: No. You play beautifully.

(13) [Pomerantz, 1984a:86]

- 1 L: You're not bored (huh)?
2→S: Bored? No. we're fascinated.

Subsequent to self-deprecations, disagreements are routinely produced and they include evaluative terms (Pomerantz, 1984a: 85), as illustrated in excerpts (12) and (13). We can see that the recipients use negations such as 'no'. A variety of cases of such disagreement for American English have been reported and it has been discussed that compliments are used in preferred environments as well as in dispreferred environments (Pomerantz, 1984a: 85). Through their sensitive activities, participants show their affiliations while expressing minimised self-praise and selecting applicable actions.

As seen above, participants routinely disagree with compliments by displaying self-deprecation, which is a preferred turn shape. That is, the actions of self-deprecation ordinarily prefer a disagreeing response. In light of the preference structure where an

agreement is preferred over a disagreement, it may also be said that participants may employ a variety of activities in order to achieve their actions. Participants may attempt to minimise an interactional disagreement in order to maximise the level of agreement. Participants organise their responses by using their inferences with limited information displayed in the speaker's utterance in the prior turn. The compliments are responded to with rejection or different forms of evaluations (e.g., change of topics) as a means of reducing the praised matters. In other words, participants show their affiliation by choosing not to express their views and statements strongly and straightforwardly but rather by carefully displaying their views and statements in a modest manner (see Pomerantz, 1984b).

1.1.3.4 Repair organisation

The term repair is used in two situations: First, repair mechanisms are used to deal with turn-taking errors and obvious violations (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). Second, repair is used in preference to alternatives such as correction (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977). Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) state that not all repairs of conversation involve any factual error on the speaker's part.⁶ The practice of repair suspends the ongoing turns or sequences in order to attend to some troubles. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 723) noted that a variety of repair devices in conversation are designed for turn-taking problems. For example, overlapping talk can be a violation of the rule of 'one speaker at a time'. However, this will be remedied by a practice that one speaker tends to stop speaking before the completion of a first

⁶ Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977: 375) argued that errors are not necessarily followed by initiations of repairs in English conversation.

turn-construction unit, which is described as ‘a transformation of a central feature of the turn-taking system’ (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974: 724).

(14) [Pomerantz, 1986:159]

- 1 M: W:e:ll? She doesn't kno:w .uhhh:
2 huhh[huh-huh-huh-heh-heh]
3 L: [Oh h m h y G h o : d.]
4→M: hhhhh Well it [was an-
5→L: [Are you watching Daktari: ?
6 (0.2)
7 M: nNo:,
8 (.)
9 L: Oh my go:sh Officer Henry is (.) ul-locked in
10 The ca:ge wi- (0.3) with a lion.

In excerpt (14) above, this is a return-telephone call between mutual friends. Obviously, the interruption occurs in line 5. Although the two speakers' talk is disjunctive, speaker M repairs by abandoning her turn in line 4 and gives her floor to speaker L and answers to the overlapping utterance in the prior turn.

The sequential organisation of repair in the second case is that the term repair is used for correction purposes. Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) identified an important distinction between the initiation of repair addressing troubles of speaking, hearing and understanding and the repair itself. There is also a distinction between repair initiated by self, and repair initiated by other. As a result, they outlined four varieties of repair sequences: (i) Self-initiated self-repair: Repair is both initiated and carried out by the speaker of the trouble source; (ii) Other-initiated self-repair: Repair is carried out by the speaker of the trouble source but initiated by the recipient; (iii) Self-initiated

other-repair: The speaker of a trouble source may try and get the recipient to repair the trouble; and (iv) Other-initiated other-repair: The recipient of a trouble source turn both initiates and carries out the repair, which is closest to what is conventionally understood as ‘correction’.⁷ Let us briefly show each of these types of repairs in turn.

Firstly, self-initiated self-repair:

(15) [Heritage I:II:I from Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 60]

1 I: Is it flu: you’ve got?

2 →N: No I don’t think- I refuse to have all the:se things

The excerpt shows that speaker N addresses his trouble source ‘No I don’t think’ and then produces the repair ‘I refuse to have all the:se things’. We observe cut-offs (marked ‘-’) which are often observed in a self-initiated self-repair case. The practice of self-initiated self-repair,⁸ as we can see in the example, is implemented within the same turn. In other words, the concept of same-turn-repair means a repair initiated by the speaker in the same turn as the trouble source element appears before the completion of the current turn. The occurrence of repair within the same turn or within the boundaries of sentences which contain the trouble source is not incidental but the systematic product of other sequential features of conversation (Schegloff, 1979: 267). According to Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), the self-repair for conversational interactions

⁷ The term ‘correction’ is a particular type of repair in which errors are replaced with what is correct (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977: 363).

⁸ What disrupts ‘fluency’ is cut-offs (or self-interruptions), sound stretches, pauses, and repetitions of earlier said items. Several features of the organisation of repair have been introduced by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) to explain the mechanisms which predominate other-repair and to show the operation of a preference for self-repair for conversational interactions. Same-turn repairs are the most common form of repair (1977: 375) in the organisation of ordinary English conversation.

is preferred, therefore, self-initiated self-repair generally comes first in English conversation. The action of repair will not obstruct the conversation in progress.

Next, self-initiated other-repair:

(16) [Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977:364]

1→B: he had dis uh Mistuh W- whatever k- I can't
2 think of this first name, Watts on, the one hat wrote that piece,
3→A: Dan Watts.

This shows that speaker B initiates his trouble when he cannot remember the first name of Mr. 'Watts' that was emphasised (marked 'underlined fragments'). In the next turn, B received A's repair.

Thirdly, other-initiated self-repair:

(17) [Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977:364]

1 K: Is Al here today?
2 D: Yeah.
3 (2.0)
4→R: he is? hh eh heh
5→D: Well he was.

(18) [Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977:367]

1 A: Were you uh you were in therapy with a private doctor?
2 B: Yah.
3 A: Have you ever tried a clinic?
4→B: What?
5→A: Have you ever tried a clinic?

6 B: ((sigh)) No, I don't want to go to a clinic

Other-initiated repair occurs in the next turn of the trouble source with forms of 'he is?' in excerpt (17) and 'What?' in excerpt (18) respectively. The forms of other-initiated repair are largely interrogative forms which contain question words and/or upward intonation, such as 'Huh?', 'What?', or partial repetitions of the trouble source. They are called next turn repair initiators (NTRIs). Here, it is noted that in excerpt (18) other-initiation of repair 'What?' in line 4 occurs as a first pair part insertion which is followed by other-initiated self-repair in line 5 that occurs as a second pair part insertion. We can observe that other-initiated repair sequences are one type of insertion sequences aimed at resolving troubles in hearing or understanding the preceding talk (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977).

Fourthly, other-initiated other-repair. In most cases, it is aimed at correction of the speaker's error. This type of repair often appears in classroom conversations between a teacher and a student.

(19) [Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977:365]

1 B: Where didju play ba:sketbaw.

2 A: (The) gym.

3 B: In the gy:m?

4 A: Yea:h. Like grou (h)p therapy. Yuh know=

5 B: =[Oh::.

6 A: [half the group that we had la:s' term wz there en we jus' playing
7 arou:nd.

8→B: Uh-fooling around.

9 A: Eh- yeah

As we can see above, the organisation of repair offers itself as an effective tool for dealing with such interactional trouble, occurring ‘within’, or ‘immediately after’, the turn-construction unit (containing the trouble source). Schegloff (1992b) argues that the majority of troubles are initiated during the TCU, in the next TCU immediately following the trouble source and/or in the next turn of the trouble source. However, there are other environments where repair is required. It arises in the situation where a speaker does not understand what the other speaker has said and that misunderstanding does not become immediately clear. The following excerpt from Schegloff (1992b) illustrates this.

(20) [Schegloff, 1992b:1321]

- 1 M: Loes, do you have a calendar,
- 2 L: Yeah ((reaches for her desk calendar))
- 3 → M: Do you have one that hangs on the wall?
- 4 → L: Oh you want one.
- 5 M: Yeah

The utterance (line 1) turns out to be problematic. In the next turn, the recipient L indicates that L understood that M needed a calendar to check some information. However, M requests a calendar to keep and initiates repair, evidenced in M’s utterance ‘Do you have one that hangs on the wall?’ following L’s turn (line 3). This is called a ‘repair after next turn’ (or ‘third position repair’). Thus, the trouble source (i.e., L’s misunderstanding) is resolved in the fourth turn (line 4) with the use of a change of state token ‘oh’.

Schegloff (1992b) underscores that the organisation of repair can be central to the management of intersubjectivity in an ongoing interaction. The organisation of repair

consists of a coordinated set of practices designed to address problems of speaking, hearing, or understanding talk (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977) and a repair is a vehicle for the expression of disagreement (or disalignment) generally (see Drew, 1997; Goodwin, 1983) and self-monitoring (Jefferson, 1974). A repair can be used flexibly and serves as a vehicle for various actions in order for the participants to maintain intersubjectivity. Furthermore, the organisation of repair is generally designed to respect the right of the co-speakers to say what they want to say. As seen above, where a current speaker anticipates a problem of understanding, she can initiate self-repair in the same turn so that the recipient avoids misunderstanding. In a situation where a recipient cannot reach an adequate understanding of the prior turn, she may initiate repair in the next turn. Finally, where a speaker recognises the recipient's misunderstanding in the next turn, she may initiate repair in the third position.

While the practice of the organisation of repair (see Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977) can be implemented explicitly, Jefferson (1987) examines correction that is done as part of the ongoing talk, which is called 'embedded correction'. When repair occurs (e.g., one speaker corrects another), the action of correction makes the talk discontinuous by addressing a trouble source. In contrast, embedded correction makes correction without referring to the trouble source, thereby, it makes the talk continuous without collapsing the sequence of the turn in ongoing interaction. This type of repair correction may be used as a technique to pursue potential information from the other speaker or to elicit a pre-emptive statement or question from the other speaker which may be constructed by her inference or anticipation.

1.2 Present study

While language has been targeted for a long time by researchers in the fields of sociology, linguistics and psychology, an area of topic has been relatively underdeveloped in academic literature. It may be because, as Schegloff (1990: 51-52) points out, analysing talk-in-interaction by reference to the notion of topic is neither exclusively relevant nor straightforward due to a number of problems arising from using 'topic' as an analytical tool. Generally, early work on topicality in conversation solely focused on the analysis of content as a problem purely because it was natural for the analysts to assume that the topic in a conversation is talk about something. Within linguistics, based on the initial notion of a sentence topic, i.e., what a sentence is about (Givon, 1979; van Dijk, 1977; Brown and Yule, 1983), the analysts developed the notion of a discourse topic in order to exposit the succession of topic in discourse and model of discourse processing (Brown and Yule, 1983: 74; Givon, 1983; van Dijk, 1977: 133-134; van Dijk and Kintsch, 1983). However, there is a recurring problem in analysing 'what the topic is' in a sentence, let alone the determination of the topic across several sentences.

The even more complex problem lies in the way the analysts approach the conceptions of topic and coherence in discourse. Analysts firstly identify what is talked about in the first sentence, then goes on to the second sentence, and so forth, following which they attempt to analyse the coherence of those series of sentences as a whole. Then the question may be raised as to how the temporality and sequentiality of topic coherence may be treated. As Schegloff (1990: 54) comments, the problems with this approach is that since the later part of the text has already been provided, analysts may use it as their

interpretive devices for the earlier part of the text. However, in real-time talk-in-interaction the participants spontaneously formulate ‘what the topic is/was’ within conversation and it is not something that is done in an unconstrained manner as is the case with professional analysis (Schegloff, 1990: 52). Schegloff (1990: 52) criticises that analysts are too much concerned with the ‘topic’ of some unit of talk and little attention has been given to what the participants are *doing* through talk-in-interaction.

The choice of topic organisation as the theme of this study was motivated by my belief in the primacy of topic organisation as a feature of human interaction. Doing topical talk is one of the most fundamental actions which we depend on in talk-in-interaction through which we display our understanding of social interaction while maintaining the discourse coherence. Talk may break down without such discourse coherence. An aspect of topic talk is suggested that it involves ‘holding off the mention of a mentionable until it can “occur naturally” in conversation (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 301), in that participants may have been waiting for an appropriate moment where a new topic can be fitted in the prior utterance. Participants are machinery checking out why an utterance is said and why now, which is built into the structure for doing talk and if it is all understandable, it is solved for the hearers (Sacks, vol.1: 542, 546). If the utterance raised by participants is fitted topically, co-participants may now attend to the present topic and provide an appropriate answer, showing her respect for that topic. In other words, topicality may be a matter participants use not only to display their understandings but also to introduce their potential mentionable topic and accomplish their turns which properly fit with a prior turn. There may also be cases where the talk which is unrelated to the prior turn may occur and topic changes, however, it is

suggested that they do not occur randomly (cf. Maynard, 1980: 264). What needs to be studied therefore is how participants introduce their mentionable (or potential) topics and how they collaboratively ratify them in local context, and how they mark a new topic or shift topic while keeping discourse coherence in the structure of sequence in interaction. That is to say, we need to describe and uncover the process of the negotiation of topicality in the collaborative sequence structure of conversation in light of discourse coherence, by focusing on the participants' activities such as what they say, how they say and when they say. As Schegloff (2006: 73) writes, 'doing topic talk is itself largely composed of such doings – telling, agreeing, disagreeing, assessing, rejecting, and so forth.' An important matter is how the elements of a turn (utterance) at talk are selected by participants. Although there is some existing work on topic organisation in English, there is almost none in Japanese, which is why it makes it valuable to focus on this topic. Additionally, if we are engaged in doing topical talk in any language, it becomes pertinent to clarify to what extent participants' practices of topic organisation are similar to, or different from, one language to another.

In recent years, there has been increasing interest in studying whether, for example, the turn-taking system displays universal application across different languages and determining if there are any cultural variations in the function of such basic structure. In most cross-cultural communication work, it is often argued that Japanese people and their communication style are characterised as unique, homogeneous, cooperative and group-oriented and that an ambiguous or indirect communication style is in fact favoured by Japanese etc. It may be said that these studies have broadly assumed that different cultures, nations, or ethnic groups inform differences in language use and this research tradition often invokes 'common sense' accounts of ethnic or national

differences. While it is important to be aware of such unique characteristics of Japanese society, culture, or language that are typically claimed by many who assume different language-use vis-à-vis different ideological background, it is worth pointing out that such holistic cultural approach fails to provide empirical evidence in support of their arguments. Little detailed explanation is offered as to, for instance, how Japanese interaction is organised and whether Japanese interaction differs significantly compared with those of English interaction, which is exactly what this study purports to examine. If we are entrenched in such stereotypical images of social interaction due to the pervasive views on Japanese culture and patterns of their interpersonal interaction, there is a serious concern that the fundamental nature of our activities in social interaction may have been overlooked. Out of such problematic aspects in the culturally-driven approaches emerged a great interest in exploring the interactional patterns of Japanese conversation through more empirically grounded approach.

With those interests in mind, the present study may be organised around two main themes. Firstly, the main theme is to examine topic organisation in ordinary Japanese conversation. Another theme is to investigate the determinants of the variations and similarities in the way participants organise their conversation between English and Japanese. This study will be carried out by using the framework of CA in order to examine the above two themes. In comparison to other cross-cultural communication studies, we believe that the framework of CA is comprehensive in its approach to reveal a more balanced understanding of participants' activities in talk-in-interaction as it provides more empirically grounded analytic framework and hence less likely to result in unwarranted misconception of features of human interaction.

Addressing the issues mentioned above, the objectives of this study may be summarised as follows: (i) to contribute an in-depth investigation into the limited knowledge of topic organisation in Japanese conversation; (ii) to identify common features between English and Japanese and whether or not there is any socio-linguistic particularities that could potentially influence the ways in which participants display their understanding and organise topics in the respective language; and (iii) to enhance the potential of the framework of CA to be a general approach in analysing conversation across different cultural settings. Therefore, the discussion will be tailored around the characteristic features of Japanese conversation in initiating, negotiating or shifting the topic and the determinants of the variations and similarities in the way participants organise their conversation between English and Japanese. The findings of this study may reveal that conversational structures are in fact somehow primordial and they transcend linguistic and cultural differences, which will contribute to extending the scope of generality of CA to broader cultural and linguistic settings. In addition, new knowledge from this study will contribute to the existing conversation research in Japanese and will offer new insights on how topic is organised in Japanese conversation and how the participants use devices properly in order to accomplish their social interactional activities.

1.3 Chapter organisation

The examination of these issues is structured around eight chapters. In this chapter, we have introduced CA and the relationships with other subject areas as well as some assumptions and basic key concepts of CA that govern the present study. This chapter has also set out the rationale and objectives of the research, providing why it is a

relevant question to address and justifying the selection of the subjects under the present study.

Chapter 2 begins with presenting the literature review of the main cross-cultural communication approaches in linguistics and psychology. This chapter also examines the literature related to the main thematic concern of this study, that is topic organisation. The literature is mainly drawn from the existing research pertinent to topic organisation which forms the basis of this study. It will also provide the literature related to another main thematic concern of this study, that is Japanese conversation. The literature highlights some of the key research on Japanese conversation from various perspectives. Furthermore, research on other non-English forms of conversation will also be briefly introduced. The findings of these studies will be discussed in depth, which will support the analysis in the empirical chapters as well as help to highlight the similarities and differences (if any) in the organisation of topic across different languages.

In chapter 3, we describe the methodology of CA that is used by the present study. Firstly, it explains the rationale for employing CA methodology to address the research questions. It then describes the procedures of data collection including the use of naturally-occurring audio-recorded telephone conversation, the sampling method and the recruitment strategy. Another important discussion included in this chapter is to explain how we process and analyse the collected data. We also describe an explanation of Japanese language with examples for the readers to understand the transcription of the Japanese conversation. A brief discussion on the ethical issues is also included in this chapter.

On the basis of chapters 1 to 3, the empirical part of the study follows and chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 present the main analysis. Chapter 4 deals with the topic initiation in Japanese conversation, focusing on the boundaried topical movement in which the closure of one topic is followed by the initiation of another. We will firstly look at various environments in which topic initiation occurs in Japanese conversation in order to generate a new topic based on the types identified in English by Button and Casey (1984, 1985). The question-answer sequences as well as the sequences of announcements will be particularly examined as topic generating devices. Various sequential types of topic initiation (cf. Button, 1987) such as arrangements, solicitudes and appreciations will also be examined. Particular attention will be paid to how participants manage their turns with certain strategic projections and deal with topic initiation through cooperation of both speaker and recipient and display sensitive negotiation in order to maintain discourse coherence.

Chapter 5 is concerned with how the participants are involved in the topic discussion and negotiation by closely examining the role of the discourse marker *dakara* ('so') as a device. We will firstly examine how the speakers negotiate with the recipients through the uses of the upshot marker *dakara* by looking at the upshot of the speaker's own talk and the upshot of the recipient's talk. Secondly, we will illustrate other uses of the discourse marker *dakara*, which include the use of stand-alone *dakara* and other use of *dakara*-prefaced utterances that are not used as the upshot marker. Through the moment-by-moment examination of ongoing talk, we attempt to uncover what kind of immediate interactional structural position triggers the use of the discourse marker *dakara* and how the sequence subsequently continues, which we believe would help us to understand how participants deal with a common interactional problem by marking

participants' orientation to, and presentation of the topic in an emerging local context.

In chapter 6, we will discuss the use of figurative expressions which act as summary assessments and deal with topic closing and topic expansion. Speakers may disengage from their previous talk and move towards topic closure due to the fact that figurative expressions act as summary and conclusion (Drew and Holt, 1998). However, figurative expressions have also been observed to function as a pivot that creates a stepwise transition which leads to topic expansion (Holt and Drew, 2005). We will see how figurative expressions work as a device orienting to topic closing by completing the preceding talk in the summary assessment sequences in Japanese conversation. While focusing on the design of turns and their positions in the sequences in which figurative expressions are displayed, we will also examine how the nature of their generality may facilitate mutual understanding of the participants in the troubles-telling situation. The effectiveness of the use of the figurative expressions will be illustrated in various situations; in particular, the present study will highlight the way the participants recurrently change the frame of their utterance from literal to figurative and vice versa by using Goffman's (1974, 1981) notion of footing.

In chapter 7 we will examine the ways topic shift is implemented through the use of reformulation and the reformulation questions which shows both disjunctive and stepwise manners in shifting topic by referring to the literature on the topic shift in English conversation proposed by Jefferson (1984a). Firstly, we will examine the topic shift in which a topic is completely changed through reformulation and the reformulation questions. Secondly, we will examine the continuous type of topic shift (a stepwise topic shift) both in light of the speaker's projection and the recipient's

projection. The analysis will not only focus on the participants' design of turns in the immediately local interactional context but also the structure of the turns in the course of interactional sequences where the process of the participants' conduct is visible as real-time activities. In English, the introduction of a new topic in institutional settings is reported whereby reformulation and the reformulation questions are used to make counter-argument and to reconstruct a prior formulation and the formulating questions (cf. Clayman, 1993; Hutchby, 1992; among others). The present study also examines whether the similar use of reformulation and the reformulation questions is observed in ordinary Japanese conversation. Each of the empirical chapters will have a discussion section at the end in order to answer the research questions set out above.

Finally, chapter 8 concludes the findings of the present study based on the analyses in chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7. It will also discuss some implications for the generic structure of conversation and the broader issue of culture in conversation. It also indicates some contribution the present study has made as well as its limitations that emerged while undertaking this study. Areas for further research will also be considered. CA's assumptions indicate that all conversations are structurally organised according to certain social conventions, which means that social action and interaction can be studied without paying attention to psychological or other characteristics involved. It may be argued that conversational structures are in fact somehow primordial and they transcend linguistic and cultural differences. If so, the findings will help to extend the scope of generality of CA to broader cultural and linguistic settings and will confirm Schegloff's (1987a) argument that by studying conversation, we are looking at basic aspects of human interaction that operate across the sociological divisions that are foregrounded in most social science and sociolinguistic work.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter begins with presenting the literature review of the main cross-cultural communication approaches in linguistics and psychology. The review is organised around the issues that the existing studies have broadly assumed that different cultures, nations, or ethnic groups inform differences in language use and this research tradition often invokes ‘common sense’ accounts of ethnic or national differences. The issues pertaining to the macro-social analytic positions will be critically examined in the discussion section of each empirical chapter. Such organisation of the review is also to ensure that the reader will be well-informed in advance of the broader cultural and traditional views of Japanese communication.

Conversation analytic approach, on the other hand, takes the view that conversation can be treated as talk-in-interaction and it does not occur randomly but is structurally organised and systematically ordered. This chapter then seeks to introduce such conversation analytic positions and examine the literature related to the main thematic concern of this study, that is topic organisation. An overview of the literature of topic initiation (Button and Casey, 1984, 1985) as well as topic shift (Jefferson, 1984a) will be described. The review of the existing studies will also be fully referenced in the empirical chapters which seek to find out how topic is organised in Japanese conversation.

This chapter will also provide the literature related to another main thematic concern of this study, that is Japanese conversation. The literature highlights some of the key research on Japanese conversation from various perspectives. Furthermore, research on other non-English forms of conversation will also be briefly introduced. The findings of this research will be discussed in depth, which will be utilised in support of an argument of the present study in that conversational structures are fundamentally universal, i.e., they transcend linguistic and cultural differences.

2.1 Cross-cultural communication studies

There has been a variety of different approaches to culture and discourse studies which aimed to show the relationship between the specific ways of speaking and the people involved in the culture. In linguistics, language-use is a central feature of social interaction and accordingly their concern is on how words or phrases are displayed by focusing on, among others, intonation and pitch. They assume that there are consistent cultural differences in directness in cross-cultural communication. In order to describe and explain the cultural aspects of discourse, analysts had to identify the relevant culture values for different cultures. Of these approaches we discuss below the literature of interactional sociolinguists' work on the cultural discourse styles (Tannen, 1981, 1984a; Schiffrrin, 1984) and the conversation styles (Tannen, 1984b).

Tannen (1981) reported that New York speech style is generally stereotyped negatively and it is particularly the case with New York Jewish conversational style. According to her, as a matter of their communication style, they prefer to talk about their personal topics, shift topics abruptly, introduce new topics without hesitation, or persist on their

own topics etc. She (1981: 138) argued that to the extent such styles are shared among similar speech communities, they become a social phenomenon and they manage to maintain thematic cohesion among various topics through established rapport between them. Tannen suggests that even though interruption often occurs they can enjoy its rudeness without resisting it since this may be an ingroup style (1981: 144). It has also been reported that a particular group of Jewish speakers use argument as a vehicle of sociability (Schiffrin, 1984: 332). Disagreements are considered as interactional frames through which they negotiate levels of seriousness, therefore, disagreements are evaluated positively and preferred.

Tannen (1984a: 193) also discusses Japanese indirectness in relation to politeness. She points out that such indirectness often puzzles a lot of Americans who are not familiar with Japanese communication system. Because of their value associated with directness in their society, Americans tend to ignore indirect expressions, hence they are frustrated when they face with Japanese who never say 'no'. Even if the answer is 'yes', Americans find it difficult to judge whether Japanese actually meant it or not since they have no clue what to look out for as a signal (1984a: 193).

Tannen (1984b) claims that we can refer to conversation style when we analyse how people communicate. Understanding the ways of speaking such as pitch, loudness, intonation, pausing etc. (i.e., contextualisation cues, see Gumperz, 1982) is crucial since these elements make up the features of conversation style which people acquire over time while growing up in their countries. Tannen (1984b: 15) also demonstrates that the speakers from different countries show different conversational style, for example, they speak loudly or show their anger when they get the floor. Even within the same country,

the speakers from different regions (e.g., New York and Boston) talk differently. That is to say, conversational style appears to reflect cultural differences.

In psychology, there have also been numerous intercultural and cross-cultural communication researches in which they broadly view that specific features of communication and discourse styles derive from cultural differences. In such approaches they divide the society, culture and language use into different categories and the stereotypes of Japanese culture, communication style and interactional patterns are described. In the following, an overview of these cross-cultural communication researches will be briefly reviewed in order to examine how such characteristic features have been formed. We firstly look at the classical value approach, Hofstede's (1980, 1991) and Hall's (1976) work whose notions are developed by numerous researchers.

Hofstede (1980, 1991) proposes four dimensions on which the differences among national cultures can be measured: individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity. In relation to these four culturally variable dimensions, Japan is characterised as collectivism culture as opposed to individualism and higher on the dimensions of power distance, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity compared with the US and the UK. Hofstede's model of national culture (1980, 1991), which simply categorises various countries into four dimensions, is developed in order to understand different cultural aspects in terms of business organisational values. The majority of subsequent studies concerned with these distinctive cultural aspects of his models are premised on the cultural differences in order to make strategies of business management for national boundaries. In his work, he uses quantitative approach and the data is drawn from the large US multinational

business corporation as an international attitude survey programme (Hofstede, 1980: 54). The surveys (which is originally written in English and translated into various correspondent languages) focused on the employees' attitude, which was then processed by the computer for an eclectic analysis of data. Groups of employees were subsequently surveyed by combining additional data.

Among Hofstede's four dimensions, the dimension of individualism vs. collectivism has particularly drawn consistent attention from both intercultural communication researchers and cross-cultural psychologists (cf. Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988; Triandis, 1994, 1995, among others). In so-called 'individualistic' cultures such as the US, the UK, Canada, Australia etc., individual rights, goals, and 'I' oriented values are considered important. In contrast, in 'collectivistic' cultures such as Asia including Japan, Africa, Middle East and Latin America, interdependent relationship is valued and in-group goals, harmony and collaboration are emphasised (Hofstede, 1980, 1991, Ting-Toomey, 1988, Triandis, 1995).

As related research, Boldt's (1979) work showed the difference between tight and loose social structures. In tight social structures such as Japan and Korea, people have many strong norms and low tolerance for deviant behaviour and in contrast, cultures with loose social structures, people have weaker social norms and higher tolerance for deviant behaviour. Triandis (1989) outlines theoretical links between the self and social behaviour in different cultural contexts and proposes three aspects of self, namely, private, public and collective self, which appear to have different probabilities in different kinds of social environments (p.506). It is argued that, in homogeneous cultures, ingroup members are required to behave in accordance with their ingroup

norms and little deviation from such normative behaviour is permitted. Such cultures are considered to have tight social structures and Japan is a representative country of such cultures.

When the collectivist culture has tight social structures, the public self (i.e., the generalised others' view of the self) appears at the front and in this case the act of the private and public selves are probably different (Triandis, 1989:514). To explain this point Triandis (1989) refers to a study by Doi (1986) which discusses that Japanese generally do not like to express their personal opinions and instead they seek consensus from public focusing on the Japanese public self (*tatemae*) and private self (*honne*). Triandis (1989: 515) also discusses Japanese social behaviour by referring to a study of Atsumi (1980) who points out that an important issue in understanding Japanese social behaviour is to consider personal relationships such as benefactors, true friends, co-workers, acquaintances, and outsiders. According to Atsumi (1980: 77), the dimension of friendship in personal relationships should be distinguished from *tsukiai* (i.e., obligatory relationships with kin or obligatory feelings and/or social necessity or desirable performance at work etc.). Although they argue that the pattern of the personal relationship is tied up with their life style, on-going circumstances, their values and attitudes, such view has not been demonstrated through an empirical analysis.

In conjunction with the core dimension of individualism and collectivism and the relation between the self and social behaviour (cf. Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1989), Markus and Kitayama (1991) focus on the concept of self-conception (which deals with how we recognise or become aware of ourselves in different situation) in order to emphasise the different aspects of the self and it is closely tied to cultural norms and

communication. They define individuals as ‘independent construal of the self’ and ‘interdependent construal of the self’, which is distinctively characterised as how much people conceive of themselves as separate or connected to others in general and in-group based interaction respectively. People who have independent construal of the self pay more attention to personal goals than people who have interdependent construal of the self and show ego-focused emotions (e.g., anger, frustration and pride) and own uniqueness. People who have interdependent construal of the self such as Japanese people, on the other hand, are ‘motivated to find a way to fit in with relevant others, to fulfil and create obligation, and in general to become part of various interpersonal relationships’ (Markus and Kitayama, 1991: 227). They tend to suppress negative emotion as a public action in order to maintain group harmony without attending to their inner feelings. In other words, emotionally positive expressions are frequently used in order to support others’ goal and show their cooperation (p.236).

Hall (1976) proposed high- and low- context communication and argued that in homogeneous countries such as Japan, China, and Korea people do not require in-depth information in communication, which is called high-context communication, since they share common experiences. In contrast, in heterogeneous countries such as the US, the UK, and Canada, people need detailed information for their communication, i.e., low-context communication, given that people are less homogeneous. Based on Hall’s (1976) conceptualisation of low- and high-context communication as well as Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey’s work (1988) and referring to the concept of the self construals from Markus and Kitayama (1991), Gudykunst, Matsumoto, Ting-Toomey, Nishida, Kim and Heyman’s work (1996) supports the hypotheses that ‘independent self construals and individualistic values mediate the influence of cultural individualism-collectivism on

low-context communication, and that interdependent self construals and collectivistic values mediate the influence of cultural individualism-collectivism on high-context communication' (Gudykunst, Matsumoto, Ting-Toomey, Nishida, Kim and Heyman, 1996: 539). The existing research from psychological theories of the self/identity has been reviewed above which brings forward the notions of cultural differences and it is worth pointing out that these studies have been mainly implemented by means of statistics.

While those literatures reviewed above may well give us insights into normative rules and values in the particular culture, it is worth pointing out that no concrete mechanisms have been offered as to how such rules are followed in an actual talk-in-interaction. Because such static model of social action is so overpowering, those theories seem to have ruled out the possibility that participants may accomplish particular social actions without following such prevailing/deterministic social rules and norms. To the extent such holistic approaches do not reveal how and when participants exhibit orientation to cultural rules and norms, it cannot be said that they have adequately addressed the complex and dynamic human conduct. Furthermore, there is a danger that too much emphasis on cross-cultural differences has led us to turn away from looking into potential similarities across different cultures. In order for us to fully understand the relationship between socio-cultural norms and patterns of social interaction, more thorough and systematic analysis is required than is currently undertaken by many research mentioned above. Next section will introduce the literature mainly drawn from the existing research pertinent to topic organisation in English conversation.

2.2 Topic organisation

Maynard (1980: 284) argued that in studying topicality in conversation, consideration should be given to the matters of ‘structure’ as well as ‘content’. As much as what participants are talking about are of obvious concern for analysts, how participants are speaking should be of equal importance in discussing topicality in conversation. In this regard, conversation analysts suggest that topicality is something organised and made observable in patterned ways and they consider the topicality as part of the procedures through which the participants display understanding and ensure that their turns fit properly with a prior. Thus, attention is directed to the structure whereby topicality is produced in conversation (Maynard, 1980). CA approaches the notion of topic and topic coherence through the analysis of a series of turns at talk and treats them as a unit of talk in which topic links to the sequence structures of turns in conversation (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; Schegloff, 1972, 1990; Jefferson, 1984a). The following two sections will illustrate the existing literature on topic organisation, specifically on topic initiation and topic shift which forms the basis this study.

2.2.1 Topic initiation

The organisation of topic initiation may be implemented in sensitive sequential environments where speakers produce a topic that is disconnected from other topics. In a sequence of conversation the action of topic initiation may be described as participants’ orientation to ‘generating a topic’ which is done interactionally and mutually.

2.2.1.1 Topic initial elicitor sequences

Button and Casey (1984) identify a particular type of topic initiating utterance, which is termed ‘topic initial elicitors’. According to Button and Casey (1984), topic initial elicitors are regularly found in closing sequences and they are projected to elicit topic generation from the next speaker who has the potential focus of the subsequent talk. Excerpt (21) illustrates this.

(21) [Button and Casey, 1984:170]

- 1 M: ... I'll ring you back. Okay?
2 N: H'ri ((brusque))
3 M: Okay?
4 N: Bye ((brusquely))
5→M: Okay. Iz there anything else yo:u-happen today of any interest?

Following the closing component ‘Bye’ (line 4), the topic initial elicitor appears in line 5 as the topic-bounding turn following the opening component ‘Okay’ (Button and Casey, 1984: 170). Another topic initial elicitor sequence is described in excerpt (22).

(22) [Button, 1991:261]

- 1 E: ...and I don't think block board would wo::rk
2 P: No::
3 E: No::
4 (0.5)
5→P: Uhm:::. So, anything new with you.

Both participants fail to produce utterances to develop the topic in lines 2, 3, and 4. The topic is exhausted. Following an acknowledgement ‘Uhm:::’ (line 5), speaker P does not display a closing initiation but produces a possible new topic ‘So, anything new with

you'. This is a question about the other speaker's news. In the next turn, the recipient of the topic initial elicitor can respond to the news inquiry either positively by making a newsworthy-event report, or negatively by making a no-news report. The latter case is illustrated in excerpt (23).

(23) [Button and Casey, 1984:168]

N: What's doing
(.)
→H: aAh:, nothi:n:,

(24) [Button, 1987:116 (Button and Casey, 1984:184)]

1 P : Ok Marvin.
2 M: How are things goin?
3 P : Oh-h-h-h nothing, doin
4→M: Nothin' doin' huh?

In excerpt (24), following no-news reports, the speaker of the topic initial elicitor uses his turn again to attempt topic generation by recycling no-news reports. According to Button and Casey (1984: 176), the topic initial elicitors aimed at the generation of topic are produced with an expectation that the next turn will be occupied with a newsworthy-event report. Even though the second turn does not produce any news report, the topic initial elicitors provide sequential opportunities for the next turn (in that third turn) to produce a possible topic initial (p.184).

2.2.1.2 Topic nominations

Button and Casey (1984:185-186) offer another technique of generating topic called

‘topic nomination’. A topic nomination may be used as itemised news inquiries in a next turn in cases where a topic initial elicitor receives a no-news response. For example, in excerpt (23) above, N provides her utterance ‘Y’didn’t go meet Grahame?’ following H’s utterance (which does not appear in excerpt (23)) in the third turn and in excerpt (24) above, P produces ‘No-o-o, how’s it with you?’ following M’s utterance in line 4 (which does not appear in excerpt (24)). The examples appeared above as topic initial elicitors and itemised news inquiries may be structured as a request form (e.g., request to tell) and are oriented to finding out about the latest news concerning a recipient-related activity or circumstance.

Button and Casey (1985: 21) also offer another type of topic nomination. News announcements may be used as a technique to start a topic in the environment where topics do not flow from one to another. Excerpt (25) illustrates this.

(25) [Button and Casey, 1985:21]

- 1 Geri : Howyih doin.h
- 2 Shirley : Okay how’r you
- 3 Geri : Oh alri: [:ght,
- 4 (Shirley): [(: hhhhhh)
- 5→Shirley: Uh:m yer mother met Michael las’night.

Button and Casey (1985) state that news announcements are headline news and designed to receive an appropriate response from the recipient (e.g., ‘Oh really?’) that allows the sequence to continue. It is because the speaker can tell more about her news in the third turn if she receives a request (to tell). In this sense, it is preferred that the recipient of the news announcement does not know about the news and promotes further talk about the news by displaying ‘news markers’ such as ‘really’, ‘oh really’, ‘did you’

‘you did’ etc. (Jefferson, 1993). However, if no such request appears (e.g., ‘Oh’), the speaker may need to continue her talk voluntarily.

2.2.1.3 Various sequential types of topic initiation

Button (1987) describes various sequential types of topic initiation that are produced in an environment where the sequence is moving towards the closing. A future arrangement can be used for an introduction of a new matter and the topic does not flow from one to another in either such case.

(26) [Button, 1987:106]

- 1 Ch: Well, it was fun Cla[ire
2 Cl: [Yeah. I en[joyed every minute of [it
3 Ch: [And- [Yeah
4→ Cl: Okay, well then we’ll see you Saturday.
5 Ch: Saturday night.
6 Cl: Seven thirty?
7 Ch: Yah.

Excerpt (26) shows that the participants reintroduce the actual arrangement made earlier and propose that the current encounter may be concluded. Button (1987: 106) argues that such reintroduction of the earlier arrangement includes the actual time and/or day, which is followed by the recipient’s confirmation or disconfirmation.

A particular topic may be initiated as an arrangement in excerpt (27) in the environment where the topic is exhausted in lines 3 and 4.

(27) [Button, 1991:263]

- 1 E: Life's a bitch.
2 B: Yeah isn't.
3 E: Yeah,
4 B: Uhm
5→E: So, are you goin Thursday?
6 B: Natch.

Thus, speaker E initiates a new topic 'So, are you goin Thursday?' in line 5. The new topic is about the specific meeting they are going to attend together. In the next turn, the response follows without delay (Button, 1991: 264). Button (1991: 263) argues that projecting future arrangements in closing sequences is a juncture in topic-in-progress but it may provide an opportunity for the participants to develop a new topic collaboratively. It is indicated that making an arrangement is either the initiation of a closing or the closing implicative. Button (1991: 272) also suggests that making an arrangement in closing sequences constitutes a social relationship between participants.

Another sequential type of topic initiation, referred to as the solicitudes, is considered (Button, 1987; Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

(28) [Button, 1987:120]

- 1 P: Thanks a lot. 'N I'll see you soon
2→M: Okay honey=
3 P: =Okay
4→M: Dri:ve ca:reful
5 P: I: wi:ll [h::
6 M: [h::a ha Bye by[e
7 P: [Bye bye
.....end call

Button (1987: 120) comments that the turn following a response to solicitudes can be generally reinitiating closings, however, in this example, the return to a response to solicitudes (line 4) does not reinitiate closings but proposes a first terminal that is possibly considered as having an abrupt nature in the closing sequence. Then he argues that the production of the first terminal is followed by the production of the reinitiated closing (at line 6), which is delayed and delivered with laughter (that makes the turn less abrupt) and he concludes that this example illustrates the case where the producer of solicitudes orients to closing and the course of action is projected closing sequence (1987: 120). In the next section, we will review the literature on the topic shift in English conversation, which has been proposed by Jefferson (1984a).

2.2.2 Topic shift

Here we can see Jefferson's (1984a) approach to topic shift. Jefferson begins with a consideration of boundaried topic shifts that may occur immediately after a troubles-telling. Thus, she describes the disjunctive topic shift focusing on such a specific and problematic context. She firstly shows that moving out of a troubles-telling is entry into closings (1984a: 191) and the following two excerpts (29) and (30) illustrate this.

(29) [Jefferson, 1984a:191]

- 1 A: Never mind it'll all come right in the end,
 2→ J :Yeah. Okay you go and get your clean trou[sers on=
 3 A: [Yes
 4→ J: =ehh hahh(h) I'll see [you in a few] minutes
 5 A: [See you then]

Excerpt (29) illustrates that speaker's utterance enters into closing by bringing up the arrangement that has already been mentioned before. Thus, it is being re-invoked to provide for entry into closings.

(30) [Jefferson, 1984a:192]

6 S: So: consequently I didn't get any wor:k done hardly.
7 (0.6)
8 S: Anyway
9 (2.0)
10→D: So you think- Can you come out for a drink tonight.

In excerpt (30), the making of an arrangement is offered in line 10 as a trouble-telling exit device. Both cases exhibit the speakers' orientation to move on to other matters in order to get away from the problem posed by a troubles-telling. In contrast to these examples, Jefferson (1984a: 193) states that moving out of a troubles-telling is not always entry into closing, but it may be used as a device to restart a conversation and introduce a new topic. The excerpt (31) illustrates this.

(31) [Jefferson, 1984a:193]

1 M: ... (.) you know bring this do:wn
2 cause God I can't afford to you know. (0.2) get
3 like that?
4 (0.3)
5 S: °Ye:ah°
6 (0.6)
7→ M : hhh tch How are you.

In excerpt (31), it is illustrated that the speaker provides the 'How are you' inquiry, which is characterised as not only moving out of troubles-telling but also proposing a

new topic and restarting their conversation (Jefferson, 1984a: 193). She writes that ‘How are you’-type utterance can start off a new conversation. A similar example is illustrated in excerpt (32).

(32) [Jefferson, 1984a:194]

- 1 M: .hh Well you never kno:w do you somet_i:mes you
2 feel as if you don't want to stay in the sa:me
3 pla:ce,. hh that where you've been with your
4 pa:ren [ts: .hh
5 [Ye:s
6 (.)
7 M: Mm [:. .hh
8 J : [But uh:: anway,
9 (0.3)
10 J: mptlk [()
11→M: [By the way Janet did you get my annie:rsary car:d

Excerpt (32) also illustrates an example of restarted conversation. Jefferson (1984a: 193) argues that an introduction of a pending matter can also start off a new conversation.

Jefferson then proceeds to contrast these disjunctive topic shifts with an alternative process of stepwise movement from troubles-talk, in which speakers gradually disengage from it over a span of talk. She describes a systematic sequence of moves that the speakers construct between ancillary aspects of the trouble and a related matter. She shows complex extended sequences. We shall see two examples below.

(33) [Jefferson 1984a:204]

4→1 G: [↑No: I ca[- I though well I c]an't leave=
 5 L [Oh: . : : :.]
 6 G: =him for [two hours if I'm if he's crying when I've=
 7 L: [n: No.

 26→2 G: Cause Norman said in the morning would I take him
 to Saltbern and I said well uh.hih hI don't kno:w...

 30→3 L: = No: No- Were they very ba:d, Gwenn[ie, ()
 31 G: [Ehm,- no it
 32 wasn't it's just that you can't go: so fas:t=

 35 G: =Little bit more ca:[reful
 36→4 L: [I↑think it's that little bit
 37 wa:rmer toni:ght [i:sn't it]
 38 G: [Oh it is i]t's not so bad it's::

 51 L: [nhh hnh hnh heh [heh he [h .hk
 52→(5) G: [.hh [Hey] listen .hhh
 53 You should have come on Tue:sda:y,

 74→5 L: .hh Eh::m, we didn't go to have our hair done by
 75 the wa:y,=
 76 G: =.h No well I gathered not

Jefferson (1984a: 204) writes that the troubles-recipient has been providing another sort of talk that may restrict the occurrence of a trouble-telling in the next position. The series of moves in excerpt (33) can be briefly shown. (→1): A summing up of the heart of the trouble by the troubles-teller; (→2): A turn by the troubles-teller to ancillary matters; (→3): A topical stabilisation of the ancillary matters by the troubles-recipient that potentially facilitates further talk on her part. It is noted that this question enables the troubles-recipient to reserve the right to turn by following the troubles-teller's

answer; (→4): A pivotal utterance by the troubles-recipient is the answer to her prior question, which is a transparently disjunctive shift; and (→(5)): In this case, the troubles-teller introduces a report of a very good time.

Jefferson (1984a: 213) states that the initial move towards a topical shift is produced with interactional cohesiveness and the summary assessments are recurrently used as pre-topical shift devices and they are strongly other-attentive. A similar case can be seen in the following excerpt (34).

(34) [Jefferson, 1984a:212]

- 1 G: Bu:t, he does feel tha:t (1.0) you know, (.) he's
2 proud of the fact that he got into the finals. .hhh
3 and he doesn't ca:re if he doesn't make the finals
4 and go o:n .hh[[to-]Berkeley or whatever,=
5→S: [Ri[:ght.]
6 G: =.h [h and then-
7 S: [Ri:ght.
8 (.)
9 G: become a Harvard attorney I mean he doesn't care
10 about ↓that. at [all, ↓
11→S: [Right.
12→S: Ri[ght.
13 G: [So,
14 S: hh So he's doing alright.
15 G: Ye:ah
16→S: Two twenty Joey,
17 (0.4)
18 S: hhhh Twenty after two.
19 (.)
20→S: hh Well I'm glad to hear he's doing reasonably
21 well.
22 G: Ye:ah,

23→S: .hh Uh:m what was I gonna tell you.

The troubles-recipient produces an item 'Right' in lines 5, 7, 11 and 12 that is recurrently used prior to a summary assessment (line 20) and appears to implicate a closure for a topic, which is followed by the troubles-recipient's announcement (line 23). Jefferson (1984a) argues that the troubles-recipient's activities may be promoting an opportunity to produce the occasioned item in various ways, for example, by producing a summary assessment and report about the third person, and each item constitutes an ancillary matter. Jefferson's approach to topic shift has been systematically described and it provides valuable points in analysing topic flow.

2.3 Japanese conversation

Another purpose of this literature review is to illustrate features in Japanese conversation as has been explored by the existing studies. Since the 1990s many Japanese researchers have been exploring language and social interaction by applying the analytical methods developed by conversation analysis to Japanese talk-in-interaction (e.g., Ford and Mori, 1994; Fox, Hayashi, and Jasperson, 1996; Hayashi, 1994, 1999, 2003, 2009; Lerner and Takagi, 1999; Mori, 1994, 1999, 2006; Tanaka, 1999, 2000, 2005, etc.). These studies have provided some of the key research perspectives and valuable findings for further research. These studies focus on the grammatical structures as a resource for interaction, investigate the production of turns and recognition of projection at possible completion turns and examine the organisation of repair focusing on the relationship of repair and syntax from the cross-linguistic perspective. In this section, we will review their literatures such as Ford and Mori

(1994), Tanaka (1999), Hayashi (1994, 1999, 2003), Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996) and Lerner and Takagi (1999). These research findings imply that the mechanism of the turn-taking system in English is also available in Japanese and the organisation of repair may be investigated across diverse languages.

2.3.1 Grammar and interaction in Japanese conversation

CA research has largely concentrated on English and other European languages; however, the use of CA as methodology to undertake cross-cultural analysis of talk is beginning to be recognised. Ford and Mori (1994) examine the similarities and differences between Japanese and English in the use of the causal connectors (i.e., ‘because’) in the sequence of talk, revealing how participants manage their conversational activities such as agreement and disagreement (Sacks, 1987[1973]; Heritage, 1984a; Pomerantz, 1984a). Looking at the causal connector ‘because’ in English and *kara* and *datte* in Japanese, they examine the pattern of the placement and the function of the causal connectors and find that Japanese connectors *kara* and *datte* are used differently in the way participants make connections whereas the English connector is used in a single way.

Ford and Mori (1994) conclude their findings as follows. While the Japanese causal clause presents the canonical order and is placed before the main clause, it may also be frequently displayed in a non-canonical use, placed after the main clauses (1994: 41). Japanese speakers use two different causal connectors *kara* and *datte* and determining which one to use depends on the interactional environment: *datte* is used for a stronger disagreement and it is never delayed, showing no hesitation or prefaces. *Datte* is also

used for pursuing a recipient's response when a recipient is hesitant to respond. On the other hand, *kara* is used for a weaker disagreement and it is often prefaced with a disagreement component involving hesitation. *Kara* is also used for pursuing a recipient's response when a recipient cannot understand or is confused with the speaker's utterance.

The English connector 'because' is only used as an initial causal connection for mitigating or intensifying the strength of disagreement (Ford and Mori, 1994: 58). That is, the functional characteristics of both causal connectors in Japanese are shared with the one in English in the use of negotiating agreement (or disagreement). Ford and Mori also observe the differences: English speakers only use 'because' as a causal connector, whereas Japanese speakers have two connectors and use them precisely in an appropriate manner depending on the contexts. However, there is a disadvantage to Japanese causal connectors (1994: 53) in that a final-*kara* clause cannot mark the logical connection until the end of the adverbial clause. Finally they suggest that 'while "universal" forces in human interaction clearly influence the use of grammar, typological differences also create advantages and disadvantages in the achievement of certain interactional functions' (p.58).

To explore the question as to whether the turn-taking system is a universal interactive mechanism, Tanaka (1999) examines the organisation of turn-taking in Japanese by using the existing work on turn-taking in English addressed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). Highlighting the grammatical structures as a resource in the production of turns and recognition of projected possible completion, Tanaka (1999) summarises her findings as follows: (i) the turn components such as turn-construction

and turn-allocation and the rules of the turn-taking system in English is applicable to Japanese conversation. The interactional problems of the projectability of transition-relevance places (e.g., delayed projectability of turn-completion) in a socio-linguistic context can be resolved and turn-allocation techniques are also operated in a similar way as in the system in English on a turn-by-turn basis; (ii) the possible transition relevance places points in Japanese include syntactically completion points as well as pragmatically completion points even if they are syntactically incomplete. The pragmatic completion is generally associated with speaker change in Japanese; and (iii) the projection of transition-relevance places is delayed on the grounds that Japanese grammar (which has the predicate-final structure) makes the progress of a turn more difficult for participants to anticipate what kind of action is being performed in contrast to English. Under these constraints, Japanese speakers also use prosodic features to project and anticipate how the other speakers develop their talk or turns and when their talk comes to an end. With respect to the progressivity of turns, because of the use of postpositional particles and other grammatical elements the turn-shapes are characterised by the incremental transformation. Ellipsis of verbal and nominal phrases and particles is frequently identified in building blocks of turns in Japanese (cf. S.K. Maynard, 1989). Through these observations, Tanaka (1999) concludes that while some characteristic features in specific practices involved in turn-taking are found in Japanese, which are attributable to divergent grammatical organisations between English and Japanese, the generic organisation of turn-taking is broadly similar.

2.3.2 Repair organisation in Japanese conversation

Hayashi (1994: 77) investigates a comparative study of repair between English and

Japanese. He focuses on the speakers' activities in which they stop their actions in the course of producing an utterance and then repeat or replace some or the whole of their utterance, by questioning whether repair organisation works differently across languages if they have a different syntax. In order to answer this question, he codes utterances of repair with respect to two syntactic parameters: (i) the repair which is immediately initiated after the production of the verb; and (ii) the syntactic organisation of the repair. Based on the organisation of repair in English, he classified the data into various categories, e.g., whether or not the repair is initiated by a word, whether the repair-initiating word is recycled by itself or replaced by a single item, or if it is a phrase that is recycled and if there is any addition of new elements. He then identified the issue that while English repair has an orientation to words or phrases, Japanese repair is a morphologic type. Hayashi (1994: 84) finds out a pattern of the repair initiation in Japanese such as recycling or replacing phrases and argues that it appears during and immediately after a noun phrase, which does not occur together with preceding word(s), while going back to the beginning of the object noun phrase. On the other hand, recycled phrases in English do not occur immediately after the subject and they go back either to the beginning of the object noun phrase or to the whole clause. They never go back to the beginning of the verb.

With respect to the recycling of the verbs, there are also differences between Japanese and English. While the verb can only appear as a recycled word and it frequently appears in Japanese, the use of verb-only type of recycling is not often observed in English (Hayashi, 1994: 84). It is because for English, a verb complex consists of both main verbs and an auxiliary plus the main verb, whereas for Japanese a verb is optionally followed by one or more auxiliary suffixes and/or particle(s) (p.84). The

examples of the replacements of the verbs are seen in English whereas the examples of the verb-to-verb replacements are not observed in Japanese (however, Hayashi shows an example of the replacement of the verb morpheme (e.g., *kurida[shi]- kuridasoo* ‘go out’) (Hayashi, 1994: 85). Hayashi (p.85) points out that although a recycling of the verb phrase is extremely common in English, it is not so in Japanese.

Finally, Hayashi (1994: 88) shows an example of repair initiated non-adjacent to the repairable: ‘*dakara amerika ni [iku] nihon josee* amerika ni iru j- nihon josee mo tsuyoku naru*’ (‘So, Japanese women who [go] to America, Japanese women who [are] in America also become strong’). He analyses this example as showing similarities between English and Japanese: in both examples, ‘what the speakers do after the repair initiation is to reproduce exactly the same syntactic format as that of the preceding phrase, and insert the repairing item in the very slot that corresponds to the one occupied by the repairable in the preceding phrase’. In the Japanese example, the speaker replicates the format of ‘America LOC Verb Japanese woman’ *amerika ni iku nihon josee*, and replaces the verb *iku* (‘go’) with *iru* (‘be, stay’). He also comments that these two Japanese verbs *iku* and *iru* have similar phonological forms, which can support the evidence that the ‘repairing segment usually belongs to the same class of words as the repairable. In this respect, too, the two languages show a similarity’ (p.88).

Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996) examine the organisation of repair, in particular, the same-turn self-repair, focusing on the relationship of repair and syntax from a cross-linguistic perspective. Showing the ways in which repair is used as a syntactic practice by the participants both in English and Japanese, they (1996) find that there are three ways in which the repair organisation works differently across two languages,

English and Japanese: (i) differences in the verb morphology in repair strategies (Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson, 1996: 202). For example, in Japanese one bound morpheme is replaced with another, each morpheme has a single grammatical meaning, and the verb endings (suffix) have no explicit relationships with the earlier utterance, thereby, Japanese verb suffixes are available as an interactional object. On the other hand, in English, most bound verbal morphemes have several grammatical meanings, and verb suffixes indicate the subject (person and number) and refer back to the earlier utterance, thereby, English verb suffixes are not available for use as an interactional object (p.203).

(ii) Delayed next noun production in repair strategies (p.205). For example, whereas Japanese speakers do not use recycling of nouns because of the delayed production of nouns, English speakers use recycling before the speaker produces a noun due to the prepositions and articles preceding the nouns; and (iii) differences in the scope of recycling. In English when the speaker repairs after the start of a noun phrase, she repeats the whole clause. In contrast, a Japanese speaker does not use clausal recycling, and if a speaker initiates repair after the noun phrase, she will recycle back to the beginning of that noun phrase (p.207). That is, the utterances in Japanese do not show tight syntactic organisation.

The basic syntactic organisation of a clause is created by the relationship between a verb (V) and its subject (S) and object (O). In Japanese, it tends to be the case that S and O are omitted and even V may sometimes be unexpressed, causing the clauses to have been more loosely organised syntactically. English, on the other hand, requires an overt subject and is rigidly organised to have SV(O) structure. Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996: 209) summarise that ‘in English the subject begins a tightly knit clause structure and hence syntactically is the “beginning” of the clause, while in Japanese there is no

consistent element that serves as the beginning of a tightly knit syntactic unit...In Japanese, elements in an utterance seem to be more independent from one another than are elements in an English utterance'. Furthermore, Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996) also suggest that these syntactic facts influence the repair organisation since they crucially affect the participants' projection. The speakers can project as soon as they hear subjects or verbs at the beginning of TCU in English. On the other hand, Japanese uses post-nominal case markings, thereby it is not possible to anticipate until the case marker is produced. That is, it is difficult to make an early projection. Thereby, a Japanese recipient needs to guess what the speaker is likely to say (p.211).

Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996) further examine that repair may function as a resource for the expansion of the syntactic practices by the participants creating two different syntactic projections. For example, while doing repair initiation, participants accomplish their syntactic reproduction so that they can get a mentionable mentioned before reaching a TRP by exploiting the occasion (p.244). Firstly, they examine an example of the practice of repair initiations in English conversation, focusing on two formulations: the first formulation addresses the issue of the student's boredom and the second formulation (as a second attempt) addresses the negative assessment of the student included in the first formulation by recharacterising his behaviour using repair initiation. The second formulation is accomplished within a single TCU while creating different syntactic projections: (i) one is focused on the student's boredom that is recasted by using a different word; and (ii) the other is projected to future behaviour of the student by using another word. They conclude that the participant produces two sets of formulation before reaching a TRP and point out that the placement of the repair initiation is precisely designed particularly in the case of the second formulation, which

allows the participants to accomplish two different projections within a single TCU (Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson, 1996: 219).

Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996: 222) then examine an example of Japanese conversation similarly focusing on the initiation of repair. They describe the environment where the repair appears. Two people (H and T) are talking about the sister of their mutual friend F and T asks H the age of this sister. Attention should be paid to the use of a word *ookii* (literally meaning ‘big’) by T in response to H’s reply. T uses it to show her surprise that she is older than she had expected. They claim that T’s lexical item *ookii* here is not referring to the sister’s physical size but her age. However, in the subsequent turn H introduces the topic of the sister’s physical size (i.e., *taikaku* ‘body’) that is connected to the use of *ookii* by T. Here, H needs to make a correction in order to avoid misunderstanding: H initiates repair and reformulates his statement (about the description of the sister’s *taikaku*) by specifying a part of her body (‘legs’) (p.222).

They conclude that although the repair is indeed used for the error correction (as H’s statement may be incorrect since the sister is not bigger than his friend), ‘the repair accomplishes interactional goals beyond simple error correction’ (1996: 223). Their interpretation is that the repaired segment *dek-* (the full word is *dekai*, which also means ‘big’) serves to introduce the sister’s physical size, which is linked to the preceding topic of the sister’s age. If H does not use the lexical item *dekai* or *ookii*, he would not have been able to introduce the sister’s physical size because ‘it would probably be odd to go directly from talking about the sister’s age to the length of her legs.’ Thereby ‘the repairable (*dek-*) plays a significant role in creating coherence with the preceding utterances which warrants getting a mentionable mentioned at this moment in the

interaction' (Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson, 1996: 223). In addition, Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (1996: 224-225) also conclude that H uses the opportunity of getting a mentionable mentioned through repair and introduces a funny story about H's friend's younger sister who has longer legs than H's friend. In other words, H not only accomplishes making a correction but also succeeds in getting a mentionable mentioned before reaching a TRP. H also introduces a new topic while maintaining coherence with the preceding topic. Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson (p.227) write that they started off their analysis with the expectation that the syntactic organisation of different language may influence the participants' interactional activities (e.g., transition relevance places, or repair initiation), however, they find that differences in the syntax may not affect participants' interaction but rather interaction may be deeply connected to grammar.

2.3.3 Joint interaction in Japanese conversation

Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson's (1996) cross-linguistic study has encouraged Japanese researchers to explore more about the relation between grammar and interaction by using CA methodology. Their research show possible connections between turn-taking and different syntactic practices between English and Japanese. Lerner and Takagi (1999) also report on the grammar and interaction across language and culture. Lerner and Takagi (1999) present a method of examining grammar as a participants' resource for conduct in interaction across languages and cultures. They compare the action of anticipatory completion by co-participants in English and Japanese by describing the practices of turn-construction in the turn-taking system. The action of anticipatory completion means that single sentences are produced by two speakers in the environment where the recipient produces a completion before the speaker's turn comes

to a possible completion. Lerner and Takagi (1999) state that the practices of compound turn-construction units (i.e., if X, then Y, see Lerner, 1991) provide an environment for anticipatory completion in both English and Japanese and the compound turn-construction units are able to enhance the co-participants' anticipatory completion. In light of grammatical practices in both languages, 'there are syntactic structures that do not ordinarily constitute compound TCUs themselves - for example, the [Subject + Predicate] form in English and the [Subject (ga) + Predicate] and [Topic (wa) + Comment] form in Japanese' (1999: 55). However, they can constitute compound TCUs in an emerging course of action or in cases where the prosodic design is used in TCU. The practice of quoted speech and the practice of terminal item co-participant completion such as cut-offs, word searches, and pre-possible completion (i.e., pitch peak, cf. Schegloff, 1996b) also provide an environment for anticipatory completion.

Lerner and Takagi (1999) conclude that their investigation of two dissimilar syntactic structures of English and Japanese provide evidence of the feature of participants' utterance production, which has similar features in terms of turn-construction. This supports the argument that turn-taking for conversation is not limited to a single language or culture. However, they (1999: 73) find a form of Japanese grammatical practice such as the use of clause-final negation and a conjunction particle to be unavailable in English conversation. Japanese speakers use a distinct method when they initiate anticipatory completion: they co-produce the terminal linking items at the point of their recognition that takes place at the end of the preliminary component, not at its onset (p.63). Lerner and Takagi (1999: 50) suggest that 'talk-in-interaction is the "point of production"' for cultural difference and the recognition of that difference. However, it is important to remember that much linguistic and other cultural difference is not

produced for the most part as difference, but as separate features situated in their own cultural milieu’.

Hayashi (1999) examines the practice of co-participants’ completion in Japanese conversation and has further developed the examination of ‘co-participant completion’ in English and Japanese (2003) which has been examined by Lerner and Takagi (1999) by describing the practices of turn construction in the turn-taking system. In his study (1999: 494) Hayashi argues that grammatical structure alone does not determine the practice of co-participant completion. Other issues, such as locally emergent structures and (grammatically) unprojected features of turn construction (e.g., sound stretches, laughter tokens, word searches etc.), often elicit the opportunity for completing another speaker’s talk-in-progress.

Hayashi (2003) explores the potential relationships between turn-taking and grammatical differences between English and Japanese by preliminary focusing on the possible completion points of turns and turn shape and projectability of the course of utterances through different grammatical resources. By describing the process of the ongoing activities of co-participant completion within the boundaries of a turn at talk, Hayashi (2003) identifies some characteristic observations: (i) the grammatical structure of an ongoing utterance can be a resource for the co-participants to build up their next action and accomplish their relevant participation. Participants achieve a shared stance or negotiate through the action of co-participant completion thereby Japanese speakers participate jointly in ongoing activities within the boundaries of a turn at talk; (ii) through the examination of grammatical structures such as variability of word order, predicate-final orientation (cf. Kuno, 1973; Shibatani, 1990), and ellipsis (S.K. Maynard,

1989), the action of the accomplishment of co-participant completion is conducted precisely in a timely manner within the boundaries of a turn at talk, in that the temporal activities of grammar and interaction can be relevant as a resource for collaborative action. Specifically, the flexibility of word order results in incremental turn construction, i.e., Japanese syntactic practices appear in a bit-by-bit fashion; and (iii) the grammatical properties of postpositions appearing can be used by the participants to accomplish certain actions i.e., ‘steering or redirecting the course of another’s utterance’ or ‘taking over another’s utterance in mid-course and shifting its trajectory’ (Hayashi, 2003: 208). Hayashi suggests that his study contributes to further understanding of the relationship between grammar and interaction as interdisciplinary research.

2.4 Non-English forms of conversation

Let us introduce a study, ‘The preference for self-correction in a Thai conversation corpus’ (1977) by Moerman who has carried out an examination by combining the CA methodology with ethnography for the first time. Moerman (1977) examines the organisation of repair in the Lue, Yuan and Siamese dialects of Thai in terms of the preference of self-correction described by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) and finds that the initiation of repair and the relationship between self and other correction are accomplished in the same way between Thai and English. He also argues that self-initiation repair precedes the opportunities for other-initiation and the self- and other- initiation lead systematically to a successful self-correction in the same turn (Moerman, 1977: 875). Then he concludes that ‘since Thai is historically unrelated to English, and since a northern Thai village is (by most standards) socio-culturally quite different from America, the detailed, systematic, and massive parallels between these

two corpora support a claim that the domain described by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) is conversation – without respect to the language, nation, class, or culture in which it occurs’ (Moerman, 1977: 875). He also comments that it does not mean that there are no differences between the two languages.

Schegloff (1987a) comments on Moerman’s (1977) work in his study which examines the possibility of culture providing for variations in conversational practice. Schegloff (1987a: 211) writes that conversation in Thai is different from English on a macro-level and its social structure, culture, value system, and language are also obviously different from the United States. However, Schegloff (p.211) states that in micro-level analysis, the practice of repair in Thai conversation is ‘well described, and in detail, by the account developed on American materials’. Schegloff (1987a: 211-214) also discusses the repair organisation which appears in the studies of Tuvaluan and Quiche. For example, focusing on the same turn repair initiation (such as cut-offs and sound stretches), he states that there are some variations in which the action is achieved; however, such differences are minor and ‘this “microdomain” shows extraordinary invariance across massive variations in social structural, cultural, and linguistic context and relatively minor variations fitted to those variations in context’ (p.213).

Afterwards, Moerman (1988) examines the relationship among languages, society, and culture by describing the case of an interaction by using the methodology of CA and ethnography. Focusing on the practices of queries and repair initiations by using the sequential organisation of conversation and the organisation of turn-taking, he finds that these practices in Thai conversation appear to operate largely independent of culture. Moerman (1988: 51-55) describes the sequential interaction of the ‘question’ and

‘answer’ between a lawyer and witness in the courtroom in Thailand and identifies the interactional format. The conversation takes the form that a lawyer asks a question to a witness who gives an answer in the next turn and the lawyer may sometimes repeat the witness’s answer in the post-answer turn, which is typically followed by a pause. The repetition is sometimes presented in a question form with or without rephrasing the answer given by the witness. The judge waits for the lawyer’s next question while recording (i.e., handwriting) the witness’s answer (Moerman, 1988: 51). The lawyer needs to elicit the witness’s answer that would be recorded as evidence by the judge.

Moerman (1988: 52) writes that repair is important to the organisation of conversation since conversation is a locally managed system and it can be used to adjust possibly unfavourable social actions. Repair operations emerge urgently and the initiation of repair proposes that the prior item is correctable. Here, Moerman makes a point that the transcript of data can reveal whether the witness’s answer is acceptable to the lawyer and whether the lawyer wants the judge to record the witness’s answer. Moerman identifies that a lawyer shows his acceptance by using a discovery marker (i.e., oh) or makes a ‘logical presupposition for a further question’ when he receives the answer (e.g., following the witness’s answer ‘Two people’, the lawyer asks ‘What were the names of those two’, or when the witness’s answer is ‘Yes’, the lawyer continues by asking ‘Whose houses did you pass’ etc.) (p.53).

In the case of rejecting an answer, the lawyer explicitly presents rejection, for example, after the witness’s answer ‘I passed a lot of houses’, the lawyer utters ‘FOR SURE! Whose house did you pass’, or he asks the question by using the initiation of repair, for example, (L: Lawyer) ‘And at the time of electing, what kind of voting’, (W: Witness)

‘In the temple’, (L) ‘Oh. I mean what kind of election’: this has initiated repair, (W) ‘Yes’, (L) ‘Open or secret’, using ‘X or Y’ form, (W) ‘Secret’. Moerman (1988: 53) writes that the lawyer usually uses queries and initiates repair when he rejects an answer. Furthermore, the lawyer typically uses specifying particles such as ‘How’, ‘What’, and ‘Who’ to elicit a more detailed version of the answer from the witness. For example, ‘What were the names of these two’ or ‘Oh. And who else’s house’, etc. Moerman also comments that ‘these direct the witness to answer with one of the alternatives specified by the question’ (p.53).

Moerman (1988: 54) shows another basic pattern of the interactional format in the following sequence: (i) the lawyer’s question, (ii) the witness’s answer, (iii) the lawyer’s repetition of the answer, and (iv) the long pause. After this sequence, there are cases in which the lawyer asks a new question, which often requires explication or expansion or repair initiation the witness’s answer. That is, the action of the lawyer’s repetition of the witness’s answer and the long pause is followed by a ‘new’ or ‘next question’ where the lawyer gives an answer to the previous question. For example, (L) ‘Could someone walk that way? Could someone go that way?’, (W) ‘He could’, (L) ‘He could’, (6): pause, ‘And along the west side?’: this initiates repair and a new question is displayed following a long pause, (W) ‘It joins with Naj Kham’s house’, (L) ‘Joins with the house or with the house compound’: this also initiates repair and uses the format ‘X or Y’, (W) ‘The compound’, (L) ‘The compound. It DOESN’T connect with the house itself. Is it a compound //or is it a garden’: this also initiates repair and also uses the format ‘X or Y’, (W) //‘Yes. A garden. AN ORCHARD.’, (1.5), (L) ‘And from there, where does one get to’: this is a new question following a pause, (W) ‘From there- (.7) to the woods beyond’ (1988: 54-55; the data from Appendix A).

He also notes that not all questions are ‘next questions’. Next questions tend to appear after a pause. Following the witness’s answer (the turn of (ii) above), the lawyer not only repeats but also modifies or adds to the prior witness’s turn in order to elicit or reject the witness’s answer. That is, Moerman (1988) shows the production of the participants’ operation through the practice of the queries and repair initiation in Thai conversation. His work implies that Thai conversation works on the interactional activities in the same mechanisms of the sequential organisation and the turn-taking system as proposed in English. Moerman (p.53) writes that ‘line-by-line examination of a piece of testimony illustrates this, and confers some ethnographic benefits.’ Through the examination of the practice of queries and the initiation of repair above, Moerman (1988) claims that the repair organisation is utilised in Thai conversation.

In sum, these studies in Japanese and Thai conversation attest to the effect of detailed examination of the practice with the use of the CA framework in the sequence of real-time activities referring to the findings or mechanisms of the studies in English conversation. In the following chapters, we will further examine the production of participants’ activities in real-time Japanese conversation and hope to explicate the process of language use in talk-in-interaction in social life.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

It is the utmost importance of any research to adopt an appropriate research methods and strategies that can attain all relevant information in order to adequately answer the research questions. The aim of this study is to find out the issues of ‘how’ participants manage topic organisation in talk-in-interaction and the goal is not to generalise the findings to the population but to study some aspects of our human interaction and reveal what is directly observable in our day-to-day conversation. As ten Have (1999: 41) argues, ‘issues of how frequently, how widely, or how often particular phenomena occur are to be set aside in the interest of discovering, describing, and analyzing the *structure*, the *machinery*, the *organized practices*, the *formal procedures*, the ways in which order is produced’ (emphasis original). Hence qualitative approach is deemed to be appropriate and, as set out at the beginning, we will employ the framework of conversation analysis (CA) as a methodology. What is prominent about the CA’s approach is that the analysts treat language as an object of interest in its own right and differs from the traditional social research where language is a means of communication between the participants and the researchers (Bryman, 2008: 493). In this chapter we start by providing the methods of data collection addressing the rationale for the use of naturally-occurring data and how this fits with the theoretical framework of the CA’s approach. We then explain the recruitment and sampling methods and strategies adopted by this study. Furthermore, the methods of data analysis including the issues relating to transcriptions and translation are discussed along with a brief explanation of some of the

grammatical aspects of spoken Japanese in order to assist the readers to understand the transcription of the Japanese conversation. Lastly, the discussion of the ethical issues pertinent to the current study will follow. This chapter therefore aims to justify the methodological choices made by the researcher for the purpose of this study.

3.1 Data collection

Within CA, there is an emphasis on the use of materials collected from naturally occurring everyday conversation by means of audio- and video-recorded data. This is a distinctive approach in that it does not use the generally favoured methods of data collection in qualitative social science research, such as the use of data obtained through interviews, observations, as well as the use of researcher-generated data. The use of interview data means that the researcher is relying on the expressions or descriptions that are not witnessed by herself, observational studies require the preparation of the field notes or coding process, and the use of researcher-generated data risks the possibility of inventing the idealised examples based on the researcher's own native intuitions and experimental action. All of these methods are criticised that collected data may be heavily influenced by the researcher's or informant's manipulation, selection or reconstruction, based on what he or she perceives likely or important (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984: 2-3). Going beyond the existing practices of 'gathering data', recording of 'natural' conversation is non-experimental and less manipulative and less dominated by the researchers (ten Have, 1999: 6). By using recorded data as the basic data, CA enhances the precise observation to be made by the analysts and promotes the transparency that the findings are not the product of artificial interpretation by the researchers by making the data publicly available for scrutiny (Heritage and Atkinson,

1984: 4).

Sacks' first lectures focused on telephone calls to a suicide prevention centre and he examined these data in order to locate fundamental conversational practices by studying the real-time sequential ordering of action, such as the rules, patterns, and structures in the relations between actions. Since then a great deal of conversation analytic research has been carried out by using the talk on the telephone. Participants use the telephone in everyday life and it was easy to record a large corpus of naturally occurring data in the early days of CA and recorded data could be seen as reproducing recourses that involved participants' activities in real-time conversation. With regard to the nature of the telephone conversations, Hopper (1992: 8) comments as follows: 'We do, in fact, recognize each others' telephone voices almost instantly. We do, in fact, interpret emotional nuances without visual data' and he argues that 'telephone speaking seems quite different from face-to-face speaking. However, face-to-face and telephone speaking remain more alike than different' (p.9). This study will use the data based on naturally-occurring telephone conversation and recordings do not include face-to-face interaction such as eye-gaze and facial expressions and so on.

Next the question arises as to what type of conversation may qualify as 'naturally-occurring' data. While ordinary conversation may be easily understood to be 'naturally-occurring', arguments may be made that an actual interview or discussion in the focus group may also be a naturally-occurring conversation in a sense that it is not one that is invented so that others can study. However, some may take the view that their naturalist approach is assumed at best but remains unsupported in practice since the interviews or focus groups sessions need to be arranged and participants are

undertaking activities which they are not normally engaged in (Bryman, 2008: 596). In this study, the choice of ordinary conversation between close participants is made since the participants who have close relationships with regular contacts would have least constraint in terms of topic organisation. In the interview format, the interviewers generally take the initiative in controlling the direction of conversation and in the case of focus group, participants may discuss issues in real life but the agenda for discussion is broadly fixed and hence it may not be an appropriate forum in order to pursue how topic is organised by the participants. For the reasons explained above, the data used in this study is based on naturally-occurring telephone conversation in ordinary Japanese conversation by using an IC recorder and a microphone.

During the period from November 2006 to April 2008, about 96 sets of conversations have been collected, some lasting only a few minutes, mostly 5-30 minutes long, sometimes lasting even an hour. Some data lasting only a minute or two were excluded from the data set due to the concern that they are too short and may not be suitable for capturing the sequence of conversation in which topic organisation is managed by participants. Also, from more of a practical concern, a few data have also been excluded from the data set given that the quality of the recordings was not satisfactory for whatever reasons such that it was considered as not ideal in light of ensuring the accuracy of the transcripts. All other Japanese conversations have been transcribed in accordance with the conventions of CA, provided with English glosses and English translations, which are further explained in section 3.3 below.

3.2 Recruitment and sampling

The participants of this study were recruited through purposive sampling. Since the goal of this study is not to generalise to a population but to obtain insights into a phenomenon, it is not required to make effort at statistical sampling. The intention was to purposively select native speakers of Japanese who regularly chat with each other as potential contributor which increases understanding of the phenomenon (Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2007: 242). Since we purport to reveal how participants display organisation of topic in talk-in-interaction, the maximum variation strategy is utilised in this study in selecting the participants. As Heritage (1988: 131) argues as follows:

CA has adopted the naturalist's strategy of building up large collections of data from as many natural sites as possible. Like a good collection of naturalist's specimens, these growing data bases contain many variations of particular types of interactional events whose features can be systematically compared. Analysts constantly seek for new variants and may focus their searches on particular settings in the expectation of finding them.

Ten Have (1999: 51) states that 'the *logic* of CA, ... , in terms of data selection suggests that *any* specimen is a "good" one, that is, worthy of an intense and detailed examination. It is focused on the specific ways in which that particular specimen has been produced as an "orderly product."' In other words, the interest of CA is the orderliness of phenomena that is discovered in the structure of interaction, which is independent of group particulars. Thus, the orderliness does not depend on particular persons or settings in conversation.

The collected data includes the talk between participants who know each other well and regularly chat, which are: (i) postgraduate students who are living in the same dormitories and some students who are taking the same course in their department; (ii) close friends including those from childhood as well as friends from adult years; (iii) colleagues who are teaching Japanese to business persons; and (iv) family members. Participants were initially recruited based on personal contact, for instance, my fellow students at university, own friends, former colleagues, and my own family members. Using their networks, further participants have been recruited through their fellow students, their close friends, their colleagues or their family members, as the case may be. Participants consist of different generations such as people of both genders in their 20s, 30s, 40s, and 50s and recordings have been collected both in the United Kingdom and in Japan.

3.3 Processing and analysing data

This section explains another important stage of the research, which illustrates how the collected data is processed and analysed. We will firstly discuss how the recorded data is transcribed and an importance of precise and detailed transcriptions will be highlighted. Secondly, we will explain how the transcriptions will be translated into English and discuss a number of issues arising in the process of translation. Lastly, we will introduce how we analyse the data and develop our account for certain interactional phenomena that are recurrently observed in the collected data.

3.3.1 Transcriptions

Working with transcripts forms an integral part of qualitative research practice since researchers could secure validity, publicly verifiable material and transparency through transcriptions (Nikander, 2008: 225, see also Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). Sacks (1984: 26) states that ‘the tape-recorded materials constituted a “good enough” record of what happened... It was not from any large interest in language or from some theoretical formulation of what should be studied that I started with tape-recorded conversations, but simply because I could get my hands on it and I could study it again and again.’ The recorded data was transcribed very carefully by using conversation analysis transcription conventions developed initially by Jefferson (1984a). This is particularly useful for the analysis of participants’ talk because each participant’s actions can be documented. Transcribed data will reveal precise details of overlaps, gaps and silences as well as audible breathing. Transcriptions will also include noticeable features of paces, stretches, stress and volume. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 71) emphasizes as follows:

The process of transcribing a data tape is not simply one of writing down the words that people exchanged. Rather, it is a process of writing down in as close detail as possible such features of the recorded interaction as the precise beginning and end-points of turns, duration of pauses, audible sounds which are not words (such as breathiness and laughter), or which are ‘ambiguous’ vocalizations, and marking the stresses, extensions and truncations that are found in individual words and syllables.

These are the features that are ‘interpreted’ by the listeners in the ordinary conversation. Thus, the participants display in their sequentially ‘next’ turns an understanding of what the ‘prior’ turn was about. We describe this as a next-turn proof procedure (Sacks,

Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). Basically, CA's central concern with turn-taking is embodied in transcriptions. CA concerns the ways in which participants manage and accomplish the sequential order of talk-in-interaction, thereby, transcriptions are required to preserve a precise description.

Sacks (1984: 24) discusses that the 'detailed study of small phenomena may give an enormous understanding of the way humans do things and the kinds of objects they use to construct and order their affairs.' In particular, there are two important aspects of speech delivery in order to do conversation analytic work: (i) stretched syllables; and (ii) the basic features of intonation.⁹ For example, as a strategy/projection, the speaker uses a stretched sound at a possible transition relevance place or possible boundary of a turn in order to hold the floor or prevent another speaker from starting a turn at that point (e.g., word searches and hesitation *ano:::* 'uh::m' etc). Different intonation contours used at the boundaries of turn-construction units indicate whether the speaker may intend to continue. Or if the speaker's intonation is noticeably falling down, the turn may be coming to an end (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 72). A rigorously empirical approach to social interaction through the detailed data transcription not only describes the participants' activities that make up their real social life but also reveals procedures in which participants display various patterns and devices, thereby enhancing the range and precision of the observation to be made.

⁹ For example, the stretched syllables are described like 'sou:::nd' with colons. The more colons there are, the greater the extent of the stretching it is. A period indicates falling intonation, a comma indicates continuing intonation, a question mark indicates rising intonation, and marking rising and falling shifts in intonation are indicated by upward and downward pointing arrows immediately prior to the rise or fall.

As ten Have (1999: 93-94) points out, the practices of presenting only the translation from the original or discussing the data based on translation while appending the original separately are not satisfactory since the readers should be provided with as much information as the original produces. In order to present the data in the most inclusive and informative manner, we adopt the three line-format by not only showing the meaning but also word order, semantic and grammatical detail on the original. In this study, the original Japanese talk is presented in the first line, a word-by-word gloss and grammatical description in English in the second line, and a vernacular translation in English in the third line. It is argued that the three-line format might be particularly useful in dealing with languages that are not similar to English (Nikander, 2008: 228; ten Have, 1999: 94). A complete list of the conventions used in the transcript and a list of abbreviations used for the interlinear word-for-word glosses are found in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, respectively. Excerpt headings in the following chapters refer to the initials of the participants and the matters related to the extracted data.¹⁰

3.3.2 Translation

Given that empirical and analytic work is done in Japanese in this study, we need to deal with further complication of having to translate the original data into English, in addition to the transcribing the original data. While an importance of producing good quality transcripts should be emphasised, it is equally important to consider a number of

¹⁰ For example, the excerpt heading ‘N and O [FP exams]’ indicates that it is a conversation between the participants N and O and the conversation is about FP exams. However, it should be noted that the matters specified in square brackets may be related to the extracted data, they do not indicate the main topics of the extracted data. Rather, they are provided purely for the purpose of data management for ease of reference for the researcher. For the discussion of ethical issues, please see section 3.5 (Ethical issues) below.

issues with regard to translation: how researchers can precisely translate data without compromising on the accuracy, how they can present data to the readers and how the process of analysis can be made transparent (Nikander, 2008: 225). As Nikander (2008: 226) points out, the exercise of translating data raises various practical and ideological questions, for example, ‘the level of *detail* chosen in the transcription, and of the way in which the translations are *physically* presented in print’ (emphasis original).

In addition, Wong and Poon (2010) point out that translation is not an objective and neutral process but it is a matter of interpretation and involves assigning meanings to words in both languages. They argue that the social positions, experiences, and worldviews embedded in the translators may significantly affect the outcomes of translation. In this study, I had the initial attempt at the translations, but then developed with the assistance of two fluent speakers of English, both of whom had a good understanding of Japanese language too. One of them was a female professional who had the PhD in linguistics and phonetics with a considerable experience in translation. The other was a male native speaker of English who used to live in Japan for a long time and he is an English teacher. Following the consultation with these translators, sometimes via e-mails or otherwise by meeting face-to-face, I have double-checked the translated extracts against the original Japanese transcripts. Where I felt that the translated texts missed certain descriptive nuances, contradictions, or paradoxes, I discuss the matter with the translators and agreed on certain expressions.

We have taken the approach that the translation from Japanese to English has been kept as literal as possible in order to remain faithful to the features of Japanese language. Unexpressed elements in the original Japanese talk are in parenthesis in the English

translation; the original talk is represented in roman orthography where possible, while illegible vocalisations are spelled phonetically. Elliptical elements such as subjects (e.g., ‘I’, ‘You’, ‘it’, ‘that’ etc.) are also enclosed in parentheses¹¹ in the English gloss. Non-vocal behaviours are also indicated in the transcript when relevant to the analysis.

As we discussed above, it is crucial to understand how and when the projection of possible turn completion is achieved in order to investigate the turn-taking organisation (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). In Hayashi’s study (1999: 479), he writes that ‘Because of the word order difference between English and Japanese, the translation lines do not capture exactly how co-participant completion is done in Japanese. Therefore, the reader is strongly advised to examine the original utterances in Japanese in addition to their translations.’ In particular, it should be noted that the original point of overlap appears at the first line of the transcripts in the present study. Because of the length of English translation, the point of overlap in the third line does not show the exact place where it appears in the original utterances. Thereby, the readers are advised to see the original utterances in Japanese and it should be noted that the actual analysis on any translated data is always done on the original.

3.3.3 Data analysis

Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 89-90) describe the process of the analysis of data in the following three steps. Firstly, we need to identify an interesting phenomenon in the data. Analysts pay attention to certain patterns in the transcription from the recorded data, for example, repeated instances provide a valid analysis ground. For example, we identify

¹¹ Examples are shown in the next section.

potential conversational devices or sequential types that are recurrently appearing in the collected data. The initiation of analysis should maintain ‘unmotivated looking’ and remain unbiased (Sacks, 1984: 27; Psathas, 1995: 45; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 26). In other words, no assumptions are made regarding the participants’ motivations and intentions and the recorded data would be the only sources of information used for analysis and no additional data is collected for the purpose of analysis. It is because CA takes the view that attribution of motives and a thorough understanding of a culture are not legitimate and information concerning the participants, for example, the general macro-sociological variables such as age, gender, and status as well as personal background, should be disregarded in analysing the data. Analysts would clearly benefit from such stringent approach since any additional information could potentially prejudice their analysis hence increases the risks of misunderstanding through an interpretation of social action.

Once a number of instances have been collected, we then examine a particular aspect in detail, focusing on the types of turn which precede and follow it through the sequence of turns. The examination of interactional phenomena reveals the structure of patterns of actions that are displayed by the participants in interaction. For example, Schegloff (1984) explores how the speakers design their utterances in terms of their particular placement in the talk-in-interaction, whereas the recipients routinely attend to that placement and determine what it means or what is intended. The two core analytic questions should be (i) what participants are trying to accomplish in interaction through the use of a sequential pattern and (ii) how they display their orientation to such interactional work (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 93).

Thirdly, Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 90) points out that it is equally important to examine other deviant instances of the phenomena. This is how a particular sequential pattern can be gradually explicated with a more refined account for such practice. While a feature observed through the examination of particular interactional phenomena may provide an account for many of the instances, by closely examining deviant instances, we could provide a more generalised account of such phenomena. In other words, the analysts' task is to provide the most generalised accounts for all examples collected in the data extracts (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 92). In addition, it is also essential to demonstrate the recipient's orientation to the use of specific device or sequential type by looking at how an utterance is responded to by the recipient in the next turn. Such analysis would reveal an achievement of negotiation between participants through the use of particular conversational device and consolidate the account the analysts have developed (p.98).

Since the primary thematic concern of this study is to explicate the mechanisms of topic organisation, a wide-ranging analysis of different aspects is required. Each of the chapters deals with a separate issue of topic organisation in Japanese conversation, namely, topic initiation, topic negotiation and topic shift by focusing on different devices identified in English conversation. Therefore, in the following empirical analysis chapters, we will have a discussion section at the end of each chapter to discuss the emerging discrete interactional practices in each chapter although certain features will recurrently appear across chapters.

3.4 Japanese language

In order to understand the transcription of the Japanese conversation, the reader requires a brief description of some of the grammatical aspects of spoken Japanese, in particular, word order and the flexibility of grammar. It has been noted that Japanese is described as a language with a subject-object-verb (SOV) word order (Kuno, 1973; Shibatani, 1990). SOV is the basic word order in the declarative sentence, however, in spoken Japanese the subject (S) in the case of the first and second person, for example *watashi* (I) and *anata* (You), are not usually used except in the case when a speaker wishes to emphasise who does, says or acts. The speaker uses the first and second person subject very consciously at that time. Subject ellipsis can be seen in the following example taken from my data collection.

(35) A and T [Back to Japan]

29→ T Demo ne kangaetara: demo fukanoo jya nai yo[ne:::
but FP think if but impossible NEG FP FP

But coming to think of (it), in fact, (it) is not impossible, is [(i::t.)

30→ A [So:: nan desu yo↓:::
COP FP

[No::, (it)'s not↓::

31→ de, osoku tomo ni-jikan mae made desu yo [ne↑
and at least 2 hours before by COP FP FO

**And the minimum check-in time is 2 hours before the flight departure time,
[isn't (it)↑**

32 T [Dakara jyyuu-ichi-ji (.) dayo ne
so 11 a.m. COP FP FP

[So (we have to get there) by 11 a.m. (.)

right?

33→ A Jya chotto hayameni- jyu-ji han ni Hiisuroo ni tsuku to shite mo::
well then a bit earlier 10:30 a.m. P Heathrow P arrive even if
Well then, if (you) aim to arrive at Heathrow a bit earlier than that, say at 10:30 a.m.,

34 T Un
uh-huh
Uh-huh

35→ A ma chotto asa hayai kedo:: (0.2) kanoo wa kanoo desu.
well a bit morning early but [possible TOP possible] COP
well, although (it) means leaving here rather early in the morning, (0.2) (it) is most certainly a possibility.

In excerpt (35) the subject in the case of the pronoun ‘it’ does not appear in lines 29, 30, 31, and 35 and the subject in the case of second person ‘you’ in line 33 does not appear in Japanese conversation. In the following example, we can see both cases of subject ellipsis and subject appearance.

(36) Y and M [London]

25→Y Boku ashita kara London ni iku koto ni shita n desu yo=
I tomorrow from London P go N decide N COP FP
I’ve decided to spend some time in London from tomorrow=

26 M =E? dooshite dooshite.
what why why
=What? why why.

27 Y Ano:: sonoo obaa-chan ni ai ni=
uhm umm old lady P see P
Uh:m umm (I’m going there) to see an old lady (who is a very close friend)=

28 M =Ara iija:n.
oh good
=Oh, (that) sounds goo:d.

29 (0.3)

30 Y Kanzume ni nariso:dakara. Sono mae ni ikkai ikoo[ka na tte.
(lit. become something canned) because it before once go FP FP QT
because (I) won't have time for anything else (if I start on my assignments)
(I)'m wondering whether (I) should go (there) [before that.

31→ M [Sore wa ii wa:: >
that TOP good FP
[<That's go::od>.

The subject of the first person 'I' does not appear in Japanese in lines 27 and 30, however, the subject *Boku* ('I') appears in line 25. The subject 'That' (line 31) is produced with a louder voice as emphasised by underlining and the utterance '<That's go::od>' is delivered noticeably slower than the surrounding talk.

We have seen that the (S)OV word order, a type of subject ellipsis, is commonly found in spoken Japanese except in the case where participants emphasise subjects or clarify who does, says, and acts. It has also been noted that although SOV word order is ideal in the Japanese language (Shibatani, 1990), verb-final or predicate-final word order is not necessarily the case (Ono and Suzuki, 1992; Fujii, 1991). Thus, predicate-initial, the (S)V word order for intransitive sentences, and the (S)VO word order for transitive sentences can be seen in the data.

A speaker may deliver his or her performance quickly by using a predicate-initial type of word order. We can see the example in which the predicate-initial type of word order

is displayed (line 22) in the following excerpt.

(37) Y and M [Assignments]

20 M Ha:: (.) Maa sonna kanji de. (.) Mata nomi mashoo=
okay uhm that again drink SFX
OKa:y (.) That's it, then. (.) Let's go for a drink again sometime =

21 Y =Hai=
yes
=Sure= Yes

22→ M =Hayame ni yattoite kadai o.
early do CONJ assignment O
=(So,) finish your assignments early.

23 Y Hu::[:.
INT
Phe:[w.

24 M [heheheheh

[heheheheh

We have briefly looked at examples which deviate from an ideal Japanese word order. Furthermore, the (S)OV is the basic word order for declarative sentences in spoken Japanese, however, this does apply to certain types of interrogatives accompanying the question particle *ka* with a rising intonation. We can also find interrogatives without a question particle *ka* in a declarative sentence with a rising intonation. In the latter case, in particular, its distinctive intonation marks the completion point of the speaker's utterance which draws the recipient's attention.

We can see an example in excerpt (38) where both cases of interrogatives are displayed: (i) one including the question particle *ka* in line 85, and (ii) the other without the question particle *ka* with a rising intonation in line 83. In the latter case, if we produce a standard interrogative form, it should be produced *anoo yotei toka wa ari masu ka?* ('Uh:m (do you) have any pla:ns (.) to come here?').

(38) N and O [Teachers]

83→ O .hhhh (.) Anoo kocchi no hoo ni kuru yoo na [(.) anoo yotei toka wa ari ma↑su=
uhm here LK direction to come plan have
.hhhh (.) Uh:m (do you) have any pla:ns [(.) to come ↑here=

84 N [Ee::ee::ee::ee.
yeah yeah yeah yeah
[Yea:h yea:h yea:h yea:h.

85→ =A-anoo (0.2) ato- sensei wa itsu made [kocchi ni irassiyaru yotei desu ka?
oh uhm you TOP when till here (Japan) in stay-POL plan COP Q
=Oh, uh:m (0.2) how long do you [plan to stay here?

86 O [<Watashi wa:::> eetoo (0.3)
I uhm
[< I a:::m > uh:m (0.3)

87 jyuu-ku ni deru n desu ga:.
19(th) on leave N COP FP
leaving on 19th.

In the following excerpt, we can see an example in which the speaker only produces a noun (e.g., *keitai-denwa* 'mobile') as an interrogative with a rising intonation in line 49.

(39) M and E [Tennis friends]

49→ M Anata saa ano- keitai-denwa wa?
you uhm mobile-phone TOP
What about, uhm, a mobile phone, (have you got one)?

50 E A- >keitai aru yo<=
oh mobile-phone have FP
Oh >a mobile phone, (yes, I've got (a mobile)<=

51 M = Keitai no meeru wa tsukaeru-
mobile LK mail TOP use-can
= (We) can send emails by the mobile-phone-

We have seen some characteristics of the Japanese language from the data collected as part of this study.

3.5 Ethical issues

There are fundamental ethical safeguards which the researcher needs to comply with in order to ensure that this study is conducted with the least risk to the participants. A formal consent was firstly obtained from the participants. The participants were briefed about the research, including what the research is about, how their conversation will be recorded and how it will be disseminated and used for the purpose of this study. Their participation was on a voluntary basis only. In other words, the participants could freely decide whether to take part in the research or not (Arksey and Knight 1999: 129). In addition, audio-recordings of their telephone conversation were only done after briefing on the purpose of the research and obtaining prior consent of the participants (British Sociological Association, 2002).

In order to ensure their anonymity, participants' personal information such as personal name, membership institution and events are modified and kept confidential (British Sociological Association, 2002: 5). For example, excerpt headings used in this study refer to the names of the participants that are described by random alphabet letters in order to respect participants' privacy and avoid using their real names. It should also be noted that the same alphabet letters appearing in other conversations do not necessarily indicate the same person. The participants were informed that personal data will be used solely for the purposes of the research and their identity was not revealed to anyone other than the researcher. Apart from the assurance that the anonymity of the participants was protected, the participants were also informed in advance that the length of their telephone conversation is totally dependent on the amount of time the participants were willing to record.

It was also made clear before the recording of the telephone conversation that the participants were free to withdraw their conversation at any point and for whatever reason if they wished to do so. Since this study targets the ordinary conversation between participants who have close relationships and it is often the case that the participants' talk extends to personal topics. In cases in which serious topics such as the participants' health issues or financial matters are included in the conversations, the researcher reminded the participants of their right to decline any part of their conversation from being disseminated in order to protect their sensitivities and privacy (British Sociological Association, 2002: 2).

CHAPTER FOUR

TOPIC INITIATION IN JAPANESE CONVERSATION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter investigates topic initiation in Japanese conversation identifying the environment and the structural patterns of the accomplishment or consequential products of the action of an abrupt introduction of a new matter and providing the description of the participants' strategic projections and the management of various problems which may occur in the course of actions in interaction. In conversation, it is unpredictable for participants when a new topic is initiated and how many topics are talkable. In the case of topic initiation in ordinary conversation, it is thought that topics can be initiated freely and both participants can initiate a new line of talk in that the action of topic initiation may be implemented in non-specialised and non-restricted way in contrast to the one in institutional settings.

In institutional settings topics are already set and the order of speakership is formatted in a rather predictable way. In the news interview, for example, the interviewees are generally expected to answer properly to the question raised by the interviewers and they are restrained from asking questions, initiating a new topic, or straying from the current topic, and the interviewers are also constrained from expressing opinions or criticising the interviewees' views overtly because of their positions of neutrality. Significant differences between ordinary conversation and that of institutional settings may be identified in the way the turn-taking system works (Heritage, 1998). Given that there are equal opportunities available for both participants to initiate a topic in the

turn-taking system in ordinary conversation, an importance should be attached to the exploration of how the co-participants treat such abrupt initiation of a topic and show their understanding and position in the next turn as to why the participants initiate a topic abruptly at that point and how the participants then manage the co-participants' response in the subsequent turn in sequence organisation.

In some researches including cross-cultural communication studies, an abrupt topic initiation may be discussed and characterised as an aspect of communication style that is directly connected to cultural dimensions or differences based on the statistic evidence or the text-based analyses. More specifically, there is a different direction of research which examined the relationship between an interruption and gender differences (West, 1979, West and Zimmerman, 1983; Zimmerman and West, 1975). By taking on interruption as an indicator and focusing on the question of whether there is any correlation between gender categories and status and power relationships, their works conclude that men interrupt women more frequently than women interrupt men (Schegloff, 2001a: 289).

However, our concern here is how participants accomplish their orientation to initiating a new topic when they face some interactional troubles in such immediate context and, in particular, how they manage such troubles as a social action in the speech exchange system while paying attention to maintaining discourse coherence. In other words, our aim is not to examine how frequently topic initiation is displayed in interaction as is often the case with the statistical approach, but is to illustrate how topic initiation is accomplished mutually and sequentially by participants through selecting proper actions or utterances. Instead of generalising the characteristics of communication styles, this

study purports to describe the participants' actions in interaction in association with the organisation of topic initiation in real-time interaction.

Based on existing research in English, such as Button and Casey (1984, 1985) and Button (1987), we will examine topic initiation through the use of (i) topic initial elicitors in various circumstances; (ii) itemised news inquiries; (iii) announcements; and (iv) various sequential types of initiation such as arrangements, solicitudes, and appreciations in both closing sequences and topic-in-progress in sequence of talk-in-interaction. The aims of this chapter are to (i) determine whether the specific devices are used in the same way in topic initiation in Japanese conversation; and (ii) identify features for topic initiation that are unique characteristics of Japanese conversation. It will be shown that, although characteristic features of English and Japanese are typologically diverse, the ways participants initiate topic are broadly similar. It will also be suggested that participants properly deal with the practical problems caused by radical initiation of topic by using repair initiation and the production of moment-by-moment activities are the consequences of their situated method of conduct in local context.

4.1 Topic initial elicitors

Button and Casey (1985: 4) identify a particular type of topic initiating utterance called 'topic initial elicitors'. Topic initial elicitors are a device that is mutually and interactionally designed to elicit a new topic for the purposes of topic generation. In this section we will pay attention to the characteristic aspects in which the use of a topic initial elicitor occurs. Button and Casey (1984, 1985, 1988/89) propose that a topic

initial elicitor is projected to elicit topic generation from the next speaker who has the potential focus of the subsequent talk. If the recipient displays a positive response to the topic initial elicitor, a possible topic initial may be extended interactionally and mutually by the practice of topic nomination (Button and Casey, 1984). However, as they mention (1984, 1985), the topic initial may not always receive a positive response. We shall look at the speaker's strategies to accomplish the role of the topic initial elicitors.

4.1.1 Topic initial elicitor ~ pause ~ recompletion sequence

There may be a case where the topic initial elicitor does not receive a prompt response from the recipient, e.g., a gap may occur. The following excerpt illustrates this. The topic initiator (line 7) is displayed immediately after the speaker's own summary assessment accompanied with laughter.

(40) N and O [FP exam]

05 O Korekara sakizaki ne:: (0.2)

Future FP

Thinking about (our) fu::ture (0.2)

06 Honto (.) nanka:: suki de yatte temo heh ¥ naka naka ¥ ne. hehehehe

actually you know my will P do-ing even if

actually (.) £(it) is hard and takes time £(you know) heh even if (I) like doing it hehehehe

07→ Doo desu ka (.) benkyoo no hoo wa.

how COP Q study TOP

How was (.) your study.

- 08 **(0.3)**
- 09 Moo::
already
Al::ready
- 10 N Nanka ne::: (0.2) ima:: (.) ee:: to ¥ano¥:: daigaku no benkyoo mo::
as a matter of fact now uhm mm university's subject also
As a matter of fa::ct (0.2) no::w (.) uh::m £m::m£ actually (I)'m taking classes
- 11 dochira kato yuu to (0.2) kenkyuu to yuu yori wa FP no shiken no tame ni::
actually research than TOP [Financial Project] LK exam
in order to prepare for the FP exa::m (0.2) rather than my research
- 12 O A::.
oh
O::h.
- 13 N jyugyoo mo [ukete iru node::.
class also take-ing because
in my main [study at university.
- 14 O [Soo ka::
uh-huh
[Uh-hu::h.
- ((continues))

We observe that a 0.3-second pause (line 8) follows the topic initial elicitor. In a turn-taking system (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974), initiating actions (the first pair-parts in adjacency pair sequences) make responses relevant. In other words, when a sequence-initiating turn reaches possible completion and the responsive turn does not occur immediately in a place where the speaker transition is relevant, the speaker may self-select to pursue a response from the recipient. It is observed that the speaker pursues the recipient's response following a gap (e.g., a 0.3-second pause) by using the

practice of self-repair (i.e., self-initiated self-repair) at line 9 in order to endorse the relevance of a response from the recipient. In this case, the recipient of the topic initial elicitor may have trouble in responding immediately. In order to elicit a potential topic, the speaker makes sequential moves by putting forward the next inquiry, 'Al::ready' (by which she probably meant 'whether her study has already been finished'). Thus, it is noted that the speaker initiated self-repair in the same turn¹² by using inference work. The speaker inferred that the lack of a timely response can be attributed to a problem with the improper inquiry.

The speaker's initiation of repair gives opportunity for the recipient to manage the construction of her response. The recipient's response, which emerges (line 10) before the completion of the speaker's repaired inquiry, is not a minimal reply but a progress report marked with a phrase 'as a matter of fact' at turn initial position and the recipient makes a summary statement that she is taking classes in order to prepare for the financial project exam rather than her research. Following the response, the speaker uses a change of state token 'O::h' (as information receipt; see Heritage, 1984b) in line 12 indicating that the recipient's response included some new information and provides the sequential opportunity for continuation by the recipient by using a continuer, 'Uh-huh', in line 14.

¹² According to Schegloff (1997: 34-35), self-repair is in most cases initiated within the same turn (or within the same turn-constructional unit) which contains the trouble source. However, there are cases where the trouble source is addressed in the terminal position or some very brief talk (or component) intervenes between the end of the trouble source turn and the start of repair in the third turn (e.g., 'mm hm', 'yeah', and 'uhm' etc.). Schegloff (1997) calls this 'third turn repair'.

Here it is illustrated that a speaker shows prompt management when the recipient of the initiator has trouble in responding. She tries again by using another initiator in order to recomplete the action to elicit the generation of a new topic. In this case, the speaker uses self-repair to pursue the recipient's response after a pause (gap), which are called 'post-gap increments' (Schegloff, 2001b). According to Schegloff (2001b), post-gap increments are implemented by the speakers in an environment where the recipient does not uptake the speaker's utterance when it has reached a transition relevance place. The recipient also displays her collaboration to generate a topic by producing an elaborate response. It may be said that such collaboration by the recipient may be essential in completing the speaker's action to generate a new topic. The next section will illustrate the competition between speakers in which the topic initial elicitor may be involved.

4.1.2 Competition for the floor

When speakers initiate a new topic while recipients are still paying attention to the prior topic, the recipients may interrupt the speakers' initiation and competition for the floor between the speakers may occur.¹³ In this section we will describe the way in which topic initiation may involve competition for the floor. Interruption means to start a turn at talk in a place where it is not a transition relevance place (cf. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). Thus, the next speaker starts to speak when the current speaker has not reached a completion point. The following excerpt (41) illustrates this. It begins with the talk about the effect of exercise, in particular, playing tennis.

¹³ For discussion of the differences between overlapping talk and interruptions, see section 4.5 below.

(41) F and M [Tennis]

81 F Kono atsui toki wa: [(.) demo tenisu o yatte ta hoo ga mi ga shamaru.
this hot season TOP but tennis O play than body S take up
When (it) is ho:t [(.) (I) suppose playing tennis is better for our body (rather than staying at home without doing anything).

82 M [Un
uh-huh
[Uh-huh.

83 A::: soo kamo shirenai naa.
oh so suppose FP
Oh (I) suppose so.

84 Sorede kekkoo ga yokunaru shi[::
so blood circulation S facilitate
So, (it) facilitates the flow of the blood[::

85 F [Yokunaru shi.
facilitate
[(It) facilitates (the flow of the blood).

86→M A::: nan[ka kore::
uh feel this
Uh::: (I) th[ink this::

87 F [De:: masu masu anata no koe kii tara ¥genki¥ ni naru hehe=
and much better your voice listen if get energy
[A:::nd (I) feel much £better£ because you gave me energy hehe=

88 M =U::soo:: (.)> hon (to):: <ureshii
oh no really glad
=Oh no:: (.)> reall::y< (I)'m glad.

- 89→ Iya: (.) nanka ichi-jikan gurai mae kara:: (.) a:: denwa shite miyoo ka na.
 well feel one-hour about before uhm phone FP FP
Well (.) uh::m (I) was wondering whether (I) can phone (you) or not (.) an hour ago.
- 90 Demo ohiru mae no o-bon da shi:: (0.1) demo maa ¥moo¥chotto ¥ato¥ ni shiyoo ka
 but lunch time Obon festival COP you know a little later do Q
But, (it)'s lunch time during the Bon Festival perio::d (0.1) um (I) was wondering
- 91 na? toka omottari shite.
 FP wondering
if (I) could phone £a little later £.
- 92 F Demo ureshi katta (0.1) honto taimingu yo katte ne.
 but delighted really timing good FP
But (I) was delighted (0.1) that (it) was really good timing.
- 93 M Hontoo:::?
 really
Really:::?

((continues))

A topic initial elicitor could have been initiated by M in line 86 where the prior topic moved towards closing: F's statement is further elaborated by M (line 84) and it is agreed by F with repetition (line 85). However, in line 87 F continues (marked with 'A::nd') on talk related to the prior topic, which interrupts M's initiation of topic. The interrupting speaker F manages her initial marker 'A::nd' as a stretched word and is awaiting for the other speaker's action. We observe that the interrupted speaker M immediately cedes the floor soon after the onset of overlap (line 86). It is frequently the case that speakers who are interrupted rapidly drop out of competition for the floor (Jefferson, 1986). Thus, the speaker of topic initiation abandons the prior initiator to

take up the other speaker's topic. Her take up utterance 'Oh no:: (.)> reall::y< (I)'m glad' not only shows the news mark 'reall::y' but also delivers her gratitude (line 88). Then she recompletes her abandoned new topic (lines 89-91). This floor competition may illustrate both speakers' orientation to the affiliative action.

This example may also indicate that F's utterance which is delivered by partially repeating M's prior utterance has not been completed, thereby, she may try to continue her talk in the subsequent turn. However, M starts her talk using a token ('Uh:::'), delivered with a stretched sound, which indicates that M searches her word to initiate a new topic. On the other hand, F starts in overlap with the token 'Uh:::' in the prior turn by using a maker ('A::nd'), which indicates F's projection to continue the current topic. In fact, F might have potentially aimed for an earliest possible start at a possible completion point of a current turn-in-progress in order to avoid a delayed utterance. In the turn-taking system, if the prior turn ends (reaches a possible completion place), the next turn beginning becomes relevant with minimum gaps and overlaps. F's turn-initial component ('A::nd') is delivered with stretches, which may indicate that she does not rush through her utterance but monitor the timing between the two speakers' utterances.

4.1.3 How are you- type inquiry

The first topic of telephone conversation may be built up after the preliminary greetings, for example, the 'How are you' inquiry is a conventional remark. Greetings may be a component of opening (and closing) access rituals (Goffman, 1967, 1971). In English conversation, Sacks (1975) demonstrated that the 'How are you' inquiries are preferably answered positively and the inquirer also does not expect that the recipient of the 'How

are you' inquiry responds negatively. The speaker may have the notion that the response to the 'How are you' inquiry cannot possibly generate a potential first topic and organises her actions of inquiries in a way that will produce a first topic. Excerpt (42) illustrates this. At the beginning of the telephone call a caller O is telling N about an accident. Her flight was delayed for one day.

(42) N and O [Japanese student]

25 O Ee ee. Hikooki ga tochuu de hikikaeshita n desu
 yeah airplane S on the way return-PAST N COP
Yeah. The airplane we took returned to Heathrow airport on the way (to Tokyo).

26 N A::: honto ni::.
 oh really
Oh::: reall::y.

27 O U:::n. (0.1) nanka mettani nai koto dakedo.
 yeah seems very unusual COP
Yea::h. (0.1). It's very unusual.

28 N Ne::[:..
 it is
It is::[:..

29→O [Ne:: (0.2) don na desu ka::.
 yeah how COP Q
[Yea::h. (0.2) How are you doin::g.

30→ A- soo soo (.) Mark san (.) doo desu?
 oh yeah yeah (name) how COP
oh- yeah yeah (.) How is Mark doing?

31 N (.) A- (0.2) hai [heh
oh yeah
(.) Oh- (0.2) **yeah** [heh

An inquiry ‘How are you doin::g’ appears (line 29) where the latest news by the speaker has come towards closure by receiving the recipient’s response ‘It is:::.’ (line 28) that is followed by the speaker’s display of recognition with the use of the pre-closing token ‘Yeah’ and a 0.2-second pause in overlap. It is noticed that the overlap appears at the moment of completion of an ongoing utterance (e.g., overlap onset, cf. Jefferson, 1973), thereby, the current speaker can talk beyond that point. Furthermore, we also observe that the initiation of the inquiry is directly followed by another inquiry about a Japanese student who is commonly known between speakers. The second inquiry, ‘How is Mark doing?’ appears as a first topic prefacing a token ‘oh’ and repeated ‘yeah’ (line 30). The term ‘How’ is pronounced louder in volume aimed to elicit the attention of the recipient. The speaker of the topic initiator aims to find out the latest news about Mark from the recipient. Therefore, the speaker produces a topic initial elicitor before a response from the recipient is received and curtails the sequential process of the exchange of the ‘How are you’ inquiry.

The initiator is recognised in the next turn by the recipient with a token ‘oh’, an acknowledgement ‘yeah’ and appended laughter (line 31). However, the recipient produces neither a positive nor negative response. That is, the recipient’s response may include troubles-telling hence she cannot produce her answer right away. In the next turn, we observe that the speaker’s utterance appears in overlap with the prior turn and the speaker displays ‘Yeah’ and laughter, which is seemingly a repetition of the prior utterance. Instead of pursuing her initial question immediately, the speaker repeats the recipient’s response and continues her elaboration by producing the question ‘why are you lau::ghing’ with laughter (line 32) before the completion of the recipient’s utterance. In this context, the speaker’s question may be aimed at giving space to the recipient to monitor and produce a proper response about the student’s latest news. In addition, the utterance of the speaker (line 32) exhibits a sense of humour to offer an environment where the recipient could start (or continue) telling her trouble. These actions demonstrate the speaker’s management of the recipient’s delayed response and her affiliation and collaboration.

The next turn exhibits the recipient’s response to the inquiry of the topic initial elicitor (line 30) by using an indirect utterance *nakanaka ne* (line 33) that is delivered with minimal possible form and is frequently used as a negative context in Japanese language. It is worth noting that the overlapping utterance by the recipient (line 33) may be used as a possible strategy for retrieving the talk in order to continue her overlapped utterance (line 31) (that is categorised as ‘post overlap resolution’ (cf. Jefferson 2004[1975])). Here, two characteristic features are illustrated: (i) topic initial elicitors may be used as an economical way in which the speaker directly pursues a topic; and (ii) when a positive answer does not follow immediately, a speaker may stop pursuing a

topic and give the recipient an opportunity to provide an appropriate answer. The next section describes the way in which the topic initial elicitor may be accompanied by the marked utterance.

4.1.4 Marked utterance

In order to focus the recipient's attention on the upcoming speaker's activity, the topic initial elicitor may be implemented by using the marked utterance. As we saw above, the use of topic initial elicitors may not always generate a topic successfully. In this regard, speakers may use a marked utterance by referring to recent events or circumstances concerning the recipient within their mutual knowledge. Excerpts (43) and (44) illustrate this.

In excerpt (43), A and M are talking about the New Year festival and agree that it is often the case that many people buy a ready-made *Osechi-ryoori* nowadays. Topic initiation starts with a marked utterance referring to a recent event involving the recipient based on mutual knowledge to produce a topic (line 84).

(43) A and M [Research]

- 81 M heheheheh gaikoku-jin no hoo ga yoku shittetari shite ne. hehehe
foreigners than S better know FP
heheheheh I guess foreigners know (how to cook Osechi) better than Japanese.
hehehe
- 82 A Soo kamo shirenai.
yeah might be
Yeah, that might be so.

- 83 M Nee. Angai ne.
yeah one expected
Yeah. It is expected.
- 84→ E- kyoo wa nani-kanzume toka kaite atta kedo[:: (.) nanka kaiteru n?
uhm today TOP what (lit. to be canned) etc written something writing N
Uhm- (you) said that you are tie::d up [(.) are (you) writing something?
- 85 A [Aa::.
ah
[Ah::.
- 86 Ee::to ne.[0.2) nanka iroiro- u::::n (.) ashita- ashita kara jyugyoo ga hajimaru[node
well something yeah tomorrow tomorrow lecture S start because
We::ll. [(0.2) There is something yea::h (.) and the classes will start tomorrow.
- 87 M [Un. [Aa::.
uh-huh oh
[Uh-huh. [Oh ::.
(continues))

The topic initiator appears in an environment where the prior topic may be approaching its closing sequence. M's statement is followed by A's agreement, which is further recognised by M in line 83. It is observed that the utterance, '(you) said that you are tie::d up' which the speaker knows from the recipient's emails, solicits the recipient's prompt recognition 'Ah::.' (line 85) and the recipient's detailed response follows that she has something to do and classes will start tomorrow. It is also noted that such detailed response may potentially include a new topic which could be extended further as the example shows the presence of a continuer, 'Uh-huh', in line 87.

Similar action can be seen in excerpt (44). Topic initiation appears prefacing the utterance of a recent event (line 88) where the speaker happened to meet the recipient

(on the bus). In the earlier turns, S was talking to K about her experience of walking at midnight.

(44) S and K [Museum]

88→S Konaida (.) tama tama anata ni atta jya nai [(.) are wa nan de i tte kita no?
the other day happen to you P meet COP that TOP why go-PAST FP
The other day (.) (I) happened to meet you (on the bus), didn't (I) [(.) why did (you) go there (London) at that time?

89 K [Haai.
yeah
[Yeah.

90 Are wa nan datta n desu ka ne.
that TOP why COP-PAST COP Q FP
(I) don't remember why (I) went there at that time.

91 S Muujika[ru?
musical
(Did you see) a musi[cal?

92 K [Hayakatta desu yo nee?=
earlier COP-PAST-TAG
[(We met) at an earlier time, didn't (we)?=

93 S =8-ji nan bo↑ datta kana=
8p.m. around COP-PAST-TAG
= (I) guess (we met) at around 8p.m.↑, didn't (we)=

94 K =Jya kitto bijyutsukan datta kanaa.
well maybe museum COP FP
=Well (I) guess (I) went to a museum. ((continues))

Although the speaker provides a marked utterance (line 88) which was projected to

obtain attention to her topic initiator, the speaker fails to receive a news report from the recipient. The recipient only acknowledges the speaker's marked utterance at a conditional relevant place (line 89) before the speaker has reached her transition relevance place and produces no news report by saying '(I) don't remember...'. Note that the speaker then makes another inquiry: '(Did you see) a musical?' (line 91), to which the speaker could presume a response based on her knowledge of the recipient. The recipient also shows her affiliation and makes an effort to find out an answer to the inquiry by asking the time they met (on the bus), which overlaps with the inquiry in prior turn. As a consequence, the topic of 'museum' has been established and it is extended in the following turn. The speaker's use of the marked utterance seems to have successfully generated a new topic since it received an acknowledgement from the recipient before the initiation has been completed. In the next section, we shall move on to the examination of topic nomination focusing on the use of itemised news inquiries.

4.2 Topic nomination: Itemised news inquiries

Unlike 'topic initial elicitors' which are aimed at topic generation, 'topic nomination' is used when a topic pursuing newsworthy items is introduced. This is an important distinction between 'topic initial elicitor' and 'topic nomination' in talk-in-interaction (Button and Casey, 1985: 4). They identify two sequence types used as vehicles for topic nominations, namely, itemised news inquiries and news announcements. In this section, we shall examine the way in which speakers initiate new topics through the practice of itemised news inquiries. An itemised news inquiry may be selectively used so as to pursue the production of a new topic which is possibly newsworthy enough to establish as a topic (Button and Casey 1985: 4). Let us look at the practice of itemised

news inquiry as a prompt action. The following excerpt illustrates this. In excerpt (45), S and K are talking about pasta sauce which is related to a story of a pasta dish S made.

(45) S and K [Student life]

40 S Un. (0.1) Dakara (.)[maa (0.1) sorezore da na:: toka omotte.
yes so uhm each COP FP think

Yes. (0.1) So (.) [uhm (it) made me think about (0.1) different people having different tastes.

41 K [Soo na n desu yo ne:.
yes COP N COP FP FP
[Absolutely.

42 .hh Yappa shoku-bunka no chigai desu yo [ne:. kore wa ne:.
[food culture] LK different COP-TAG this COP FP
(This) is a case of ‘different culture – different food’, [isn’t it.

43 S [So so so so.
Yes yes yes yes
[Yes yes yes yes.

44→ Aa ima (.) moo (.) benkyoo shihajimete masu ka?=
uhm now already study start be-ing Q
Uhm (.) have (you) already (.) started studying yet? =

45 K =A- ie(.) mada=
well not yet
=Well, no, (.) not yet=

46 S =¥Otto¥ [(0.2) ¥Otto¥[(0.1) (°kigen° ga)¥ ki masu¥ yo::.[heheheh
oh dear oh dear deadline S come SFX FP
**=£Oh dear£ [(0.2) £oh dear£[(0.1) (°the deadline° is) £approa::ching£ you know
[heheheh**

47 K [heh [heh [¥Ki masu¥ ne:.
 come SFX FP
 [heh [heh [£(It is) approaching£ (but)

48 (.) saki ni ohuro ni haitte shimaoo [ka to.
 first at take a bath finish FP FP
 (.) (I)'m thinking of taking a bath [first.

49 S [A- anata wa warito hayaku hairu n da:.
 oh you TOP rather early take N COP
 [Oh, your bath-time is quite early.

50 K U:::n. Watashi (.) kami-no-ke o[::: (0.2) kawakasu mono
 yeah I hair o dry instrument
 Yea:::h. I (.) (my) ha:::ir[(0.2) (you know), what's used for drying hair

51 S [U:::n u:::n u:::n.
 yeah yeah yeah
 [Yea:h yea:h yea:h.

52 K motte nai n desu yo=
 have-NEG N COP FP
 well, (I) don't have it=

((continues))

The abrupt initiation of topic is displayed where the prior topic 'pasta sauce' has moved towards closure (line 44) through the practice of a yes/no inquiry (Raymond, 2003). It is immediately recognised by the recipient due to being known in advance between speakers. In this case, the speakers were chatting about the deadline of the recipient's essays during lunch time on that day.

Here, we notice that the recipient's response '=Well, no, (.) not yet=' is latched on to (Jefferson, 1984c; Schegloff, 2000a) by the speaker's subsequent comment (line 45).

The equal signs [=] at the end of the recipient's response and at the start of a next indicate this 'latched' relationship between prior and subsequent utterances. Jefferson calls it 'latched-to-possible-completion onset' (Jefferson, 1984c: 16). Jefferson (1984c: 17) mentions that 'the recipient/next speaker is achieving onset precisely no sooner and no later than the moment at which a possible completion point has occurred'. In this respect, she also argues that this 'latched onset' poses a problem for a prior speaker as she cannot produce further talk.

An orientation to one party speaking at a time is the central point on the turn-taking organisation for conversation. Therefore, as soon as the speaker starts talking, the recipient immediately takes up the speaker's comment, suspends her talk and provides laughter and repeats an utterance in the prior turn '£(It is) approaching£' (line 47). The repeated utterance displayed with a smiling voice indicates that she agrees and accepts the speaker's laughter invitation in the prior turn (Jefferson, 1979; Glenn, 1992; Holt, 2010). She then reconstructs her suspended response by referring back to the original inquiry of topic initiation and reveals a recipient's potential new topic to the speaker, 'taking a bath', which is further elaborated by the other speaker in the next turn by focusing on the 'bath time'. It can be said that topic initiation through the itemised news inquiry is specifically recipient-designed given prior topical talk and it is mutually and collaboratively accomplished by both speakers by using their mutual knowledge.

The following excerpt illustrates similar actions. In earlier turns, the speaker was talking to the recipient about a coffee table which she would like to buy. While talking about the price of the table, she just remembered that the recipient also wanted to buy a printer.

(46) Y and M [Printer]

- 96 M Aa: nanka moo chotto dashite mo:, ure rebaa- (.) .hh ureru jan mata.
uhm well more a bit pay CONJ sell can if can sell later
Uhm: (I) wouldn't mind paying a bit mo:re, if it's sold- (.) .hh (I) can sell it later on.
- 97 Y So::desu ne=
yes COP FP
Yes, (that)'s right=
- 98 M =Anata jya nai(kedo)-
you COP NEG
=Like you (said)-
- 99→ A- purintaa (.) katta?
oh printer buy-PAST
Oh-, did (you) buy (.) a printer?
- 01 Y A- purintaa. Kaimashita=
oh printer buy-PAST
Oh- printer. (I) bought it=
- 02 M =A- <sugo::i>.
wow great
=Wow! < that's gre::at >.
- 03 (0.4)
- 04 Koodoo[-ha
(action-type)
(You) act very qui[ckly.
- 05 Y [a: nan dakke na::.
what COP FP
[Uh:m let me see::.

recipient-designed given prior topical talk. Thus, talk is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are co-participants within the conversation (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974: 727). It is also said that any 'next turn' in a sequence exhibits the producer's understanding of the 'prior turn' (that is, the 'next turn proof procedure'; see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). Through participants' prompt activities, the recipient design of a turn-in-interaction refers not only to the speaker's ability to understand what the recipient knows but also to the speaker's ability to continuously monitor the recipient's action and modify their talk interactionally in response to the production of the recipient. In other words, they re-organise their emerging actions with reference to the recipient's responses to their talk. Let us move to another type of topic nomination: the practice of news announcements.

4.3 Topic nomination: News announcements

In this section, we will see an environment where new topics are initiated through the practice of news announcements. Two methods of boundaried topical movements are observed: the announcement of recipient's news or activities and the announcement of the speakers' own news. First, the announcement of a recipient's news or activities is described.

4.3.1 News announcement: Recipient's news or activities

News announcements related to a recipient's news or activities may be used for topic initiation. The following excerpt illustrates this. In earlier turns, M was asking Y

whether he has ever been to the shop (B&Q) to look for a coffee table.

(47) Y and M [Workshop]

56 Y So::desu ne. Anmari tsukau mono wa nai=
well not much use something TOP NEG
We:ll (they) don't have much that could be of any use (to us)=

57 M =Soo ka soo ka. Wakatta.
okay okay right
=Okay okay. Right.

58 Sore o chotto ne:: kyoo misucchatte. Anoo kae-kaena katta kara=
that O INT FP today miss-PAST chance uhm can buy-PAST NEG because
(I) missed (my) chance uh:m to bu- buy a (table) earlier today=

59 Y =Hai.
yeah
=Yeah

60 M Hayaku chotto teeburu ga hoshii naa to omo tte.
soon uhm table S want to get QT think CONJ
(I) just wanted to get a table as soon as possible.

61 Y A-soo desu ka.
oh I see
Oh, I see.

62 M Ojyamashimashita.

(I)'m sorry to have troubled you.

63 Y Iie iie.
no no
No worries.

- 64 M Sumimase[n.
sorry
Sorry about th[at.
- 65→ Y [Otsukaresamadeshita. Kyoo wa ichinichi-jyuu.
you must be tired today TOP all day long
[(You) must be tired. (You) attended (the workshop) all day today.
- 66 M Kyoo to ashita mo[nan desu. heheheh heheheh
today and tomorrow also COP N SFX
(Yes, I did. And) tomorrow as we[ll. heheheh heheheh
- 67 Y [Aa:. Ashita mo nan desu ka.
oh tomorrow also NCOP SFX Q
[Oh. (so) there's a workshop again tomorrow.
- 68 M Kuji kara zutto. heheheh. Dakara nanka dareka ga 'hirugohan tabe ni kita' tte
9a.m. since been so someone S lunch (o) eat P come-PAST QT
(It) starts at 9a.m. and goes on all day heheheh. So someone said '(I) thought (I)'d come here for lunch'.

((continues))

A new topic is initiated (line 65) after the possible completion of a sequence-in-progress. The initiation of the topic emerges as an offer of Y's sympathies that is not from out of the prior turn¹⁴ but the event M attended on that day. The topic moves from 'a coffee table' to 'another speaker's current event'. Thus it is offered as the recipient's news. Closer attention to the topic initiation turn reveals that it occurs after the beginning of a sequence closure. It is observed that the possible pre-closing marker (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; Maynard, 1980; Jefferson, 1980, 1984a, 1993) 'okay' is used (line 57), the reason for the phone call is explained (lines 58 and 60), and the sequence closing third 'oh' appears (line 61), all of which indicate that the conversation is coming to an end.

¹⁴ Sacks (1992) describes that a new topic emerges from out of the prior topic thus speakers display an orientation to topic which is related to the prior talk.

After the topic initiation, the turn expands while keeping the new topic.

An abrupt initiation of the new topic is recognised by the recipient of the topic initiation in line 66, which is displayed with no gap. In the third turn of the sequence structure of the talk, a token ‘oh’ appears in overlap with the prior talk, which is followed by the speaker’s recognition about his misunderstanding (line 67). The sequence closing third (see Schegloff, 2007) could have been used to close the sequence. In this case, however, the recipient continues her talk about the workshop.¹⁵ The utterance, which is seemingly a joke, is displayed with laughter.

An interesting point is that Y’s misunderstanding that the workshop was only for the day (it was in fact a two-day workshop) does not cause a sequential breaking down (e.g., gaps) or suspension (e.g., repair work). Rather, the talk expands following the sequence closing third. It may be said that the recipient’s collaborative actions may be one of the key tools in accomplishing a move to a new topic and that the speaker’s selection of topic initiation may be influenced by the speaker’s knowledge about the recipient’s news or activities. Speakers’ relationships may also help in order to resolve trouble when a misunderstanding (cf. Schegloff, 1987b; 1992b) occurs. The example also shows that laughter and jokes (or expressions that amuse the recipient) may be useful resources to resolve trouble. The next section illustrates the practice of the

¹⁵ In Schegloff’s work (1992b: 1328-1329) of the third position repair, he writes that there are some alternatives to the third position repair: there are cases where misunderstandings of the prior turn can sometimes be followed by the action of jokes by the recipient of the trouble-source turn. Another case is where the misunderstandings do not initiate repair but the recipient of the trouble-source turn proceeds with the talk with laugh (e.g., ‘let it go’). The example in excerpt (47) is not exactly the case which Schegloff suggests as alternatives to the third position repair; however, the recipient of the trouble-source turn treats the speaker’s misunderstandings as non-serious and continues to talk without breaking down the sequence of turns.

announcement of the speaker's own news.

4.3.2 News announcement: Speaker's own news

A news announcement is generally oriented to the speaker's news whereas an itemised news inquiry is oriented to recipient-related activity or circumstances (Button and Casey, 1985: 22). The speaker of a news announcement may display his or her knowledge in reference to the announcement. However, the recipient may also have some knowledge of aspects of the news report. Button and Casey discuss how a news announcement may be 'headline' news (1985: 23) so that it could be elaborated further. Excerpt (48) illustrates this. The initiation of the news announcement is displayed as the speaker's own news in line 25. M is telling Y that she had a two-day workshop and they were tied up in that meeting.

(48) Y and M [*Obaachan*]

- 18 M (.) Dakara sonna kanji de kon-gakki wa owari soo desu ne.
 so like that CONJ this term TOP end looks like COP FP
 (.) So, it looks like this is how it is going to be during the whole of this term.
- 19 Y Aa:::.
 oh
 Oh, I se::e.
- 20 M Ha::: (.) Maa sonna kanji de. (.) Mata nomi mashoo=
 okay uhm that again drink SFX
 OKa:y (.) That's it, then. (.) Let's go for a drink again sometime =
- 21 Y =Hai=
 yes

=Sure=

- 22 M =Hayame ni yattoite kadai o.
early do CONJ assignment O
=(So,) **finish your assignments early.**

- 23 Y Hu::[:.
INT
Phe:[w.

- 24 M [heheheheh

[heheheheh

- 25 Y→ Boku ashita kara London ni iku koto ni shita n desu yo=
I tomorrow from London P go N decide N COP FP
I've decided to spend some time in London from tomorrow=

- 26 M =E? dooshite dooshite.
what why why
=What? why why.

- 27 Y Ano:: sono obaa-chan ni ai ni=
uhm umm old lady P see P
Uh:m umm (I'm going there) to see an old lady who is a very close friend=

- 28 M =Ara ii ja:n.
oh good
=Oh, (that) sounds goo:d.

- 29 (0.3)

- 30 Y Kanzume ni narisoo dakara. Sono mae ni ikkai ikoo kana tte.
(lexical fixed expression) because just before once go QT
**(I'm wondering if (I) should go there before (I) start on my assignments,
because (I) know that once (I) start, (I) won't have time for anything else.**
((continues))

Turning back to the prior sequence, a future arrangement for both speakers (Jefferson 1984a: 192; Button and Casey, 1988/89) ‘Let’s go for a drink again sometime’ (line 20) is displayed by M which is accepted by Y. Further, laughter (line 24) occurs, which may be a possible pre-closing marker (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; Maynard, 1980; Jefferson, 1980, 1984a, 1993). That is, topic initiation appears after the beginning of a sequence closure. Observation results are as follows: (i) initiation of the announcement appears with no signals and markers in a turn initial; (ii) the topic is completely new (the topic has been changed from ‘M’s workshop’ to ‘Y’s trip to London’); and (iii) the topic is not from the recipient’s news but from the producer’s own news. In the next turn, news receipt tokens are displayed by the recipient by ‘What? why why’ (line 26). The use of ‘what?’ usually means surprise or confusion. In CA, the use of ‘what’ defined as a next turn repair initiator (NTRI) occurs in the next turn of trouble source (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977).¹⁶

The key issue is that the sequence is suspended for a while by the insertion of the repair work. The recipient’s repair initiation occurs because of the abruptness of the topic initiation. However, in this case, it is considered that the NTRI ‘what’ (line 26) is one of the ‘open’ class repair initiators (Drew, 1997). The characteristic of the ‘open’ class repair initiators, e.g., ‘pardon?’, ‘sorry?’, ‘what?’, is that they indicate the recipient’s difficulty in understanding the sequential connection between the prior turn and its prior sequence (1997: 73). This means that the abruptness of the topic initiation cannot immediately fit in the current sequence of the topic talk. However, as we shall see, the

¹⁶ The use of NTRIs is associated with a single specific repairable word or phrases located in the prior turn. When speakers find troubles in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk such as speaker’s grammatical errors, errors in the use of word meaning or the recipient’s failure to hear or a misunderstanding of the speaker’s utterance, NTRIs occur in the next turn of the trouble source (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977; Schegloff, 1992).

feature of the NTRI in this excerpt is not a simple ‘What?’ but ‘What? why why’, which is delivered with the producer’s interest. The new topic is subsequently linked back to a prior topic, the essay writing. That is a common topic for both speakers in the whole conversation.

We have seen that the topic initial elicitors appeared in the closing sequence where they are designed to generate a new topic (Button and Casey, 1985). We have also seen that the itemised news inquiries appeared in the topic-in-progress sequence where they emerged promptly, pursuing a particular newsworthy items. The initiation of topic through the itemised news inquiries is implemented by thoroughly focusing on the other speaker’s event (‘other-attentive’ termed by Jefferson, 1984a) and is sequentially projected by the speaker to make a possible completion place clear and select a topic that may be of high concern for both participants. However, in cases where topic initiation is implemented the utterance turn is crucially designed by the recipient, thereby the initiator’s projection may not be successful and we illustrated how they managed such situation. In contrast, news announcements are initiated with an orientation to the speaker’s news, thereby, they may constitute a strong movement to introduce a topic and either preferred or dispreferred news markers are. The third turn has shown the speaker’s orientation to closing or extending the topic.

4.4 Various sequential types of topic initiation

In English conversation, various sequential types of initiation of topic, such as arrangements, solicitudes and appreciations have also been identified (Button, 1987). Similar to what we have seen above, these sequential types of initiation of topic are

produced as a disjunct topic movement. According to Button (1987), these sequential types of topic initiation typically occur in the closing sequences and there are cases where the closing sequence has been completed with further closing components. However, there are also the cases where the sequential type of topic initiation is implemented and a new topic line is expanded.

4.4.1 Arrangements

Arrangements may be used as a device for topic initiation (Button, 1987). In general, arrangements are known as the last topic and the other speaker can recognise this. The following excerpt (49) illustrates this activity. O and N are talking about a student who is a businessman. They have knowledge of the third party and O is glad to hear that her ex-student is keeping up with his study at his own pace.

(49) O and N [Japanese student]

77 N hehe (.) Nee (.) doo [nan da ka.

well how COP Q

hehe (.) Well (.) (I) don't [know (what he thinks of me).

78 O [heheh (.) Iya:. (.) tekisuto o ano hajimeta no ka na:: toka

uhm textbook o uhm start-PAST FP Q FP

[heheh (.) uhm (.) (I) would have thought that (he) had begun to use the textbook.

79 chotto sono hen ga: (.) are datta n [desu kedo:

that thing S COP-PAST N COP but

(That)'s the thi:ng (.) (That)'s what (I) thou[ght, but:

- 80 N [Aa::.
Oh I see
[Oh, I se::e.
- 81 O Maa maa (.) mai peesu de yarasete itadaite iru yoo de (.)[anoo arigataku. hehehehe
well one's own pace at do POL-ing look because uhm appreciate
Well, that's fine (.) (He) seems to be allowed to study at (his) own pace, so [(.)
(I) am thankful. hehehehe.
- 82 N [Aa::.
oh
[Oh::.
- 83→O .hhhh (.) Anoo kocchi no hoo ni kuru yoo na [(.) anoo yotei toka wa ari ma↑su=
uhm here LK direction to come uhm plan TOP have SFX
.hhhh (.) Uh:m (do) (you) have any plans [(.) uhm to come ↑here=
- 84 N [Ee:::ee:::ee:::ee.
yeah yeah yeah yeah
[Yea:h yea:h yea:h yea:h.
- 85 =A-anoo (0.2) ato- sensei wa itsu made [kocchi ni irassyaru yotei desu ka?
oh uhm you TOP when till here (Japan) in stay-POL plan COP Q
=Oh, uh:m (0.2) how long do you [plan to stay here?
- 86 O [<Watashi wa:::> eetoo (0.3)
I TOP uhm
[< I a:::m > uh:m (0.3)
- 87 jyuu-ku ni deru n desu ga.
19(th) on leave N COP FP
leaving on 19th.

((continues))

The initiation of arrangement appears in an environment where the prior topic may move towards closing. Whereas the speaker displays her summary (lines 78-79) and

shows an appreciation to her (line 81), the recipient displays her recognition and information receipt by producing ‘Oh, I se::e’ (line 80) and ‘Oh::.’ (line 82). Looking closely at the relation between the initiation and the prior turns, the initiation is produced completely in the same pattern as the topic initial elicitor is displayed in excerpt (40). The initiation of arrangement is displayed immediately after the speaker’s own summary assessment accompanied with laughter. The topic is disjunct from the prior topic concerning the student who is studying Japanese. The differences are the initiation of the arrangement prefaces an audible inbreath ‘.hhhh’ and a token ‘Uhm’ and receives the prompt recognition, ‘Yea:h yea:h yea:h yea:h’, by the recipient (line 84) overlapping with the prior turn.

Here it is noted that the initiation of the arrangement ‘(do) (you) have any plans (.) uhm to come ↑here’ may be analysed as a preliminary arrangement (cf. pre-sequence, see Sacks, 1992, vol.1: 685; Schegloff, 1968, 1980, 1990; Terasaki, 2004[1976]), thereby, the arrangement may be announced in the following turn. The re-initiation of the arrangement, ‘Oh, uh:m (0.2) how long do you plan to stay here?’, is produced by the recipient and not by the speaker. Under these circumstances, the recipient attempts to accomplish their activities concerning the other speaker’s activities. It may be said that the initiation of an arrangement may be accomplished interactionally and mutually by both speakers. The next section illustrates the practice of solicitude as a sequential type of topic initiation.

4.4.2 Solicitudes

Solicitudes as a sequential type of topic initiation may be disjunct from the prior topic

and the producer orients to closing the topic. The initiation may receive a positive or negative response from the recipient. The following two excerpts (50) and (51) illustrate this. In excerpt (50), at the beginning of the excerpt, T says she needs digital means (e.g., camera, or video) in order to see how E looks young.

(50) T and E [Digital means]

43 T Ko[re wa ¥yappari ¥(.) dejitaru de:[:: hehehehe
 this TOP definitely digital means
Thi[s means that £definitely£ (.) (we) need to use digital mea:::ns (in order to see each other)[hehehehe

44 E [Nani (o)- [hehehe
 what
[What- [hehehe

45 Kowai kowai
 scary scary
(That) is scary.

46 T >Kowai kowai< (.) hehehehe
 scary scary
>(That) is scary < (.) hehehehe

47→ .h Maa maa genki soo de naniyori desu yo=
 anyway good hear so glad COP FP
.h Anyway, (it)'s so good to hear that (you) are doing well=

48 E =Soo honto yoo (.) Aa:: iya ureshii wa.
 oh yes definitely oh yes glad FP
=Oh yes, definitely. (.) Oh:: yes, (I)'m so happy (you called).

The initiation of topic by using the utterance of a solicitude is displayed in line 47, prefacing the discourse marker ‘anyway’ in the environment where the previous topic moves towards closing. The topic moves from ‘digital means’ to the speaker’s solicitude ‘(it)’s so good to hear that (you) are doing well’. Looking at the prior turns, the previous context is briefly assessed by both speakers (with a repetition ‘(That) is scary’) with laughter. Then, the producer moves on to the next topic by initiating the practice of solicitude in the same turn, which is followed by a positive response: ‘Oh yes, definitely’ (line 48). This means that the recipient agrees with the producer’s solicitudes which may embrace a request for permission to move away from the previous topic. It is also noted that the recipient herself produces her appreciation and the sequence continues to the next topic about their emails to keep in touch (which does not appear in the excerpt).

In contrast, excerpt (51) illustrates that the initiation of solicitude receives a negative response (line 21). A and M are talking about their research. Again, the initiation of solicitude appears in a similar environment where the prior topic moves towards closing.

(51) A and M [Research]

- 18 M Dooshiyoo kana tte kangaeru hodo (.) iyana mono wa nai yo ne (.)
how should I do QT consider-ing terrible thing TOP NEG - TAG
The most terrible situation is (.) to think about how (I) should do from now,
- 19 naka naka
anyway
isn’t it. (It)’s difficult to do, anyway.

20→ A- demo:.(.) o-genki soo jan.

oh but look fine -TAG

Oh- bu::t (.) (You) look fine, don't you.

21→A Un. >Genki wa genki na no<. .hh demo nee::

yeah fine TOP fine COP FP but uhm

Yeah. >(I) am fine. < .hh but uh::m

22 M Un.

uh-huh

Uh-huh.

23 A >jyuu-ni-gatsu ni kata no dakkyuu no shujyutsu o shita no ne<

December P shoulder LK bone dislocation LK surgery take-PAST FP

> (I) had bone dislocation surgery for my shoulders in December<.

((continues))

The initiation of solicitude appears (line 20) on the topic of the 'recipient's health', which is not related to the prior topic 'research'. The initiation occurs in an environment where the speaker's own assessment is displayed as a tag question and a discourse marker 'anyway' appears at the end of the utterance (lines 18 and 19). It is observed that the speaker shows her intention of topic movement by displaying a change of state token 'Oh' and a discourse marker 'but' at turn initial, and then organises initiation by using a tag question to elicit the recipient's response.

The response comes with no gap with an acknowledgement of 'Yeah' and her comment on her health condition follows, '> (I) am fine. <', that is delivered at a pace quicker than the surrounding talk. Then the recipient shows her trouble by prefacing it with '.hh', a discourse marker 'but' and a token 'uh:m'. A continuer 'Uh-huh' displayed by the speaker (line 22) may elicit the recipient's further talk about her trouble (line 23). It is

possible that the initiation of solicitude may elicit the recipient's potential trouble, which may be established as a new topic. The new topic is indeed extended in this excerpt. This is a case where solicitudes as a sequential type of topic initiation can work to further extend the new topical line. The final section illustrates an initiation by the use of appreciation.

4.4.3 Appreciations

As observed above, the speakers who are overlapped (or interrupted) abandon their sayings even if they are in the midst of their utterance. In ordinary conversation, dropping out of competition for the floor is one routine way for the speakers to try to minimise the overlap (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 1987a). However, there may be a case that the speakers who are interrupted do not drop out of competition for the floor and continue to talk. In this environment, appreciations as another sequential type of topic initiation may be used. Excerpt (52) illustrates this. Topic initiation is displayed immediately after their competition (line 57). N and O are talking about a student's learning style.

(52) N and O [Japanese student]

52 N Kaite oboeru taipu de wa nai [node::
 write and learn type COP-NEG because
(He) is not the type of person who writes (kanji) in order to learn [so:

53 O [Nai nai nai nai.
 yes yes yes yes
[Yes yes yes yes.

[illegible]

that ‘the function of multiple sayings is to display the speaker’s stance against the prior speaker’s perseverating course of action. In taking this stance through the production of a multiple saying, the speaker proposes that the course of action be halted.’ Thus, in this case, multiple sayings, ‘yes, yes, yes, yes’, displayed by O (line 53) can be used as a solution for the interactional trouble that N persistently repeats her utterance ‘(He) is not the type of person who write (kanji)’ in the course of action.

Turning back to the example above, O not only produces the multiple sayings of ‘yes’ (line 53) but also continues her argument by agreeing that he (student) is not the type of person who writes in order to learn (line 54) and then arguing that his learning style does not have bad effects in developing his ability (which is not clarified in her utterance) because each person has own style of studying (line 55). Notice that the utterance of the speaker of multiple sayings is interrupted by the recipient (line 56) with the repeated utterance of ‘as there is a type of person’. The recipient is notably resistant. Facing this continuous interactional problem, topic initiation is displayed (line 57), which expresses her appreciation and is delivered with a smiling voice and laughter. In other words, the speaker does not attend to the interrupting utterance but carries on to display appreciation as a sequential type of topic initiation. It may be said that the speaker may have changed her projection: the speaker’s idea was contrary to the recipient’s one but then she changed her strategy by producing her appreciation. We propose that this type of topic initiation may be used when the speaker is trying to avoid or resolve interactional trouble. This is an example where the topic initiation does not occur in the closing sequences but is implemented in the topic-in-progress sequence.

4.5 Discussion

In this chapter we illustrated the organisation of topic initiations in Japanese conversation and identified the environment and the structural patterns of the consequential products of the action of an abrupt introduction of a new matter and described the participants' strategic projections and the management of various problems caused by the radical introduction of topics in the course of actions in interaction. In the question-answer sequences the questions are structurally followed by the answers as second-pairs of the adjacency pairs, thereby it is crucially characterised as the recipient design. We identified certain speakers' strategic projections in both closing and topic-in-progress sequences and observed that the use of questions that are implemented by the speakers exclusively seeks the recipients' events or information (except the case of the initiation of news announcements). It is also shown that the questions used as topic initial elicitors or itemised news inquiries are often designed by the speakers in the way that the recipients can identify the possible completion easily (e.g., change in prosody) or that the recipients' attention is drawn to marked utterances which signal the possibility of the upcoming abrupt initiation of topic.

The main strategic management displayed by the speakers during the negotiation with the recipients is shown. When the recipients failed to uptake the new topic initiated by the speakers (e.g., the answer is sequentially absent or delayed), the speakers attempted to provide another initiator or inquiry by using repair initiation in order to resolve the recipients' potential trouble in responding and reconstructed their questions. When the speakers' initiators were overlapped by the recipients, the speakers stopped speaking and attended to the recipients' overlapping utterances and then recompleted their

original initiators or inquires within the same turn or in the subsequent turns, which is an orderly display of the key feature of the turn-taking system in conversation, i.e., an orientation to one party speaks at a time. Various types of overlap have been illustrated in our data which fall into those categories proposed by Jefferson (1984c: 12-13) such as transitional onset (i.e., when the next speaker orients to a possible transition relevance place), recognitional onset (i.e., when the next speaker recognises that the current speaker projects its completion), progressional onset (i.e., when there is some disfluency such as ‘hitches’ in the current turn and the next speaker proposes a completion so as to move forward the conversation), and terminal overlap (i.e., the next speaker starts up at the end of the last word which constitutes a possibly complete utterance). Jefferson argues that even when it is apparently interrupting (i.e., the next speaker starts up in the midst of the prior turn at talk where the next speaker recognises that the current speaker projects its completion), these categories may be used to account for the orderly production of overlapping talk (Jefferson, 1984c: 37-38). In many cases overlaps are managed and resolved by the withdrawal of one participant (or both of them) or by one of the participants upgrading the talk and the recipient’s cut-off (Schegloff, 2000a: 22-24).

On the other hand, the recipients also displayed the strategic operations in order to manage interactional problems while showing their understandings, alignments, or cooperation with the speakers in the prior turn. The recipient’s strategic operation is well projected in her response to ‘How are you’ type inquiry in excerpt (42) in our data. In this excerpt, the recipient provides *hai* (‘yeah’) in response to the question ‘How is Mark doing?’ and the response in this case is not an answer but is an acknowledgement. The response also attaches laughter. We argue that this response *hai* (‘yeah’) is

specifically designed as premonitory trouble in order to signal the possibility of a forthcoming troubles-telling without directly reporting detailed description of the trouble (Jefferson, 1980: 183) and this makes the troubles-recipient prepared to track a report of a trouble and negotiate with the troubles-teller. In addition, the laughter produced by the troubles-teller functions as ‘trouble resistance’ (cf. Jefferson, 1984b: 351) so that the troubles-teller takes the trouble lightly. As a consequence the troubles-recipient in our data immediately recognises the signal of the existing trouble and provides further questions in overlap with the response. Such action is characterised as performed in a non-serious way,¹⁷ which may be specifically designed to provide the troubles-teller a monitoring space when the response is not immediately given or delayed.

We have illustrated the structural patterns of the organisation of topic initiation and particularly focused on both participants’ strategic projections and management, which are reflected in the design of the utterances (actions) in talk-in-interaction and it is interesting to observe that the ways topic is initiated is systematically similar in English and Japanese despite the fact that they are typologically diverse. However, a unique feature in terms of the design of the initiation of self-repair has been identified in our data, which is designed and built with humorous, funny or non-serious utterances as demonstrated in the three examples as follows.

Firstly, we pay attention to a ‘yes-no question’ sequence which is extended into

¹⁷ In troubles-talk, a troubles-recipient’s job is to take the trouble seriously as a troubles-recipient (Jefferson, 1984b: 367). However, there is an occasion in which a troubles-recipient joins troubles-teller’s laughter who is talking about a buffer topics (e.g., jokes etc.) associated with the troubles (1984b: 351).

subsequent turns in excerpt (45). The question is ‘Uhm (.) have (you) already (.) started studying yet?’ and its answer is ‘Well, no, (.) not yet.’ The question of whether a caller is interrupting the recipient is often used at the beginning of the telephone conversation with a preliminary search token *Aa* ‘Uhm’ (Jefferson, 1980: 164). However, in this case, the question has been delivered in the middle of this talk. A normative answer to this kind of question is ‘no’ and informs the availability to talk. Here, the ‘no’ answer has two implications in the context: one is that she is available to talk and the other is that by answering the question that she is available to talk, it has been suggested that she has not yet started studying. As we wrote above, the topic ‘studying’ is known between the speakers. They were talking about the deadline of the recipient’s essays during lunch time on that day and thereby it is possible that the recipient immediately recognises what the speaker was referring to by the use of the word ‘study’ in her utterance. The speaker initiates repair after the response by saying ‘£Oh dear£(0.2) £oh dear£ (0.1) (°the deadline° is) £approa::ching£ you know heheheh’ and a new sequence has already been established and the speaker is referring to a new topic ‘studying’ by suggesting that the deadline is approaching. It can be said that the speaker’s projection is well-organised and systematically implemented in that she firstly initiates the topic abruptly by asking if she is interrupting the recipient but it is displayed as a routine activity such as greeting and proper telephone etiquette and the speaker operates her strategic projection after the response from the recipient. Such speaker’s strategic projection is visible and it is not only a simple routine business but includes a potential topic which can be extended in the third turn. The utterance is delivered in a non-serious way (e.g., joke). The recipient immediately recognises and accepts the speaker’s joke: she also laughs in overlap and says ‘£(It is) approaching£’ by partially repeating the speakers utterance with a smiling voice that is produced completely in the same tone as the speaker’s

utterance in the prior turn. Here, the repair initiation (the third position repair, cf. Schegloff, 1992b) is specifically used to create humour.

Secondly, we pick up an example of the recipient's response to an announcement which is delivered to generate a new topic in the topic closing sequence. The action of announcements is generally initiated as the speakers' news or events but this example in excerpt (47) involves an announcement as a recipient's news or event. Our data illustrated a case in which the recipient of the news announcement regarding the recipient's events reveals that there has been a misunderstanding in the speaker's announcement and the recipient designed her response in a non-serious manner by appending laughter so that they can pass it through without particularly emphasising such misunderstanding. The speaker of the news announcement immediately recognises that there has been a misunderstanding and treats it seriously. The speaker repeats the recipient's prior utterance in overlap with her response in the third turn before the recipient starts appending laughter. The recipient displays strategic projection in the next turn by describing the event (i.e., workshop) as a routine business and shifting the topic to a student who made funny comments at that workshop. The speaker's misunderstanding has been completely passed through with the joke that the student attended the workshop for lunch. Once it becomes apparent that the misunderstanding is resolved, speakers normatively refrain from making further reference on that matter. Laughter and jokes (or expressions that amuse the other speaker) may have helped to maintain the relationship between the participants.

Thirdly, we discuss an example of the sequential type of topic initiation, the utterance form of appreciation, in excerpt (52), which is also identified in English conversation

(Button, 1987). Paying attention to the position and the composition of the turn of the utterance, it is displayed differently from the other examples. The utterance of the turn is delivered with a format 'yes - but' and it appears in the environment where the original assertion (a response to the prior assessment) is persistently interrupted by the other speaker's assessment. The topic initiation is reconstructed through the repair initiation which is structurally linked to the prior utterance in the argument sequence and accomplished through the other speaker's cooperation (i.e., shared laughter) in the subsequent turn. The topic initiation expressing her appreciation is organised to get away from the problem in such an argumentative sequence and restart a new sequence.

Here we used the word of 'interruption' in argumentative sequences in interaction. Apparently, in this example, the next speaker starts to talk in the midst of the prior turn at talk while the current speaker is still talking (as is the case of transitional onset (Jefferson, 1984c, 1986) and it is the fact that more than one person talking at a time that is overlapped phenomenon. However, Schegloff (2001a: 290) discusses that 'interruption' is 'often used to mean not only a starting up an intervention, but also as we say, "not letting them finish," a "full-fledged interruption" we might call it.' Schegloff (2001a: 294) suggests that interruption might be analysed in two ways: one is a transitional space onset (cf. Jefferson, 1984c, 1986) which means that although the next speaker starts up in the midst of the current speaker's turn at talk, she is not letting the other finish and she recognises that the current speaker projects its completion. The other is the case that the next speaker continues to talk until the current speaker stops.

As we discussed above, while participants' real activities are complex and some unique features in the design of the initiation of self-repair in Japanese conversation has been

highlighted, our analysis has shown that the structural patterns of the organisation of topic initiation are found to be broadly similar in English and in Japanese despite diverse typology between these two languages. This is somewhat striking findings, which draw a line against the claims made by some researchers including cross-cultural communication studies. When an abrupt topic initiation is discussed as an aspect of communication style based on the statistic evidence, their attention is directed to cultural differences and different cultural dimensions. More specifically, there is a different direction of research which examined the relationship between an interruption and gender differences (e.g., West, 1979, West and Zimmerman, 1983; Zimmerman and West, 1975), in which an interruption in conversation may be used as an index to find out gender differences, which may be discussed further in connection with power relation in society. As Schegloff (2001a: 288) points out, the problems associated those approaches is that they are driven by their interest in providing a general characteristic aspects of actions based on the statistics or the assumption of differences between cross-cultural communication styles. A more empirically grounded analysis of participants' real activities has revealed what is actually happening in our social interaction and shown overwhelming similarities across different languages in different cultural settings. While generalised images of specific language use or communication styles that are directly connected to cultural dimensions may tell us some aspects of communication styles in different cultures, it should be reminded that the conversational structures are fundamentally shared across different languages.

CHAPTER FIVE

DAKARA IN JAPANESE CONVERSATION

5.0 Introduction

The chapter explicates how participants negotiate a particular topic by orienting to topic closing sequence and how they re-open or initiate a new matter in order to continue the talk by using the Japanese discourse marker *dakara* ('so') at turn initial position as a resource. Turn beginnings are important places structurally in terms of sequence organisation.¹⁸ It is because discourse markers at turn-initial can be used by the participants not only to project the turn design sequentially but also to anticipate what kind of actions are being constructed and what it will take for those actions to be completed.

We ordinarily demonstrate the gist of our talk at some point in conversation with a view to make sense of our reasoning mutually. If the co-participants agree with the gist or the upshot displayed by the participants, it becomes possible for either participant to initiate a new topic by moving from the current topic to another. The gist or upshot of talk in interaction carries the main (or essential) meaning of, or the final result of, a conversation. Thus, it is the statement not only referring to the immediately preceding turn but also to the earlier turns in sequence at talk-in-interaction and it is the summaries provided by the producer in her own words. Participants provide the gist or upshot and

¹⁸ Schegloff (1987c: 71) observes that 'one important feature of turn construction (that is, constructing the talk in a turn in a conversation) and the units that turn construction employed (e.g., lexical, phrasal, clausal, sentential constructions) is that they project, from their beginnings, aspects of their planned shape and type'.

the co-participants may respond either with agreement or disagreement. It is through these actions that participants show their positions. In addition, they may also display accounts of their actions by exhibiting to what extent they agree or disagree, for example, by way of upgrading or downgrading agreement (see Pomerantz, 1984a). We need to describe all these actions and accounts of their actions by identifying what these actions do and how these actions are accomplished (Schegloff, 1996a: 169).

Linguists have traditionally investigated discourse connectives and linguistic elements by looking at their roles and the structure of discourse relations mainly based on the text-based analysis. For example, sentence-initial ‘so’ has been examined by a number of researchers (e.g., Halliday and Hasan, 1976, van Dijk, 1979; Schiffrin, 1987) in terms of its function. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 229) described the cohesiveness of a text and argued that cohesive devices are explicitly marked in a text (e.g., ‘and’, ‘but’, ‘so’, and ‘then’) so that it gives signals to the other speakers. Van Dijk (1979: 453) described that ‘so’ has a function of drawing a conclusion with respect to the previous clause or sentence and he (p.449) noted that the examination of pragmatic connectives requires describing their functions in pragmatic context. Schiffrin (1987) attempts to incorporate the methodology of CA and defines the discourse markers as sequentially dependent elements including the form, meaning, and action. In her model, an English discourse marker ‘so’ is used at a transition relevance place and it represents the meaning of a ‘result’ or a ‘consequence’ of the talk (1987: 324). Schiffrin’s approach to the exchange structure, while incorporating some conversation analytic concepts, seems to have heavily focused on the markers themselves.

The Japanese discourse marker *dakara* is defined as a conjunction in the Kenkyusha’s

New Japanese-English Dictionary (Masuda, 1974) and can be translated into English as ‘so’; accordingly; therefore; consequently; for that reason; on that ground; that is why; and so that. Another example of the use of Japanese discourse marker *dakara* is a phrase ‘xxx *dakara*’, which can be translated into English as because; because of; on account of; by reason of; owing to; in consequence of; since; now that and so on. In English, it has been considered that the discourse marker ‘so’ is a marker of the main units in discourse, whereas the discourse marker ‘because’ is a subordinate marker (Schiffrin, 1987: 320). Likewise, the Japanese discourse marker *dakara* functions in two different ways, both as a marker ‘so’ and as a marker ‘because’¹⁹ in different positions. This study will focus on the use of *dakara* as the marker ‘so’²⁰ as a turn initial.²¹

Matsumoto (1988) examines some Japanese connectives in both formal and functional changes. He writes that a copula *da*, combined with a connective particle *kara*, shifts into an initial connective *dakara*. As a consequence, a connective *dakara* increases the freeness of morphemes. S.K. Maynard (1993) examines discourse markers such as *datte* and *dakara*. She describes that *dakara* provides additional information to support a position or to elaborate on the information given in the prior utterance (1993: 119).

¹⁹ Ford and Mori (1994) examine the functions of causal markers in Japanese and English conversations by focusing on the causal connectors *kara* and *datte* (that are equivalent to the causal connector ‘because’ in English).

²⁰ The discourse marker ‘so’ is equivalent to *dakara*, *sorede*, *yueni*, *shitagatte*, and the like in Japanese. The conjunction *yueni* and *shitagatte* are rarely used in spoken Japanese. Kenkyusha’s New Japanese-English Dictionary (Masuda, 1974) translates *sorede* as ‘and’, ‘then’, and ‘thereupon’. Thus, *dakara* and *sorede* are used similarly to express causes and consequences, however, they are not always exchangeable. In my data collection, there are cases where *sorede* cannot be replaced by *dakara* in context. The conjunction *jya* can also be replaced with *dakara* in certain contexts in my data. In the dictionary, *jya* can be translated into English as: well; then; in that case; if that; if (it is) so. For example, *Jya sore wa so shite okusa* (‘So that’s that’) (Masuda, 1974: 178).

²¹ There have been reports focusing on the turn component at turn-initial position in Japanese conversation: Mori (2006) investigates the function of the Japanese token *hee* (that is equivalent to ‘oh’ in English) by analysing sequential context and turn shape. Targeting an English token ‘oh’, Hayashi (2009) examines ‘Ah- prefaced’ turns in Japanese conversation.

These previous studies examine the functions of *dakara* but they do not provide a systematic analysis of the sequential environment where participants use *dakara*. In CA research in Japanese Mori (1999) examines the ways in which agreement and disagreement are produced with the use of different types of connective expressions such as *dakara*, *datte*, *demo*, *kara*, and *kedo*. In her study, she (1999: 67) illustrates the function of a discourse marker *dakara*: ‘utterances marked by *dakara* often introduce consequences or examples of the described circumstances’ and she compares the recipient’s response by using *dakara* and *datte* when the recipient demonstrates his agreement. The use of *datte* tends to provide justification by referring back to the prior speaker’s utterance, whereas the use of *dakara* marks ‘a “forward” linkage and introduces a natural consequence by elaborating on the prior speaker’s utterance’ (p.68).

In CA research in English, Raymond (2004) shows that the discourse marker ‘so’ functions not only as an upshot of the prior or earlier turns orienting to closing of the current topic but also as an indication that the speaker is pursuing the other speaker’s opinion, highlighting the distinctive role of the stand-alone ‘so’ in comparison with ‘so’-prefaced utterances and demonstrates that discourse marker ‘so’ functions differently depending on whether it is used as ‘so’-prefaced upshot or as a stand-alone ‘so’. Bolden (2008) also proposes another function of the discourse marker ‘so’, focusing on the ‘so’-prefaced question, ‘So what’s up’, which can be a useful device to obtain the reason-for-call (cf. Schegloff, 1986: 117, 132; Sacks, 1992) or to initiate catching up when no specific topic is expected (cf. Button and Casey, 1988/89).

In this chapter, we shall firstly examine the uses of the upshot marker *dakara* by looking at the upshot of the speaker’s own talk and the upshot of the recipient’s talk. Secondly,

we will illustrate the other uses of the discourse marker *dakara*, which include the use of stand-alone *dakara* and other use of *dakara*-prefaced utterances that are not used as the upshot marker. Focusing on the sequential position of the discourse marker *dakara*, this chapter aims to identify (i) how and when the discourse marker *dakara* is used as a resource for achieving particular actions e.g., negotiation for topic closing and solicitation of the recipient's response for topic expansion within these sequences; and (ii) how both speakers build their actions and activities in an ongoing context while identifying the relevant actions in order to accomplish their activities. In other words, how the speakers negotiate while showing the orientation to topic closing and inviting the recipients' response by singnalising their actions, how the recipients respond while showing their stance, and how the speakers manage and construct the topic following the recipients' response will be the focus of our analysis. The moment-by-moment examination of ongoing talk with a focus on the use of discourse marker *dakara* will reveal the participants' orientation to topic in emerging local context in order to deal with various common interactional problems.

5.1 Upshot marker *dakara* : Speaker's own talk

In this section we will show the speaker's use of *dakara*-prefaced turn construction units (TCUs) which express the upshot of prior talk to mark the completion of turns or activities. Looking at the placement of *dakara*-prefaced utterances in sequences, we can see how the upshot marker *dakara* is exhibited in the speaker's sequential management of the topic talk and how it influences the recipient's uptake. We shall see various uses of the upshot marker *dakara* as the speaker's own talk in turn below.

5.1.1 Upshot of the prior or earlier turns of talk

There may be a case where the speaker uses the upshot marker *dakara* to provide her final decision or result after talking about her situation. Excerpt (53) illustrates this. M and A are talking about A's news that she has been offered a good research opportunity. However, she is now busy writing her dissertation and therefore the timing does not seem so good.

(53) A and M [Research]

73 M Soo da yoo anata. Mettani nai mono (.) sonnani koro koro koroga tte wa
you are right once in a million like that (onomatopoeia)
You are right. Once in a million (.) naturally, (we) won't get

74 ko nai shi::.
rolling TOP come-NEG
it very often::.

75→A Dakara, koroga tte ki tara ¥ tsukama nakya ikan¥ tte=
so come tumbling in if grasp have to QT
So, if (it) comes tumbling in, (I) £ have to grasp it (definitely) £=

76 M =So(h)o da yoo[:.
yes you do
=Ye(h)s (you) d::[o

77 A [u::n.

[Yea::h.

78 M Asonde ru baai jya nai yo ne. hehhehehe
enjoy oneself case –COP-NEG FP FP
(You) shouldn't be wasting your time (chatting with somebody). hehehehe

79 A he[hehehehe

he[hehehehe

80 M [hehehehehe .hh sooka sooka. Demo maa::: hontoni ii koto ga koroga tte ki te
I see I see but well uhm really good news S come tumbling-PAST
[hehehehehe .hh I see I see. Well uhm (I) am really delighted for your news

81 yokatta yo.
delighted FP
came tumbling in.

82 A Iya::: (0.1) nanka ne[:..
well how can I say
We::ll (0.1) how can I sa::[y.

83 M [U:::n.
yeah
[Yeah.

84 Yonezawa tte yuuto (.) donogurai kakaru no?[(.) Tokyo kara.
(place name) QT how long takes Q (place name) from
(You) said you can go to Yonezawa (.) how long does it take [(.) from Tokyo.

85 A [Yonezawa wa:::
(place name) TOP
[Yonezawa is:::

86 ni-jikan han gurai ka na.
two hours and a half about
(It) takes about two and a half hours (from Tokyo).

87 dakara:::(.) koko kara Sendai ni itte-kaeru yoo na kanji ka na.
so here from (place name) P return like that I suppose
So::: (.) (it) is almost the same as to Sendai from Tokyo.
((continues))

The upshot is initiated in line 75 in the environment where it is topic-in-progress, which receives a strong agreement of the recipient in the next turn ‘Ye(h)s (you) d::o’ produced with a loud voice. That is, in the initial turn, the speaker shows her orientation to disengage the current topic by using a *dakara*-prefaced upshot, inviting the recipient’s preferred agreement. We also notice that the recipient accepts the laugh invitation that is delivered with a smiling voice by producing a laughable response (‘Ye(h)s’) which includes a laugh particle (Jefferson, 1979). According to Jefferson (1979), laughter by the speaker can serve to invite the recipient to laugh. In this case, laughter appended to a turn, or laugh particles within speech may act as an invitation to the recipient’s laughter and it results in shared laughter.

The recipient, in this case, clearly shows her position by agreeing with the speaker’s upshot utterance. However, the recipient does not immediately initiate a new topic but she elaborates on the current topic by displaying a joke appending the laughter invitation (line 78), which is accepted by the speaker (line 79). That becomes shared laughter (Jefferson, 1979; Glenn, 2003; Holt, 2010) in line 80. Here, the current topic moves towards the closing. Immediately after the shared laughter, it is observed that the recipient reformulates their talk in line 80, referring back to a specific prior point *korogatte* (‘tumbling in’) in lines 73 and 75. We notice that the recipient’s response in line 82 ‘We::ll (0.1) how can I sa::y’ may be treated as a compliment response, which Pomerantz (1984a) calls self-deprecation. The recipient does not display her agreement using the dispreferred component ‘well’ in response to the speaker’s compliment.

A new topic is initiated by the recipient in line 84, prefacing the utterance, ‘(You) said you can go to Yonezawa’ (the place name ‘Yonezawa’ was mentioned by the speaker in

an earlier turn but it was not topicalised then). Thus, the recipient takes up the topical item which was mentioned in the earlier turn. It is initiated as a disjunct inquiry and established as a new topic here. The answer is given in overlap with the disjunct inquiry in the prior turn topicalising ‘Yonezawa’, which indicates that the speaker immediately recognised and understood the inquiry.

5.1.2 Upshot used as a summary assessment

The speaker may also use a *dakara*-prefaced upshot to offer a summary assessment of the speaker’s prior or earlier talk. In this case, our concern is to understand how the recipient constructs her response and how the producer of the *dakara*-prefaced assessment reacts to the recipient’s response. There was an example given above where the recipient’s strong agreement is received. However, it was anticipated that there may be various kinds of responses; for example, the recipient may deliver a weak agreement, or the recipient may produce her own statement in response to the speaker’s line of statement (cf. Pomerantz, 1984a). The following excerpt illustrates the case in which the recipient produces her independent views after the speaker’s summary assessment prefacing *dakara*. S and K are talking about the bus service that they use on a daily basis. The excerpt begins with a story of a bus service for Clacton.

(54) S and K [Bus service]

- 70 K Kekkyoku hantai-undoo ga attee.
after all opposition (from the people of Clacton) S there
After all there was the opposition from the people of Clacton.

- 71 S Ee soo na no.
so COP FP
Is (that) so.
- 72 K De, i-ppon nokotta mitai desu.
so one leave-PAST seems COP
So, (it is said) only one line is left.
- 73 S So: nan daa=
I see
I se:e=
- 74→K =Dakara tsukawanai to son desu yo ne.
so use-NEG if lose money COP SFX- TAG
=So if (you) don't use (the bus pass), (you) will lose money, won't you.
- 75 S Purosesu ga aru n da ne (.) nan demo=
background S there N COP- TAG everything
There is a background to every story (.), isn't there=
- 76 K = [hehehehe

=[hehehehe
- 77 S [hehehehe

[hehehehe
- 78 henkoo ga atte saa (.) Kongetsu no hajime da tta kana.
change S there FP this month beginning COP-PAST FP
(I)'m not sure when but (it) was at the beginning of this month, there was a change to the bus time schedule.
- 79 Nichi-yoobi mo 61 ban no basu ga hashiru yoo ni natta n datte.
Sunday also (line of bus numbers) bus S runs-PAST N according to
According to the information, the number 61 bus starts running on Sundays.

80 K A- kikimashita.
 ah hear-PAST
Ah (I)'ve heard about that.

81 S Kiitaa:: ↑
 hear-PAST
Have (you) hear::d ↑

((continues))

The speaker's assessment in line 74, 'So if (you) don't use (the bus pass), (you) will lose money, won't you', offers a conclusion to the prior talk and it is displayed as a tag question.²² Generally, when the possible offer to conclude the topic-in-progress arises, the recipient may produce preferable responses such as agreement, confirmation of receipt, or in the case of assessment, a second assessment that corresponds to the first assessment (Pomerantz, 1984a). However, in this case, while the speaker provides an assessment and engages in an activity which offers a possible conclusion to the topic-in-progress, the recipient orients to summarise or conclude her own views (Button, 1991: 255). In this respect, the recipient in the example above (line 75) provides her second summary assessment that is delivered as a general comment or an aphoristic expression. In other words, she does not provide an agreement with the prior conclusion or assessment but rather she provides her independent remarks, and it is displayed by appending a tag component. This means that the recipient invites the speaker to accept her summary assessment. Immediately after the recipient's remarks (that are latched on to), the shared laughter²³ (Jefferson, 1979; Glenn, 2003; Holt, 2010) is initiated by both

²² Heritage (2002a) observes the comparison of the placement of negative interrogatives at turn initials and turn endings (e.g., tag questions) in news interviews. He suggests that whereas turn initial negative interrogatives provide a projection of an expected (preferred) answer, turn endings negative interrogatives are treated as less assertive. Thus, tag questions are projected to request the other speaker's confirmation or statement rather than simply seeking an agreement or disagreement.

²³ The shared laughter rarely begins with both speakers starting laughter at the same time,

speakers as an acceptance, which may indicate that the sequence of their utterance turns has been completed at that point (line 77).

The actions displayed by both speaker and recipient indicate that the speaker's assessment appending a tag elicits the recipient's agreement or disagreement and the recipient claims her independent views by also appending a tag in a neutral form. However, as we can see, the recipient's action is structurally performed as an agreement (e.g., no delay, no hesitation, no accounts, etc.) and the use of a tag question indicates that the producer gives her opinion, and seeks further agreement or disagreement from the other speaker. As a consequence, both speakers laugh together at the same time. When the speaker does not completely agree with the recipient's second assessment, she may further elaborate in the third turn. When the speaker agrees with the recipient's second assessment, she may display acknowledgement and confirm that she agrees with the recipient in the third turn. It is worth noting that the speakers constantly analyse their situation and different strategies may be employed by both speakers from time to time in order to accomplish their actions.

Here, we also notice that the recipient makes an announcement (line 78) in the same turn by providing new information about the number 61 bus service. The announcement is not a completely new topic since it is still related to the bus service but the story has moved from the prior story about the bus service for Clacton. That is, the turn is extended while preserving the related topic. Over the course of two turns, the speakers may indicate to each other that the talk on the topic-in-progress may possibly be

which is illustrated above. Rather, one speaker invites the other speaker to laugh by laughing during or after an utterance, which is illustrated in excerpt (53).

complete. It is said that the recipient's response may exhibit her stance on the speaker's statement. In addition, shared laughter may show both speakers' understanding and completion of two turns of negotiation between speakers.

The following example shows a similar case. N is telling K that she had difficulty in finding out what her allergy was; for example, she was looking for an allergic substance on the website since her doctor did not mention anything about it. In fact, the doctor told her that he had never heard about such an allergy.

(55) N and K [Doctors]

77 N Uchi no- watasi no niku no arerugii datte::
 our my meat LK allergy also
As for our- (I mean), my allergy to mea::t

78 K Un un.
 uh-huh
Uh-huh.

79 N moo isshoo sareta n da yo (.) >sonna no arikko arimasen< tte
 [one-laugh] N COP FP that COP NEG-SFX QT
**(I) couldn't believe it. (My doctor) just laughed at me (.) saying that > (he)'s
 never heard of any such thing<.**

80 (.) saikin ni natte [(.) niku no tanpakushitsu ga awanai tte yuu no ga::
 recently meat LK protein S cause trouble QT things S
**(.) Recently, [(.) (it) has been found that the protein in meat could trig::er
allergic**

81 K [Un

[Uh-huh

- 82 N wakatte kita n dakedo:.
find-PAST N COP but
reactions.
- 83 K A:: (0.2) anata oniku tabenai n dakke.
oh you meet eat-NEG COP-TAG
O::h. (0.2) you don't eat meat, do you.
- 84 N Oniku taberu to dame nano=
meat eat if bad COP FP
Whenever (I) eat meat, (it) worsens my allergy=
- 85 K =Ha::.
oh
=Oh::.
- 86 (0.5)
- 87→ N A:: (0.2) dakara (.) isya(h)hodo ateni na (h) ranai heheh mono wa nai hehheh
Uh so [doctors be trusted- NEG]
U::h (0.2) So (.) (You) can ne(h)ver trust do(h)ctors heheheh
- 88 K Aa yatteru koto ga minna senmon-baka dakara sa:.
yeah doing things S all [specialist- idiot] because FP
Yeah. (It)'s because (they) are all so much into whatever (they) specialise in that
- 89 sore igai no ryooiki no koto made wa wakatte nai (.) machi-isha no ho:ga
outside LK area LK things a TOP know-NEG practitioner better
(they) don't know an::ything outside their area of expertise. (.) Compared to them, GPs (general practitioners)
- 90 igai to wakatteru kamo ne.
know might FP
might turn out to be better (at identifying the problems of the patients).

- 91 N Nanka nan-nante yuuka kan-dokoro mitai na yatsu ne=
 well how can I say [intuition-place] like one FP
Well how ca-can I say (you mean something like) (GPs) having better intuition.
- 92 K = Aa::.
 yeah
=Yea::h.

Paying attention to the environment where the upshot *dakara* appears (line 87), the speaker closes the prior insertion sequence which starts in line 83 and returns to the main sequence by producing her summary assessment in order to complete her talk. Following an acknowledgement, ‘Yeah’, the recipient also produces her assessment (line 88) with the use of the lexical figurative expression *senmon-baka* (literal meaning is: specialist+idiot), which is further elaborated by the speaker (line 91).

The topical talk such as medical treatment may be quite a serious matter; however, it is observed that the assessment sequence is expanded with non-serious utterances (with laughter and jokes). In fact, the upshot by the speaker, ‘(You) can ne(h)ver trust do(h)ctors’, is used as an exaggerated expression (Drew, 2003) and delivered with a laugh invitation. However, the recipient refuses the laugh invitation. In this regard, she pursues the topical talk (without laughter) in order to add to her statement (Jefferson, 1979; Holt, 2010). The assessment she provided is also an exaggerated expression which may support the speaker’s upshot and show her affiliation.

The topic is held over and preserved for at least three turns to a topic-in-progress and it is further elaborated. The use of these figurative expressions will be further examined in the next chapter. In this case, the initiation of the upshot *dakara* shows a precise

moment in reference to the current talk-in-progress; for example, the upshot *dakara* is delivered with appropriate timing where the talk may depart from the insertion sequence (or side sequence) and return to the main sequence.

5.1.3 Upshot following news receipt

Other cases where the upshot *dakara* is displayed will now be introduced. The upshot may mark or deliver additional information to provide support for the speaker's position or to elaborate on the information given in the prior utterance. There is a case where the upshot follows after news receipt. The following example illustrates this sequence. K is telling N that she has been ill for a few weeks and her husband also had back pain which is getting worse these days, so he went to the hospital.

(56) N and K [*Karei-gensho*]

- 31 K de:: mite morattara::
and see PAST a doctor
A::nd when (he) was seen by (a doctor), (he) was to::ld that
- 32 .h nanka tsuikanban-herunia [no ippo-temae toka::
well like (name of disease) LK [one step away from] (COP) QT
.h well (he) is on the brink of an [intervertebral disc hernia.
- 33 N [Aa.
oh
[Oh.
- 34 Ara:: un.
oh dear right
Oh de:ar right.

- 35 K Un. Nanka: sore wa:: karei-genshoo (.) nan da tte.
 yeah well it TOP [advancing age-phenomenon] COP QT
Yeah. We:ll (The doctor) said that (it) seems to be an aging phenomenon.
- 36 N Aa:.
 oh
Oh:.
- 37→K Dakara hippatte moratte kusuri non de=
 so pull out make-PAST medicine take-PAST
So, (they) stretched his back and gave him medication=
- 38 N =U:::n.
 right
=Ri:ght.
- 39 K Un. heh watashitachi mo heh so(h)o::yuu heh to(h)shi da yo ne::
 yes we also sort of age COP -TAG
Yes. heh (this means that) we have reached that sort of age, don't you think.
- 40 N Sooyuu toshi da yo machigai-nai wa yo. heheh
 that age absolutely FP FP
(We) have reached that age. Absolutely. heheh,
- 41 datte mago ita tte okashiku nai n dakara::
 because grandchild have possibility N CONJ
because (we)'re not too young to have grandchild:n.
- 42 K Ne.(.) a:: iya da wa[ne::
 FP uh like-NEG FP
(We) are, yes. (.) U::h (I) do::n't like [this.
- 43 N [Ya::ne::
 like-NEG FP
[(I) do:n't like it either.

We observe that the upshot follows a news receipt 'oh' (a change of state token, cf.

Heritage, 1984b) and provides a conclusion of the speaker's husband's examination at the hospital in line 37 which forwardly links the result of the doctor's diagnosis in line 35. The recipient, noting its newsworthiness with 'Oh' in lines 33, 34, and 36, then only displays a minimal token 'Ri:ght' with no elaboration, which may possibly orient to topic closing. The speaker then produces her summary assessment as a conclusion that 'we have reached that sort of age, don't you think' (line 39), which links back to the result of the doctor's diagnosis in line 35. This means that the speaker orients to provide further comment and she does so by using indexical expressions 'that sort of age' in order to tie her comment to the prior turns.

The recipient expresses her agreement in subsequent turns (line 40) with a loud voice by partially repeating the speaker's indexical expression 'that sort of age' and producing the extreme case formulation,²⁴ 'Absolutely' (Pomerantz, 1986). After displaying the extreme case formulation, she also reformulates her description by giving an account of her agreement in order to show her strong support and affiliation with the speaker. The account was produced by the recipient's selection of the word, 'grandchildren', which is not a completely new topic but is related to 'that sort of age' in the prior turn (i.e., an ancillary matter). The related topic is extended in subsequent turns (that does not appear in the excerpt). The speaker's use of the upshot *dakara* to deliver additional information may trigger the generation of a potential topic.

²⁴ Extreme case formulation is a description such as 'everyone', 'all', 'none', 'always', 'brand new', 'completely innocent', and 'absolutely'. Pomerantz (1986: 227) reports that such formulations 'assert the strongest case in anticipation of non-sympathetic hearings' or 'speak for the rightness (wrongness) of a practice' in everyday talk, mainly used in complaint sequences.

5.1.4 Upshot following the third turn in a closing sequence

There may be a case where the upshot *dakara* appears after the sequence closing third (Schegloff, 2007). A sequence closing third is ‘*designed* to constitute a *minimal* expansion after the second pair part. It is designed to move for, or to propose, sequence closing’ (Schegloff, 2007: 118; emphasis original). The most common sequence closing thirds are ‘oh’, ‘okay’, and assessments such as ‘good’. Here, a *dakara*-prefaced upshot appears following a sequence closing third where the initiation of a new sequence is relevant by either speaker in the next turn position. Excerpt (57) illustrates this. After a long talk of illness, N is naturally asking about K’s phase of treatment. N knows that K had a serious illness a few years ago.

(57) N and K [Medical treatment]

- 18 N Haa. (0.1) saikin chiryo tte dooshiteru no yo.
right these days medical treatment TOP how about FP
Right. (0.1) How’s (it) going with (your) treatments these days.
- 19 K Chiryo wa nee: (.) moo maitzuki yatte ita chuusha wa nakunatta no
medical treatment FP no longer monthly LK injection TOP have-PAST-NEG FP
(My) treatments (.) (I) no longer have the monthly injections.
- 20 N Qo::.
good
Goo::d.
- 21→K Dakara, iryoo-hi wa nomigusuri to [teiki-teki na tenken mitaina yatsu[↑
so medical expense TOP pills and regular routine checkups like that
**So, the medical bills (I) now have to pay are for my medication and [regular
check-ups[↑**

- 22 N [Haa [Un.
uh-huh yeah
[Uh-huh [Yeah.
- 23 K anoo: shaken-ku(h)ruma no shaken mitai na[a.
uhm MOT like FP
uhm [annual motor vehicle inspection authorised by the British Ministry of Transport] like
uh:m (it)'s like an MO[T.
- 24 N [Un un
yes yes
[Yes yes.
- 25 K Eettoo nen ni 2-kai gurai noo (.) soregurai dake dake doo:
well per year twice about that's all only COP uhm
Well, (I) need to have (a check-up) about twice a ye:ar (.) that's all (I ne:ed)
- 26 anoo iryoo-hi wa sugoku sukunaku natta no.
uhm medical expenses TOP very get less FP
uh:m (my) medical expenses are a lot less than before.
- 27 N Oo (0.2) iya iryoo-hi tte yuuka sa [a (.) yappari chiryoo suru to sore ga kurushii tte
well uhm medical expense QT say Q FP after all be treated when it S feel pain QT
Well. (0.2) uhm what (I) worry about is not your medical expense, [(.) but the fact
- 28 K [Un
uh-huh
[Uh-huh.
- 29 N yu:nomo aru jya nai?
GEN FP COP- TAG
that any treatment comes with some sort of pain or suffering?
- 30 K U:::n (.) nanka nee betsuni kurushii toka jya nai n dakedoo:.
uhm what I'm saying is (that) nothing feel pain COP-NEG N but
Uh::m (.) well (I) don't actually suffer pain when treated but

31 hora (0.2) anoo >yappari okane ga kurushii no yo ne<:: yappari
 you know uhm after all (lit. money S painful) GEN FP FP after all
 you know, (0.2) uh:m > after all (I) must admit that money's ti:ght <after all.

32 N Dayo nee yappai.
 COP FP FP after all
 (It) must be:. after all.

In line 21 the *dakara*-prefaced upshot is used by the answerer following sequence closing third that is displayed as a minimal assessment, ‘Goo::d’, with no elaboration. This can make the start of a next sequence relevant, and therefore, the answerer takes action to show that she has something more to mention. The upshot is further incremented by the producer herself, facilitated by the questioner’s use of a continuer, ‘Uh-huh’, and acknowledgement, ‘Yeah’ (line 22). The answerer further elaborates in the subsequent turns. Here it is noted that while the questioner may be concerned with whether her medical treatment causes any pain or suffering, the sequence of turns are extended focusing on ‘medical expenses’. It may be said that the upshot *dakara* is used to build her action at the transitional relevance place as a focal point, which may include a potential new topic (i.e., ‘medical expenses’).

Furthermore, given that the financial problem may be a sensitive matter and may cause an embarrassing situation for both speakers, it is observed that answerer manages her response in answering the question. For example, we notice that in response to the further question the answerer repeats the word *kurushii* (‘pain or suffering’) in line 30 that was used in the question in organising her response e.g., *okane ga kurushii* (that means that the money is painful) in line 31, which makes the situation less serious. It

may also be implied that the response may be projected to avoid a face threatening²⁵ situation. It is evidenced in the questioner's third turn that '(It) must be:.. after all' (line 32) which is a confirmation by the questioner that she completely accepted and agreed with the position of the answerer.

5.2 Upshot marker *dakara*: Recipient's talk

This section shows the different use of the upshot marker *dakara*, namely the upshot of the recipient's talk. We will look at the recipient's uses of upshot displayed as an assessment in the second position and as a request for confirmation below. The upshot of the recipient's talk does not shift directly to turn-closure, and hence the topic is expanded.

5.2.1 Upshot used as an assessment in the second position

We saw the examples above in which the *dakara*-prefaced upshot as the speaker's summary assessment is followed by an agreement and a statement by the recipient. In contrast, there may be a case where the speaker's utterance may solicit the recipient's

²⁵ Goffman (1967) worked on the moral and social order of everyday life known as 'face work.' He insists that maintaining face is a condition of interaction that could be shared among members of the society. Goffman offers an interesting observation that people attempt to avoid face-threatening events. When one encounters face-threatening events, he can change the topic of conversation or change the direction of activities (1967: 16). Brown and Levinson (1987) have developed Goffman's theory of face in their politeness theory and proposed that there is 'positive face' that is the desire of every member who wants to be approved of by others, and 'negative face' that is the desire of every member whose actions may be unimpeded by others (1987: 13). 'Positive face' seeks to establish a positive relationship between friends and parties, and 'negative face' aims to make a request less infringing, for example, by saying 'if you don't mind.' Schegloff (1988: 95) comments that Goffman's analyses focus on ritual and face in pursuit of talk with an emphasis on individuals and their psychology. Lerner's work (1996b: 303) also comments on Goffman's face-work.

use of a *dakara*-prefaced upshot which includes her abstract or core information. The following excerpt illustrates this.

(58) E and M [*Dooshi*]

38 E Yappari sonoo (.) nante yuu ka (0.1) chicchai ko to chigatte::
 maybe uhm how can I say small children COP-NEG
How can (I) say that (0.1) maybe uh:m (.) all in all> (they) would understa::nd<

39 mata oya no kimochi ga >wakatte kuru yoo ni naru yo ne::<=
 all in all parents LK thoughts and feelings S would understand FP FP
their parents' thoughts and feelings because (they) are growing u::p=

40→M =Soo. (.) Dakara saikin wa:: (.) dooshi::?
 yeah so nowadaysTOP like-minded
= Yeah. (.) So nowadays (we) ar::e (.) like-mi::nded?

41 E Un. A-yappari soo ne.
 yeah oh yes
Yeah. Oh yes.

42 (0.1)

43 mata onnaji yoo na koto yatteru kara ne=
 Same thing do-ing because FP
(You) are doing the same thing (as your daughter), aren't (you)=

44 M =Soo nano soo nano. Honde:: (.) nanka minna ga batabata osokute::
 yeah yeah and uhm everybody S (onomatopee) late
=Yeah yeah. An::d (.) uhm everybody came home la::te (because they were busy).

((continues))

The recipient's second assessment in line 40 appears immediately after the stretched component of the prior utterance (Jefferson, 1973), which is composed of minimal

acknowledgement ('Yeah') and a *dakara*-prefaced assessment using a try-marker (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979: 18; Schegloff, 1996b: 460; Lerner, 1996a: 262) which is delivered with upward intonation. This means that while the recipient may engage in an activity of making summaries or conclusions, she offers a possible conclusion to the topic-in-progress by using the practice of an inquiry. The speaker produces an acknowledgement and a strong confirmation, 'Yeah. Oh yes', in the next turn and a 0.1-second pause occurs. At this point (line 42), the sequence closing is relevant; however, the speaker further provides an account with a tag question, which leads to a new matter. The recipient immediately acknowledges (line 44) and then produces a new topic ('everyone in the family') with a marker 'An::d' in the same turn.²⁶ The new topic continues in subsequent turns.

Pomerantz (1984a: 61) argues that 'when a speaker assesses a referent that is expectably accessible to a recipient, the initial assessment provides the relevance of the recipient's second assessment' and that the initial assessments have a format of either interrogatives (e.g., 'Isn't she...') or interrogative tags (e.g., '...isn't it') to invite a subsequence to develop. As we discussed above, Jefferson (1973: 50, 73) argued that the use of the tag-positioned component as well as the stretched word at the end of the utterance not only provides the speakers with a monitoring space but also avoids silence following the turn. The speakers use interrogative tags to make it more accessible for the

²⁶ The recipient's utterance (line 44) introduces a new topic which is linked to her assessment with a tag inquiry (line 40) and it is also noted that another minimal topic movement seems to have occurred in line 43. The word *dooshi* ('like-minded') in the utterance in line 40 may be referring to two cases: one is the relationship between 'parents' and 'children' and the other is the relationship 'mother' and 'daughter'. In the next turn, the speaker recognises that the prior utterance was meant to be the latter case, thereby, she produces her summary assessment (with tag) topicalising the relationship between 'mother' and 'daughter' by saying '(You) are doing the same thing (as your daughter), aren't (you)', which is immediately followed by the recipient's re-formulaic utterance topicalising a new matter 'everyone in the family'.

co-participants. Therefore, in this excerpt, the recipient may produce her assessment (in the second position) (line 40) immediately after the tag question or the stretched final component, which enables the speaker to produce her own statement or assessment in the subsequent turn in line 43 (see Davidson, 1984; D.W. Maynard, 1989).

The data shows that the recipient's assessment (line 40) displayed with a try-marker, agreeing with the prior utterance as a preferred action (Pomerantz, 1984a; Sacks, 1987[1973]), is organised to receive an expected response and is projected to make it more accessible for the speaker to provide her subsequent statement. In fact, the speaker shows that the response is acceptable (line 41) and produces her own comment (line 43) which is also delivered with a tag question. We observe that both speakers mutually and collaboratively accomplish their activities by displaying their understanding at turn-by-turn topic-in-progress.

5.2.2 Upshot used as a request for confirmation

Another use of a *dakara*-prefaced upshot by the recipient is to provide a request for confirmation. The request for confirmation is recurrently used by speakers in ordinary conversation, which aims to have a clear understanding and is obviously projected to pursue the other speaker's confirmation. Excerpt (59) illustrates this. T and A are flying back to Japan together and discussing the schedule of their trip. T is wondering whether or not they should stay in London overnight before the departure date.

(59) A and T [Heathrow]

25 T Maa sonna konna de (.) doko ga doo daka wakan nai kedo[::
well all told which one S good or bad know NEG CONJ
**Well, .hh (I) have considered all possibilities (.) but (I)'m not really sure what
the best option [i::s.**

26 A [Ha::i.
yeah
[Yea::h.

27 T sono hi ni kaeru tte shitakoto nai n de=
that day P return QT do-PAST NEG N COP
**(because) (I)'ve never started my homebound journey on the same day as my
flight (from Heathrow)=**

28 A =Eee[ee:
right
=Rig[h:::t.

29 T [Demo ne kangaetara: demo fukanoo jya nai yo[ne:::
but FP think if but impossible COP-NEG-TAG
[But coming to think of it, in fact, (it) is not impossible, is [i::t.

30 A [So:: nan desu yo↓::
COP FP
[No::, (it)'s no::t↓

31 de, osoku tomo ni-jikan mae made desu yo [↑ne↑
and at least 2 hours before by COP SFX-TAG
**And the minimum check-in time is 2 hours before the flight departure time,
[↑isn't it↑**

32→T [Dakara jyu-ichi-ji (.) dayo ne
so 11- o'clock COP- TAG
**[So (we have to get there) by 11 a.m
(.) right**

- 33 A Jya chotto hayameni- jyu-ji han ni Hiisuroo ni tsuku to shite mo::
 well then a bit earlier 10:30 a.m. P Heathrow P arrive even if
Well then, if (you) aim to arrive at Heathrow a bit earlier than that, say at 10:30 a.m.,
- 34 T Un
 uh-huh
Uh-huh
- 35 A ma chotto asa hayai kedo:: (0.2) kanoo wa kanoo desu.
 well a bit morning early but [possible TOP possible] COP
well, although (it) means leaving here rather early in the morning, (0.2) (it) is most certainly a possibility.

While topic talk is sequentially developing in cooperation with both speakers, the *dakara*-prefaced upshot (line 32) seeks for the other speaker's confirmation using a tag, which topicalises the specific time ('11 a.m.'). The question, which is delivered as first pair part of adjacency pairs, is followed by a concrete suggestion ('10:30 a.m.') prefaced by 'Well then'. Thus, the *dakara*-prefaced upshot works for expanding the sequence by requesting for confirmation. The topic talk continues. It may be said that the action of requesting for confirmation topic-in-progress is used as a resource to expand the turn and confirm the mutual events or activities.

5.3 Other uses of the discourse marker *dakara*

In English conversation, it has been proposed that the stand-alone 'so' in a sequence of talk can be deployed to generate further action or the next relevant action from their co-participants, which functions like the practice of repair (Raymond, 2004). In the setting of talk radio, Hutchby (1996: 489) states that the stand-alone 'so' (as a complete

turn) in the second position can be used as an argumentative move. Challenged by the other speaker, the first speaker is required to take the floor again and give an account for her claims. Local and Walker (2005) suggest that stand-alone ‘so’ may also be used for the purpose of holding the floor. In this section, we will examine the use of stand-alone *dakara* in Japanese conversation which is designed to elicit the other speaker’s talk or hold the floor in order for the speaker to pursue his or her own action. In addition, we will also look at the use of the discourse marker *dakara* which may not appear in a form of ‘stand-alone’ but be displayed as a *dakara*-prefaced utterance. While we have seen the use of a *dakara*-prefaced upshot by both speakers and recipients above, it is suggested that the *dakara*-prefaced utterance may also be used to mark the upcoming actions.

5.3.1 Stand-alone *dakara* used as a request for further action

Stand-alone *dakara* may invite the recipient to reiterate her utterance in response to the speaker’s utterance in the prior turn. The following excerpt illustrates this. I and R are talking about the meeting that is scheduled on 20th January.

(60) R and I [Meeting]

01 I Hatsuka dakedo [(.) nan-ji ni suru?
20th about what time at meet
What time (.) [shall (we) meet on 20th?

02 R [un.
uh-huh
[Uh-huh.

13→R Dakara?

so

So?

14 I Doo suru?

what do

What shall (we) do?

((continues))

Stand-alone *dakara* appears (line 13) with upward intonation (cf. Local, 1992, 1996, 2004) (which is used when a question is raised) following a 0.3-second pause. Stand-alone *dakara* is produced in the environment where the speaker in the prior turn does not show her clear position and therefore the recipient requires the speaker to make her stance clear or to proceed with her action. This means that the sequence may be suspended at line 13 where the recipient is waiting for the other speaker's talk. As Raymond (2004) points out, stand-alone 'so' is produced in the environment where the recipient has trouble in producing her response to the speaker's utterance in the prior turn, which is similar to the practice of repair.

However, in the next turn, the speaker raises another question 'What shall (we) do?' instead of providing a clear answer for the recipient. Thus, the recipient fails to receive a revised or reiterated utterance from the speaker and the topic is suspended at line 14. This means that stand-alone *dakara* does not always receive a response from the recipient. In this case, the topic is not specifically nominated. Here, it is notable that the speaker uses the term 'we', which indicates that she is hesitant to make up her mind by herself or that it is not something that she can decide on her own (and she would like to have the recipient's view on the matter).

5.3.2 Stand-alone *dakara* used as floor holding

There may be a case where stand-alone *dakara* is displayed by the speaker to hold the floor when the speaker is pursuing his or her own talk. The use of stand-alone *dakara* as holding the floor functions slightly differently from other uses of the discourse marker *dakara*. It neither triggers the shift to topical talk nor elicits the other speaker's talk rather it gives a moment for the speaker to come up with his or her appropriate response. Excerpt (61) illustrates this. It is a continuation of excerpt (59). T and A are discussing the schedule of their trip and T is wondering whether it is possible for them to leave for Heathrow on the departure date. The stand-alone *dakara* appears in line 36.

(61) A and T [Heathrow]

- 31 A De, osoku tomo ni-jikan mae made desu yo [↑ne↑
and at least 2 hours before by COP-TAG
And the minimum check-in time is 2 hours before the flight departure time,
[↑isn't it↑
- 32 T [Dakara jyu-ichi-ji (.) dayo ne
so 11- o'clock COP-TAG
[So (we have to get there) by 11 a.m
(.) right
- 33 A Jya chotto hayameni- jyu-ji han ni Hiisuroo ni tsuku to shite mo::
well then a bit earlier 10:30 a.m. P Heathrow P arrive even if
Well then, if (you) aim to arrive at Heathrow a bit earlier than that, say at
10:30 a.m.,
- 34 T Un
uh-huh
Uh-huh

- 35 A ma chotto asa hayai kedo:: (0.2) kanoo wa kanoo desu.
 well a bit morning early but [possible TOP possible] COP
well, although (it) means leaving here rather early in the morning, (0.2) (it) is most certainly a possibility.
- 36→T Dakara:: (.)
 so
So:: (.)
- 37 maa (.) daijyoobu da. .heheh .h:: kore (.) hito-anshin=
 well (.) okay COP ah this relief
well (.) (that) will work. heheh .h Now that there's one less thing to worry about=
- 38 A =Hai.
 yeah
=Yeah.

The stand-alone *dakara* (line 36) is displayed by the recipient with stretches (*dakara::*) after the speaker's confirmation and her formulation (lines 33 and 35). As we have examined in excerpt (59) above, the speaker provides confirmation (line 33) to the recipient's request for confirmation prefacing the upshot *dakara* (line 32) by saying that they have to get to Heathrow by 11a.m. (in order to get on board at 1p.m.). In addition, the speaker also provides formulation (line 35) that it is possible to leave home on the departure day. That is, in response to the speaker's formulation, the recipient provides stand-alone *dakara* that is not hearably an immediate agreement but rather it may be an action of the recipient holding the floor and pursuing her appropriate response (preferably an agreement). Following a component 'well', she then produces her agreement ('that will work') with laughter and shows her collaboration by saying 'Now that there's one less thing to worry about', which is followed by the speaker's acknowledgement.

5.3.3 *Dakara*-prefaced utterance used as a resumption of pending matters

There may be a case where the recipient uses a *dakara*-prefaced utterance in order to resume the pending matters (Bolden, 2009). Excerpt (62) illustrates this. This excerpt is a continuation of excerpt (60) above and I and R are talking about the meeting that is scheduled on 20th January.

(62) R and I [Meeting]

07 I (.) Doo shiyoo ka na::=
what do FP FP
(.)**What shall (I) do::=**

08 R =Jya nimotsu tori ni iku yo=
well then baggage pick up go FP
=Well then (I)'ll go to (the station) to pick up (your) baggage=

09 I =Sukoshi hayaku dete mo ii n dakedo::.
little earlier leave also available COP CONJ
=(I) can leave (for London) a little earlier bu::t.

10 R Sore demo ii [kedo.
Such case available CONJ
(It)'s alright [with me.

11 I [U:::n (.) asa hayaku deru no wa ne::
uhm morning early leave LK TOP FP
[Uh:m (.) (I) don't like to leave early in the mor::ning.

12 (0.3)

13 R Dakara?
so
So?

- 14 I Doo suru?
what do
What shall (we) do?
- 15→R Dakara mukae ni iku yo.
just pick you up FP
So (I)'ll pick you up.
- 16 I so↓o↑
so
Are you sure?
- 17 R Iiyo::.
yeah
Yea::h.
- 18 I Dakara 4ji-han da yo ne.
so 4:30 p.m. COP-TAG
So (it)'s 4:30 p.m., isn't it.
- 19 R Un soo da ne.
yes it is
Yes, it is.
- 20 **(0.2)**
- 21 Sorede (.) gaido-bukku miru?
so travel guide look
So (.) do (you) want to look at a travel guide?
- 22 I Miru miru.
yes yes
Yes yes.

((continues))

The response to the speaker's question is displayed prefacing *dakara* (line 15), which

may be associated with the pending matter of fixing the time to meet up. We observe that the recipient reiterates her position and claims that she will pick her up by partially repeating her prior utterance (line 8). That is, the *dakara*-prefacing utterance is used to resume their talk and it is different from the use of *dakara*-prefaced upshot we saw above in that it may be used to signal the upcoming action and show the producer's interactional stance (see Bolden, 2009: 976). The talk is expanding by the use of the upshot *dakara* (line 18) that may be used as a request for confirmation and a new topic is displayed (line 21) in subsequent turns. The topic moves from a 'meeting time' into a 'travel guide'. During the exchange of the talk, the previous topic is maintained. However, it is observed that the talk is resumed by using a *dakara*-prefaced utterance aimed to resolve the pending matter. In the turn-taking system (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974), speakers most commonly attend to the immediately preceding talk (Sacks, 1987[1973], 1992; Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). However, in this case, the *dakara*-prefaced utterance may not be produced to attend to the immediately preceding talk but rather it may be displayed to link the matters across sequences of action in a larger sequential context.

5.3.4 *Dakara*-prefaced utterance pursuing new matters

There may also be a case where the recipient pursues further new information from the other speaker by using the discourse marker *dakara*. For example, while getting the other speaker's attention, the producer may use a *dakara*-prefacing utterance in order to accomplish her activity. Excerpt (63) exhibits this. It begins with the recipient's talk in reference to the event they are talking about.

(63) S and U [Church]

29 S Ima tsukue ni mukatte (.) shizun deru tokoro datta no yo. heh
now desk in front of feel tired COP-PAST FP FP

When (I)'m sitting at my desk (.) (I) feel tired. heh

30 Ee:: soo nan daa heh tte omocchatte.

ah (she became) QT think-PAST

(I)'m thinking about her heh ah she became (a Christian).

31 U Irorio [arun desu nee.

strange things there COP SFX-TAG

Strange [things happen, don't they.

32 S [Soo::

yeah

[Yeah.

33→ Dakara, (.) a: Misato-chan nanka wa (.) are (.)

so uhm (name) TOP ehm

So, (.) uh:m Misato, are (you) (.) ehm(.

34 >kyookai toka wa< (.) saikin (.) itte nai no?

church TOP recently go-PAST-NEG FP

> (have you) been to church < (.) recently (.)?

35 U (0.1) A- (.) watashi (.) kyookai wa itte nai [desu.

ah I church TOP go-PAST-NEG

(0.1) Ah (.) I (.) haven't been to chur[ch.

36 S [Nanka shiriai no hito:: (0.3) nanka.

uhm met some people (Christians) uhm

[Uhm (I)heard that (you)'ve met some

Christians (0.3) uhm

- 37 U Hai hai. (.) hosuto famirii ga ite=
 yes yes a family S have
Yea yes. (.) (I) have a family (I) visit=
- 38 S =Soo soo (.) hosuto famirii no tokoro ni wa (.) toki-doki ojama shite ru no? mada.
 yes yes a family house P TOP sometimes visit them Q still
=Yes yes. (.) Do (you) still sometimes (.) visit them?
- 39 U Aa (.) tsuki ni ikkai gurai.
 ah per month once about
Ah (.) (I) go there about once a month.

((continues))

In line 33 *dakara* appears followed by an inquiry aimed to pursue a new matter, which is not directly connected to the prior turn but related to the preceding turn. We have observed that the new matter that is about to be initiated is concerned about someone's religion or beliefs, so it may potentially be a sensitive matter. Thus, she constructs her inquiry by implementing self-repair (from 'are (you)' in line 33 to '(have you) been to...' in line 34), which is delivered with fast speed (' > (have you) been to church <') prefacing a token 'uh:m' and a micro-pause. In this case, the response to the inquiry is negative (line 35), thereby, it leads to the recipient's further inquiry in order to pursue a potential topic with the use of shared knowledge that the speaker met some Christians (line 36). We notice that the recipient pursues the speaker's information with the use of an itemised question in the subsequent turn (line 38). The talk continues. In English conversation, Bolden (2008) proposes the similar use the discourse marker 'so', focusing on the 'so'-prefaced question which is aimed at introducing a new matter. According to Bolden (2008), for example, 'So what's up' can be a useful device to obtain the reason-for-call (Schegloff, 1986: 117, 132; Sacks, 1992) or to initiate catching up (Button and Casey, 1988/89) when no specific topic is expected. Thus, a

‘so’-prefaced utterance can function as a topic elicitor (Bolden, 2008, 2009; Button and Casey, 1984).

5.4 Discussion

This chapter has shown the way participants negotiate through the use of the Japanese discourse marker *dakara* in association with topic organisation specifically showing an orientation to topic closing and how they continue topic talk while managing interactional problems while keeping discourse coherence in Japanese conversation. The analysis has been conducted both from the speaker’s position and from the recipient’s position and it has been revealed that a *dakara*-prefaced upshot is recurrently used in context where the activities are summarised or assessed when the speakers orient to the topic closing or when they need to say more about the topics in the following turn. The recipient’s talk using a *dakara*-prefaced upshot shows her position providing an assessment and a request for confirmation. Other uses of discourse marker *dakara* such as stand-alone *dakara* and *dakara*-prefaced utterances are observed to accomplish a variety of actions such as a request for further action, floor holding, resumption of pending matters, and pursuing a new topic. These observations imply that the participants use *dakara* not only as a resource to elicit the co-participants’ recognition and understanding to accomplish their work but also to offer a solution for the participants to deal with a common interactional problem by marking participants’ orientation to, and presentation of, the topic in an emerging local context in an ongoing sequence of interaction.

In fact, the initial upshot or summary assessment prefacing *dakara* suspends the course

of interaction, which illustrates the speaker's orientation to disengagement from the current topic and signals an upcoming possible topic closing and invites a response from the recipient. Thus, during the negotiation sequence (i.e., a minimum of two turns), the topic may be maintained. The initial assessment as a first pair part is organised to invite a preferred answer in the next turn based on the concept of the preference organisation. In English, Pomerantz (1984a) proposes that in most of the cases, an agreement comes as a preferred answer; however, a dispreferred response is also available for the recipient. When a dispreferred response is provided by the recipient marked by a pause (i.e., delayed answer), a preface such as 'well' and 'you see', or an account, it is noted that the prior speaker manages the recipient's dispreferred response and she may elect to resume talk since she may perceive the delayed response as a disagreement. To complete the initial upshot or summary assessment, an agreement is required for ending the topic. Thereby, the speaker may project to elicit the recipient's understanding and agreement.

We observed that *dakara*-prefaced upshots or assessments with question tags are recurrently used as a speaker's projection, which elicit the recipient's preferred response or the recipient's second assessment, as illustrated in excerpts (54), (55) and (56), and those characteristic aspects can also be seen in English (Pomerantz, 1984a : 61-63). It is shown that the *dakara*-prefaced upshot as a summary assessment initiated in topic-in-progress received various responses from the recipient and it is argued that the recipient's responses are closely related to how the initial summary assessment are coordinated with possible next utterance (cf. Pomerantz, 1984a: 97). For example, the second assessment in response to the initial assessment with tag question have two patterns: (i) it is proffered as an agreement in concert with an initial assessment as

shown in excerpt (55) and (ii) it is not completely proffered as an agreement but as an independent access to the referent assessed in the prior as shown in excerpt (54).

We argue that the speaker's *dakara*-prefaced upshot or assessment with a tag question restrictively invites the next speaker to answer (i.e., agreement or disagreement; confirmation or disconfirmation) or provide second assessment in response to the initial assessment. The recipient responds with her independent statement with regard to the referent assessed in the prior turn by also using a tag question in the agreement format (in that it is produced without delay and with no dispreferred markers). That is to say, participants project to employ this kind of statement so that dispreferred utterance may be delivered in a covert way. It may also be the case that because Japanese is a verb-final language, when the second speaker answers to the first speaker's utterance, she often supplies a verb (or other predicate) together with 'utterance-final elements' such as auxiliary verbs, sentence-final particles (e.g., *yo ne*) etc., expressing various epistemic and/or interpersonal positioning (Hayashi, 2003: 72). In this situation, the recipient's use of tag questions further invites the speaker to answer, which is followed by shared laughter, as observed in excerpt (54), which indicates that they may have reached a point of mutual understanding. We observed both the speaker's and the recipient's management of interaction through which they build the context of their talk cooperatively.

We observed another way of the recipient's response to *dakara*-prefaced upshot in excerpt (56), that is, a minimal token 'right' with no elaboration, which works as a continuer (cf. Schegloff, 1982) while producing her understanding and passing the opportunity to comment on the speaker's statement. This indicates that the extended unit

of talk is underway by another. The speaker then produces her summary assessment (in this case with no marker *dakara*) with a tag question as a conclusion to recomplete her utterance, which links back to the speaker's statement displayed in the earlier turn. This means that the speaker orients to the completion of the turn and topic closing. She provides further comment by using an indexical expression (i.e., 'that sort of age'), which ties her comment to the prior turns. The recipient expresses her agreement in subsequent turns with a loud voice by partially repeating the speaker's indexical expression 'that sort of age' and producing extreme case formulation, 'Absolutely' (Pomerantz, 1986). After displaying the extreme case formulation, she also reformulates her description by giving an account of her agreement and shows her strong support and affiliation with the speaker.

An additional characteristic feature of the participants' management we discuss here is an example of the second assessment which is proffered as an agreement and described as a complaint assessment in concert with an initial complaint assessment as seen above in excerpt (55). This is an example in which the recipient's strong support and affiliation with the speaker (as a response) have been seen in an environment where the troubles-teller makes her summary assessment. Whereas the initial assessment the troubles-teller makes is her summary assessment based on her actual experience of the troubles, the recipient's second assessment provides an account of the speaker's initial assessment as well as her own claims while accessing the referent assessed in the prior turn, which seems to have escalated the complaint sequence.

Furthermore, another point which is worth mentioning is that the upshot or summary assessment by the speaker, '(You) can ne(h)ver trust do(h)ctors', is used as an

exaggerated expression (Drew, 2003) and delivered with a laugh invitation. However, the recipient refuses the laugh invitation. A similar phenomenon has also been reported in English. According to Jefferson (1984b: 346), when a troubles-teller produces an utterance with laugh, the troubles-recipient does not laugh and treats the matter seriously, which may support the speaker's upshot and show her affiliation. In excerpt (55), when the speaker produces an exaggerated utterance about a doctor with laugh, the recipient does not laugh but produces an even more exaggerated response about a doctor by using a figurative expression.

The topical talk such as medical treatment may be quite a serious matter; however, it is observed that the assessment sequence is expanded with non-serious utterances through the exaggerated utterances of both speakers. Here, it is also worth noting that, in response to the recipient's overstated utterance, the speaker elaborates in the subsequent turn by referring not to a doctor (the target of the exaggerated expressions in their earlier talk) but to the 'general practitioners' used by the recipient in the prior utterance. That is, the speaker modifies and establishes a normative comment through the repair initiation 'you mean', which is followed by the recipient's acknowledgement. This phenomenon can also be seen in English, for example, it is said that the overstated utterance is modified or revised by the speaker herself in the subsequent turn (cf. Drew, 2003). Furthermore, Pomerantz (1984a: 97) also writes that 'whereas it is being argued that the initial complaint assessment invited agreement or a subsequent complaint assessment, it also should be mentioned that negative assessments, as a class, often are converted by one party or the other in a subsequent turn to positive assessments'.

This chapter suggests that *dakara* offers a solution for the participants to deal with a

common interactional problem by marking participants' orientation to, and presentation of, the topic in an emerging local context and that *dakara* can be a resource for promoting understanding and cooperation between the participants. It is also argued that the negotiation in the assessment sequences is quite complex and sensitive and it requires the participants' moment-by-moment adjustment and modification in the sequence of turns. In linguistic research, on the whole, researches have demonstrated that the discourse markers (including 'so') have pragmatic functions and they are considered to be playing a role in maintaining coherence in the exchange structure. However, these literatures on the use of 'so' (e.g., as a preface) has limited application in that there is little consideration of the interactional context where the participants' activities are sequentially produced and the participants' strategies are also embedded as the social expectations which we are supposed to assume in adopting our roles in society. It is obvious that the simple characterisation or symbolisation of Japanese conversation style based on the statistic research without regard to interactional process, which may be described as being indecisive or inclined to the collectivism behaviour by avoiding overt statements or individual opinions etc., do not adequately reveal what participants are doing in the talk-in-interaction.

Participants provide the upshot or summary assessment and the co-participants respond with agreement or disagreement. It is through these actions that participants show their positions. They also display accounts of their actions by exhibiting to what extent they agree or disagree, for example, by way of upgrading or downgrading agreement (see Pomerantz, 1984a). We need to describe all these actions and accounts for their actions by identifying what these actions do and how these actions are accomplished (Schegloff, 1996a: 169). By doing so, we can describe how participants engage in social actions as

members of society. The analysis based on the detailed transcriptions can illustrate the real activities, which are not based on hypotheses or assumptions that are linked to specific cultural dimensions. The analysis of this chapter suggests that the structural patterns of the negotiation with respect to topic closing or expansion between participants in Japanese are broadly similar to those of English.

CHAPTER SIX

FIGURATIVE EXPRESSIONS IN JAPANESE CONVERSATION

6.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the analysis focuses on the details of talk and actions as patterns of accomplishing activities in interaction aimed to uncover the sequential environment where figurative expressions can display participants' orientation to the completion of topic talk, which are followed by an introduction of a new topic or an expansion of the current topical talk. Figurative expressions including proverbial or aphoristic expressions may be powerful and economical in that they are easily recognised by members of society and their pragmatic quality of generality may have the power to implement and accomplish some actions. The use of figurative expressions may facilitate speakers' activities since they enable speakers to impart their understanding through their shared knowledge instead of giving the whole story. However, it may be thought that figurative expressions may not be frequently used in ordinary conversation since it is often assumed that figurative expressions are more difficult to understand than literal expressions. In linguistics, early research on the use of figurative language has entirely focused on how people understand the figurative expressions as a single type of language. While linguists, psychologists and philosophers are mainly concerned with how people's intuition is associated with the use of figurative expressions, psycholinguists claim that exploring people's intuition is insufficient and examine how the figurative language is processed by using a wide range of experimental methods (Gibbs and Colston, 2012).

However, these research traditions may be criticised in that participants are forced to engage themselves in the tasks that are arranged by the experimenters and the experimented data is analysed in light of the possible hypotheses (Gibbs and Colston, 2012: 3). Some researchers explored figurative expressions (e.g., metaphor) in connection with culture with an assumption that the cultural difference causes metaphor variations (e.g., the concept of anger has a cultural significance) (Kovecses, 2004; Lakoff and Kovecses, 1987). Others explored the correlation between the comprehension of idioms and the recognition of the culture-typical idioms (Boers, Demecheleer and Eyckmans, 2004). It is evident that figurative expressions have been explored from various interdisciplinary interests. However, what has not been studied in their research is how and when figurative expressions are used in social interaction and what participants are trying to accomplish by use of figurative expressions.

In English conversation, Drew and Holt (1988, 1995, 1998) and Holt and Drew (2005) have shown that conversation analysts investigate the role of the figurative expressions in light of both the design of utterances and the patterns that underlie the way in which the utterances are assembled into sequences. These studies have been conducted using CA framework and take a different direction of inquiry from most research in linguistics and psycholinguistics where analysts have little systematic investigation into the use of idioms in naturally occurring conversation (Drew and Holt, 1998). Drew and Holt (1998) observe that figurative expressions provide summary and assessment of the preceding talk and by using a figurative expression the speaker may move away from their detailed literal expressions (p.503). Drew and Holt (1998) conclude that in producing a figurative expression speakers become empirically disengaged from their previous talk due to the fact that it acts as a summary and conclusion, which enables the

speakers to move towards topic closure.²⁷ In this case, an agreement or confirmation from the recipient is due. On the other hand, Holt and Drew (2005) also observe that a number of cases do not follow such a pattern (that a figurative expression is followed by an agreement or a confirmation from the recipient that leads to a new topic). Holt and Drew (p.38) argue that there are cases where a figurative expression may be used as a pivot that creates a stepwise transition (Sacks, 1992; Jefferson, 1984a) from one story to another. In addition, Antaki (2007) investigates institutional settings where the speakers (therapists) often use idiomatic expressions on behalf of recipients (patients). That is, the therapists offer answers to the patients which summarise their positions in order to carry out their work.

Research on topic organisation focused on figurative expressions as a resource using the framework of CA is almost absent in Japanese.²⁸ Therefore, we investigate the present study on the basis of the research in English conversation illustrated above.

²⁷ In Schegloff and Sacks' (1973: 306) study, they wrote that a proverbial or aphoristic formulation (of the conversation wisdom) can be used as a topic-bounding technique (e.g., as a resource of the pre-closing topic). Thus, when a speaker offers a proverbial or aphoristic formulation, the recipient may agree, and a topic may be brought to a close.

²⁸ Mizushima and Stapleton (2006) analyse the function of meta-oriented critical comments in Japanese comical conversations. It is not a study in CA but a discourse analytic one. Focusing on the teasing remarks, Mizushima and Stapleton (2006) observe that some Japanese humorous conversations follow a distinctive formulaic communicative pattern.

[Mizushima and Stapleton, 2006: 2105]

A: (*Awaking from a nap during a lecture*) *Hmm... that was a good speech!*

B: (*Laughing*) *You weren't listening, idiot!!*

Using the data above and referring to Norrick's (1993) study, they (2006: 2106) propose that sarcastic humour (by speaker B) accompanied by laughter serves as 'a social lubricant allowing interlocutors not only to confirm mutual understanding, but also to foster friendly relations.' Although invitations to teases may appear to be connected with self-deprecating humour, they suggest that the teasees are not genuinely making a critical comment about themselves in their exchanges but they may be simply setting the stage for the teasers to respond to those invitations. Their study may be somewhat relevant for our analysis of the figurative expressions which are used by the speaker within a humorous context.

Figurative expressions may be categorised in various ways. Moon (1998) classifies idioms into three major categories such as anomalous collections, formulae and metaphors, and further notes that sayings, proverbs and similes are added as subcategories in formulae. She treats all of these expressions as fixed expressions and examines how they are used. In this study, we adopt the concept of Moon's categorisation and will define Japanese figurative expressions as not only proverbial or aphoristic expressions but also figurative lexical expressions: e.g., '*kanzume*' *ni naru*: the literal meaning is 'to become something canned' which figuratively means that 'I won't have time for anything else.' There are also compound words and phrases which are relatively literal and routinely used. For example, *senmon-baka* (lit. 'specialist' + 'idiot') means 'people who don't know anything outside their area of expertise' and so on. We will focus on the figurative expressions including proverbial and aphoristic expressions, figurative lexical expressions, and compound words and phrases that would be distinctively recognisable by speakers in Japanese conversation.

This chapter aims to identify (i) how and when a speaker proposes topic closure or topic expansion by using figurative expressions, showing her orientation to the completion of the current talk; (ii) how the recipient recognises the speaker's actions and shows her understanding and how the speaker manages the recipient's response; (iii) whether figurative expressions are used in the same way in Japanese conversation as in English; and (iv) what the characteristic features of the participants' activities are in the use of figurative expressions in Japanese conversation. Figurative expressions may be recurrently used as an emergent context either to accomplish the current topic talk orient to closing a topic or to elicit the other speaker's potential topic to extend the talk. Figurative expressions may also be jointly constructed with other components in order

to accommodate the needs of the other speaker while maintaining coherent discourse. Participants may organise their turns over the course of their actions in interaction by recurrently changing their talk from literal to figurative expressions or vice versa (cf. Goffman's (1981) notion of footing).²⁹

6.1 Summary assessments as the speaker's talk

Figurative expressions, in particular, figurative lexical expressions may be widely used by speakers to implement some actions probably because lexical expressions are easily recognised, require a minimal amount of processing effort and enhance cooperation between speakers. There are cases in which figurative expressions may be used by the speakers to provide summary assessments at a transition relevance place in order to complete their talk.

²⁹ Goffman states that 'A change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance. A change in our footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame for events...participants over the course of their speaking constantly changes their footing, these changes being a persistent feature of natural talk' (1981: 128). Clayman (1992:174) also examines and comments that the footing shift is used to initiate a new topical line of talk. For example, after commenting on the interviewee's statements, the interviewers may make an opening question which is not a simple question but it is a question in which the interviewer's formulation is embedded (p.177). It may be said that Goffman's footing concept was based on the assumption that the speakers and the recipients inhabit in separate worlds (Goodwin, 2007). Participants may use the frame to establish mutually their activities (Kendon, 1990; Hutchby, 1999a). In CA, earlier research in institutional settings has been done by using this frame work (Goffman, 1974, 1981), for example, Heath (1981) in the study of GP consultations, Clayman (1991) in television news interviews, and Hutchby (1999a) in the study of opening sequences in talk radio. In ordinary conversation, the works of Goodwin (1984, 1988), Goodwin (1990) and Holt and Clift (2007) have adopted the frame analysis and the concept of footing has been applied in analysis many times by conversation analysts (e.g. Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991; Clayman, 1992). By illustrating participants' talk-in-interaction focusing on both speaker and recipient, Goffman's frame analysis and the concept of footing are effective resources in describing the organisation of topic and participants' actions and their participation and alignment. In particular, a key element or aspect of participants' orientation may be embedded in their topical talk.

6.1.1 Completion ~ a new topic emerging sequence

As Drew and Holt (1998) illustrate, there is a case where figurative lexical expressions may be used to complete the speaker's talk. Excerpt (64) shows this. Here, the figurative lexical expression *kanzume* appears in line 30. This is a continuous talk used in excerpt (48) in chapter 4. The talk comes from the exchanges between postgraduate students. M knows Y's busy life. The excerpt begins with Y's announcement that he has decided to go to London.

(64) Y and M [*Obaachan*]

25 Y Boku ashita kara London ni iku koto ni shita n desu yo=
I tomorrow from London P go decide N COP FP
I've decided to spend some time in London from tomorrow=

26 M =E? dooshite dooshite.
what why why
=What? why why.

27 Y Ano:: sonoo obaa-chan ni ai ni=
uhm umm old lady P see P
Uh:m umm (I'm going there) to see an old lady (who is a very close friend)=

28 M =Ara ii ja:n.
oh good
=Oh, (that) sounds goo:d.

29 (0.3)

30→Y Kanzume ni nariso:dakara. Sono mae ni ikkai ikoo[ka na tte.
(lit. become something canned) because it before once go FP FP QT
**because (I) won't have time for anything else (if I start on my assignments)
(I'm wondering whether (I) should go there [before that.**

- 31 M [Sore wa ii wa:: >
that TOP good FP
[<That's a go::od>.
- 32 Y Chotto ikinuki ni:: heheheheh
just [breathing + space] P
A little change would do me good. heheheheh
- 33 M A- sore wa ii (.) sore wa ii wa.
ah that TOP good that TOP good FP
Ah-that's good (.) that's good.
- 34 .hh< So::ka> ashita wa jyugyoo nai tte itte ta yo ne=
right tomorrow TOP lecture NEG QT say-PAST-TAG
.hh <Righ::t> (you said that you) have no classes tomorrow, didn't you=
((continues)

A figurative lexical expression *kanzume ni narisoo* ((I) won't have time for anything else) follows the third turn in the closing sequence (Schegloff, 2007) and a 0.3-second pause (cf. Maynard, 1980). The expression produced by the speaker may be used to complete his talk as summary assessment followed by the recipient's positive assessment in overlap and his talk may be completed in line 32 with a laughter invitation. In the next turn, the recipient initially provides her positive assessment 'Ah-that's good (.) that's good. .hh' and then produces a new topic prefacing a token 'right' which is delivered slowly with stretches in lines 33 and 34. The new topic is about the speaker's class schedule which is not linked to the previous topic 'staying with his friend'. Here, it is observed that the figurative expression functions as a pre-closing device given that the speaker's self summary followed by elaborations leads to a disjunctive change of topic.

6.1.2 Completion ~ a related topic emerging sequence

Let us introduce another case in which the figurative lexical expression is used as a summary assessment followed by the speaker's elaboration, which leads to topic expansion. In excerpt (65), M is talking about a two-day workshop for PhD students and in earlier turns M complains about the tight schedule which goes on all day from 9 a.m.

(65) Y and M [*Kanzume yo Kanzume*]

69 M Dakara nanka dareka ga 'hirugohan tabe ni kita' tte.
so someone S lunch (o) eat P come-PAST QT
So someone said '(I) thought (I)'d come here for lunch'.

70 Kantan-na sandoicchi nan ka ga deru kara::
simple sandwiches sort of S served because
(You know), since they served some sandwiche::s

71 Y A:::naruhodo=
oh I see
Oh, I se:::e=

72 M =U:::n maa maa.
uhm not bad
=Uh::m (that)'s not ba:d.

73 (.)

74 → Dakara:: .hh kanzume yo kanzume.
so (lit. being like canned)
So:: .hh (we) were tied up.

75 Y Aa::
oh
Oh::.

Here, the question arises as to why the speaker provides her summary assessment twice in the same turn in line 74. In other words, why does the speaker replace a literal expression with a figurative expression? One reason may be that the speaker's first assessment does not deliver a clear message, for example, the term 'that' in line 72 could be referring to 'lunch' or a 'workshop'. Another reason is that the recipient's response does not immediately occur in the next turn (e.g. a pause in line 73). A figurative summary may be used as a resource to restart the talk referring back to the earlier turn where she mentioned the tight schedule of the workshop.

Following the expression *kanzume* which summarises and assesses an entire outline of the workshop as a whole, the topic moves from a timeline of the workshop to a guideline of PhD work. These topics are related issues; however, it is noted that the speaker changes a frame of her report here by using the figurative expression (which will be discussed later in detail) and continues her elaboration by presenting her position, saying '(I)'m not sure how useful (this meeting) is going to be' and the talk extends. This means that the talk changes after the use of a figurative expression but it does not appear in a disjunctive manner.

6.1.3 Answer to the other speaker's assessment

The speaker may also use a figurative lexical expression as an answer to the other speaker's assessment which is aimed at persuading the speaker and helping the speaker to come to a conclusion. The following excerpt illustrates this. A figurative lexical expression appears (line 62) following the recipient's assertive formulation. T and I are talking about T's new project and discussing how to incorporate it in her dissertation.

(66) T and I [*Omake*]

57 T konkai tama tama kore o yaru koto ni natta kara=
this time as it happens this O get because
As (it) so happens that (I) got this project=

58 I =Un un [un un.
yeah yeah yeah yeah
=Yeah yeah [yeah yeah.

59 T [Kore ga haitta kara: .hh > daiichi-gengo no hijyuu ga ookiku nacchatta<=
this S get-PAST because first-language LK play a large part
**[As (I) go:t this (project) .hh > research on the first language plays a
large part<=**

60 I =Demo sore wa sorede
but it TOP it (one's way)
=But, (I think) that is your way.

61 .hh socchi no hoo ga .hh nanka (.) ano ii yoo na ki mo suru kedo.
it than S you know uhm better seems
.hh (So), (it) seems to be better than the other, (you know).

62→ T U:::n. Dakara: (.) daini-gengo no hoo wa¥ omake¥ [de.
yeah so second-language TOP (lit. free gift) COP
Yea::h. So: (.) second-language research £would not be primary[£.

63 I [Omake [da yoo nee.
(lit. free gift) COP-TAG
**[(It) sounds [not primary,
doesn't it.**

64 T [¥Nakunatte shimai soo ¥
nothing will be
[£(It) will be nothing£

displayed by a word ‘seems’ (line 61) that respects the speaker’s knowledgeable position. In the latter, the recipient uses a downgraded assertive formulation (Heritage and Raymond, 2005) in order to represent her position. It is because they are talking about the speaker’s dissertation, thereby the speaker should have more knowledge than the recipient. The speaker’s use of the figurative lexical expression *omake* (lit. free gift) ‘not primary’ (line 62) in her utterance prefaced with a discourse marker *dakara* may appear as an answer or a conclusion to the other speaker’s assessment. It is followed by the recipient’s confirmation expressed by repetition.

Here, we observe that the recipient further displays her confirmation (line 66) while taking up the speaker’s elaboration on a section of second language research (lines 64 and 65) and then provides her independent position (line 67) in terms of the speaker’s dissertation by saying ‘it might be interesting if (you) can display your uniqueness’. The recipient’s clear formulation may elicit the talk. For example, the speaker (line 68) also provides further elaboration which shows her appreciation of the grant.

In sum, it may be said that the recipient’s assessment, in particular, positive action aimed to support the speaker, may encourage the speaker’s actions. The speaker makes a summary assessment by using a figurative lexical expression *omake* (‘free gift’) with a smiling voice, orienting to accomplish the preceding talk, which triggers both speakers’ further topical talk in subsequent turns. That is to say, a figurative lexical expression may be a resource for representing the producer’s position, which may enable the turn to expand with their cooperation.

6.1.4 Answer to the other speaker's inquiry

There may be a case where the other speaker's inquiries solicit the speaker's responses prefacing discourse marker *dakara* followed by the use of a figurative expression in the topic development sequence. The following excerpt illustrates this. T is talking to I about her surgery and she explains her current situation.

(67) T and I [Left hand]

89 T Yoosuruni .hh kata mada-nan te yuu no migi kata ga zutto ugokase nai-
in short shoulder yet how can I say right shoulder S move-NEG
In short, .hh how can I say (I) can't move the right shoulder yet-

90 kotei sareteta [wake.
fixed because
because (it) was fixed [all the time.

91 I [A:::
uh-huh
[Uh-huh.

92 T Dakara, mada (.)
so not yet
So, (it)'s not (.)

93 jibun no kata de atte jibun no kata de nai tte yuu ka: an[mari
my shoulder though my shoulder COP-NEG QT feel
(it) doesn't feel as though (it)'s my shoulder, though (it) is my shoul[der

94 I [Haa:::
uh-huh
[Uh-huh.

95 (0.3)

A *dakara*-prefaced figurative expression, delivered with an exaggerated expression (Drew, 2003), is demonstrated in the phrase ‘that are heavier than chopsticks’ accompanied with a smiling voice. According to Drew (2003: 922), the speakers in ordinary conversation use extreme or exaggerated claims in interaction (cf. Pomerantz, 1986; Sacks, 1975), but these overstated utterances are subsequently modified or revised in order to avoid misunderstanding (Drew, 2003: 924). Let us take a closer look at the sequential environment in which the figurative expression appears in order to try to understand what it is about an utterance that makes the figurative expression an appropriate response. The speaker formulates her story (the current situation) by saying that she can’t move her right shoulder yet (lines 89 and 90) marked with the use of words ‘in short’ and then gives a *dakara*-prefaced formulation (lines 92 and 93) following a continuer (‘Uh-huh’) displayed by the recipient, saying that ‘(it) doesn’t feel as though (it)’s my shoulder, though (it) is my shoulder’. Thus, the speaker clearly shows her orientation to close a current topic here since the *dakara*-prefaced formulation exhibits the end of her reporting and shows her position (line 93).

However, the recipient does not comment on it and provides a continuer (‘Uh-huh’) again (line 94), which is followed by a 0.3-second pause (line 95). This means that the recipient prompts the speaker to provide further comments by using the continuer but the speaker does not provide it. In order to manage this situation, the recipient produces a pre-emptive inquiry by her inferential work (line 96). It is observed that the recipient’s inquiry following a 0.3-second pause elicits the speaker’s further elaboration which is provided with the figurative expression. Thus, the inquiry of the recipient works to uncover the speaker’s concrete information. On the other hand, the speaker uses the figurative expression as an answer by changing the frame (from the literal into the

figurative) in order to accomplish her activities (while restating her formulation expressed in lines 92 and 93) since the speaker has not received a preferred (or dispreferred) response or a confirmation (or disconfirmation) from the recipient. The figurative expression may also work subsequently to extend the talk.

Here we notice that the speaker's use of a figurative expression displayed as a response to the inquiry may not only provide her with concrete information but also makes their talk humorous. The topic of talk is actually a serious matter in that the speaker had surgery and she cannot move her right shoulder yet; however, the figurative expression delivers an exaggerated formulation (Drew, 2003) with a smiling voice and it changes the talk to non-serious. In line 98 the recipient produces an utterance, 'Come on::.', that is followed by a further inquiry prefacing a marker 'You mean'. This could indicate that the recipient of the figurative expression responds by making jokes in a friendly way and displays the other-initiated repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977), which is often framed by 'you mean X' in order to confirm the participant's understanding of the trouble source.

Thus, it is noted that the inquiry may be constructed by the recipient using her inferential work through the figurative expression displayed by the speaker; the fact that the speaker cannot carry and lift the things that are heavier than chopsticks means that she cannot use her right hand, thereby the inquiry '(you) can only use (your) left hand' is established in line 99. The inquiry enables the talk to expand sequentially while itemising the topic 'left hand'. The answer to the inquiry is delivered focusing on the left hand (line 1). However, it is observed that the answer also provides updated information in terms of her right hand, which is followed by the recipient's receipt token

‘Oh:::.’ and ‘Oh’-prefaced utterance (lines 3 and 4). The talk continues. As Drew (2003) suggests, it is observed in this case that the talk includes the use of the exaggerated figurative expression and expands with the speaker’s modification or revision of her overstated utterance. In the next section there are examples in which figurative expressions may be employed by the recipient.

6.2 Summary assessments as the recipient’s talk

In this section, we will examine the examples where figurative expressions are used by a recipient to summarise and assess the other speaker’s talk. We will look at various figurative expressions such as aphoristic expressions, lexical expressions and others. These expressions are routinely used between people in Japanese conversation in various environments, for example, in (i) the argument sequence; (ii) the recompletion sequence; (iii) the competitive sequence; and in (iv) asking a question.

6.2.1 Argument sequence

There is a case in which a figurative expression may be used as a positive action in the argument sequence that enables speakers to mutually understand when they have opposite views. In earlier turns, M was asking why Z went to London the other day, remembering that she happened to see Z on the bus. Z answered that she went to the museum, which is followed by her elaboration at line 1 in the following excerpt.

(68) Z and M [*Koyashi*]

01 Z Maa tada tanoshimi[de. (.) benkyoo jya nai kara.
 well uhm enjoyment P study COP-NEG because
Well uhm it is for enjoyment [(.) not for study.

02 M [U::n un un
 uh-huh
[Uh-huh.

03→ Sore ga benkyoo ni naru no yoo (.) chi to nari=
 it S study become FP FP blood become
**(You) can learn (even if you can't take classes) (.) it will be useful knowledge
 some day=**

04 Z =Nan nai desu yo[o::.
 become-NEG COP FP
=(It) won't be u::sefu[l.

05 M [Naru no yoo (.) [naru naru (.) nan demo soo
 become FP yes yes everything become
[(I definitely think) it can be (.) [yes yes (.) everything is useful.

06 Z [Nan nai desu::.
 become-NEG COP
[(I think) it wo::n't be useful.

07 →M Koyashi da[kara.
 (lit. manure) COP because
(You) can learn from every[thing.

08 Z [¥Koyashi¥
 (lit. manure)
[£(I) can learn from everything£

- 09 M Koyashi koyashi.
(lit. manure)
(You) can learn from everything.
- 10 Z Koyashi wa atte mo sodata nai n desu. [hehehehe
(lit. manure) TOP there even if grow-NEG N COP
Even if there is manure, (it) doesn't grow. [hehehehe
- 11 M [Iya iya iya sodatsu no. Ato de wakarun dakara.
no no no grow FP later notice N I mean
**[No no no. I mean (it) grows and (you) will
notice it later.**
- 12 Z Hai
uh-huh
Uh-huh.
- 13 M Soo yo (.) sono toki wa mienai n dakara.
yeah FP at that time TOP recognisable-NEG N because
Yeah (.) (It) isn't recognisable at that time.
- 14 Z U:::n
uh-huh
Uh-huh.
- 15 M Sore wa nani (.) raaningu toka kyooiku no muzukashi-sa jya nai?
that TOP uhm learning or education LK difficulty COP- TAG
That's uhm (.) the difficulty of learning or education, isn't it?
- 16 Z Aa soo desu ne.
oh yeah
Oh yeah.

We observe characteristic features in the sequence of turns where speakers present an oppositional movement between speakers. For example, at line 1 Z claims that viewing some pictures at the museum is just for enjoyment, which is followed by an opposition

from M, saying ‘(it) will be useful knowledge someday’ that involves a figurative expression *chi to nari* (lit. blood became) ‘useful knowledge’ (line 3). The figurative expression is characterised as a positive action. However, Z raises an objection (line 4) against M’s summary assessment, displaying her position. Here, we notice that Z’s action may be treated as ‘self-deprecation’ which is followed by M’s objection (line 5) that is delivered with extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986) by using the word ‘everything’. This is further interrupted by disagreement by Z (line 6) who repeatedly states ‘(it) won’t be useful’. That is to say, an oppositional movement between the speakers may be sequentially extended.

Then, it is observed that M changes her strategy after the interruption by Z. She uses another figurative lexical expression *koyashi* (lit. manure) meaning ‘(You) can learn from everything’ (line 7), which is also treated as a positive summary. In overlap, it is repeated by Z with a smiling voice (line 8). This means that Z shows her attention to M’s utterance by repeating the figurative lexical expression used by M. However, Z does not immediately accept M’s summary assessment. Z still keeps her position by providing her self-deprecation (line 10), whereas M still challenges Z’s position by using a marker ‘I mean’ and emphasises her point that she will notice it later (line 11). We note that her utterance overlaps with Z’s laugh invitation but M does not laugh in this case and Z produces a continuer ‘Uh-huh’ instead. It is observed that Z has completely changed her position (line 16) when M correlates ‘learning’ and ‘knowledge’ with ‘education’ over the sequence of turns in lines 11, 13, and 15.

It may be thought that M organises her utterances in order to pursue the other speaker’s agreement by selecting the figurative expression *chi to naru* and the figurative lexical

expression *koyashi* at the beginning of this excerpt and she finally selects a word ‘education’ (line 15) as a general term in order to recomplete the talk, which is followed by a confirmation of the other speaker: ‘Oh yeah’ (line 16). Thus, it may be said that the recipient convinces the speaker to change her mind by adopting general notions including figurative expressions and the notion of learning and education. In other words, figurative expressions may be used as a resource for someone to change her position. A positive summary is also useful to elicit the other speaker’s affiliation in order to co-construct discourse coherence as illustrated in this excerpt when M uses it to encourage Z over the turns of talk. The next section illustrates how jokes influence the action between speakers in the recompletion sequence.

6.2.2 Recompletion sequence

There may be a case in which a figurative expression elicits the closing of a topical talk and re completes the talk after the competition of a series of jokes between speakers. In particular, a figurative expression may be used as a response to an ironical proposition in order to recomplete the talk. Excerpt (69) illustrates this. In earlier turns, M complains that when she exercised in her room she spilt a cup of coffee on the table. In response, Y comments that M’s room is large enough for her to exercise as her legs are not so long. The excerpt begins with a response to a joke by Y in the prior turn of the utterance in line 57.

(69) Y and M [*Nemuku nari soo*]

57 M A-<so::o>↑ heheheh (.) >ara zannen<=
 oh oh shame
Oh, <(you) think so::o>↑ heheheh (.)>Oh (that)'s a shame<=

58→Y =Nemuku narisoo desu yo nanka.
 get sleepy COP FP indeed
=(Your story) is boring indeed.

59 M Wakarimashita. Su (h) mimasen (.) sukkari ojamashimashita.
 all right sorry very sorry for having bothered you
All right. So(h)rry (.) (I)'m very sorry for having bothered you.

60 Ganbatte kudasai kore kara=
 Good luck from now
Good luck=

61 Y =Hai arigatoo gozaimasu.
 yes thank you
=Yes, thank you.

In response to an assertive statement by Y (that does not emerge here) which is produced with ironic overtones, it is observed that the utterance (line 57) produced by M is constructed by using the marker 'Oh' followed by a hearably ironic proposition 'Oh< (you) think so::o>↑'. While taking up the previous turn, it may be produced as a counter position delivered slowly with a stretched word 'so' and a loud voice. In the same turn, prefacing laughter, M then produces an ironic assessment '>Oh (that)'s a shame<' using the marker 'Oh' and a proposition, delivered quickly with a loud voice.

According to Hutchby (2001), a device of 'oh' plus an ironical proposition may be used as a device in an argumentative sequence. Referring to Heritage's (1984b) work on the

structural forms of ‘oh’ as a change-of-state marker, such as ‘oh’ plus a noticing, ‘oh’ plus a request for information and ‘oh’ plus a partial repeat of the prior turn, Hutchby (2001: 131) argues that ‘oh’ plus an ironical proposition in his data presents a similar form but it was not examined by Heritage in that early study. In order to analyse the excerpt above, Hutchby’s observation is effective in that he (2001: 124) treats ‘a conception of arguments as sequentially emergent phenomena. CA encourages us to see arguments not as the rationalistic pursuit of opposing viewpoints but as events unfolding in a real-time flow of turn-taking...Arguments are thus seen as emergent in the display of opposition’. He also suggests that the device of ‘oh’ plus a proposition can be seen as a culturally available resource.

Returning to the utterance in the extract above, the responses of ‘oh’ plus a proposition (line 57) to the assertion in the prior turn may be displayed in an argumentative frame, dealing with the other speaker’s line by using the word ‘so’ in the prior turn (e.g., ‘Oh< (you) think so::o>↑’) and pursuing her own line (e.g., ‘>Oh (that)’s a shame<’). Thus, the ‘oh’ plus a proposition may be used by speakers to formulate positions in different lines in an argumentative sequence and it may involve ambiguity. The utterance ‘>Oh (that)’s a shame<’ is the speaker’s assertion which shows her position clearly, but it may not be expressing her real intention since it is delivered as a joke. A figurative expression *nemuku narisoo* (lit. get sleepy), meaning ‘(Your) story is boring indeed’ (line 58), is employed by the recipient following the speaker’s utterance and it may be used to accomplish the talk. In response to Y’s orientation to topic closing, M replies firmly with a token ‘All right’ (that shows her acceptance) followed by a terminal greeting message which is followed by Y’s acceptance (line 61). This means that the figurative expression may work as interactional resources. The next section will

examine a humorous talk involving the use of figurative expression in the competitive sequence.

6.2.3 Competitive sequence

The speaker may also use a figurative expression as humorous assessment and a resource to persuade the other speaker after competitive actions. Excerpt (70) illustrates this. In earlier turns (it has not appeared here) K reports to N about her terrible situation. K had had an infectious disease about a week ago at the time of talking and soon after she had the norovirus from which she was suffering severe symptoms such as high fever, diarrhoea and emesis.³⁰ The excerpt begins with a response by N to the severe symptoms.

(70) N and K [Trendy]

- 12 N Aa::: iya iya iya iya. Nanka koo hayari ni nori sugi↑ (.) heheh
oh sounds like [ride a wave] too much
Oh::: dear, dear, dear dear. (It) sounds like (you)'re putting too much time and effort into being trendy↑ (.) heheh
- 13 K Un. nanka::>kodomo no toki kara ryuukoo no sai(h)-sentan o[itte ta monode< heh
yeah actually child L when since [be at the forefront of trends]-PAST because
Yeah actually >(it)'s because ever since (I) was a child, (I) have always been at the frontier of trendy fashion.< heh

³⁰ The three components such as high fever, diarrhea and emesis are called 'three-part-lists' (Jefferson, 1990) which can work as a sign of turn completion (1990: 73). The speakers project their own utterance completion using the three-part-lists, whereas the recipients can anticipate when that device will end. It is effective for both speakers to display their affiliation.

- 14 N [heheheheh
[heheheheh
- 15 sonna mon mo(h)ratteremo hehehe[heh
sort of things get even if
Who wa(h)nts it. hehehe[heh.
- 16 K [Moraeru mono nara nandemo byooki demo
can get something if anything sickness example
[(I'd) take anything (that's free), even a disease.
- 17 morau chuu kono binbo-konjoo ga:: heh[eh
get QT this [poverty-grit] S
(It) is beca:use of my poverty-driven greedy nature, heh[eh
- 18 N [heh demo so:: datte,
but so COP QT
[heh but, (they) say that,
- 19→ kotsuu-jiko ni atta toki wa takarakuji mo ataru n datte yuu kara.
traffic-accident be-PAST involved when TOP lottery also win N COP QT say FP
if you happen to get hurt in a traffic accident, (you) will also win the lottery.
- 20 K Aa[:.
oh
Oh[:.
- 21 N [Ataru n datte.
win N COP QT
[(You)'ll win, they say.
- 22 K A::: naruhodo ne.
oh I see
Oh::: I see.

23 N Nanka ko: mainasu ga ookii toki wa purasu mo ookii no ga kuru hazu dakara::
 just like minus S great when plus also great LK S come must so
(It)'s just li:ke 'bad luck often brings good luck', s:o::

24 (.) makasetoke tte he[heheheheheheheh
 no problem QT
(.) (you) should just let it happen. he[heheheheheheheh

25 K [heheheheheheheheh
[heheheheheheheheh

The recipient produces her summary assessment using an expression *hayari ni noru* ('ride a wave') in line 12. Actually, the topic of the talk is not 'fashion' but a 'disease.' However, she uses the word *hayari* focusing on the meaning of 'fashion'. The utterance *hayari ni nori sugi* means that 'you are putting too much time and effort into being trendy (in terms of catching diseases)'. The recipient selects the figurative expression using a marker 'oh' as a receipt token at turn initial followed by the expression 'dear dear dear' and appends laughter at the end of her turn. Thus, it may be said that the speaker's description of the three-part-lists may trigger the recipient's response which involves her appreciation of the other speaker who had had a terrible situation. In addition, the recipient also intends to treat the speaker's serious situation as a non-serious talk by using a figurative expression.

In the next turn, prefacing a minimal acknowledgement ('Yeah'), the speaker takes up the summary assessment in the prior turn described in a figurative sense. She continues the talk which may be seen as a competitive action by using an expression *ryukoo no sai-sentan* ('be at the forefront of trends') meaning that '(I) have always been at the frontier of trendy fashion'. We notice here that *hayari* (the recipient used in the prior

turn) is emergently replaced by *ryuukoo* ('trend' or 'fashion') and the talk is completely extended in the frame of a figurative manner. In other words, the talk seems to be completely changed in a humorous way.

However, we notice that both speakers change their strategies. For example, the recipient remarks 'Who wa(h)nts it'³¹ with an appended laugh invitation prefacing laughter in the overlap (lines 14 and 15). After this action, the speaker may also change her strategy in the frame of talk and her utterance involves a literal word 'disease' and an expression 'my poverty-driven greedy nature' that is an expression of self-deprecation (lines 16 and 17 respectively). In other words, it is far from the talk of 'trends' or 'fashion'. Thus, the topic has moved on in the frame of reality by using literal expressions. Then it is observed that the recipient completely changes her strategy again: she accepts the laugh invitation in the prior turn by starting her response prefacing laughter, then delivers her counter argument with a marker 'but' (lines 18 and 19); she then provides a positive humorous summary assessment '(they) say that...' which may be thought to be used to encourage or persuade the speaker in a humorous way. In the subsequent turn, she continuously uses an aphoristic assessment 'bad luck often brings good luck' (line 23).

In parallel, it is noted that the speaker also changes her actions in association with the recipient's change of strategy: she displays 'Oh::.' as a receipt of new information and a confirmation 'Oh::: I see' (lines 20 and 22 respectively) which sequentially work to mutually construct their activities, showing their common knowledge and their positions.

³¹ Drew (1987) writes that in English conversation, recipients of teases recurrently respond quite seriously even though they recognise that the tease was displayed humorously. Drew called this the 'po-faced' receipt of teases.

The aphoristic summary assessment with a laugh invitation in line 24 (Jefferson, 1979) may elicit the recipient's activities and it is displayed to complete the current topical talk. We observe that the recipient's laugh invitation may be accepted by the speaker and it becomes shared laughter in line 25 (Jefferson, 1979; Glenn, 2003; Holt, 2010) which indicates that both speakers may have reached the point where the current topic may possibly be closed since they show their mutual understanding by using shared laughter. This means that the topical talk may possibly be closed locally in the sequence of turns. Thus, it may be said that the positive and aphoristic summary assessments can be used as resources to accomplish the topical talk and there may be a possibility to move on to a new topic or to continue the talk with a related topic.

6.2.4 Asking a question

There may be a case in which a figurative expression may be used as a question that can possibly involve a major concern to the producer. The following excerpt exhibits this. Z and K are talking about a taxi company. Before the beginning of this excerpt, the recipient K asked the question 'Do you know a taxi company (.) you can recommend?' and the speaker Z answered that she always calls a taxi company whose number is 543210 (that does not emerge in this excerpt).

(71) **Z and K** [*Atari hazure nai*]

79 Z 01206 datta ka na. .hhhh sore no 5432[10.
(tel number) COP Q FP follows (tel number)
(It) must be 01206 followed by 5432[10.

- 80 K [A- sugoi oboe yasui. Jya::
oh wow remember easy so
[Oh- wow. (It)'s easy to remember. So::
- 81 Z Dakara sore ni shite n no.
so it call N FP
So (I) (always) call it.
- 82 .hhh ato wa :: (.) 541541 (.) mitai na no ga (.) yoku aru jan.
another one TOP (tel number) like that LK S often heard
.hhh Another one is:::. (.) 541541 like that (.) (I)'ve often heard.
- 83 K Aa:::
oh
Oh:::
- 84 Z Kiteru kedoo .hh watashi wa itsumo- MA no toki kara (.) koko dake[(0.1)
come-PAST but I TOP always (degree course name) since this one only
(I found before that one) came to our place but .hh I've always- been calling (.)
- 85 K [Un un un.
yeah yeah yeah
[Yeah yeah yeah.
- 86 Z tsukatte ru kara. .hhhhh
call-ing
only this (company) [(0.1) since (I) was an MA student. .hhhh
- 87 →K Maa atari-hazure nai? (.) tte kanji desu ka?
uhm (lit hit-miss-nothing) QT think COP Q
Uhm can (you) rely on that company?
- 88 Z Daitai (.) kuru=
almost always come
(I think they) (.) came almost always (punctually)=

89 K =A- (0.3) wakarimashita.
 ah I see
 = Ah- (0.3) I see.

When the speaker answered in earlier turns, she added the information that she has not checked whether the price of this company is really cheap or not. The recipient shows her position by saying that the number of the company the speaker always used is easy to remember (line 80) and the speaker points out the fact that the speaker has used only this company. The speaker may have thought that these things are important issues for the recipient. However, we also observe that a figurative expression *atari hazure nai* (lit. hit-miss-nothing) meaning ‘the company is reliable or not’ is used as an inquiry (line 87). In other words, another key issue for the recipient is whether the company is reliable or not, which is displayed with a figurative expression in the form of an inquiry. The answer comes immediately in the next turn which is delivered with the use of a literal expression ‘(I think they) (.) came almost always (punctually)’, followed by a token ‘Ah’ plus ‘I see’. That means that the recipient provides a receipt of information and her understanding at the third turn of the sequence closing (Schegloff, 2007). However, the talk still continues with the speaker’s elaboration that may sequentially extend the turn on a related topic.

6.3 Assessment of the third person

Another use of a figurative expression by the speaker as an assessment of the third person will be examined. The recipient of a figurative expression may or may not know the third person. Firstly we will look at a case in which the speaker may assess a third person who is not known by the recipient.

6.3.1 Recipient of a figurative expression who does not know the person

We can now move on to the use of figurative expressions which are similar to proverbial expressions which people are generally familiar with. Some proverbial expressions include key words. One example is *te-hacchoo kuchi-hacchoo* (*kuchi-hacchoo te-haccho*), the literal meaning being ‘eight mouths and eight hands’ and the figurative meaning being ‘a type of person who is as good with words as he is with his hands.’ There may be a case in which a speaker uses a figurative expression to describe or assess a person who is not known by the recipient. The following excerpt illustrates this. K and N have been friends since they were small children. K knows that N has a son but she has never met him. N was talking about her son who looks like his uncle, which led to another story about K’s mother who was impressed by N’s performance at a chorus festival where her son’s uncle was present.

(72) N and K [*Kuchi-hacchoo te-hacchoo*]

- 03 K N-chan anna tokugi ga atta towa shiranakatta yo toka tte
(woman’s name) like possess a talent for know-NEG-PAST FP QT
(My mother) was so impressed, saying things like: ‘I didn’t know N-chan possessed such a talent.’
- 04 N A:::

Uh-huh.
- 05 K Ara (0.1) anohito nandatte yaru yo:: .h chugakko no toki benrontaikai
oh the person whatever do FP junior high school LK when speech contest
(I said to her) ‘Oh, (0.1) didn’t (you) know that she is a person of many talents.

- 06 yu:shoo yo [tte.
win-PAST FP QT
(She) even won in a debate contest when (we) were in junior high sch[ool?.
- 07 N [heheheheheh

[heheheheheh.
- 08 K Sugoi n daka[ra:::
great N COP
(She) is truly ama:::zi[ng.
- 09 N [heheh ho(h)nto ni so:dawa heheh ben(h)rontaikai ni deta no heheh
oh yes so COP FP speech contest P compete-PAST FP
**[heheh. Oh y(h)es, (I) di:d, didn't I? heheh (I) did take part in the
debate contest, heheh**
- 10 sugoine:: heheheh
great (self-praise)
(I) was ama::zing, heheheh.
- 11 K un.
yeah
Yeah.
- 12 N zenzen soo yuu ko jya naino yo. (.) watashi ni nitayoo na
completely such a person COP NEG FP I P look like
(He) isn't like that at all. (.) (He)'s so different (.) from me.
- 13→ kuchi-hacchoo te-hacchoo jya nai kara:::
(lit. eight mouths and eight hands) COP NEG CONJ
**(He) is not the type of person who is as good with words as he is with his
ha::nds.**
- 14 K Un.

Uh-huh.

15 N ko:: (.) ohayoo-gozaimasu mo ookii koe de ienai yoona yatsu dakara::
greetings also clear voice in can say NEG like boy CONJ
For exa::mple, (.) (he) ca::n't even say a simple greeting like 'good morning' loudly and clearly.

16 K Un.
oh
Oh.

To analyse the placement of a proverbial expression (line 13) in a sequence of turns, a compliment sequence used by reporting speech³² can be seen. For example, K uses direct reporting speech to praise N, consisting of two parts: the compliment by K's mother (line 3) and the compliment by K herself (lines 5, 6, and 8). In English conversation speakers do not simply accept a compliment and they will choose to avoid self-praise instead (Pomerantz, 1978: 88-91). Even if they accept it in the form of appreciation such as 'thank you', they will downgrade the compliment in their response. In other words, when they reject a compliment, the response will be either a disagreement or a qualification of the assertion (p.85). In response to such compliment sequences the recipient of the compliment provides a continuer 'Uh-huh' (line 4), laughter, and laughter along with another turn component ('Oh yes') in lines 7 and 9 respectively. As a consequence, the recipient of the compliment (N) accepts K's compliments once and praises herself with laughter *sugoi*ne:: *heheheh* ('I was amazing. heheheh') in lines 9 and 10, commenting on the common experience of the event between speakers. It may be said that N accepts K's compliment by displaying a 'humorous' positive face (Goffman, 1967).

³² Holt and Clift (2007: 1) state that 'We recurrently use talk to report talk, whether we are reporting the compliment someone gave us or conveying how we made a complaint or told a joke.'

The data shows that direct reporting speech here may work as a resource to serve a compliment which may be immediately recognisable by the other speaker. As a consequence, direct reporting speech may be used to elicit the other speaker's understanding since it provides evidence of their statements (Holt, 1996: 241). It may also be said that while serving a compliment by reporting, the speaker shows her own position (e.g. through her mother's utterance) in order to elicit the recipient's actions such as interest, motivation, or emphatic agreement (e.g., laughter or laughter plus 'Oh yes'). In line 12, the speaker shifts the topic of the conversation from the story of the speaker to her son. This means that the topic may be referring back to the talk in earlier turns where they were talking about N's son. However, N's utterance shows that the new topic is somehow related to the prior turn: N takes up the prior utterance by using a deixis (e.g., like 'that') which means that N not only shows her understanding of the utterance of K but also states that her son is not like the speaker K describes.

Continuously, N provides a proverbial expression *kuchi-hacchoo te-hacchoo* in line 13 (lit. eight mouths and eight hands) that means that 'the type of person who is as good with words as he is with his hands'. Thus, her literal comments about her son, '(He) isn't like that at all. (.) (He)'s so different (.) from me' are clearly replaced by the proverbial expression in the same turn. Thus, the recipient uses self-initiated repair in order to switch from literal to figurative statements. Here, Goffman's concept of 'footing' (1981) may be applied. He (1981: 128) defined footing as 'participants' alignment, or set, or stance, or posture, or projected self' and shifts of footing as 'a change in the alignment we take up for ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance. A change in footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame of events'. Here, it is worth

considering why the speaker uses a proverbial expression in order to reiterate her assessment about her son. She may select the proverbial expression so that the recipient promptly recognises and understands her son's characteristics/descriptions (see Sacks and Schegloff, 1979). Sacks (1992) writes about the concept of a 'recognition-type description' for places and objects in story-telling. The description is specifically designed to secure a display of recognition by the recipient (Sacks, 1992, vol.2: 180).

Another use of proverbial expression may also be considered. Sacks (1992, vol.1: 107) notes that 'one uses proverbs of this character to make events noticeable, perhaps to make their ordered character noticeable, and then to formulate their ordered character by reference to their possible illegitimacy' and points out that proverbs are generally short, consisting of single sentences or not longer than phrases of sentences, and they are quite abstract (1992, vol.1: 109). Thus, proverbs enable the producer to use a minimised description. Following the recipient's continuer ('Uh-huh'), the speaker further elaborates about her son in a literal way³³ (line 15) because she has not received a preferred answer from the recipient to her downgraded proverbial expression. She describes her son as someone who cannot even say a simple greeting, which is a form of self-deprecation (Pomerantz, 1984a), using the same grammatical frame as the proverbial expression 'X -*ja nai*' ('not X'). Similar ways of compliment responses are observed in English conversation.

The data above shows that the action of the proverbial expression promptly occurs

³³ Jefferson (2003) writes that the inexplicit expressions such as indexical references (e.g., 'that', 'it', etc.) are routinely used by the participants in their interaction, thereby, in order to understand each other adequately, the participants need to rely on their assumption as to what those inexplicit expressions refer to.

following a literal expression with a view to judging references (her son's personality) which is legitimate. In order to describe her son's personality to the other speaker who does not know him, the producer uses a proverbial expression next because its proverbial common sense is not only reflective but also provides the producer's point of view. An example in this excerpt shows that the proverbial expressions can be used as the speaker's assertive formulation of her son.

6.3.2 Recipient of a figurative expression who knows the person

In contrast, there may be a case where the recipient of a figurative expression knows the person who is referred to by the speaker. As a final example, let us look at a figurative expression, which can be understood to have a different meaning in the context of conversation, is used by the other speaker in a sarcastic sense of humour. O and N are teachers who have different views on teaching methods and are having an argument about a student who is leaning Japanese.

(73) O and N [My pace]

57 O Soo ne:: (.) A:: (.) nanka demo (.) anshin-shimashita. Onaji peesu de ano hito mo::
 yeah ah you know but relieve-PAST same pace P that person
Yea::h (.) ah (.) but (.) (I) am relieved that he's been (studying) at the same pace

58 suki-hoodai ¥yatteru¥ [heheheh
 as much as he likes do-ing
as befo::re, you know (he)'s £doing£ as much as he likes [heheheh

59 N [heheheh

[heheheh

60 O Suki-hoodai[ttara chotto::
as much as he like if we say a little bit
(If we say that he)'s doing [as much as he likes, a little bit::

61 N [heheh

[heheh

62 Jubun no peesu de [hehe
one's own pace
(We can say he)'s (studying) his own pace [hehe

63 O [hehehe

[hehehe

---Some lines deleted---

71→O maa (.) mai peesu mitai ne=
anyway [my pace] seems FP
Anyway (.) (he) seems to go at [my pace] (his own pace), doesn't he=

72 N =Ne::: (.) soo dato [omoimasu.
he is yes
=He is (.) [yes.

73 O [Maa (.) shiawase nan jya nai n desu ka?=
anyway happy COP-TAG COP Q
[Anyway (.) (I) think (he) seems to be happy, doesn't he?=

74 N =hehehe

=hehehe

The excerpt begins with a formulation by O expressing relief, which is considered as a shift of topic (line 57). Although the recipient shows her relief to hear that her

ex-student is learning at the same pace, N is not satisfied with his way of learning since she thinks that it is important to learn by writing (she complained that he did not try to write Kanji in earlier turns). Thereby the recipient further elaborates on her formulation (line 58). To be more precise, while the recipient supports the student's active learning even if it may not be a perfect way, she criticises him, saying '(he)'s doing as much as he likes' in order to respect the speaker's position. In overlap, laughter suddenly emerges as shared laughter. In overlap with the recipient's self-initiated repair (line 60), the speaker N laughs (line 61) and co-constructs a repair (line 62) at the transition relevance place and laughter emerges at the same time (lines 62 and 63). Thus, both speakers start laughing at the same time again. In other words, the self-initiated utterance (repair) by O may be projected in order to elicit the speaker's cooperation. She avoids making a personal comment but uses the grammatical format 'if we say' that is displayed as a general comment.

It may be noted that the recipient employs a shift in topic by producing an utterance prefacing a component 'anyway' in which a phrase *mai peesu* ('my pace') is embedded (line 71) which was used by N in an earlier turn in a negative sense meaning 'self-centred'. That is to say, the recipient takes into account the speaker N's position with the use of a tag question and organises the utterance to pursue an agreement or confirmation from the speaker N in the next turn. It may be said that the utterance 'my pace' (line 71) may possibly be used with a sarcastic sense of humour. Following an immediate agreement and confirmation, 'He is (.) yes', by the speaker N, the recipient's formulation is delivered which prefaces the discourse marker 'Anyway' and the recipient O says that he may be happy. In response, laughter occurs (line 74).

6.4 Discussion

The analysis focused on the details of talk and actions as patterns of accomplishing activities in interaction aimed to uncover the sequential environment where figurative expressions can display speakers' orientation to the completion of topic talk or the expansion of the topic talk. Through the observations of the analyses it is noticed that, while the completion sequences may be largely governed by the recipient design, how the speaker of figurative expressions manage the recipient's design of actions are also crucial since both participants' cooperation is required in order to complete the negotiation of topic talk. These characteristic features identified in our data appear to be consistent with what has been reported in English conversation by Drew and Holt (1998) and Holt and Drew (2005).

In fact, the figurative expressions may be powerful and economical in that they are easily recognised and less arguable. It is evidenced by the fact that the participants' use of figurative expressions elicit the co-participants' better understanding and positive thoughts. In particular, it is worth noting that the participants negotiate with the co-participants by using the figurative expressions, which is well organised by switching from literal to figurative and vice versa through the repair initiation. For example, the speaker reconstructs her summary assessment displayed with a figurative expression *Koyashi* through the third-position repair ('I mean'). Thus, the utterance is replaced from literal to figurative and it allowed the speaker to reconstruct her stance by changing the frame and it enabled both the speaker and the recipient to restart conversation in a different mode. On the other hand, the recipient provides a pre-emptive question through the other-initiated repair ('you mean'), which is projected

to seek the speaker's concrete response. The recipient's question described in the literal manner may be projected to generate a new sequence. It has been illustrated that figurative expressions are employed by participants as moment-by-moment activities and they are displayed locally in sequential interaction. That is to say, these actions are displayed as a situated method of conduct (cf. Schegloff, 1992a: xxciiii) since they fit in local context and exhibit local relevance.

The figurative expressions also appear with prefaces such as a token 'oh', 'yeah', and discourse markers *dakara* ('so') etc. and are delivered as an answer to the other speaker's assessment. For example in excerpt (66), the recipient of the troubles-telling uses figurative expression (i.e., *sore wa sorede*) as concluding remarks, to which the troubles-teller responds with smiling voice and delivers the figurative lexical word (i.e., *omake*) which is prefaced with 'Yea::h' and 'So:'. The recipient of the troubles-telling then displays her agreement by partially repeating the figurative lexical word (i.e., *omake*) with tag. In the fourth turn, the troubles-teller also elaborates in overlap with the prior tag question with smiling voice and laughter.

In excerpt (67) another case where a figurative expression appears following a preface *dakara* ('so') is found in an answer to the other speaker's pre-emptive inquiry. This is hearably an exaggerated expression and laughable, however, the recipient of this humorous figurative expression does not laugh and she organises and produces further pre-emptive inquiry, which is conducted by repair initiation ('you mean'). This means that she reconstructs her inquiry following the other speaker's figurative summary, which is included in an answer to her original question. This reconstructed inquiry is followed by an acknowledgement and further concrete statements containing literal

expressions. Thus, it is noted that the troubles-teller often talks about her situation in a non-serious manner through figurative expressions (sometimes with prefacing components) with laugh, however, the recipient of the troubles-telling does not always laugh. She controls and manages her response, while switching the frame from literal to figurative and vice versa and using the repair initiation. This feature is also commonly observed in English.

In English conversation, laughter has often been seen as resulting from humour or an index of humour. However, laughter may not only be an indication of perceived humour but there may be other factors that may trigger its occurrence (Glenn, 2003). In Jefferson's work (1979), responses to the speaker's laughter are analysed to have three possibilities such as recipient laughter, recipient silence and recipient non-laughing speech. The recipient non-laughing speech indicates that the recipient declines the first speaker's laugh invitation. On the other hand, Jefferson (1984b) also examines laughter in the non-humorous context of 'trouble-talk'. Troubles-tellers laugh to display their resistance to the trouble so as to take it lightly, whereas the recipient does not laugh since she treats the turn as serious. The laughter in this environment is not a response to humorous discourse. These characteristic features reported in English conversation (Jefferson, 1979) have also recurrently appeared in Japanese conversation.

As Drew (2003: 922) reports, the speakers in ordinary conversation use extreme or exaggerated claims in interaction (cf. Pomerantz, 1986; Sacks, 1975), but these overstated utterances are often subsequently modified or revised in order to avoid misunderstanding (p.924). In fact, this mechanism is available in Japanese conversation and through the examination of the data above, there are similarities between English

and Japanese in the environment where figurative expressions are properly fitted in the context and timely used as a situated method of conduct. If we could point out a specific feature in Japanese, the switch in the use of figurative and literal expressions may be recurrently seen in Japanese conversation, which makes the talk shortened and delivered economically and gives the participants better understanding with direct and indirect information. In addition, while the speaker's use of figurative expressions (as self summary assessments) in ordinary conversation have been mainly reported in English, it is the recipient's use of figurative expressions that have also been observed in Japanese.

The analysis of this chapter revealed that figurative expressions in Japanese conversation described as a consequential product of participants' activities in sequence organisation, which has taken a thoroughly different path from the notion underlying the indirect speech act theory (i.e., the concept of politeness as indirect speech acts, cf. Brown and Levinson, 1978; Levinson, 1983; see also Schegloff, 1992a: xxix). Levinson (1983: 356-364) also discussed on this matter and explains the differences in the approach taken between CA and the speech acts theories with an example of the action of pre-request which may be used to avoid request refusals. He (1983: 361-363) argues that CA may analyse the action of request in pre-request sequences which have a standard structure which occurs in the order of 'pre-request', 'responses' and '(direct) request', whereas the indirect speech acts may look at the utterances that are designed to obtain the response directly within a single turn thereby the subject of their analysis may be an inquiry such as 'You don't have his number I don't suppose'. This means that such indirect speech acts do not pay attention to the utterances in sequence and the participants' strategic considerations in sequential interaction (Schegloff, 1992a: xxix).

There may be a possibility that the pre-request might receive the account (e.g., ‘Why?’) and the producer of pre-request has to answer the question in this situation.

Since figurative expressions generally involve non-literal and indirect expressions, attention may also be directed to understanding why participants use figurative expressions instead of literal ones (which may be argued, from the perspective of cross-cultural communication studies, as the preference of euphemisms or indirect expressions over direct literal expressions etc.). As we discussed above, linguists, psychologists and philosophers’ concern is how people’s intuition is associated with the use of figurative expressions and psycholinguists investigate how the figurative language is processed by using a wide range of experimental methods. What is prominent with the approach taken in our study is that we do not aim to reveal why participants use figurative expressions but to understand ‘why an utterance is said, why now, why did he do that, why did he refer that way’ (Sacks, 1992, vol. I: 545). That is to say, whatever characteristic it is, talking of such cultural traits or norms by analysing the utterances without having regard to the context and relation with the prior and the subsequent turns may not have sufficiently addressed what is actually going on in talk-in-interaction. Instead, what we need to explore is the certain conversational trajectories that can be describable in sequential analysis of successive turns.

CHAPTER SEVEN

TOPIC SHIFT IN JAPANESE CONVERSATION

7.0 Introduction

This chapter explores the mechanism of topic shift in Japanese conversation, focusing on how the turn is designed as the participants' projections and how it is sequentially related to the action of the preceding turn in topic-in-progress in interaction. In English conversation, the common practice of dealing with topic structure within conversation analysis (CA) is to recognise that the participants gradually change the topic (see Sacks' (1992) and Jefferson's (1984a) 'step-by-step transition' or 'stepwise transition' and Schegloff and Sacks' (1973) 'topic shading'). In the mechanism of the stepwise movement, what participants have been talking about ties to what they are now talking about (Sacks, 1992, vol.2: 566). That is to say, participants are machinery checking out why an utterance is said and why now, which is built into the structure for doing talk and if it is all understandable, it is solved for the hearers (Sacks, vol.1: 542, 546). Under these circumstances, there are places in which utterances are not related to the talk in the prior turns but they may include new referents, constituting a different line of talk. Such transition may be characterised as disjunctive topic shift and is distinguished from the stepwise topic shift. Maynard (1980) reports that topic change occurs in the environment where the speech exchange in the transition relevant place has failed and Jefferson (1984a) states that topic shift occurs in a specific and problematic context, by making statements immediately after a troubles-telling in order to disengage the current topic and restart conversation.

An important matter is how the elements of a turn (utterance) at talk are selected by participants in order to accomplish topic shift in ongoing talk-in-interaction. Formulation is often used by participant in order to accomplish different lines of topical talk (Maynard, 1980: 271) and it is not only used as a move to refocusing or restarting a topic but also as an invitation to a new matter (Sacks, 1992, vol.1: 301; Maynard, 1980: 275, 280; Heritage, 1985; Schegloff, 1990: 51). According to Heritage and Watson (1979), participants may be capable of ‘folding back’ the conversation in progress by making summaries and conclusions through the practice of formulation, therefore a crucial aspect of the prior turn may be consequently embedded in the practice of formulation (p.128). Heritage and Watson (1979: 150-153) observed that whereas formulation by the speakers are used as an upshot or gist of the prior talk in order to move towards a closing of a course of action, formulation by the recipients are employed in the form of questions in order to develop a course of action (p.157). While both types of formulation can be seen in institutional settings, the latter is most frequently used by the questioners in institutional settings (Heritage, 1985: 100), for instance, doctors, teachers and interviewers may often use the practice of formulation which is embedded in their next questions in order to achieve their activities (Heritage, 1985:101-104; Drew and Heritage, 1992b: 49).

When formulation is employed by the participants in achieving the end of topical talk but a coherent confirmation or disconfirmation is not received from the co-participants, they may try another attempt at formulation or formulation in question forms by recycling or renewing the original formulation through, for instance, initiation of repair, which may be called the practice of reformulation or the reformulation question (Heritage and Watson, 1979: 152). Reformulation and reformulation embedded in a

question are recurrently used by interviewers, counsellors, or hosts as a resource to accomplish their activities after the responses to the formulation and question. For example, the reformulation is delivered as a contrastive device (e.g., ‘you say X, but what about Y’, cf. Hutchby, 1992) and the reformulation question, aimed to contest the response, is displayed while taking up and dealing with some elements of the response in the prior turn and it contains an expected answer in a form of reformulated questions (cf. Greatbatch, 1986a, 1986b; Hutchby, 1991; Clayman, 1993). Clayman (1993: 165) focuses on a reformulated question which appears in an environment where the complex question is raised and the response is potentially problematic (e.g., there is a lack of coherence between the question and the response or an expected answer is not produced in response). He argues that the reformulated question is associated with both an original question and the response to the original question and that the reformulated question is presented in a way that the recipient understands what the expected answer is. Of particular interest is that there has not been much studies which focuses on the procedure of reformulation with an attempt to reveal a pattern of the structure of topic shifting in ordinary conversation.

In this chapter, we aim to (i) examine the way topic shift is implemented focusing on the participants’ design of turns (utterances) and the structure of the turns in the course of interaction through reformulation and the reformulation questions as a resource in ordinary Japanese conversation and (ii) reveal how the shift in topic is sequentially implemented and a new topic is sequentially developed without breaking down discourse coherence. The analysis will reveal a systematic way in which topic shift is accomplished through the turn which is composed of two turn-construction units and illustrates how the device is sequentially projected to fit in immediate local context. We

suggest that there are systematic similarities in conversation practice between English and Japanese in the ways participants manage their topical talk and implement topic shift in order to maintain the relationship between them.

7.1 Topic shift

In this section we examine the way in which the speaker implements topic shifting through reformulation or a reformulation question. Even though the speaker may change the topic, she may be able to propose her action through reformulation or a reformulation question which is somehow sequentially linked to the utterance in the prior or earlier turn. Let us now see various examples of topic shift in turn.

7.1.1 Counter-movement: presenting a new question

There is a case where the speaker faces the other speaker's troubles-telling (Jefferson, 1984a) and a new topical line may be introduced to get away from it. The speaker may use the practice of reformulation questions. The excerpt (74) exhibits this. F and M are talking about their latest news. They played tennis together a couple of years ago. The excerpt begins with F's news announcement in reference to her husband's retirement.

(74) F and M [Playing tennis together]

- 13 F .h san-san-nen ni naru-yo-nen ni naru n da wa (.) 7-gatsu de.
three three-years P COP four-years COP N COP FP July P
.h (It)'s been three-three years now, four years to be exact (.) in July.

- 14 M E? (.) Nani ga.
What? what S
What? (.) What's been (four years).
- 15 F Teinen ni natte.
Retirement age P
Since (he) retired.
- 16 (0.2)
- 17 M .hhh A-<soo na n daa::>=
oh so N COP
.hhh <oh, is (that) rig::ht>=
- 18 F =Un.
Yes
=Yes.
- 19→M A- (0.2) demo (0.1) hora: .hh aikawarazu ohutari de tennis shite ru no?
oh but you know as usual a couple P tennis do-ing FP
Oh (0.2) but (0.1) you kno:w .hh do (you) still play tennis together, the two of you?
- 20 F Tennis wa ne:: (.) shuu san-kai shiteru no=
Tennis TOP FP per week three-times do-ing FP
(We) are playing tennis three times a week=
- 21 M =Chotto yamete yo. Watashi (.) sore- igirisu ikihajimete .hh i-kkai mo tennis
hey say-NEG I it UK go-PAST once tennis
=Hey don't say (it) like that. I haven't played (tennis) since (I) went to the UK
- 22 shitenai yo.
play-PAST-NEG FP
for the first time.

((continues))

The management of the recipient's topical line is to get away from the trouble-telling

and avoid getting into a discussion of whether or not the retirement is the right thing. Instead, the recipient points out the merits of the speaker doing something with her husband. The recipient uses the reformulation question (line 19) to manage this topical talk and displays a counter position with the use of ‘but’ (see Hutchby, 1992).

Looking at the sequence of turns from the beginning of this excerpt, it is observed that since the speaker’s utterance may not be fitted in the context (Drew, 1997), the recipient produces an initiation of repair; ‘What? (.) What’s been (four years).’ in line 14 in order to produce a response properly (Schegloff, 2007). Following the speaker’s repair, the recipient shows her understanding saying ‘<oh, is that rig::ht>’. The utterance is delivered with slow speed and stretched words, prefacing the inbreath (‘.hhh’) in line 17. Following the speaker’s acknowledgement ‘yes’ (line 18), the recipient’s reformulation question is produced, prefacing a change of state token ‘Oh’, a 0.2-second pause, a marker ‘but’, a 0.1-second pause, a component ‘you kno:w’, and a short inbreath ‘.hh’. This indicates that this is a very sensitive question.

The topic is then completely changed from ‘her husband’s retirement’ to ‘playing tennis’, which is immediately accepted and extended by the speaker (line 20). That is to say, the recipient promptly accomplishes topic shifting and as a consequence it enables the speaker to get away from the trouble-telling. As we observe in the following conversation, the turn extends with a new topical line. The recipient makes use of the reformulation question as follows: (i) she topicalises ‘tennis’ and emphasises that it is a great opportunity for them; and (ii) she additionally mentions that she has not been playing tennis in recent years (lines 21 and 22), which may further encourage the speaker to realise that she has a good life.

7.1.2 Pursuing an active response

The following excerpt also shows topic shift in the environment where the speaker only receives a brief answer to a question without elaboration. In this circumstance, the speaker may need to take actions, for example, stating something that touches off further talk through the implementation of the reformulation question that involves a new matter. In earlier turns K and S were talking about a lot of their problems in their busy life. They used to live in the same accommodation for a couple of months. The excerpt starts with S's question about K's latest news.

(75) K and S [Midnight work]

34 S Iya nani (.) yonaka ni toshokan ni ittari rabo ni ittari nanka shita?
well uhm midnight library P go-PAST laboratory P go-PAST
Well uhm (.) did (you) go to the library or the laboratory at midnight?

35 K Shimashita[ne.
do-PAST
(Yes, I) di[d.

36 S [Yappari-
expected
[(That)'s to be expected-

37 K Yaranai to ¥ owaranakute ¥ heheheh
do-NEG if finish-NEG-PAST
(You know) If (I) don't £ (it'll) never be finished £ heheheh

38→S Jya yokatta jya nai .h hikkoshi shi[te::
if so good-PAST COP-TAG move-PAST
If (you did) so, (it) sounds good (for you) to move there, do::esn't [it.

39 K [A- sore wa honto yokatta desu.
 yeah it TOP really good-PAST COP
[Yeah- It was really good (for me to move here).

40 Nanka yonaka ni (.) yoku itte mashita nee.
 you know midnight P often go-PAST FP
(I) often went there (.) at midnight, you know.

((continues))

A new topic is initiated by the recipient through a reformulation question in line 38, which consists of two parts: (i) ‘If (you did) so’ that attends to the prior utterance that she studied at the library or the laboratory at midnight, and (ii) ‘(it) sounds good (for you) to move there, doesn’t it’ that introduces a new matter on ‘moving’. The new topic ‘moving’ did not become a topic for discussion in earlier turns but it is immediately recognised and accepted by the speaker in the next turn, on the basis of shared knowledge (S knew that K has moved to a new place).

Shared knowledge is essential to mutually construct the talk-in-interaction and to accomplish shifting in topic. In the following turns, the recipient elaborates her response (line 40), which extends the talk. It may be said that the topic ‘moving’ may be a topic of high interest for both speakers and the selection of the topic in an emergent context may depend on the producer’s knowledge, and at the same time, the construction of the talk will need both speakers’ alignment and coordination. It is also observed that the assertive reformulation in the question (tag) strongly pursues an agreement from the speaker, which is clearly projected to elicit or develop the new topic. As a consequence, the production of the reformulation question may enable both speakers to extend the talk actively. The talk will be subsequently extended from ‘moving’ to her room and the environment of the dormitory (which does not appear in this excerpt).

7.1.3 Pre-emptive movement to termination

There is a case where the speaker projects shifting a topic as a pre-emptive movement in order to orient to a termination in the environment where the recipient's elaboration continues despite the speaker's attempt to disengage from the current topic by displaying a series of assessments. The excerpt (76) illustrates this. Y is talking about a trip to London to see his friend. He stayed at her house a few years ago. The excerpt begins with his talk in reference to his feelings when he visited her. In the earlier turns, the recipient M provides assessments repeatedly to Y's statements (this does not appear in this excerpt).

(76) Y and M [Like my parents' house]

75 Y So:: desu ne. Ie ni kaeru mitai na.

yeah home go like FP

Yeah, (it)'s like going home to my parents' house.

76 M Ne.(.) Ii ne: honto yukkuri shite kitara ii ne::

good stay for long if nice FP

Wow. (.) (That) sounds wonderful. (I)'m sure that (it) would really do you good to prolong your sta::y.

77→ Jya:: Kin to Do: to (.) Nichiyoo-bi ni kae-kaette kuru n da=

so Friday and Saturday Sunday P return N FP

So:: (after staying there) Friday and Saturday, (.) (you)'ll be coming back here on Sunday=

78 Y =Un. Nichiyoo no ohiru no chiketto nan de moo .h yuugata mae ni wa koko ni kaette
yes Sunday LK noon LK ticket COP CONJ evening before P TOP here

=Yes. Since my ticket is for Sunday noon, (I) should be able to get back here

79 koreru n [de::
 can return COP
 before (it) gets too late in the aftern[oo::n.

80→ M [A::: (.) a- iya: igai ni basu mo benri na n da ne. So:shite miruto.
 oh I see uhm unexpectedly bus also convenient COP FP if so
 [Oh I se::e. (.) uhm- (I) must say that (I) didn't expect the bus to be so
 convenient.

81 Y <So::desu ne:::>
 yeah
 < Yea::h.>

Let us look at M's utterance at lines 76 and 77. She (i) comments on the topic in the prior turn (Y's feelings at this friend's house) and then (ii) introduces a new topic that is about Y's future schedule, e.g., Y will be coming back on Sunday (M knows that Y needs to attend the class on Monday). The new topic is provided by using the upshot marker 'so' in that M produces a reformulated version of talk focusing on a new matter which is completely unrelated to the prior topic. We notice that the recipient's production of the reformulation aims to orient to a termination, which is projected to receive the speaker's agreement. As we observe, the new topic is immediately acknowledged by Y (line 78); thereby, it is said that the recipient's projection of shifting a topic may be well organised. In the following turn, it is observed that the recipient further implements topic shifting by providing a summary assessment in reference to the bus transportation that has already been consistently claimed by the speaker in earlier turns (line 80). The observation result is that the recipient may orient to terminate the conversation collaboratively while pursuing the matter. We also notice that the producer of the topic shift shows her upcoming shifting in topic; for example, she prefaces a micro-pause and a token 'uhm'.

7.1.4 Proposing a pending matter

There may be cases in which speakers initiate rearrangement when the arrangement has not yet been completed. The excerpt (77) exhibits this. N and O were arranging their meeting in earlier turns, which touches on the topic of *Sado* (tea ceremony) that N enjoys once a week. The excerpt begins with O's assertive formulation which is a compliment, saying that N's life is well-balanced since she has been trying to take exams which are 'something hard', whereas she is enjoying the tea ceremony which is 'something graceful'.

(77) O and N [Tea ceremony]

69 O yuugana no ga ¥ majitte te¥ iru no ga ii he[hehe
 graceful LK S mixture LK S good
 (That)'s great. (You) are trying to do £a mixture off£ something hard and
 something graceful he[hehe

70 N [Maa. heheheh
well
[Well. Heheheh

71→O Ne:: (0.1) Jya:: (.) ano:: jikan o doo shi mashoo.
 you are so uhm time O how arrange
 (You) ar::e. (0.1) So:: (.) uh::m what time can (we) meet.

72 N Ee::to.
mm
M::m.

73 O E:: jya: (.) ano wazawaza kite morau::[koto ni (nari masu ga).
mm well take the trouble come and see me
M::m we::ll (.) uhm thank you for taking the trouble to co::me [and see me.

[Demo:: (.) daijyoobu desu yo::
 well all right COP SFX FP
[We::ll. (.) (that)'s all right.

We notice that a compliment is used by the speaker O to accomplish their talk and it is followed by self-deprecation (line 70) as a response. The self-deprecation is displayed with a dispreferred component ‘Well’, which indicates that the recipient rejects the compliment. This action is similarly observed in English conversation (Pomerantz, 1978). Following the self-deprecation, the speaker implements topic shift (line 71), commenting on the prior turn, saying ‘(You) ar::e’ (in that she insists on her compliment) and initiating a new topic prefacing a discourse marker ‘so’ and a token ‘uh::m’. They need to fix the time of the meeting, thereby the speaker resumes rearrangement. In fact, the deployment of the rearrangement is topically disjunct from the prior turn even though there is a use of the marker or the token and the topic is related to both speakers. However, the talk does not break down. It is because the topic is completely changed from the prior turn but it is a resumed topic that has not been settled with in earlier turns. Looking at the sequence of turns, the speaker does not fail to get a coherent confirmation from the recipient, however, the recipient’s response (‘M::m’) is potentially problematic (line 72), therefore, the speaker needs to re-establish their arrangement. She produces an appreciation pursuing the recipient’s preferred response.

7.1.5 Restarting the talk

There may be a case where the speaker introduces a new topic in order to restart the talk. The new topic may be a key component to proceed with their conversation. The

following excerpt exhibits this. In earlier talk, K complains that she went to see ballet in London by train but the taxi fare on her way home from the station was almost the same as the price of a ballet ticket. She cannot avoid taking a taxi if she arrives at the station late at night.

(78) M and K [Train]

94 M >Demo shoo ga nai. London ni sunde nai [n dakara<
but have to put up with London P live-NEG N because
>**But (you) have to put up with (the situation)[because (you) don't live in
London<**

95 K [Soo sun de nai node nee.
yeah live-NEG because FP
**[Yeah because (I) don't live in
London.**

96 M U::[:n.
yeah
Yea::[h.

97 K [Shoo ga nai n desu.
have to put up with
[(I) have to put up with (the situation).

98→M Sorede, densha wa nan- pun no ni noru?
so train TOP what time P get on
So, what time do you get on the train?

99 Nan- dono gurai ni notte (.) sono gurai na no?
what about what P get on that time
**(You) usually arrive at (North Station) late. (.) what-which train do (you)
usually get on?**

01 K .hhhh Moo (.) dakara (.) jyyu-jj-han no ni norenakereba[::hh ato wa nan-ji demo
 well so 10.30p.m. LK train get on-NEG if any time
.hhhh Well (.) So (.) if (I) can't get on the 10.30p.m. tra::in [hh (I) will be in the

02 M [Un.
 uh-huh
[Uh-huh.

03 K issho dawa tte omotte
 same COP QT think
same situation (it means that (I) have to take a taxi)

The target is the production of the utterance in line 98. Paying attention to the structure of the sequence of turns from lines 94 to 99, it is noted that K (lines 95 and 97) repeats M's utterance (line 94) and complains about the taxi fare and inconvenience of the transportation. Of course, K does not reject M's formulation since K shows her acknowledgment ('Yeah') in line 95 and M also acknowledges K's utterance (line 96). However, the talk is a standoff, and therefore, they need to restart the conversation. In line 98, M initiates a new topic 'what time do you get on the train?' prefacing the discourse marker 'so' and then she implements self-initiated self-repair (line 99). In other words, she is paraphrasing and modifying her initial question, which may be a key component to restart the talk. Looking at a large scale sequence of turns, it is noted that the marker 'so' (line 98) may work as a 'bridge' between her prior utterance 'But (you) have to put up with (the situation) because (you) don't live in London' (line 94) and 'what time do you get on the train?' (line 98). As a consequence, they extend their talk with a concrete time (line 1).

7.1.6 Competitive movement

There may be cases where the speaker produces her reformulation with a general expression so as to accomplish their activities by referring back to the earlier turns. The figurative expressions or aphoristic expressions are often used for this purpose. In the following excerpt (79), the speaker T was telling M that while she is writing her dissertation, she has also received an offer for research and the excerpt begins with the speaker's formulation.

(79) T and M [*Kuru toki ni wa ichido ki ni kuru*]

79 T Dakara sooyuu katachi de yarasete moraoo[to.
so such a proposal P try to do that
So (I)'m going to try to present like tha[t.

80 M [Un. Ii chansu jyan nee=
yeah good chance COP-TAG
[Yeah. (It) sounds good, doesn't it=

81 T =Dakara ima komotte iroiro=
so now [stay in my home] things
=So now (I)'m doing things staying in my home=

82→M =Aa:: soo ka soo ka. U::n (.) kuru toki ni wa ichido ki ni kuru kara sa::
oh I see I see uhm [lit. when one is coming, another thing is coming at the same
time] because
**= Ah I see. Uh::m (.) when one comes, another thing also comes at the sa::me
time.**

83 T Un soo [nano::.
yeah it does
Yeah (it) do[::es.

- 84 M [Ano:: ¥ano¥ .hhh heikin teki ni konai jyan. [hehehe
uhm you know average P come-NEG COP-TAG
[Uh::m £you know£ .hhh things don't happen in an orderly way. [hehehe
- 85 T [u:::n.
Yeah
[Yea::h.
- 86 M hehehe[hehehehe

hehehe[hehehehe
- 87 T [¥Doo shite na no:::¥?
why
[£Wh:::y£?
- 88 M .hh Sore wa nan demo na no=
it TOP everything COP FP
.**hh (It) applys to everything, (I) think=**
- 89 T =Un.
Uh-huh
=**Uh-huh.**

((continues))

The speaker concludes the talk prefacing the upshot marker *dakara* in line 79. An indexical expression 'that' is embedded in her utterance, thereby, it may be said that she presents a decisive stance without saying specific things. It is immediately acknowledged and agreed with a tag question. In the next turn, prefacing the upshot marker *dakara*, the speaker gives an answer to the question. In fact, the answer does not correspond to the immediately preceding question but it is displayed as an answer to the question that appeared in an earlier turn of conversation. At the beginning of the telephone call, the speaker was asked by the recipient whether the speaker is busy, but

she did not answer clearly at that time. Thus, the speaker delivers the answer to the earlier question at this timing. This means that their conversation may possibly be coming to an end.

In the following, the recipient puts the topic back through reformulation by using an indirect expression, ‘when one comes, another thing also comes at the same time’. Thus, the recipient does not refer to the speaker’s prior utterance but rather she speaks in generalities. Whereas the speaker disengages the topical talk, the recipient re-states her formulation referring back to the earlier talk with the use of figurative expression. Due to their generality, figurative expressions, sayings and some other indirect expressions are much less pointed and may have a useful function in an environment where both speakers are monitoring whether they have any topic that is mentionable or not. If they decide to close the current topic or terminate the conversation, the topical talk may be closed collaboratively.

Here, it is observed that in line 84 the recipient is reiterating her (indirect) reformulated utterance in a more literal manner using concrete words and it is displayed prefacing a token ‘Uh::m’ with smiling voice and provides a long laugh invitation (line 84). Two observations can be made with regard to the recipient’s utterance. By showing her position, she offers an opportunity to consider whether they can continue the current topical talk. In fact, she is reiterating or paraphrasing her own utterance but not initiating a new topic. The other point is that she clearly shows her position by producing laughter at the end of her utterance (Jefferson, 1979) which indicates that her utterance is completed. Thus, she is ready to close the topical talk.

This is accepted by the recipient with a laughable utterance (Jefferson, 1979; Glenn, 1992; Holt, 2010) ‘£Wh:::y£’ in the next turn, which is followed by an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986) by using the word ‘everything’, and thereby the turn is extended more. We notice that this two-turn exchange (question-answer sequence) is not serious and the speaker does not ask the reason seriously and the recipient also understands that the speaker is not asking the reason seriously. She selects the word ‘everything’ meaning that the situation of the speaker is not a specific problem but that everybody must face such a situation (cf line 82). The speaker also offers an opportunity for the recipient to consider whether she still has a mentionable topic by displaying a continuer ‘Uh-huh’ (line 89) instead of confirmation. It is said that both speakers always probe whether there exist any further mentionable topics or not.

7.1.7 Inserting a commentary

When the speaker misses an opportunity to comment on a topic, she may find an environment later where she could comment on the prior topic. The excerpt (80) illustrates this. In earlier turns (this does not appear in this excerpt) M complains that her family members are too busy to have dinner together even though she prepares it perfectly. The story begins with M’s question in reference to E’s latest news.

(80) E and M [Cram school]

- 86 M Nani nani nani nani (.) arekara- kocchi de sensei o shiteta jyan.
 what what what what since then here (Tokyo) P teacher O do-PAST-TAG
What what what what. (.) since then- (you) were teaching here (at senior high school), weren’t you.

- 87 E Ima (.) yobikoo de yatteru yo=
now cram school P do-ing FP
Now (.) (I) am teaching at a cram school=
- 88 M =Usoo:: (0.2) >Yobikoo no sensei shiteru no::↑<
really cram school teacher COP FP
=Reall::y (0.2) > (You) are teaching at a cram sch::ool ↑<
- 89 E <Dakara:: >
so
<So::>
- 90 (.)
- 91→ >dakara watashi mo sa::< he[he
so I also
>so I als::o < he[he
- 92 M [Un.
uh-huh
[Uh-huh.
- 93→E yoru wa:: hehe ¥sono¥ (.) gohan nantoka tte yuu kanji jya nai heh
evening TOP uhm dinner something situation COP-NEG
In the e::vening hehe (I) don't have enough time £uhm£ (.) to prepare dinner or something heh
- 94 M hahahahahahaha[ha

hahahahahahaha[ha.
- 95 E [Iya, mochiron (.) gohan wa tsukuru kedo ne:: ichiyoo wa::
well of course dinner TOP make anyway
[Well, of course (.) (I) can make our dinne::r anywa[y (before leaving for work)

((continues))

Let us pay attention to the upshot marker *dakara* in lines 89 and 91. Two different phonetic designs (cf. Local and Walker, 2004, 2005) can be seen. The former stand-alone *dakara* is delivered with slow speed and with sound stretches (<So::>), which follows the co-speaker's news receipt 'Reall::y'. It works as the confirmation of the speaker's announcement in the prior turn and it is projected to hold the floor or prevent another speaker from coming in (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). On the other hand, the latter, following a micro-pause, appears in speed-up delivery (>so I als::o <'). This may show the speaker's change of strategy, for example, to restart or recast something. Thus, a micro-pause may possibly function as a bridge between the two upshot markers, *dakara*. She shifts the topic from 'teaching' at a cram school to the 'family dinner'. The topic of family dinner may be a mentionable event which she failed to comment in an earlier turn where M was talking about her 'family dinner'. She then finds a place to comment on it in line 93. In that sense, it may be said that the speaker succeeds in topic shifting and extension of the talk.

Here, it is worth noting that the recipient's alignment e.g., with the use of a continuer 'uh-huh' (line 92), may elicit or enable the speaker to establish shifting in topic. Continuers such as 'mm hm' and 'uh huh' exhibit producers' recognition and understanding that a turn-in-progress is incomplete and at the same time the producer uses them to pass on opportunities to take the floor (Jefferson, 1984d; Schegloff, 1982). Thereby, continuers 'are taken to exhibit the expectation that there is more to come in the prior speaker's talk' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008: 225). Therefore, they may work as resources to facilitate the other speaker to produce utterances to extend turns.

We also notice that laughter 'hehe' is embedded in the utterance (line 91). How can we

treat this? It may be said that the current speaker may perform a self-tease, or self-deprecation by using laughter (Glenn, 1992: 142). However, it is not serious since she produces her utterance with a smiling voice which is followed by the recipient's laughter (line 94) (Jefferson, 1979). It is observed that the laughter extends the turn by receiving the speaker's elaboration (line 95). It is because the speaker is aware that the recipient of the laugh invitation understands what the speaker said and shows her affiliation by accepting the laugh invitation.

7.2 Stepwise topic shift: Speaker's projection

In this section, we observe how the speaker deals with the topic in the prior turn and how she initiates a new topic on a related matter. The speaker may implement the stepwise topic shift through the use of reformulation in order to continue the talk by proposing another point, giving further information or by deleting the sequence.

7.2.1 Proposing another point

Let us look at the excerpt (81). Reformulation is displayed in the environment where the sequence may have possibly been ended in line 20. How does the reformulation work here? In earlier turns, K and N were talking about the doctors and the story is then extended to N's terrible experience in recent days. After a long talk of illness, N asks a question about K's phase of treatment. N knows that K had a serious medical illness a few years ago and she is still visiting the hospital for regular treatment.

(81) N and K [Medical treatment]

- 18 N Haa. (0.1) saikin chiryoo tte dooshiteru no yo.
right these days medical treatment TOP how about FP
Right. (0.1) How's it going with your treatments these days.
- 19 K Chiryoo wa nee: (.) moo maitzuki yatte ita chuusha wa nakunatta no
medical treatment TOP FP no longer monthly LK injection TOP have-PAST-NEG FP
My treatments (.) (I) no longer have the monthly injections.
- 20 N Qo::.
good
Goo::d.
- 21→K dakara, iryoo-hi wa nomigusuri to [teiki-teki na tenken mitaina yatsu [↑
so medical expense TOP pills and regular routine checkups like that
So, the medical bills (I) now have to pay are for my medication and regular check-ups[↑
- 22 N [Haa [Un.
uh-huh yeah
[Uh-huh [Yeah.
- 23 K anoo: shaken-ku(h)ruma no shaken mitai [naa.
uhm MOT MOT like FP
Uh:m (it)'s MOT- like an M(h)[OT.
- 24 N [Un un
yes yes
[Yes yes.
- 25 K eettoo nen ni 2-kai gurai noo (.) soregurai dake dake doo:
well per year twice about that's all only COP uhm
Well, (I) need to have (a check-up) about twice a ye:ar (.) that's all (I ne:ed)

26 anoo iryoo-hi wa sugoku sukunaku natta no.
 uhm medical expense TOP very get less FP
 uh:m my medical expense has become much less than before.

((continues))

It is observed that K's statement prefacing the upshot marker *dakara* reformulates her answer in line 19 (that is a second pair part of adjacency pair) in response to N's question (that is the first pair part of adjacency pair). The answer that K no longer has monthly injections is followed by an assessment displayed as a sequence closing third (Schegloff, 2007) in line 20. It can be seen that K restarts her reports (line 21) using the upshot marker *dakara* which marks reformulation and it makes the turn to expand. We notice that K initiates a new topic 'medical bills' which is replacing the existing topic 'medical treatment'; however, the new topic is still related to the prior turn (K no longer has the monthly injections). K has successfully topicalised a new matter without marking a disjunctive move through the reformulation. The medical bills may be mentionable to the speaker and the talk continues. Otherwise, the sequence could have been terminated. We also notice that the practice of reformulation is implemented immediately and casually. How does the recipient react to this action in the next turn?

The observation result is that the new topic is immediately recognised by N with a continuer 'Uh-huh', an acknowledgement 'Yeah' (line 22), and 'Yes yes' (line 24), which makes the information incremented and the turn expanded. For example, the speaker provides further information such as her medication and regular check-ups, which is compared to an MOT (an annual motor vehicle inspection authorised by the British Ministry of Transport). This excerpt illustrates how speakers are able to establish their talk through reformulation by addressing the prior topic and then introducing

another topic. In order to continue or extend the talk the speaker requires a new topic that may be mentionable to the speaker or otherwise it is interesting to the other speaker to attend to the new topical talk. We observe that both speakers implement the practices collaboratively. That is to say, they achieve stepwise topic shift at the transition space through reformulation by (i) providing an outcome of the talk so far and (ii) offering a related topic in order to continue and extend the talk.

7.2.2 Giving further information

Reformulation may also be used in the environment where the prior response is not inappropriate but rather the speaker reconstructs herself while giving further information. This may be projected to give an opportunity for the recipient to attend the topical talk. Hearing a story from N about her son, K has just discovered that he plays baseball.

(82) N and K [*Mannen-hoketsu*]

50 K Fu::n. (0.2) ima (.) nani:: (0.2) yakyuu yatteru n daa.
 oh now so baseball plays N COP
Oh:: (0.2) now (.) so:: (0.2) (he) plays baseball.

51 N Yakyu: yatteru, demo mannen-hoketsu³⁴ dakedo.
 baseball playing but [ten-thousand years reserve] COP but
(He) plays baseball, but (he) is always on the bench.

52 K Hee:
 is he
Is he::

³⁴ A word *mannen hoketsu* ('ten-thousand years reserve') is produced as extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986) in order to assess her son's positioning in the baseball team.

- 53→N Un (.) demo sensei ga ii sensei de::.
 yeah but teacher S good teacher COP
Yes, (.) but the teacher (who is coaching the team) is won::derful.
- 54 K Un
 uh-huh
Uh-huh.
- 55 N Ano: yakusokusarenai koto ni ganbaru kotoga erai tte koto o oshiete iki tai
 uhm uncertain things P push oneself that S good QT O teach want to
(He) said that (he) wants to teach (his) players that good sportsmanship means
- 56 to omoimasu toka
 QT think QT
pushing oneself, even if (it) doesn't lead to playing in a match.
- 57 K Ha::[::
 wow
Wow::[::
- 58 N [Anmari shabera nai hito nan dake[do,
 much talk-NEG person COP but
[(He) is not a teacher of many wor[ds,
- 59 K [Ha:::
 uh-huh
[Uh-huh
- 60 N reguraa kakuritsu toka yuushuu toka jya nakuttemo,
 regular maintaining etc brilliant person etc COP-NEG CONJ
**(he) said that his biggest concern is not about who gets to be a regular player
 or who scores,**
- 61 K Un
 uh-huh
Uh-huh

62 N mannen hoketsu datte mo ganbareru tte yuu hyooka datte aru mitai tte.
 [ten-thousand years reserve] even if can push oneself appraise seems QT
**(he) seems to appraise the effort and achievement of all players, even those who
 never get to play in a match.**

((continues))

The reformulation (line 53) follows a newsmarker 'Is he::', which engages in the talk '(he) is always on the bench' (line 51). A newsmarker is used by the recipient of a prior turn, which indicates that what was said is either new information or it is something of particular noteworthiness for her (Jefferson, 1993; Heritage, 1984b; Hutchby, 2005). However, it is observed that by prefacing an acknowledgement 'yes' and a marker 'but', N provides reformulation to topicalise her son's 'teacher' instead of her son. In other words, the subject has been immediately changed to 'teacher'. That is to say, the speaker changes the frame of her talk (see Goffman, 1981). The new matter may be related to the prior talk and it may be mentionable to the speaker, or it may be a key component to extend the talk.

The new matter is accepted and extended collaboratively between speakers with the use of a series of continuers 'Uh-huh' (lines 54, 59, and 61) or a receipt token 'Wow:::' (line 57). Following N's utterance in line 62, K, in turn, actively attends to the new topical line in reference to the 'teacher' (it does not appear in this excerpt). She builds her talk while commenting on the role of the teacher in general. As we have seen above, speakers may attempt to shift the topic through reformulation aimed at offering an opportunity for the other speakers to attend to the topic talk and give comments actively.

7.2.3 Continuing the talk by sequence deletion

We have seen examples above of the achievements of topic shifting as continuous type that are constructed by the speakers' collaborative actions. However, there is a case in which a speaker ignores or disattends to the other speaker's utterance in the prior turn. The excerpt (83) shows this. Y and M are discussing Y's trip to Mrs. Smith's residence in London. Y was explaining how cheap it is to go there by bus (which does not appear in the excerpt).

(83) Y and M [Going to London by bus]

51 M Aa:: jya³⁵ sono basu o orite kara chotto aruku n da.
ah so its bus O get off then a little walk N COP
Oh, so (you) have to walk a bit after getting off the bus.

52 Y So:: desu ne=
Right COP FP
That's right=

53 M = Demo maa aruki kata wa wakaru tte yuu koto da yo ne.
but well how to get to TOP know QT things COP-TAG
= But, if (you) know how to get there from the bus stop, that's fine.

54→Y Dakara soo sureba itten-go mukoo ni tsuite kara itten-go de mukoo no ie made ikeru
after all so if 1.50 pounds there arriving after 1.50 pounds Mrs. Smith's house go can
So, in this way, it's 1.50 pounds – (I) only have to pay 1.50 pounds after getting there (London) in order to get to her house.

55 node (.) sonnani takaku nai=
so much expensive-NEG
so, (.) (it)'s not as expensive (as taking the train)=

³⁵ In this case, the discourse marker *jya* can be completely replaced by the discourse marker *dakara* ('so').

- 56 M =A::: kimochi tekini ne↑ suggoi hutaŋ o kakete iku tte yuu kanji ja nai yo ne=
 ah [adv. Little] FP much money with go QT COP NEG FP FP
 =O:::h, I see. (It)'s better this way↑ because (you) will be able to visit her
 without feeling that (you) are spending too much money=
- 57 Y =Ee ee.
 yes yes
 =Yes yes.

In line 51, M summarises Y's talk by using the upshot marker *jya* ('so') followed by Y's confirmation 'That's right.' After that, Y produces reformulation (line 54) and clearly disattends to M's upshot in the prior turn. If Y answers or confirms M's comment, M may receive the floor (cf. turn-taking). Thus, Y abandons M's statement in order to keep the floor. In other words, Y selects an economical way to accomplish his talk; through the reformulation, he provides the actual bus fare and concludes that 'it's not as expensive as taking the train'. Y's projection is immediately accepted by the recipient (line 56). The recipient quickly takes up Y's reformulation without attending to her own statement and shows her understanding with 'Oh I see' and gives her elaboration. Although the recipient does not totally agree with him (since she does not provide her agreement), she produces a response in a minimised shape without delay, hesitation or dispreferred marker (e.g., 'well'). In other words, the recipient organises her response so that it can be treated as preferred status (cf. preference organisation, Sacks, 1987[1973]). In addition, the selection of the word *kimochi teki ni* ('(It)'s better this way') also shows her affiliation with the speaker since it is not only an indirect expression but also she delivers it as a preferred response, thus less likely to receive objection from the speaker.

7.3 Stepwise topic shift: Recipient's projection

In this section, we shall focus on the recipient's projection in reference to the stepwise topic shift. The reformulation questions may be used to achieve the stepwise topic shift where the expected answer or definitive answer is not provided in response to a question.

7.3.1 Counter-movement: giving an answer

There may be a case where an expected answer to the question is not returned, therefore, an attempt may be made to retrieve an expected answer. In such case, the original question may be re-established by means of a reformation question. The excerpt (84) illustrates this. This excerpt is a continuous story of the excerpt (81), in which a reformulation question may be displayed to pursue an expected answer to the original question (line 18), which is displayed as a topic initial elicitor. The answer comes back but it does not seem to be what the questioner was expecting.

(84) N and K [Medical treatment]

18 N Haa. (0.1) saikin chiryoo tte dooshiteru no yo.
right these days medical treatment TOP how about FP
Right. (0.1) How's it going with your treatments these days.

19 K Chiryoo wa nee: (.) moo maitzuki yatte ita chuusha wa nakunatta no
medical treatment FP no longer monthly LK injection TOP have-PAST-NEG FP
My treatments (.) (I) no longer have the monthly injections.

- 20 N Oo::.
good
Goo::d.
- 21 K dakara, iryoo-hi wa nomigusuri to [teiki-teki na tenken mitaina yatsu[↑
so medical expense TOP pills and regular routine checkups like that
**So, the medical bills (I) now have to pay are for my medication and [regular
check-ups[↑**
- 22 N [Haa [Un.
uh-huh yeah
[Uh-huh [Yeah.
- ((several lines deleted))
- 26 K anoo iryoo-hi wa sugoku sukunaku natta no.
uhm medical expense TOP very get less FP
uh:m my medical expense has become much less than before.
- 27→N Oo (0.2) iya iryoo-hi tte yuuka sa [a (.) yappari chiryoosu to sore ga kurushii tte
well uhm medical expense QT say Q FP after all be treated when it S feel pain QT
We::ll. (0.2) uhm what (I) worry about is not your medical expense, [(.) but the
- 28 K [Un
uh-huh
[Uh-huh.
- 29 N yu:nomo aru jya nai?
GEN FP COP- TAG
fact that any treatment comes with some sort of pain or suffering?
- 30 K U:::n (.) nanka nee betsuni kurushii toka jya nai n dakedoo:.
uhm what I'm saying is (that) nothing feel pain COP-NEG N but
Uh::m (.) well (I) don't actually suffer pain when treated but

7.3.2 Counter-movement: pursuing a definite answer

Similar points can be observed where the questioner pursues the answerer's definite answer when an ambiguous response is received. The following excerpt illustrates this. M is calling F on a day during the *Obon* period when many people take a holiday. In the earlier turn M asked F if it is not a bad timing to call and F says it is a good time to talk because she is just going out with her husband. The excerpt begins with the questioner's utterance (line 96) where she displays her counter argument to the answerer's dubious answer.

(85) F and M [*Obon*]

96 M =Aa (.) jaa imakara deru tokoro datta n da=
ah well from now go out just COP-PAST N
=Ah (.) (I) am afraid that (you)'re just going out=

97 F = Sugu ja nai yo (0.1) datte goruhu i tteru mono.
just now-NEG because golf go-PAST because
= (It)'s not just now (0.1) because (he) went somewhere to play golf.

98→M A- <soo nan da::>[(0.2) nani so-
oh I see um so
Oh- <I see::> [(0.2) um so-

99 F [Soo >soredake ga watashi no shihuku no jikan<=
yeah only that S my happy moment
[Yeah > that is my only happy moment<=

01→M =hahahahahahaha (0.1) demo renshuu da ttara sugu kaette kuru jyan.
but practice COP if soon come back COP-TAG
=hahahahahahaha (0.1) but (he) will be back soon if (he) went there to practice,
won't he.

- 02 F E?
What
What?
- 03 M Renshuu da[ttara,
practice COP if
If (he went there) to prac[tice,
- 04 F [Renshuu ttemo (0.1) uchi-hoodai da mono.
practice but use the machine COP because
**[(He) went to the place (0.1) where (he) could use the golf machine
to practice.**
- 05 M Aa (.) uchihoodai. (0.2) Ichi-ni-jikan jaa itte rassharu no?
oh use the machine one or two hours go-POL FP
**Oh (.) (He went to) the place for practice using the machine (0.2) so (it) takes
one or two hours, does it?**
- ((continues))

Let us look at the utterances (lines 98 and 1) which exhibit the questioner's management that aims to accomplish her talk. In line 98, the questioner provides an acknowledgement to the prior turn by displaying 'Oh- <I see::>' but also produces 'um so-' following a 0.2-second pause. However, before the questioner's completion of her statement, the answerer's formulation is displayed (line 99). The formulation, an overlapping utterance, is in fact displayed at the transition-relevance place (TRP) where the speakers' change possibly occurs. Thereby, the answerer performs her talk keeping the floor, whereas the questioner momentarily refrains from proceeding with her question. The trouble here is that although the answerer sets forth formulation, the questioner has not yet received an expected answer. Here, we pay attention to the questioner's next action which exhibits her management: (i) she takes up the answerer's formulation (topicalised on her happy time) by using laughter, deleting her overlapped

utterance, and then (ii) establishes her talk through reformulation question pursuing the proper answer to her original question by using the structure of ‘if-clause’ (line 1).

On the other hand, the answerer responds to the repeated question and claims that her husband went to use the ‘golf machine to practice’. In response to the answerer’s counter argument, the questioner proceeds to accomplish her talk: (i) she takes up the prior utterance providing a token ‘Oh’ that deletes her overlapped utterance and repeats the word *uchihoodai* and (ii) directly asks the reformulation question, prefacing the upshot marker ‘so’. The reformulation question in this case pursues a concrete answer in reference to the duration time of the practice (e.g., one or two hours). We observed that the questioner seems to have changed her strategy in order to avoid further competitive actions even though the answerer’s counter argument is off the point. The questioner stops pursuing a concrete answer but instead makes an assertion that it will not be long before her husband to finish the practice and come home. It is worth noting that while she does not agree with the answerer’s view about the duration time, the question is not delivered as a dispreferred response.

7.4 Discussion

This chapter has shown the mechanism of topic shift in Japanese conversation examining how the turn is designed as the participants’ projections and how it is sequentially related to the action of the preceding turn in topic-in-progress in interaction. The analysis showed that topic shift is systematically accomplished by participants through the turn which is composed of two-turn construction units (TCUs). The first TCU is composed of a preface component and the second TCU is an additional

component through which topic shift is deployed and achieved. It has been illustrated that reformulation and the reformulation question are sequentially projected as a device to fit in immediate local context. In particular, participants accomplish their work without clearly signalling upcoming topic shift while engaging in the utterance in the prior turn through these devices. The design of the turn consisting of multiple components enables the participants to implement their strategic operation which can avoid the rejection from the co-participants in the stage of generation of a new topic while maintaining discourse coherence. Thereby participants not only resolve their interactional problems but also introduce a potential topic in order to extend the topical talk or a new line of talk-in-interaction.

In English conversation, Jefferson (1984a: 193) specifically focused on the problematic context, so-called the troubles-telling, in order to describe the disjunctive topic shift and proposed that the 'How are you'-type utterance and the introduction of a pending matter can be a device for moving out of talk about a trouble and starting a new topic sequence. Jefferson (1984a) also argues that topic shifting may be topically disjunctive but interactionally coherent and that a device such as an arrangement may function as a useful resource for a troubles-telling exit, however a device of 'entry into closing' (Button, 1987, 1990) does not automatically provide termination but there remains a possibility that the topical talk continues (Jefferson, 1984a: 192).

Firstly, we pick up examples of the topic shift in the troubles-telling situation. Excerpt (74) is an example of getting away from the troubles-telling, in which a completely new topic is introduced by the repair initiation and a reformulation question is used as a device to make a counter-movement. However, in this case, it is noted that the recipient

of troubles-telling may not aim to make an argument but rather she tries to make the troubles-teller realise how happy she should be with the fact that she has still been playing tennis together with her husband. A new topic ('tennis') received the trouble-teller's attention. The troubles-teller immediately attends to the new topic and displays her response topicalising the new matter by using a particle *wa* (topic marker) and adding detailed information (i.e., 'three times a week'). The new topical talk is further expanded by the speaker in the next turn with her current information. In fact, 'there is a recurrent problem in determining "what the topic is"' (Schegloff, 1990: 51); however, as Schegloff stated, 'the sequence structure of a spate of talk and its topical aspect or structure are analytically distinct' and 'the sequence structure itself can provide for the organizational coherence of the talk' (p.53).

We have also seen a similar example where a reformulation question is used to pursue a potential topic when the producer can only receive a brief answer from the troubles-teller. A new topic ('moving') is entirely different from the prior topic ('midnight study'); however, the troubles-teller immediately attends to the new topic as we have seen in excerpt (75). In overlap she provides a strong agreement: 'Yeah- It was really good'. Here it is noted that she uses 'It' (referring to 'moving') and emphasizes her utterance. It indicates that the troubles-teller clearly recognises the new topic and understands why the producer has introduced that topic. This means that a new topical line has been established. Continuously she provides her statement, including a word 'midnight' (which is the previous topic) and gives a perfect response to the previous question and subsequently a new topical line ('moving') continues. This case indicates that a prompt shift of topic is effectively used in pursuing an active response. In both cases, the new topics may be mentionable for the other speaker and they are based on

their common experience ('playing tennis') and shared knowledge ('moving'). Topics are sequentially developed by both speakers. It is particularly notable that these topics are provided not only because they are the other speaker's events but also because they are matters of high concern for both speakers.

Secondly, it is interesting to note that the mechanism of topic shift through reformulation and a reformulation question seems to be a relatively secure method for the participants to insert a new topic. We saw examples of the initiation of the new topic in chapter 4 in the topic closing sequence or in the topic-in-progress sequence, which are implemented by interrogatives (e.g., topic initial elicitors) in order to generate a new topic. The crucial point is that the producer of the inquiries does not know the answer to the inquiry (i.e., the recipient's responses); that is, it is totally designed by the recipient (cf. 'other-attentive' in Jefferson (1984a)) and the new topic is disjunctively initiated with no relation to the prior turn. There is a risk of failing to generate a new topic. By contrast, the new topic displayed through reformulation and the reformulation questions (including try-marking and tag questions) is controlled or managed by the producer herself, by directly accessing the interactional troubles (i.e., an inappropriate, unfitted, unexpected, and counter-argumentative utterances) or by pursuing some activities. Thus, topic shift is implemented by the speaker in the environment where a new topic is entirely independent from the recipient's response, and thereby the participants move to a new sequence with little constraint. In addition, reformulation and the reformulation questions are somehow linked to the prior or earlier turns and a preface unit is connected to the prior turn. Thus, even though the speaker inserts an entirely new topic in her utterance through reformulation or a reformulation question, a new topical line will be developed that is sequentially coherent. This indicates that the speaker controls

whether to insert a topic, and whether this is either a new or a related topic. However, there is a case in which the other speaker may start up before the speaker reaches a possible completion place in the implementation of topic shift.

Thirdly, we discuss the cases where the speaker who displays a reformulation question in order to implement topic shift may have a constraint when the utterance is not composed of a single unit but multi-units since the other speaker may start up before the speaker reaches a possible completion place in the implementation of topic shift. The data has shown that the utterance is composed of two turn-construction units and they are both sentences. The second turn-construction unit is a practice of reformulation through which topic shift is achieved. In the turn-taking system (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974) the co-participant may treat the end of a first unit (a sentence) as the end of the turn-unit and there is a possibility that the co-participant starts up to extend the turn. If she does, the turn will end before the second unit is produced. Schegloff (1982: 76) proposes a device called 'rush-through' which the speaker uses aimed at resisting an expected action by the co-participant. The rush-through is a practice in which a speaker speeds up the pace of the talk just before the possible completion of the first unit of the turn and moves into a next (e.g., the second) unit. Sound stretches are also offered as another device (see also Sacks, 1984: 24). The data in excerpt (76) has shown that the sound stretches ('sta::y') are used at the end of the first unit (that is delivered as an affiliative assessment) and then the second unit is displayed through reformulation providing a detailed description of the co-participant's schedule (i.e., he is staying there on Friday and Saturday and will be coming back on Sunday). The utterance is prefaced with a discourse marker 'so' and creates a new sequence. Thus, the speaker's projection is successful with no uptake by the co-participant. The

co-participant in the next turn takes up the new topical line with no gap and shows his alignment by providing an acknowledgement and further definite information (i.e., Sunday afternoon), which leads to expand the topical talk. It is true that the participant can control and manage the shifting of topic; however, it is said that minimising the gap between the first and the second unit of the turn may be required to accomplish the work.

Next, we further discuss the use of a continuer (e.g., ‘uh-huh’; cf. Schegloff, 1982) as a device for the co-participant’s interactional management of the topical talk and it shows his cooperation/affiliation to accomplish the activities. In excerpt (84), the continuer ‘uh-huh’ appeared in the midst of the talk in progress (at the point where a micro-pause appears) in a single sentence in the counter-movement sequence. According to Schegloff (1982), continuers appear at the end of or in the midst of the turn, and the producer uses them to pass on the opportunities to initiate the turn transfer or to facilitate another speaker to continue her extended turn. The data has shown that the utterance is delivered as a reformulating question which is organised to give another speaker an expected answer to the original formulating question. In this case, neither the device ‘rush-through’ nor sound stretches are used by the speaker in organising the utterance. Instead, a continuer ‘uh-huh’ is delivered by the recipient of the utterance, which indicates that the speaker’s extended talk continues until the question is completed (1982: 83). Schegloff argues that a continuer also works to indicate that a repair initiation (i.e., other-initiated repair) for the purpose of managing some problem of understanding may not occur until the question has been completed (p.88). If other-initiated repair appears, the speaker may be required to further make the reformulating question as we have seen in excerpt (85).

Finally, we focus on the reformulating utterances which appear in the competitive movement and are implemented in the larger sequential context. We saw various practices to resolve interactional problems or pursue some activities. In order to accomplish these works, the initiation of third position repair (Schegloff, 1992b) is used as a useful device. There are cases where the reformulating assertions and the reformulation questions are displayed whose targets are not on the prior turn but on the earlier spate of talk. In excerpt (79), a speaker summarises the current topic talk with a *dakara*-prefaced upshot, which is followed by a preferred utterance (using an acknowledgement ‘Yeah’ and a subject marker ‘It’) that clearly topicalises the issue of the speaker’s upshot. Thus, these two turns are closely tied and structurally and topically coherent. In the third turn, the speaker incrementally produces her assertion with a *dakara*-prefaced upshot. However, this is not the same as the *dakara*-prefaced upshot in the previous turn but it is an answer to the first question by the recipient at the beginning of the talk which was raised over an hour ago as to why the speaker is at home. This utterance is topically disjunct and it may be a conclusion of the talk. In the fourth turn where the reformulation is implemented, the speaker firstly responses to the prior utterance, ‘Ah I see’, (i.e., the first unit) and provides her reformulating assertion (i.e., the second unit) with the use of a figurative expression which is not connected to the prior utterance but is displayed in the larger context to complete the talk as a whole.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, reformulation and the reformulation questions are recurrently used in institutional settings as a useful device when an interviewer or a host has a counter position. As the subject of our analyses is that in ordinary conversation, the counter position in this thesis does not have those meanings such as debates or some argumentative positions in meetings or some other institutional

settings. However, we recurrently face the situation where we have different ideas and opinions among close friends and have to comment immediately in real time conversation. It is also said that in order for the participants to construct a logical conclusion, they require a capacity to implement topic shift, in particular, by use of reformulation and reformulation questions. It is of interest to us that these practical activities are taken for granted by the participants and they manage them smoothly in everyday social life. Observation results revealed that the production of reformulation and the reformulation questions in Japanese ordinary conversation are similar to those in English conversation in institutional settings.

In Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson's (1996) cross-linguistic study they show how participants introduce a new topic through repair initiation in Japanese conversation (cf. section 2.3.2 in chapter 2). Using repair initiation participants are not only correcting the prior utterance but also successfully getting a mentionable mentioned and introducing a new topic while maintaining coherence with the preceding topic. They (1996: 227) conclude that differences in the syntactic organisation of different languages may not influence the participants' interactional activities. We have also seen in our analysis that participants systematically manage their topical talk and implement topic shift in order to maintain their relationship, which also highlights the similarities in conversation practice between English and Japanese. Topic shift may not be implemented in the overt way but it involves a specific strategy of the participants in order to avoid causing interactional problems between them and breaking down topic talk sequentially such that participants may successfully implement an abrupt topic introduction, offering a new line of topic talk. As Jefferson (1981) pointed out, a general technique the participants use for their management of topical talk is to display their

position while showing interactional cohesiveness.

If we are to highlight the difference between English and Japanese conversation, we may find it in the management of topic monitoring when participants implement topic shift. It may be said that the participants present their support for the co-participants' troubles using the humorous utterance. In such troubles-telling environment, the participants in Japanese conversation may use humorous talk more which means here that it is not just a funny joke but it is implemented in a positive way with a humorous sense. They do not immediately avoid a serious matter but rather they treat the trouble as their own and give support or positive comments with the use of sayings, jokes, laughter and so on. In addition, they switch the frame of the utterance in a timely manner in ongoing interaction and monitor whether the co-participant has mentionable talk.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

8.0 Introduction

The study investigated the organisation of topic in ordinary Japanese conversation. Using the framework of conversation analysis (CA), it aimed to unfold the mechanisms of topic organisation, in particular, by focusing on the participants' actions and management and identifying the placement of actions and the ways in which the participants accomplish their actions through specific devices in immediate local contexts. We will summarise the key findings of the investigation from the empirical chapters as illustrated in chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7. This chapter will also discuss some implications for the generic structure of conversation and the broader issue of culture in conversation. We will end this chapter by considering several limitations this study has and setting out some prospects for future research.

8.1 Findings of the study

Due to its nature of abruptness, the sequential environments where the topic initiation is displayed may be sensitive and problematic (e.g., no immediate uptake, an overlap, a delayed answer, a misunderstanding etc.). The initiation of the topic is implemented and accomplished through the questions (e.g., topic initial elicitors) in such an emergent context and the use of topic initial elicitors and itemised news inquiries has not always generated a topic straightforwardly. The recipients' cooperation (e.g., answers, in particular, preferred answers) is essential. The data shows that the speaker produces a

topic initial elicitor in the environment where the recipient can easily recognise the possible completion place. For example, a topic initial elicitor directly follows the producer's own summary assessment accompanied with laughter at the end of the utterance (that indicates the end of the utterance). When the recipient of the initiator has trouble in responding, the speaker uses repair initiation (e.g., the third turn repair and third position repair) and seeks a resolution in response to a sequentially problematic turn. When the question (i.e., the initiator) is overlapped by the other speaker, the speaker firstly conducts self-interruption and moves to take up the overlapping utterance and then she recompletes that question. These activities are systematically seen in Japanese, as have been reported in English (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977; Schegloff, 1997, 2000a; Jefferson, 1984c, 1986). Similar patterns have been observed in the various sequential types of topic initiation such as arrangements, solicitudes and appreciations which have been identified as a disjunctive topic flow in English conversation (Button, 1987).

In the news announcement the speaker of the announcement recognises his misunderstanding. However, the recipient of the news announcement continues her talk following the speaker's acknowledgement and it does not cause a sequential breaking down or suspension. Rather, the talk is expanded by the recipient with a joke, which is delivered with laughter. This indicates that the recipient treats the speaker's misunderstanding as a non-serious matter, which can be seen as a recipient's management in response to a topic initiation. This phenomenon can also be seen in English conversation (cf. Schegloff, 1987b). Such management by the recipient to produce a joke first before providing serious next action when there has been an interactional misunderstanding in the prior talk has been reported as a particular type of

practice in talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 1987b: 212). Schegloff notes that ‘misunderstanding’ induces interactional trouble in talk-in-interaction; however, the participants’ efforts to understand such ‘misunderstanding’ could be identified across cultural, linguistic, and social differences (Schegloff, 1987b: 201). The ways in which the topic is initiated in Japanese are similar to those in English and we discussed that sensitive strategic projections are involved in the management of the speaker and the recipient as have been reported in English.

Chapter 5 has shown how the participants discuss and negotiate a topic through a Japanese discourse marker *dakara* (‘so’) and various mechanisms of deployment of topic talk-in-interaction as real-time activities. While there are cases where a new topic is introduced in a timely way after the discussion and the negotiation between the participants using the marker *dakara*, there are also cases where the topic talk is elaborated and the topic has been maintained and extended in the subsequent turns. It should be noted that the action of the initial upshot or summary assessment marked by *dakara* temporarily suspends the course of interaction. It is because the speaker shows her interactional disengagement from the current topic of talk and invites the recipient’s preferred answer (an agreement) in order to complete her work. Thereby, the topic is maintained during the discussion and negotiation. The recipient displays to what extent she agrees or disagrees with the speaker’s *dakara*-upshot in their responses. When a strong agreement is received, it leads to an introduction of a new topic. However, we have also seen that when the recipient does not totally agree with the speaker’s *dakara*-upshot, the recipient produces her independent opinion as a second assessment even if the speaker’s upshot is organised by appending a tag, indicating the speaker projection for a strong request for an agreement. This is an example of a distinctive case

of topic negotiation which is followed by the shared laughter.

Stand-alone *dakara* is used as a request for further action where the topic is not specifically nominated thereby further action is required and also as floor holding where the topic is to be maintained. We have also seen that *dakara*-prefaced utterances are used to signal the upcoming action in resolving the pending matters or pursuing new matters. *Dakara* may offer a solution for the participants to deal with a common interactional problem by marking participants' orientation to, and presentation of the topic in an emerging local context. *Dakara* can be a resource for accomplishing understanding between the participants. In addition, *dakara* functions as a topic initiator prefacing an utterance in order to pursue a new matter.

Chapter 6 analysed figurative expressions as an interactional device in association with topic organisation and examined how the figurative expressions work as a device orienting to topic closing by completing the preceding talk in the summary assessment sequence. The analysis uncovered that participants recurrently use figurative expressions and two types of completion sequences have been observed: (i) the preceding talk has been completed with the co-participant's strong preferable assessment and a new topic emerges after some elaboration, and (ii) the preceding talk has been completed with the co-participant's change of state token 'oh', however, the topic talk is elaborated and expanded by the producer of the figurative expressions in a stepwise manner. We suggest that the producer may restart her talk through the figurative expression by completing the preceding turn of talk.

Figurative expressions work as an effective way for the participants to mutually

understand each other and provide positive thoughts while demonstrating their assertion in the competitive sequences. It is possible to do so probably because the figurative summary does not target an individual case but a more general matter. Therefore, the figurative expression is particularly effective when a negative assessment is displayed as a result of self-deprecation. Participants also recurrently use figurative expressions as a resource for constructing laughter or providing humorous assessment in the troubles-telling situation. Furthermore, we have also seen that figurative expressions are used as a response to an ironical proposition in order to recomplete the talk. While the design of turns and their positions in the sequences present some complexity, they work similar to those in English conversation. Even though the troubles-telling is designed to be non-serious, it has recurrently received serious response. The effectiveness of the use of figurative expressions was seen in various situations and, in particular, the use of concept of footing (cf. Goffman, 1981) has been found to be effective resource whereby participants recurrently change the frame for their talk from literal to figurative and vice versa.

In chapter 7 we have examined how topic shift is implemented through reformulation and the reformulation questions as a resource by focusing on not only the participants' design of turns (utterances) in the immediate local interactional context but also the structure of the turns in the course of interactional sequences where the process of the participants' conduct is visible as real-time activities. Observation results have shown that there are two types of topic shift in Japanese conversation: the topic shift in which a previous topic is closed and a new topic is introduced in a turn, which is somehow sequentially linked to the prior or earlier turn, thereby, even though the topic is a completely new matter, it is not implemented in an overt way. In contrast, the stepwise

topic shift is the case where a topic introduced in a turn is not completely new but is related to the prior turn. These types of topic shift are also reported in English conversation (Jefferson, 1984a). Reformulation and reformulation questions through which topic shift is implemented are typically prefaced with markers such as a change of state token 'oh', discourse markers 'so' (*dakara*, *jya* and *sorede*), a marker 'well', a token 'uhm' etc. or the combination of these markers, connecting the topic shifting utterance to the prior turn.

It may be said that topic shift implemented through the practice of reformulation and the reformulation questions enables the participants to manage or control the topical movement with little constraint from the co-participants' responses since the producer directly accesses the interactional troubles or pursues certain activities. For example, we have seen that the topic shift is implemented in order to move away from the troubles-telling and restart conversation, as observed in English conversation (Jefferson, 1984a). Participants also implement topic shift whose target is not on the prior turn but on the earlier spate of talk in order to propose a pending matter, restart the talk or to insert a commentary. We have also observed stepwise topic movement when participant proposes another topical point, gives further information or makes assertion by deleting the co-participant's additional comment. Reformulation and the reformulation questions are recurrently used to make counter-argument and to reconstruct a prior formulation and the formulating questions, which has led to the introduction of a new topic in institutional settings (cf. Clayman, 1993; Hutchby, 1992, among others). We have seen a similar use of reformulation and the reformulation questions in ordinary Japanese conversation when an expected answer is not received or participants seeks to receive a definite answer.

In conclusion, the findings revealed that there are similarities in English and Japanese beyond all expectations in the ways topic initiation emerges as an abrupt movement aimed at topic generation as well as topic shift is accomplished through reformulation and the reformulation questions. The study also illustrated the ways in which participants negotiate a topic with the co-participants by marking their orientation to closing the topic talk with a discourse marker *dakara* and figurative expressions. A new topic has been introduced following an agreement after a negotiation or a talk on a related topic has been extended. Observation results suggest that participants in Japanese conversation use humorous talk in order to show support for the co-participants' troubles while providing positive comments without immediately avoiding a serious matter, which could be a slightly different feature between English and Japanese.

8.2 Implications and contributions of the study

In this section, we discuss some implications for the generic structure of conversation and culture by referring to a number of studies reported across different languages and cultures reviewed in chapter 2 as well as drawing from the findings of this study as summarised above. We also consider the importance this study has in making new contributions to the existing literature on topic organisation and Japanese conversation.

Detailed empirical investigation of topic organisation in Japanese conversation undertaken by this study tends overwhelmingly to reveal commonalities with English conversation, not differences. The implications of these findings are profound as it directly contradicts common sense assumption that people from different cultures have

different communication styles. As we reviewed in section 2.1, many of the cross-cultural communication studies which are concerned with the relationship between the patterns in talk and interaction and wider cultural characteristics often invoke 'common sense' accounts of ethnic or national differences. For example, it is argued that Japanese people are homogeneous, cooperative and group-oriented (Hofstede, 1980, 1991, Ting-Toomey, 1988, Triandis, 1989, 1995), like indirect communication style (cf. Tannen, 1984a) or high-context communication style (Hall, 1976) and respect harmony (Markus and Kitayama, 1991), which may be contrasted to English speakers who have opposite traits in every respect. Although such macro-social approaches might seem intuitively reasonable, those approaches have methodological problems in their underlying assumption as well as empirical approach. There is an underlying assumption that different cultures/nations/ethnic groups inform differences in language use, therefore, analysts work is to find out such differences, not similarities. Overall, the purpose of their analysis is to find value differences among countries and relate these to characteristics of the countries involved (cf. Hofstede, 1980). Another problematic aspect of these macro-social approaches is that little evidence is offered in support of their arguments.

Conversation analysis, on the other hand, makes a clear departure from those holistic approaches. CA claims that all conversations are structurally organised and this means that social action can be studied independently of the participants' characteristics, psychological or otherwise, and it takes a rigorously empirical approach. We have reviewed the literature of Japanese conversation by applying the methodology developed by CA (Ford and Mori, 1994; Tanaka, 1999; Hayashi, 1994, 1999, 2003; Fox, Hayashi, and Jasperson, 1996; Lerner and Takagi, 1999), which broadly found that the

generic conversational structures between Japanese and English are similar despite the typological divergence between the two languages. Moreover, the organisation of repair between Thai and English are found to be similar without respect to the difference in language, nation, class or culture between the two languages and Moerman concludes that the practices of inquiries and repair initiation in Thai conversation appear to operate with little influence of culture (1977, 1988). Schegloff (1987a) argues that, although some variations may be observed in the ways certain actions are accomplished, it is possible to analyse different languages in detail on a micro-level. He then concludes that those variations can be considered as rather minor given the major differences in social structure, culture, value system, and language on a macro-level.

In light of the above, it is suggested that conversational structures are in fact somehow primordial, in that they transcend linguistic and cultural differences. Detailed analysis reveals that participants' actions are produced in an orderly way and researchers find the systematic patterns of talk as the production of the talk-in-interaction. These are identified in a sequence of interaction as the products of participants' orientation to normative procedures (cf. Drew, 1990: 29). Drawing from this empirical study, it is confirmed that, by studying conversation, we are looking at basic aspects of human interaction that operate across the sociological divisions that are foregrounded in most social science and sociolinguistic work. It can be said that assuming differences based on rather gross national or ethnic characteristics does not adequately reflect the actual interactional practices that can be discovered through conversation analytic studies.

In this study we illustrated topic organisation, referring to the initiation, negotiation and the shift of topic in conversation. In each organisation, we specifically saw the

participants' management of actions with orientation to the closing and the initiation of topic as well as shifting of a topic. As we mentioned above, there is much existing work on topic organisation in English, however, there is almost none on topic organisation in Japanese. In this regard, the study of topic organisation contributes to the existing conversation research in Japanese. The findings from the systematic examination of topic initiation and topic shift through different techniques and management offer new insights on how topic is organised and how the participants use devices properly in order to accomplish their social interactional activities. In addition, the study also contributes to further understanding of the relationships between languages (e.g., grammar) and social interaction providing detailed production of participants' real activities through the organisation of turn-at-talk.

This study has also identified specific devices such as a discourse marker *dakara*, figurative expressions, and the practice of reformulation and a reformulation question. The discourse marker *dakara* has been investigated in earlier research focusing on the linguistic function; however, we focused on *dakara* at turn initial position which has been displayed as the constituent of interactional discourse in association with topics. Description of various uses of *dakara* in on-going interaction revealed the participants' orientation to topic organisation. In addition, this study can be regarded as a first step in research on topic organisation using figurative expression as device in Japanese conversation. In particular, we illustrated the effectiveness of the use of figurative expressions in various situations by using Goffman's (1974, 1981) notion of footing. The analysis contributes to a better understanding of the use of figurative expressions in ordinary conversation. There has not been much research of topic organisation using the practice of reformulation and the reformulation questions as a device in ordinary

conversation in English or in Japanese conversation. This study uncovered that the similar mechanisms are reported as in topic shift in institutional settings.

Lastly, the study reminds us of the importance of the initiation of repair to resolve the troubles and reconstruct utterances (cf. Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977; Schegloff, 1992b, 1997) and in particular, the third position repair is clearly beneficial. It is because the third position repair enables participants to implement topic shift in a covert way in emergent local context, which prevents a sequence suspension and maintains discourse coherence. We illustrated human interaction by describing the process of the participants' activities in the implementation of topic initiation, topic negotiation and topic shift. It can be said that the study enabled us to understand the fundamental mechanisms of people's management of the topic talk in real life. Having said the above however, this study encountered several limitations, which will be discussed in the next section along with consideration for the directions and prospects for future research.

8.3 Limitations of the study and prospects for future research

This study has several limitations. Although it may not be possible to adequately address such limitations, we will also consider certain directions and prospects for future research. Firstly, the nature of interactions in telephone conversations does not include face-to-face interaction such as eye-gaze, gestures and facial expressions. This means that non-vocal interactions are not available for analysis and that our scope of research is limited to hearable words and sounds and the examination of participants' verbal utterances in conversation. Use of the video- recorded conversation as data may allow analysts to take multifaceted approach though it would be an undeniably

challenging task to analyse and describe in detail participants' visually accessible aspects of conduct in interaction.

Our focus on the telephone conversation also means that the target of our analysis was interaction between two people. Therefore, the consideration has not been given to the speaker selection. It has been an advantage to focus on conversation between the two since we could see the turn shift clearly thereby making it easier to analyse the flow of conversation. Broadening the scope of our analysis to a group conversation will show the extent to which the patterns identified by the present study in the case of two-participant conversation stand valid or vary according to the number of participants in talk-in-interaction. Analysis of talk among multiple participants will require consideration as to who the question is directed to and when the participants initiate/shift topic, and we suspect that participants' knowledge of the role of distribution would become more important for smooth transition.

Secondly, the present study is primarily concerned with the analysis and description of topic organisation in ordinary conversation, in particular, focusing on the conversation between the participants who regularly chat. While we have provided some empirical evidence as a consequence of participants' actions in sequence of interaction, it can offer us more potential prospects for future research to consider. It would be of interest to examine topic organisation between the participants who met for the first time. In an environment where participants do not have shared knowledge about each other, how do they build their utterances turn-by-turn in local context and initiate, negotiate or shift topic in the sequence of conversation? Furthermore, it may be worth examining the mechanism of topic organisation in different settings such as business conversation and

institutional talk in environments where participants are oriented to the accomplishment of specific tasks.

In addition, due to the friendships that form the integral part of the sample of this study, some of the conversation included the author to be recorded as part of the data set. In other words, I occasionally had the role of both participant and analyst. It may not be ideal in light of the general CA preference of not to study interactions in which oneself is involved due to the possibility that the researcher may be biased in analysing what actually happened (ten Have, 1999: 66). The fact that I was one of the participants, and that I had some background knowledge on many of my interlocutors, may have influenced my analysis of such data to some extent and in some cases without noticing it.

Lastly, as discussed in Chapter 3 (see section 3.3.2), since the focus of the study is Japanese conversation, it was a challenging task to translate the Japanese data into English accurately. In order to minimise the risk of losing meanings while translating the data into English, I had carefully examined the translated texts. There may also be the case that it is not possible to translate certain expressions precisely in another language since those expressions may not exist in English. It is admitted that the transcripts are best understood in the original language, and there remains some discrepancies between the original Japanese transcription and the translated texts in English.

APPENDIX 1

Transcription conventions

→	Arrows in the margin point to the lines of the transcript relevant to the point being made in the text.
[Left-side square brackets indicate where an overlapping talk begins.
(0.3)	Numbers in parentheses indicate periods of silence, in tenths of a second.
(.)	Dots in parentheses indicate a silence of less than two tenths of a second.
()	Empty parentheses indicate the presence of an unclear fragment on the tape.
=	Equal signs (ordinarily at the end of one line and at the start of an ensuing one) indicate ‘latched’ utterances, with no interval between them.
[word]	Words or sentences in square brackets indicate the English translation of special Japanese words or phrases (e.g. figurative expressions).
((points))	Words in double parentheses indicate the transcriber’s comments.
sou:::nd	Colons indicate that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound or letter. The number of colons is proportional to the length of the stretched sound.
soun-	Dashes indicate an abrupt cut-off or self-interruption of the sound in progress.
!	Exclamation marks are used to indicate an animated or emphatic tone.
CAPS	Words transcribed in capital letters indicate those produced at relatively high volume.

<u>Under</u>	Underlined fragments indicate the speaker's emphasis.
° °	Degree signs are used to indicate a passage of talk which is quieter than the surrounding talk.
> <	Inward chevrons indicate that the talk was produced noticeably quicker than the surrounding talk.
< >	Outward chevrons indicate that the talk was produced noticeably slower than the surrounding talk.
word.	Dots at the end of the sentences indicate falling intonation.
word,	Commas indicate continuing intonation.
word?	Question marks indicate rising intonation.
↑↓	Upward pointing arrows indicate rising intonational shift and downward pointing arrows mark falling intonational shift. They are placed immediately before the start of the shift.
.hh	Dots before an 'h' indicate the speaker's in-breath. The length of the in-breath is indicated by the number of 'h's'.
Hh	The letters 'h' indicates the out-breath. The length of the out-breath is indicated by the number of 'h's'.
(hh)	The letters 'h' enclosed in parentheses indicates laughter within a word.
¥ (£)	The currency marks ¥ (£) indicate a smiling voice between markers.

APPENDIX 2

Abbreviations used in the interlinear gloss

COP	Various forms of the copula verb <i>be</i>
CONJ	Conjunction
FP	Final particle
GEN	Genitive
LK	Linking nominal
N	Nominaliser
NEG	Negative morpheme
O	Object marker
P	Particle
PAST	Past tense
POL	Politeness
Q	Question marker
QT	Quotative marker
S	Subject marker
SFX	Suffix
TAG	Tag-like expression
TOP	Topic marker

REFERENCES

- Antaki, C. (2007) 'Mental-health practitioners' use of idiomatic expressions in summarising clients' accounts', *Journal of pragmatics* 39 (3): 527-541.
- Arksey, H. and Knight, P. T. (1999) *Interviewing for social scientists. An introductory resource with examples*, London: Sage.
- Atkinson, J. M. and Drew, P. (1979) *Order in court. The organisation of verbal interaction in judicial setting*, London: Macmillan.
- Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. (1984) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Atsumi, R. (1980) 'Patterns of personal relationships: A key to understanding Japanese thought and behaviour', *Social Analysis* 6 (5/6): 63-78.
- Boers, F., Demecheleer, M. and Eyckmans, J. (2004) 'Cross-cultural variation as a variable in comprehending and remembering figurative idioms', *European Journal of English Studies* 8 (3): 375-388.
- Bolden, G. (2008) "'So what's up?': Using the discourse marker *so* to launch conversational business", *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (3): 302-337.

- Bolden, G. (2009) 'Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker "so" in English conversation', *Journal of Pragmatics* 41 (5): 974-998.
- Boldt, E. (1979) 'Structural tightness and cross-cultural research', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 10 (2): 221-230.
- British Sociological Association. (2002) 'Statement of ethical practice': <http://www.brisoc.co.uk>.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987) *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2008) *Social Research methods. Third edition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Button, G. (1987) 'Moving out of closings', in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds) *Talk and social organisation*, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, pp. 101-151.
- Button, G. (1990) 'On varieties of closings', in G. Psathas (ed) *Interaction competence*, Washington: University Press of America, pp. 93-148.

- Button, G. (1991) 'Conversation-in-a series', in D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and social structure*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 250-277.
- Button, G. and Casey, N. (1984) 'Generating topic: the use of topic initial elicitor', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 167-190.
- Button, G. and Casey, N. J. (1985) 'Topic nomination and topic pursuit', *Human Studies* 8: 3-55.
- Button, G. and Casey, N. J. (1988/89) 'Topic initiation: Business-at-hand', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 22: 61-92.
- Clayman, S. E. (1991) 'News interview openings: Aspects of sequential organisation', in P. Scannell (ed) *Broadcast talk*, London: Sage, pp. 48-75.
- Clayman, S. E. (1992) 'Footing in the achievement of neutrality: the case of news-interview discourse', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 163-198.
- Clayman, S. E. (1993) 'Reformulating the question: A device for answering/not answering questions in news interviews and press conferences', *Text* 13 (2): 159-188.

- Clayman, S. E. and Heritage, J. (2002) *The news interview. Journalists and public figures on the air*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. and Selting, M. (1996) 'Towards an interactional perspective on prosody and prosodic perspective on interaction', in E. Couper-Kuhlen and M. Selting (eds) *Prosody in conversation. Interactional studies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-56.
- Davidson, J. (1984) 'Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 102-128.
- Doi, T. (1986) *The anatomy of conformity. The individual versus society*, Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Drew, P. (1987) 'Po-faced receipts of teases', *Linguistics* 25: 219-253.
- Drew, P. (1990) 'Conversation analysis: Who needs it?', *Text* 10 (1/2): 27-35.
- Drew, P. (1997) "'Open" class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation', *Journal of Pragmatics* 28 (1): 69-101.
- Drew, P. (2003) 'Precision and exaggeration in interaction', *American Sociological Review* 68 (6): 917-938.

- Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (1992b) 'Analysing talk at work: an introduction', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-65.
- Drew, P. and Holt, E. (1988) 'Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints', *Social Problems* 35: 398-417.
- Drew, P. and Holt, E. (1995) 'Idiomatic expressions and their role in the organisation of topic transition on conversation', in M. Everaert, E-J. Van der Linden, A. Schenk, and R. Schreuder (eds) *Idioms: Structural and psychological perspectives*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 117-132.
- Drew, P. and Holt, E. (1998) 'Figures of speech: Figurative expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation', *Language in Society* 27 (4): 495-522.
- Edwards, D. (1997) *Discourse and cognition*, London: Sage.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (1992) *Discursive Psychology*, London: Sage.
- Ford, C. E. and Mori, J. (1994) 'Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: A cross-linguistic study of interactional grammar', *Pragmatics* 14 (1): 131-161.
- Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M. and Jasperson, R. (1996) 'Resources and repair. A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair', in E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A.

- Thompson (eds) *Interaction and grammar*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp185-237.
- Fujii, Y. (1991) 'Nihongo ni okeru gojun no gyakuten [Reversed word order in Japanese]', *Gengo Kenkyu* 99, pp. 58-81.
- Garfinkel, H. (1963) 'A conception of, and experiments with "Trust" as a condition of stable concerted actions', in O. J. Harvey (ed) *Motivation and social interaction. Cognitive determinants*, New York: Ronald Press, pp. 187-238.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Garfinkel, H. and Sacks, H. (1970) 'On formal structure of practical actions', in J. C. McKinney and E. A. Tiryakian (eds) *Theoretical sociology*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, pp. 338-366.
- Gibbs, Jr. R. W. and Colston, H. L. (2012) *Interpreting figurative meaning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givon, T. (1979) *On understanding grammar*, New York: Academic Press.
- Givon, T. (1983) *Topic continuity in discourse. A quantitative cross-language study*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Glenn, P. (1992) 'Current speaker initiation of two-party shared laughter', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 25: 139-162.
- Glenn, P. (2003) *Laughter in interaction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959) *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction ritual. Essays on face-to-face behaviour*, New York: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1971) *Relations in public. Microstudies of the public order*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame analysis*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, E. (1981) 'Footing', in Goffman, E. *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 124-159.
- Goffman, E. (1983) 'The interaction order', *American Sociological Review* 48: 1-17.
- Goodwin, C. (1984) 'Notes on story structure and the organisation of participation', in M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 225-246.

- Goodwin, C. (1988) 'Participation frameworks in children's argument', in K. Ekberg and P. E. Mjaavatn (eds) *Growing into a modern world. Proceedings from an interactional interdisciplinary conference on the life and development of children in modern society*, Trondheim: The Norwegian Centre for Child Research, pp. 1188-1195.
- Goodwin, C. (2007) 'Interactive footing', in E. Holt and R. Clift (eds) *Reporting talk. Reported speech in interaction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 16-46.
- Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M. H. (1987) 'Concurrent operations on talk: notes on the interactive organisation of assessments', *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics* 1, pp. 1-54.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1983) 'Searching for a word as an interactive activity', in J. N. Deely and M. D. Lenhart (eds) *Semiotics*, New York: Plenum, pp. 129-138.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990) *He-said-she said. Talk as social organisation among black children*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Greatbatch, D. (1986a) 'Aspects of topical organisation in news interviews: the use of agenda-shifting procedures by interviewees', *Media, Culture and Society* 8 (4): 441-455.
- Greatbatch, D. (1986b) 'Some standard uses of supplementary questions in news interviews', *Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics* 8: 86-123.

- Gudykunst, W. B. and Ting-Toomey, S. (1988) *Culture and interpersonal communication*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K. and Heyman, S. (1996) 'The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures', *Human Communication Research* 22 (4): 510-543.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1992a) 'Contextualisation and understanding' in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds) *Rethinking context. Language as interactive phenomenon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 229-252.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1992b) 'Interviewing in intercultural situations' in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 302-327.
- Gumperz, J. J. and Hymes, D (eds) (1972) *Directions in sociolinguistics. The ethnography of communication*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hall, E. T. (1976) *Beyond culture*, New York: Anchor Books.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman.

- Hayashi, M. (1994) 'A comparative study of self-repair in English and Japanese conversation', *Japanese/ Korean Linguistics* 4: 77-93.
- Hayashi, M. (1999) 'Where grammar and interaction meet: A study of co-participant completion in Japanese conversation', *Human Studies* 22: 475-499.
- Hayashi, M. (2003) *Joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hayashi, M. (2009) 'Marking a "noticing of departure" in talk: *Eh*-prefaced turns in Japanese conversation', *Journal of Pragmatics* 41 (10): 2100-2129.
- Heath, C. (1981) 'The opening sequence in doctor-patient interaction', in P. Atkinson and C. Heath (eds) *Medical work. Realities and routines*, Aldershot: Gower, pp. 71-90.
- Heritage, J. (1984a) *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984b) 'A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 299-345.
- Heritage, J. (1985) 'Analysing news interviews. Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience', in T. van Dijk (ed) *Handbook of discourse analysis*, vol.3,

London: Academic Press, pp.95-119.

Heritage, J. (1988) 'Explanations as accounts. A conversation analytic perspective', in C. Antaki (ed) *Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods*, London: Sage, pp. 127-144.

Heritage, J. (1998) 'Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analysing distinctive turn-taking system', in S. Cmejrkova, J. Hoffmannova, O. Mullerova and J. Svetla (eds) *Proceedings of the 6th Interactional congress of IADA (International Association for Dialog Analysis)*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 3-17.

Heritage, J. (2002a) 'Oh-prefaced responses to assessments. A method of modifying agreement/disagreement', in C. Ford, B. Fox and S. Thompson (eds) *The language of turn and sequence*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 196-224.

Heritage, J. and Atkinson, J. M. (1984) 'Introduction', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-20.

Heritage, J. and Greatbatch, D. (1991) 'On the institutional character of institutional talk. The case of news interviews', in D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and Social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*, Berkeley, CA: University California Press, pp. 93-137.

- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2005) 'The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68 (1): 15-38.
- Heritage, J and Watson, D. R. (1979) 'Formulations as conversational objects', in G. Psathas (ed) *Everyday language*, New York: Irvington Press, pp. 123-162.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's consequences. Interactional differences in work-related values*, London: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991) *Cultures and organisations. Software of the mind*, London: McGraw-Hill.
- Holt, E. (1996) 'Reporting on talk: the use of direct reported speech in conversation', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29 (3): 219-245.
- Holt, E. (2010) 'The last laugh: Shared laughter and topic termination', *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (6): 1513-1525.
- Holt, E. and Clift, R. (eds) (2007) *Reporting talk. Reported speech in interaction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holt, E. and Drew, P. (2005) 'Figurative Pivots: The use of figurative expressions in pivotal topic transitions', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38 (1): 35-61.

- Hopper, R. (1989a) 'Conversation analysis and social psychology as descriptions of interpersonal communication', in D. Roger and P. Bull (eds) *Conversation*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 48-65.
- Hopper, R. (1992) *Telephone conversation*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hutchby, I. (1991) 'The organisation of talk on talk radio', in S. Paddy (ed) *Broadcast talk*, London: Sage.
- Hutchby, I. (1992) 'The pursuit of controversy: Routine scepticism in talk on "talk radio"', *Sociology* 26 (4): 673-694.
- Hutchby, I. (1996) 'Power in discourse: The case of arguments on a British talk radio show', *Discourse and Society* 7 (4): 481-498.
- Hutchby, I. (1999a) 'Frame attunement and footing in the organisation of talk radio openings', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (1): 41-63.
- Hutchby, I. (2001) '"Oh", irony and sequential ambiguity in arguments', *Discourse and Society* 12 (2): 123-141.
- Hutchby, I. (2005) '"Active listening": Formulations and the elicitation of feelings-talk in child counselling', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38 (3): 303-329.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998) *Conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (2008) *Conversation analysis. Second edition*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1973) 'A case of precision timing in ordinary conversations: overlapping tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences', *Semiotica* 9 (1): 47-96.

Jefferson, G. (1974) 'Error correction as an interactional resource', *Language in Society* 3 (2): 181-199.

Jefferson, G. (1979) 'A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination', in G. Psathas (ed) *Everyday language. Studies in ethnomethodology*, New York: Irvington Publishers, pp. 79-96.

Jefferson, G. (1980) 'On "trouble-premonitory" response to inquiry', *Sociological Inquiry* 50 (3): 153-185.

Jefferson, G. (1981) "'Caveat speaker": A preliminary exploration of shift-implicative reciprocity in the articulation of topic', *End of grant report to the (British) Social Science Research Council on the articulation of topic in conversation*.

Jefferson, G. (1984a) 'On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, pp. 191-222.

Jefferson, G. (1984b) 'On the organisation of laughter in talk about troubles', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 346-369.

Jefferson, G. (1984c) 'Notes on some orderliness of overlap onset', in V. D'Urso and P. Leonardi (eds) *Discourse analysis and natural rhetoric*, Padua, Italy: Cleup Editore, pp. 11-38.

Jefferson, G. (1984d) 'Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens "Yeah" and "Mm hm"', *Papers in Linguistics* 17 (2): 197-216.

Jefferson, G. (1986) 'Notes on latency in overlap onset', *Human Studies* 9: 153-183.

Jefferson, G. (1987) 'On exposed and embedded correction in conversation', in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds) *Talk and social organisation*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 86-100.

Jefferson, G. (1990) 'List construction as a task resource', in G. Psathas (ed) *Interaction competence*, Washington, DC: University Press of America, pp. 63-92.

Jefferson, G. (1993) 'Caveat speaker: Preliminary notes on recipient topic-shift implicature', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26 (1): 1-30.

- Jefferson, G. (2003) 'A note on resolving ambiguity', in P. J. Glenn, C. D. LeBaron, and J. S. Mandelbaum (eds) *Studies in language and social interaction. In honour of Robert Hopper*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 221-240.
- Jefferson, G. (2004[1975]) 'A sketch of some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation ', in G. H. Lerner (ed) *Conversation analysis. Studies form the first generation*, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 43-59.
- Kendon, A. (1990) *Conducting interaction. Patterns of behaviour in focused encounters*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kovecses, Z. (2004) 'Introduction: Cultural variation in metaphor', *European Journal of English Studies* 8 (3): 263-274.
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The structure of the Japanese language*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Lakoff, G and Kovecses, Z. (1987) 'The cognitive model anger inherent in American English', in D. Holland and N. Quinn (eds) *Cultural models in language and thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 195-221.
- Lerner, G. (1991) 'On the syntax of sentence-in-progress', *Language in Society* 20 (3): 441-458.

- Lerner, G. (1996a) 'On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation. Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker', in E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and grammar*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 238-276.
- Lerner, G. (1996b) 'Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59 (4): 303-321.
- Lerner, G. and Takagi, T. (1999) 'On the place of linguistic resources in the organisation of talk-in-interaction: a co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices', *Journal of Pragmatics* 31 (1): 49-75.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983) *Pragmatics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Local, J. (1992) 'Continuing and restarting', in P. Auer and A. D. Luzio (eds) *The contextualisation of language*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 273-296.
- Local, J. (1996) 'Conversational phonetics. Some aspects of news receipts in everyday talk', in E. Couper-Kuhlen and M. Selting (eds) *Prosody in conversation. Interactional studies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 177-230.
- Local, J. (2004) 'Getting back to prior talk: *and-uh (m)* as a back-connecting device in British and American English', in E. Couper-Kuhlen and C. E. Ford (eds) *Sound patterns in interaction. Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 377-400.

- Local, J. and Kelly, J. (1986) 'Projection and "silences": Notes on phonetic and conversational structure', *Human Studies* 9 (2/3): 185-204.
- Local, J. and Walker, G. (2004) 'Abrupt-joins as a resource for the production of multi-unit, multi-action turns', *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (8): 1375-1403.
- Local, J. and Walker, G. (2005) 'Methodological imperatives for investigating the phonetic organisation and phonological structures of spontaneous speech', *Phonetica* 62:120-130.
- Markus, H. R. and Kitayama, S. (1991) 'Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation', *Psychological Review* 98 (2): 224-253.
- Masuda, K. (ed) (1974) *Kenkyusha's New Japanese-English Dictionary*, Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988) 'From bound grammatical markers to free discourse markers: History of some Japanese connectives', *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14, pp. 340-351.
- Maynard, D. W. (1980) 'Placement of topic changes in conversation', *Semiotica* 30 (3): 263-290.
- Maynard, D. W. (1989) 'Perspective-display sequences in conversation', *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53: 91-113.

- Maynard, S. K. (1989) *Japanese conversation. Self-contextualisation through structure and interactional management*, Norwood: NJ. Ablex.
- Maynard, S. K. (1993) *Discourse modality*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mizushima, L and Stapleton, P. (2006) 'Analysing the function of meta-oriented critical comments in Japanese comic conversations', *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (12): 2105-2123.
- Moon, R. (1998) *Fixed expressions and idioms in English. A corpus-based approach*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moerman, M. (1977) 'The preference for self-correction in a Tai conversational corpus', *Language* 53 (4): 872-882.
- Moerman, M. (1988) *Talking culture. Ethnography and conversation analysis*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mori, J. (1994) 'Functions of the connective *datte* in Japanese conversation', *Japanese Korean Linguistics* 4: 147-163.
- Mori, J. (1999) *Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Japanese*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Mori, J. (2006) 'The working of the Japanese token *hee* in informing sequences: An analysis of sequential context, turn shape, and prosody', *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (8): 1175-1205.
- Nikander, P. (2008) 'Working with transcripts and translated data', *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 5 (3): 225-231.
- Norrick, N. R. (1993) *Conversational joking. Humour in everyday talk*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Ono, T and Suzuki, R. (1992) 'Word order variability in Japanese conversation: motivation and grammaticisation', *Text* 12 (3): 429-445.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. and Leech, N. L. (2007) 'Sampling designs in qualitative research: Making the sampling process more public', *Qualitative Report* 12 (2): 238-254.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978) 'Compliment responses. Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints', in J. Schenkein (ed) *Studies in organisation of conversational interaction*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 79-112.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984a) 'Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments. Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-101.

- Pomerantz, A. (1984b) 'Giving a source or basis: the practice in conversation of telling "how I know"', *Journal of Pragmatics* 8 (5/6): 607-625.
- Pomerantz, A. (1986) 'Extreme case formulations', *Human Studies* 9 (2/3): 219-229.
- Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and social psychology. Beyond attitudes and behaviour*, London: Sage.
- Psathas, G. (1995) *Conversation analysis*, London: Sage.
- Raymond, G. (2003) 'Grammar and social organisation: Yes/No interrogatives and the structure of responding', *American Sociological Review* 68: 939-967.
- Raymond, G. (2004) 'Prompting action: The stand-alone "So" in ordinary conversation', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37 (2):185-218.
- Sacks, H. (1975) 'Everyone has to lie', in B. Blount and M. Sanches (eds) *Sociocultural dimensions of language use*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 57-80.
- Sacks, H. (1984) 'Notes on methodology', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-27.
- Sacks, H. (1987[1973]) 'On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequence in conversation', in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds) *Talk and social organisation*,

Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, pp. 54-69.

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on conversation vol.1 and vol.2*, G. Jefferson (ed), Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. A. (1979) 'Two preferences in the organisation of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction', in G. Psathas (ed) *Everyday language. Studies in ethnomethodology*, New York: Irvington, pp. 15-21.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation', *Language* 50 (4): 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968) 'Sequencing in conversational openings', *American Anthropologist* 70 (6): 1975-1095.

Schegloff, E, A. (1972) 'Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place', in D, Sudnow (ed) *Studies in social interaction*, New York: The Free Press, pp. 75-119.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979) 'The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation', in. T. Givon (ed) *Syntax and semantics*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 261-286.

Schegloff, E. A. (1980) 'Preliminaries to preliminaries: "Can I ask you a question?"', *Sociological Inquiry* 50 (3/4): 104-152.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1982) 'Discourse as an interactional achievement. Some uses of "uh-huh" and other things that come between sentences', in D. Tannen (ed) *Georgetown University roundtable on language and linguistics*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 31-93.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1984) 'On some questions and ambiguities in conversation', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 28-52.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1986) 'The routine as achievement', *Human Studies* 9: 111-151.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987a) 'Between micro and macro: contexts and other connections', in J. M. Alexander, B. Clevedon, R. Munch and N. J. Smelser (eds) *The micro-macro link*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 207-236.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987b) 'Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction', *Linguistics* 25: 201-218.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987c) 'Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation' in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds) *Talk and social organisation*, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, pp. 70-100.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988) 'Goffman and the analysis of conversation', in P. Drew and A. J. Wootton (eds) *Erving Goffman. Exploring the interaction order*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1990) 'On the organisation of sequences as a source of coherence', in B. Dorval (ed) *Conversational organisation and its development*, New Jersey: Ablex, pp. 51-77.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992a) 'Introduction', in G. Jefferson (ed) *Harvey Sacks: Lectures on conversation*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. ix-lxii.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992b) 'Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defence of intersubjectivity in conversation', *American Journal of Sociology* 97 (5): 295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996a) 'Confirming allusions: Towards an empirical account of action', *American Journal of Sociology*, 102 (1): 161-216.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996b) 'Turn organisation: One intersection of grammar and interaction', in E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.52-133.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997) 'Third turn repair', in G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin and J. Baugh (eds) *Towards a social science of language. Papers in honour of William Labov, volume 2, Social interaction and discourse structures*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 31-40.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000a) 'Overlapping talk and the organisation of turn-taking for conversation', *Language in Society* 29 (1): 1-63.

- Schegloff, E. A. (2001a) 'Accounts of conduct in interaction: Interruption, overlap and turn-taking', in J. H. Turner (ed) *Handbook of sociological theory*, New York: Plenum, p. 287-321.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2001b) *Conversation analysis. A project in process 'Increments'*, Paper presented to the Linguistic Institute, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006) 'Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted', In N. J. Enfield and S. C. Levinson (eds) *Roots of human sociality. Culture, cognition and interaction*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 70-96.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007) *Sequence organisation in interaction: a primer in conversation analysis I*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H. (1973) 'Opening up closings', *Semiotica* 8 (4): 289-327.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977) 'The preference for self-correction in the organisation of repair in conversation', *Language* 53 (2): 361-382.
- Schiffrin, D. (1984) 'Jewish argument as society', *Language in Society* 13 (3): 311-335.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987) *Discourse markers*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Selting, M. (1996) 'Prosody as an active-type distinctive signalling sue in conversation. The case of so-called "astonished questions" in repair initiation', in E. Couper-Kuhlen and M. Selting (eds) *Prosody in conversation. Interactional studies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 231-270.
- Selting, M. (2000) 'The construction of units in conversational talk', *Language in Society* 29 (4): 477-517.
- Shibatani, M. (1990) *The languages of Japan*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975) *Towards an analysis of discourse*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stivers, T. (2004) "'No no no" and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction', *Human Communication Research* 30 (2): 260-293.
- Tanaka, H. (1999) *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation. A study in grammar and interaction*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, H. (2000) 'The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation', *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (8): 1135-1176.
- Tanaka, H. (2005) 'Grammar and the "timing" of social action: word order and preference organisation in Japanese', *Language in Society* 34 (3): 389-430.

- Tannen, D. (1981) 'New York Jewish conversational style', In S. F. Kiesling and C. B. Paulston (eds) *Intercultural discourse and communication. The essential readings*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, D. (1984a) 'The pragmatics of cross-cultural communication', *Applied Linguistics* 15 (3): 189-195.
- Tannen, D. (1984b) *Conversation style. Analysing talk among friends*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ten Have, P. (1999) *Doing conversation analysis. A practical guide*, London: Sage.
- Terasaki, A. K. (2004[1976]) 'Pre-announcement sequences in conversation', in G. Lerner (ed) *Conversation analysis. Studies from the first generation*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp.171-223.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1988) 'Intercultural conflict styles: A face negotiation theory', In Y. Y. Kim and W. Gudykunst (eds) *Theories in intercultural communication*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989) 'The self and social behaviour in differing cultural contexts', *Psychological Review* 96 (3): 506-520.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994) *Culture and social behaviour*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Triandis, H. C. (1995) *Individualism and collectivism*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1977) *Text and context. Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*, New York: Longman Inc.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1979) 'Pragmatic connectives', *Journal of Pragmatics* 3 (5): 447-456.
- van Dijk, T. A. and Kintsch, W. (1983) *Strategies of discourse comprehension*, New York: Academic Press.
- West, C. (1979) 'Against our will: Male interruptions of females in cross-sex conversation', *Annals of New York Academy of Science*, 327: 81-97.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. H. (1983) 'Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons', in B. Thorne, C. Kramarae and N. Henley (eds) *Language, gender and society*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House. P. 102-117.
- Wong, J. P. H. and Poon, M. K. K. (2010) 'Bringing translation out of the shadows: Translation as an issue of methodological significance in cross-cultural qualitative research', *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 21 (2): 151-158.
- Wooffitt, R. (2005) *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis*, London: Sage.

Zimmerman, D. H. and West, C. (1975) 'Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation', in B. Thorne and N. Henley (eds) *Language and sex. Difference and dominance*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House, p. 105-129.