

TURN-TAKING IN JAPANESE TELEVISION INTERVIEWS: A STUDY ON INTERVIEWERS' STRATEGIES¹

Lidia Tanaka

Abstract

Despite interviewers having a wide range of strategies to elicit talk, English language interviewers overwhelmingly use syntactic questions. In contrast, most turns in Japanese semi-formal television interviews end in non-interrogative forms, and other methods are used to achieve smooth turn yielding. This study looks at the interviewers' turns and examines how interviewees recognize turn-yielding. It argues that interviewers prefer using interviewing strategies other than canonical question forms to avoid any possible FTA (face threatening act).

Keywords: Question, Turn-taking, Television interviews, Conversation analysis, Japanese.

1. Introduction

Television interviews are 'institutional' events where a number of restrictions² shape not only the discourse of the participants but also the turn-taking system. They are quite distinct communicative events defined by a number of characteristics such as the unequal distribution of turn types and the strict allocation of the participants' rights and obligations. Interviews are initiated and terminated by the host alone as opposed to daily conversation where participants have more freedom. Only the host has the right to introduce a new topic or to maintain the present one (Hutchby 1996). Attempts by guests to change turn-type allocation or topic can be seen as a clear deviation from the interview format. Like all 'institutional' exchanges, interviews are goal-oriented tasks where the

¹ This study was supported by a La Trobe University OSP grant. I wish to thank the anonymous reviewer for the very valuable and detailed comments and suggestions that helped to improve this paper. However, all errors are mine. I also would like to acknowledge Ms. Ann Verhaert for her professional assistance.

² Some restrictions in 'institutional' settings seem to be less stringent in cultural and educational interviews or talk shows. Given that talk shows or cultural interviews do not have the same impact as news or political interviews (the broadcast of the latter can have wider implications such as influencing voters at election times), hosts are freer to show a 'friendlier' or more conversational approach, as is testified by, for example, the high use of news receipts that may indicate agreement or even approval, (Clayman and Heritage 2002; L. Tanaka 2004).

interviewer or host interviews the 'expert' on behalf of a wider audience. This audience (although not physically present) defines the television interview as a public exchange.

A distinctive characteristic of most 'institutional' talk is turn-type pre-allocation, where only one of the participants (in case of an interview, the host) has the right to ask questions. The other participant (the guest) has the obligation to answer such questions or to provide information. Interviewers' turns can comprise single questions, but in the majority of the cases they are long, and constitute multi-unit turns. The question can follow an introductory section or preface. Clayman and Heritage (2002) write that "until a recognizable question has been produced, interviewees display their understanding that the initial statement is intended to be 'prefatory' to a question, and is not to be responded to in its own right. Moreover, by not responding or intervening in the middle of the interviewer's turn, they also collaborate with the interviewer's effort to arrive at a question" (2002: 105).

Syntactic interrogativity does not necessarily appear in turn-end position, yet interviewees interpret turn-yielding correctly. Heritage and Roth (1995) found that while a vast number of interviewers' turns in news interviews can be syntactically identified as questions, other sequences show that interrogativity is not necessary for questioning. A similar observation is made by Schegloff (1984), who writes that statements can also function as questions. Others too, point out that questioning can be accomplished by other actions that do not take an interrogative morphosyntax (Athanasiadou 1991; Coulthard 1985; Heritage and Roth 1995; Schegloff 1984; Takagi 1999).

Even though syntactic interrogativity is not essential in interviewers' turns, interviewers' turns in British and American news interviews overwhelmingly end in syntactic questions.³ In Japanese, however, canonical questions are used less frequently and other types of questioning are favoured as is observed in political debates and cultural and educational interviews (Nakajima 1997; L. Tanaka 2004; N. Tanaka 2001; Yokota 1994). In fact, the use of grammatically complete questions is explicitly avoided in many cases, as is seen in the data of the present study. This phenomenon has also been observed in informal interactions (Oshima 2001) and may be normative in the interview context.

Heritage and Roth write that "questioning handles the main interactional and institutional tasks" in news interviews (1995: 1). Thus, we can infer that the success of an interview relies on the host's interviewing skills as well as the correct interpretation of turn yielding cues by the guests. Explicit questions or other structures that 'do questioning' do not always occur in turn-end position, yet guests interpret and manage turn-taking. The research question of this paper is to try to understand how and why turn-taking occurs successfully at points of grammatical incompleteness and why interviewers seem to disprefer the use of questions in the interview. Is this phenomenon based on the tacit understanding that the interview format has a turn-type pre-allocation, or is it due to more complex factors related to the syntactic and pragmatic characteristics of the Japanese language?

This paper investigates how interviewees in Japanese television interviews recognize turn-yielding when interviewers' turns do not end in syntactically recognizable question forms. It also seeks to understand why it is that interviewers' turns overwhelmingly end in non-questioning forms. Looking at the difference in frequency

³ Out of 600 turns in British and American news interviews, 85% are questions (Clayman and Heritage 2002).

between Anglo-American and Japanese interviews, one cannot ignore the difference in the higher frequency of questions in the former and the syntactical unfinished turns in the latter. By examining interviewers' turns in semi-formal 'institutional' settings, this paper also looks into the nature of interviewing in Japanese. It is hoped that the findings in this study will be valid in a wider context due to the fact that turn organization is implicitly understood (Harre and Gillet 1994) and because turn-ending is closely connected to the theoretical question of how participants know when to take their turn.

2. Background

Turn-taking in 'institutional' settings is different to everyday conversation. A number of restrictions apply (Greatbatch 1986a, 1988; Heritage 1985; Yamada 1995) that affect not only the turn-allocation, but also other aspects of the interaction such as topic control (Drew and Heritage 1992; ten Have 1999), turn-types (ten Have 1999), or the absence of news receipts (Heritage 1985). Arguably, questions are the 'core' of interview interactions (Bilmes 1999; Button 1992; Clayman and Heritage 2002; Drew 1992; Heritage and Roth 1995; Jucker 1986), as they can be a powerful tool to control the topic and are strategically used, as attested by various studies (Button 1992; Clayman and Heritage 2002; Drew and Heritage 1992a; Gnisci and Bonaiuto 2003; Gnisci and Pontecorvo 2004; D. Maynard 1992; Macaulay 1996; ten Have 1999; Yokota 1994; Wilson 1991; Zimmerman and Boden 1991). The importance of questioning can also be observed in the growing number of studies in Conversation Analysis (CA) (Atkinson and Drew 1979; Bilmes 1999; Bull 1994; Button 1992; Clayman 1993; Clayman and Heritage 2002; Drew 1984; Greatbatch 1986b; Heritage 1995, 2002; Heritage and Roth 1995; Roth and Olsher 1997; Takagi 1999; West 1984; Yokota 1994) and other related disciplines such as discourse analysis (Gnisci and Bonaiuto 2003; Gnisci and Pontecorvo 2004; Macaulay 1996; Nylund 2003). It is fair to say that an interview's success or failure depends on the interviewer's questioning skills.

Clayman (1988, 1992, 1993) has written extensively on questions asked by interviewers and how interviewers maintain neutrality in American interviews. Similarly, Heritage (1985, 2002), Heritage and Greatbatch (1991), Greatbatch (1986a, 1986b, 1988, 1992) have written widely on news interviews' turn taking in the British media. Their work is instrumental in creating a 'niche' for the study of 'institutional' interactions within CA. One of the most important works on questions in news interviews is the work by Heritage and Roth (1995), not only because of their pioneering standing but also because it provides a framework to determine "the extent to which interviewers engage in questioning" (1995: 42). Their work begins with the identification of questions using grammar as the starting point and includes a systematic quantification of their data. They found that 62.9 percent (British news interviews) and 49.7 percent (American interviews) of interviewers' turn construction units (TCU) end in syntactic questions. However, they write that grammar is not a sufficient tool when coding interactions when questioning is accomplished by pragmatic and turn-constructural features. Similarly, grammatical interrogativity does not automatically lead into questioning such as the case of rhetorical questions. Their work is invaluable as it provides a template for similar studies, including this paper.

While a growing body of CA research on Japanese interactions has presented interesting results (on turn-taking in daily conversation see H. Tanaka (1999, 2000,

2001), on dominance and gender Itakura (2001)),⁴ there are still very few studies on ‘institutional’ language (Furo 2001; L. Tanaka 2004). Other studies take different approaches, such as the Gricean pragmatic perspective (N. Tanaka 2001) or the discourse analytical approach (Honda 2002; Yokota 1994). Furo (2001) carried out a comparative study on turn-taking in Japanese and English. She compared daily conversation and political news interviews. She writes that in Japanese political news interviews “semantic completion points are more likely to be accompanied by speaker changes than grammatical or intonational points” (2001: 140). Similarly, L. Tanaka (2004) writes that interviewer’s turn constructional units (TCU) in her study on Japanese cultural television interviews overwhelmingly occur at syntactically incomplete points. This aspect contrasts with the interviewees’ TCUs, which exceedingly show grammatical completion. Both studies, though, are case studies and despite the fact that other CA studies seem to confirm that grammar is not an essential condition for turn-yielding, more research is needed to confirm this observation. Moreover, Furo’s study does not specify any difference between interviewer and interviewee, which is a problem. Depending on the role of each participant, one expects clear differences in the interview turn-taking.

Yokota’s (1994) research is on Japanese political discourse, where questioning is used to avoid open conflict and antagonism. Moderators choose questions that have the least degree of topic and turn control, thus avoiding open confrontation (Yokota 1994). This contrasts with the Anglo-American situation where questions are sometimes used to challenge or probe the interviewee (Clayman and Heritage 2002). Yokota’s study (1994) on questioning in Japanese televised political discourse is of utmost relevance to this study. While her data are from an argumentative situation with more than two participants, her observations are very important in understanding the questioning process in Japanese. Using a television panel discussion with eight participants, she looks at the function and use of different question types in the interaction. Her study emphasizes the cultural aspect of Japanese communication where open conflict is avoided. She shows that questions are used to mitigate potential conflict in the interaction based on an analysis of broad and narrow questions, and concludes that ambiguous questions are the most frequent in the discussion, and participants use them strategically (Yokota 1994). Thus, conducive questions such as the Yes/No pattern are rare. Wh-questions that exert moderate control over topic and sequence are more common. Interestingly, questions with least control, such as the *ne* particle, are the most frequently used.

Similarly, CA research on questions and interrogativity in Japanese has, so far, not been widely published. Questions have predominantly been the interest of grammarians (Masuoka 1991; Nitta 1995; Shinzato 2002; Teramura 1982, to name a few). Studies on this topic from the discourse perspective are few, and the more relevant have focused on the non-interrogative function of questions (S. Maynard 1995; Takagi 1999). S. Maynard (1995) writes on the use of rhetorical questions in spoken and written Japanese not for information seeking purposes, but for the expression of the speaker’s feelings. On the other hand, Takagi (1999) looks at questions focusing on grammar and interaction in argumentative talk. She shows that questions can perform other functions such as challenges or accusations, and the fact that they can also be used more broadly

⁴ Itakura (2001) uses CA methodology in conjunction with discourse analysis and dialogical analysis.

(requests, offers, invitations and so on) suggests that “interrogative grammar is grammaticized in such a way that it reflects the fundamental interactional unit of [recipient-oriented action]-[response]” (Takagi 1999: 418).

Another important work on interrogativity is Oshima’s (2001) study on the use of the particle *ka*. She writes that most subjects in her study avoid using questions that end with the *ka* particle in informal conversations. Instead, statements with a final rising intonation are the most common choice. This is partly based on the syntactic structure of informal statements that do not require the addition of the particle *ka* to become an interrogative. Her study compares female and male usage, because *ka* is closely related to other sentence final particles associated with the speaker’s gender speech style. Similarly, she reports that her subjects relate the use of the particle *ka* to status differences in a similar manner to that explicated by Athanasiadou (1991). The act of asking among equals does not present any problems. However, when there is status difference the situation changes because “questioning carries a command function apart from asking for information” (Athanasiadou 1991: 119).

To sum up, studies on Japanese ‘institutional’ discourse have yielded interesting results but are still too few and not comparable because of significant differences in types of data and genre. The nature of dyadic interactions in interviews, for example, is indisputably different from political debates where turn-taking is more complex due to the number of participants and/or conflicting viewpoints. Similarly, we can expect major variations in the turn-taking characteristics of political news interviews and cultural interviews, where a more adversarial stance can be expected in the former. These differences will probably be more apparent in the interviewers’ interviewing strategies and use of questions.

In addition, studies on Japanese interrogativity in the discourse, as seen in this section, are still in an early stage. While on one hand, the existing studies demonstrate that questions have different functions, it is not very clear why people use different forms for the same function, that of asking. It is not clear, whether indeed the *ka* question is avoided in formal interactions due to its higher degree of imposition simply because there are not enough studies that confirm or deny Oshima’s (2001) claims.

Likewise, it is important to explore whether the pervasive grammatical incompleteness at turn-ends in Japanese daily conversation can also be found in ‘institutional’ discourse. The connection between form and function in Japanese colloquial interactions is still unexplored. Findings in this area can be of significance not only to CA, but also to related fields in sociolinguistics and politeness studies.

3. Data

The data in this study comprise 12 educational and cultural interviews featuring different interviewers and interviewees. Each program is on average 40 minutes long. They were recorded over a period of nine years from 1994 to 2003 and include ‘expert’⁵ interviews and cultural interviews. The ‘expert’ interviews are *Ningen Yuuyuu* (broadcast by the Japanese national broadcasting Nippon Hoosoo Kyoku or NHK), *Kenkoo* (NHK) and *ETV* (NHK). In *Ningen Yuuyuu*, people working in education, foreign aid or social work

⁵ ‘Expert’ interviews, as opposed to witness interviews, feature people who are known to possess an expertise in a particular area.

are invited to talk about their activities. *ETV* tackles contemporary issues, and guests are influential figures. *Kenkoo*, on the other hand, invites health professionals who share their expertise and give advice on a number of health topics. The cultural interviews include *Ningen mappu* (NHK) and *Sawayaka Intabyuu* (NHK) with artists, writers, or photographers as guests. The guests talk about their work and other relevant topics. The remaining interviews are from the series *Tetsuko no Heya*⁶ and feature influential people in the arts, sports, and literature, and former government officials. It should be noted that all of the interviews analyzed in this study are very harmonious and do not contain any antagonistic or aggressive exchanges. The male and female interviewers are all professional anchors or have been working in the television industry for several years.

4. The analysis: Interviewers' turn construction units (TCUs)

A detailed analysis of the interviewers' turn construction units (TCUs) based on their grammatical structure is presented in this section, beginning with a preliminary quantification process⁷. The controversy surrounding data quantification has been lively in recent years (Drummond and Hopper 1993; Schegloff 1993). CA studies that include quantification have been undertaken (Ford and Thompson 1996; Zimmerman and West 1975; West and Zimmerman 1983; West 1984), despite cautionary remarks forewarning that statistics should never replace analysis (Schegloff 1993). At present, quantification is thought to be useful in particular circumstances: a) in situations where 'interesting phenomena' are to be isolated; b) in order to 'consolidate intuitions'; c) when independent results can have indirect statistical support; and d) where a claim is related to particular psychological or social categories (Heritage 1985; Schegloff 1993; ten Have 1999). In this study, the first two cases apply; our numerical results are used only to reinforce the 'emic' analysis, as suggested by Schegloff (1993).

Figure 1 Hosts' TCUs

	Ques	SFP	UU	Overlaps	FU	Post	Pause	Interr	Others	Total
TCU	99	57	147	101	29	15	12	9	4	473
%	20.9	12	31	21	6.1	3.2	2.5	1.9	0.8	100

Ques: Questions, SFP: sentence final particles, UU: unfinished utterances

FU: finished utterances, Post: postpositions, Interr: interruptions

Among the 473 turns, only 99 or 20.9 percent end in syntactic questions. Fifty-seven turns (12%) end in the sentence final particle (SFP) *ne* that functions like tag questions. However, most turns are syntactically unfinished (UU) (147 turns – 31%), which suggests that syntactic incompleteness is more frequent than other types of turns. Given that syntactically incomplete turns comprise almost one third of the hosts' turns, we can assume that they are used strategically (Hayashi 2003; Mori 1999). It has also been

⁶ *Tetsuko no Heya* is a popular television interview series broadcast by *Asahi Terebi* (a private television station).

⁷ Although Heritage and Roth (1995) conclude that syntactic analysis of questions has limitations because it cannot satisfactorily explain turn-taking, it is, nevertheless, a useful tool and is used in the present study.

pointed out that they are used as a politeness device in Japanese (Lebra 1976; Kabaya 1993; Kindaichi 1990; N. Tanaka 2001; L. Tanaka 2004). Overlapping occurs in 101 cases (21%), and grammatically complete utterances (FU) are observed in 29 cases (6.1%). It should be pointed out again that these numbers contrast with results found in British and American interviews where more than a third of turns are syntactically complete questions. Moreover, the lower number of questions is observed across all the interviewers, which suggests that it might be a phenomenon related to the Japanese language. These differences in interviewing might be related to the difference in syntax or to pragmatic differences.

In the next sub-sections, we look at two main types of interviewers' TCUs: Turns that end in grammatical questions or directly request the interviewee for information (direct strategies) and turns that do not have interrogative syntax yet accomplish questioning and successful turn-yielding (indirect strategies). In the direct questioning group, there are canonical questions, utterances ending in rising intonation, requests and sentence final particles. In the indirect questioning group there are statements (FU), grammatically incomplete utterances (UU), postpositions and overlaps. Direct strategies included all the turns produced by interviewers that directly address the interviewee by asking a question, requesting for information, or inviting an answer with the use of a sentence final particle. Indirect strategies comprise all instances of statements and grammatically incomplete turns. Overlaps were analyzed separately because their occurrence involves a number of issues related to turn-yielding.

4.1. Direct strategies

4.1.1. Questions

In the present study, grammatically complete questions in the data comprised Wh-questions⁸ and Yes/No questions⁹. The projectability of a question in Japanese is delayed in cases of Yes/No questions, as listeners do not know until the end of a turn whether the turn will end with a question. This is because in Japanese there is no process whereby constituents are moved or auxiliaries added, as in other languages such as

⁸ The canonical Japanese question is realized by the addition of the question particle *ka* at the end of the utterance and by the final rising intonation. The following example is a Wh-question that contains the question word 'how/what kind'. Naturally, other question words such as 'who, where, why' fall into this category.

(i) (FM2)

1 H5: *sono* *toki* *dooiu* *inshoo* *deshita* *ka?*
 that time what-kind impression COP-PAST Q

'H.5: What was your impression then?'

⁹ The next example shows a Yes/No question formatted with an additional complementizer *n*, which is used in questions and answers or explanations. It provides an account of events in a more explanatory way.

(ii) (FF1-1)

1 H: *de* *sore* *mo,* *mo* *kawaisoona* *kawaisoona onna*
 and that too well poor poor woman

2 *no egakikata* *datta* *n* *desu* *ka?*
 of depiction-way COP-PAST COM COP Q

'H1: And, also that, would you also say, that (the Japanese) women were depicted as really poor and wretched?'

In a similar manner to when hosts start the interview proper with a question, new topics are introduced with a syntactic question. Example (2) is one in which we see how a new topic is introduced by the host in lines 5–8. In lines 1–4 the guest explains her motivation to continue working for her organization. Then the host asks her about the activities she has started working on.

(3)									
<i>1H:</i>	<i>aa,</i>	<i>(hai.)</i>	<i>soo</i>	<i>desu</i>	<i>ka.</i>	<i>(hai.)</i>	<i>kokoro</i>	<i>suicchi</i>	<i>o</i>
	oo	yes	yes	COP	Q	yes	heart	switch	DO
 2									
	<i>kiranaide kudasai</i>	<i>tte</i>	<i>(hai.)</i>	<i>nee/</i>	<i>wakarimashita.</i>		<i>kyoo</i>		
	cut-NEG please	Qt	yes	FP	understand-PAST		today		

3	<i>saigooni</i> lastly	<i>sono</i> that	<i>kotoba</i> word	<i>o</i> DO	<i>ne/</i> FP	<i>watashitachi</i> we	<i>mo</i> also
4	<i>koo</i> well	<i>mune</i> heart	<i>ni</i> in	<i>itadaite,</i> receive	<i>ee</i> uhm	<i>ohanashi</i> talk	<i>owaritai</i> finish-DES
5→	<i>to</i> Qt	<i>omoimasu.</i> think	<i>hontooni</i> really	<i>Osawa</i> Osawa	<i>san</i> T	<i>arigatoo</i> thank you	
6	<i>gozaimashita. ((bowing))</i> very-much						
7 G:	<i>arigatoo gozaimashita. ((bowing))</i> thank-you-very-much						

'H: Oh, (yes), is it so? (yes) we should not turn off the switch of our hearts (yes), that is your message, (yes) isn't it? We understand. Today's last words, we will remember them and I would like to finish the talk. Really, Ms Osawa, thank you very much ((bowing)).'

G: Thank you very much ((bowing)).'

According to their format, questions can be used to facilitate a particular stance in the interview. Clayman and Heritage (2002) describe three features that characterize interviewers' questions; they "establish a particular agenda for interviewee responses...that they embody presuppositions about the subject...and they are designed to invite or favor one type of answer" (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 192). For example, Yes/No questions limit the possibilities of the next turn and are regarded as more controlling than Wh-questions, which give addressees a wider choice in their answers (Yokota 1994). Yokota (1994) writes that the use of different types of questions is strategic in avoiding overt control in Japanese argumentative discourse. For example, she reports that Yes/No questions are seldom found in televised political discourse, and that other strategies are used instead, such as the SFP *ne*.

Similarly, 'negative' questions are also reported to be conducive in the interview context when interviewers wish to project expected answers (Heritage 2002). Criticism is embedded in this type of questioning and a particular answer from the interviewee is expected. 'Negative' answers in Japanese show agreement or denial towards what the speaker asked, not towards the prepositional content of the question. In this respect, 'negative' questions are more face-threatening than ordinary Yes/No questions, as answers can show open disagreement with the speaker (Yokota 1994).

Due to the nature of these interviews where cultural topics are discussed, there were extremely few instances of 'negative' questions or Yes/No questions. When used, they indicated some kind of 'trouble', as is seen in the following two excerpts. The first one shows a number of places for potential TRPs (indicated by the ↑ arrow) that are all ignored by the guest, who is a writer. The host starts her turn with the word *sorenishitemo* 'admitting that nevertheless, even though', which is followed by a filler *maa* and the clause *juurokunenkan* 'during 16 years'. The guest sends her *aizuchi*¹⁰ but does not take the floor, despite the host's pause in line 2. Another missed TRP can be seen after the question word *darenimo* 'to anyone', which projects that a question is going to follow. In other similar cases where a question word is uttered, guests invariably

¹⁰ In this study, *aizuchi* is the term used for listeners' response vocalizations known as minimal responses, backchannels, acknowledgements or news receipts.

take their turn even if the host's turn is not syntactically finished. It is even more obvious because the format of the question following *darenimo* requires the verb in the negative form; however, the host changes it into an affirmative question *misete wa irasshitan desu ka* 'were you showing it (to someone)'. Again, this is a conducive question where the host expects the guest to name a person who had read her manuscripts; however, we see the opposite result. The guest says that she did not show her work to anyone (for criticism).

(4) FF.2

1H:→	<i>demo.</i> but	<i>sorenishitemo</i> however	<i>(hai.)</i> yes	<i>ma=↑</i> well	<i>juurokunen</i> 16-years	<i>kan</i> during	
2→	<i>(hai.)...↑</i> yes	<i>shinjinshoo</i> Shinjin-Prize	<i>morau</i> receive	<i>made</i> until	<i>kotsukotsu</i> ONMT	<i>kotsukotsu,</i> ONMT	
4→	<i>darenimo..↑</i> to-no-one	<i>misete</i> show	<i>wa</i> TOP	<i>irashita</i> be-HON-PAST	<i>n</i> COM	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ka?</i> Q
5G:	<i>iya</i> No	<i>daremo</i> no-one	<i>miseru</i> show	<i>hito</i> person	<i>imasen.</i> be-NEG		
6H:	<i>misenaide.</i> Show-NEG	<i>(hai.)...↑</i> yes	<i>naze</i> why	<i>sonnani</i> that-much	<i>kaketa</i> write-PAST	<i>n</i> COM	<i>desu</i> COP
7	<i>ka?(@@)</i> Q						

'H: But, however (yes), well, during 16 years (yes) until you received the Shinjin Prize, (you worked continuously) didn't you or did you show it to someone?

G: No, there wasn't anyone I could show to (my writings).

H: Without showing to anyone (yes)....Why is it that you could write so much?

We see that line 5 is a short turn and sounds rather abrupt. The guest does not use mollifiers which usually accompany dispreferred answers. In line 6, the host echoes her guest's word, *misenaide* 'without showing', which functions as a confirmation of the previous statement. This is acknowledged by the guest, who gives an *aizuchi* that also appears in turn-initial position. However, it is followed by a pause, which indicates that neither participant is willing to take the floor. It is only after this that the host sends a canonical question, as is seen in lines 5–6.

In example (4), it appears that the host uses questions as a last recourse. Similarly, in (5), we see a very high number of missed TRPs, as indicated by the arrows. In line 2, the SFP *ne* invites the hearer to agree and is a potential TRP. In line 4, we can speculate that the context of the statement is too broad. The host says that the organization is already ten years old and there is a pause after the guest's *hai* 'yes', which can function as an *aizuchi* or can be used at the beginning of a turn. *Hai*, in contrast to *ee*, has been reported as preceding immediate action (McGloin 1998) and as "willingness to take current (or future) interactional obligations" (McGloin 1998: 115). Given that the guest sends *hai* on three occasions and there are right after TRPs, it is puzzling that the guest does not take her turn. It is after the third *hai* that the host finishes his turn with a canonical question in line 6.

(5)

1H:	<i>maemuki desu</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>ne/</i>	<i>sono</i>	<i>[hoo</i>	<i>ga]</i>	<i>[(soo</i>	<i>desu</i>
	<i>optimist COP</i>	<i>FP</i>	<i>FP</i>	<i>that</i>	<i>way</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>that</i>	<i>COP</i>
2 →	<i>ne.) tashikani</i>	<i>ne/↑</i>	<i>(hai.)</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>sono</i>	<i>pupoppu</i>	<i>suteeshoon</i>	
	<i>FP definitely</i>	<i>FP</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>and</i>	<i>that</i>	<i>Puoppo</i>	<i>station</i>	
3	<i>no jiggyoo</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>sutaatoshite,</i>	<i>moo</i>	<i>juunen</i>		<i>ni</i>	<i>of</i>
	<i>organization S</i>	<i>start-CONJ</i>	<i>already</i>	<i>10-year</i>		<i>to</i>		
4 →	<i>naru</i>	<i>soo desu</i>	<i>kedomo, ↑</i>	<i>(hai.)..↑somosomo</i>	<i>kono</i>	<i>jiggyoo</i>		
	<i>become hear COP</i>	<i>but</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>initially</i>	<i>this</i>	<i>organization</i>		
5 →	<i>o hajimeyoo</i>	<i>to ↑</i>	<i>(hai.)</i>	<i>omowareta</i>	<i>tte iu</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>wa</i>	
	<i>DO start-HORT</i>	<i>Qt</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>think-HON-PAST</i>	<i>Qt say</i>	<i>COM</i>	<i>TOP</i>	
6	<i>kore</i>	<i>douiu</i>	<i>tokoro</i>	<i>kara</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>desu</i>	<i>ka?</i>
	<i>this</i>	<i>what-type</i>	<i>place</i>	<i>from</i>	<i>COP</i>	<i>COM</i>	<i>COP</i>	<i>Q</i>

‘H: That way is more positive (**yes, surely**) definitely (**yes**) and it is 10 years already since your organization was founded but (**yes**)....initially, what was the thought behind (**yes**) when you started?’

4.1.2. The explanatory ‘n’

In Japanese, the particle *no* is used when the participants “recognize a situation, and they try to understand it or they want the listener to understand it” (Teramura 1982: 309). This particle follows plain forms of verbs, adjectives and nouns and appends an additional pragmatic meaning to the sentence or question. A question which contains *no* or the shortened form *n* assumes that the speaker and hearer share the same information (Makino et al. 1992). There are cases in which the use of a question without the explanatory *n* would be pragmatically incorrect. However, this *n* is used when shared information is non-existent. In these cases, the speaker wants to appeal to the hearer, and in this way attain a more personal communicative exchange. Syntactically complete questions found in the present study are overwhelmingly accompanied by this explanatory *n*. The next example (6) shows one such question. The host asks her guest where he had studied bibliography (a rather uncommon field of study). In line 2, we can observe the *n* added to the honorific verb in the past tense. By adding the *n*, the host conveys an additional sense of interest in the exchange and, in doing so, invites the hearer to participate in a similar fashion.

(6) (M10)

1 H:	<i>sooiu</i>	<i>benkyoo</i>	<i>doko</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>nassatta</i>
	<i>that-type</i>	<i>study</i>	<i>where</i>	<i>LOC</i>	<i>do-HON-PAST</i>
2 →	<i>n</i>	<i>desu</i>	<i>ka?</i>		
	<i>COM</i>	<i>COP</i>	<i>Q</i>		

‘H: Where did you study (can you tell us)?’

The same question could have been formulated in the canonical format:

(6a)

<i>Souiu</i>	<i>benkyoo</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>doko</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>nasaimashita</i>	<i>ka?</i>
That-type	study	TOP	where	LOC	do-HON-PAST	Q

Even though both questions contain the same semantic content, there is a pragmatic difference between them. While question (6a) is simply an inquiry about the facts, (6) has an additional meaning. It appeals for the listener's participation and demonstrates the questioner's interest. Questions of the type shown in (6a) are rarely found in informal speech or between intimate friends (Oshima 2001). It should be noted that both the explanatory *n* and the SFP *ne* elicit the listener's involvement in the interaction; in that way they create a more intimate and cooperative environment. In this sense, we can say that these two linguistic devices facilitate the questioning process without the risk of being too straightforward; they thus avoid face threatening acts (FTAs).

4.1.3. Tag-like phenomena

Tag questions in Japanese are characterized by the use of sentence final particles (SFP) such as *ne* or *deshoo* (the copula *desu* in the hortative case). Both are often accompanied by rising intonation. SFPs, as opposed to grammatical particles, do not have any syntactic function; however, they are important pragmatic elements in the spoken discourse. They add an additional meaning to the utterance, such as the speaker's point of view and/or an "additional hint of what (the speaker) is saying: Doubt, conviction, caution, inquiry, confirmation or request of confirmation" (Martin 1975: 914). In conversations, SFPs occur in turn-initial, turn-middle and turn-final position (S. Maynard 1989; H. Tanaka 2000). Generally, SFPs have been seen as having a diversity of pragmatic meanings and as being multi-functional markers in the discourse (Cook 1990; S. Maynard 1989; H. Tanaka 2000; White 1989). Despite the variety of SFPs, the only particles found in the present data are *ne*, *no*, *kashira*, *wa* and *yo*. *Ne* is the particle with the highest frequency and occurs in different turn positions. The limited type of SFPs used in the interviews is an indication of the formality of the television interview context and its 'institutional' nature.

Traditional grammarians do not consider *ne* as a category of questions (Masuoka et al. 1997). Nor does a general consensus exist on their varied functions in discourse. However, scholars who have considered these particles as important tools in communication agree that the particle *ne* is used to confirm information (Nakada 1980; Nitta 1995). Nitta (1995) writes that *ne* is used to get the hearer's confirmation on a matter that is known to both (speaker and listener) but not to obtain unknown information (Nitta 1995). However, *ne* is a multifunctional particle, as speakers can use *ne* even in the absence of a preceding statement with a propositional or information content (Cook 1990; H. Tanaka 2000). Moreover, the SFP *ne* appeals more for an 'affective' response from the listener, than for the propositional content of the statement (Cook 1990). In this aspect, it functions very differently to a question, whose main function is to inquire about unknown information. Kamio (1994) explains the usage of *ne* in terms of how much information is shared between the speaker and the listener. He argues that the use of *ne* is possible only when the information is highly accessible or

predictable. On the other hand, Nakada (1980), who uses the term tag-like phenomena (the term adopted in this study), compares *ne* to the English tag question. The reluctance to use an equal term for Japanese is explained in terms of its difference not only in structure but also, most importantly, in its function.

Although *ne* is an extremely versatile particle that appears in turn-initial, turn-middle and turn-end position, this study concentrates on cases where it occurs turn-finally. When *ne* occurs in turn-final position, it invites speaker-change and a “supportive action in the next turn” (H. Tanaka 2000: 1171). The use of the SFP *ne*, however, does not warrant an automatic response, even though it might be accompanied by rising intonation thus creating a possible TRP. In the next excerpt, there are two occasions when the host uses *ne* (indicated by the ↑). In both cases, *ne* is accompanied by rising intonation, inviting the guest to either continue talking or to provide additional comments. However, on both occasions no turn-taking occurs. In addition, one more potential TRP is missed in line 5. Prior to this excerpt, the guest explains how gratifying it is to see the response of people they are helping. She says that they are more appreciative after they learn that ordinary people have donated the money. The host’s turn in lines 1 and 2 is very interesting because it starts with a monosyllable *un* followed by the guest’s *aizuchi*. There are two occurrences of *ne*, the first followed by two consecutive *aizuchi*; however the second *ne*, which is pronounced with vowel lengthening and rising intonation, is not followed by a response. The host’s comment in lines 1–2 followed by the use of *ne* is not a request for information; rather it is an affective display of empathy. Even though hosts conduct some research about their guests, it is not possible to say that both share the same information. The host can only ‘imagine’ the feelings the guest has experienced, and in this way the use of *ne* proves to be more versatile than requesting or agreeing (Kamio 1994; Nakada 1980; Yokota 1994).

(7) MF2. Yy-44

1 H:	<i>uhn.</i> yeah	<i>(hai.)</i> yes	<i>sono</i> that	<i>yorokobu</i> happy	<i>kao</i> face	<i>(hai.)</i> yes	<i>miruto</i> see-COND	<i>hontooni</i> really
2→	<i>[ureshii</i> happy	<i>deshoo]</i> COP-HORT		<i>ne/↑</i> FP	<i>[(soo</i> yes	<i>desu.]</i> COP	<i>hai.</i> yes	<i>hai.)</i> yes
3	<i>soo</i> yes	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ka.</i> Q	<i>maa</i> well	<i>iroiro</i> various	<i>hontooni</i> really	<i>NGO</i> NGO	<i>de</i> in
4	<i>katsudoo</i> activity	<i>suru</i> do	<i>sono</i> that	<i>genba</i> place	<i>no</i> of	<i>hanashi</i> story	<i>kikimashita.sooshita sono</i> hear-PASTthat-type that	
5→	<i>enjoo</i> help	<i>katsudoo</i> activity	<i>o</i> DO	<i>tsuzukeru</i> continue	<i>NGO,</i> NGO	<i>(hai.)</i> yes	<i>.. ↑</i>	<i>korekara,</i> from-now-on
6	<i>donna</i> what-type	<i>yaku[wari]</i> role	<i>[(hai.)]</i> yes	<i>(hai.)</i> yes	<i>ga</i> S	<i>kitaisareteiru</i> expect-PASS	<i>to</i> Q	<i>(hai.)</i> yes
7→	<i>omou n</i> think COM	<i>desu</i>	<i>ka?</i> COP	<i>Q</i>				

‘H: Uhm (yes), it must be really rewarding (yes) to see such a happy face, [isn’t it]?
 [(yes, yes. It is.)] Really. Is it so? Well, you have written about the various NGO activities. Those
 continuing NGO activities (yes) from now on, what kind of [roles] [(yes. yes)] do you think
 (yes) are expected?’

On the other hand, *ne* in turn-final position can function as a ‘request’ for agreement when there is some shared information, as exemplified below:

(8) (Yy. MF.1)

1 G:	<i>hai.</i> yes	<i>nihon</i> Japan	<i>ni</i> LOC	<i>mo,</i> also	<i>tokuni</i> especially	<i>ano,</i> uhm	<i>indoshina/o</i> Indochina DO	(uhn.) uhm
2	<i>chuushinni</i> mainly		<i>nanmin</i> refugees	<i>no</i> of	<i>kata</i> person	<i>ga</i> S	<i>oraremashte,</i> be-CONJ	<i>anoo</i> well
3	<i>sooiu</i> that-type	<i>katatachino</i> form	<i>of</i>	<i>shingaku</i> study		<i>no</i> of	<i>otetsudai o</i> help DO	<i>shitari,</i> do-CONJ
4	<i>shoogakkin</i> scholarship		<i>o</i> DO	<i>odashishitari,</i> give-HUMB-CONJ	<i>e.</i> uhm	<i>sorekara</i> then		<i>ano,</i> well
5	<i>natsu</i> summer	<i>ni</i> in	<i>wa</i> TOP	<i>minasan</i> everybody	<i>to</i> with	<i>isshoni</i> together	<i>gasshuku ni</i> camp to	
6	<i>ittari</i> go-CONJ	<i>toka</i> like	<i>shite</i> do-CONJ	(uhn.) uhm	<i>imasu.</i> be-PRE	<i>Hai.</i> yes		
7H: →	<i>soshite,</i> and	<i>afuganisutan</i> Afghanistan		(hai.) yes	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ne/</i> FP		
8 G:	<i>hai.</i> yes	<i>ano-</i> well	<i>afuganisutan</i> Afghanistan	<i>no</i> of	<i>baai</i> situation	<i>atashitachi</i> we	<i>ano-</i> well	
9	<i>jirai</i> land-mine	<i>no</i> of	<i>jokyoo</i> removing	<i>no</i> of	<i>shien</i> help	<i>o</i> DO	<i>kyuujukyuuunen</i> 1990	
10	<i>karashite-orimasu. ((continues))</i> do-HUMB-PRE							

‘G: Yes, also in Japan and in Indochina **(uh-huh)** there are many refugees, and we help them to continue studying by providing scholarships. And in summer we do things like going to camp **(uh-huh)**. Yes.

H: And in Afghanistan, **(yes)**, isn’t it?

G: Yes, well in Afghanistan’s situation, we have been helping since 1999 in the removal of mines. **((continues))**.’

Example (8) is from the same interview with a volunteer working for an NGO. In lines 1–6, she talks about the activities of the organization in Japan and Indochina. Line 7 is the comment by the host, which ends with the SFP *ne*. In this case, both participants share the same information; the host knows that the organization also works in Afghanistan. The turn-final *ne* is used as a request for confirmation, as we see in the following guest’s turn, in which she provides a detailed account of the organization’s activities in that part of the world. The use of this SFP is also a very efficient communication tool because there is no need for the host to utter a whole question.

It has been argued that intonation determines the function and meaning of SFPs (Cook 1990). In general, rising intonation indicates an active appeal for the listener’s agreement or cooperation. However, the next example shows that intonation is not

necessarily obligatory to fulfill a questioning function. The topic is a flying-squirrel that glides from tree to tree. In line 1 of (9), the guest says that this animal flies. Note that there is a sequence of the SFPs *yo+ne* with flat intonation and a very short pause that is interpreted as a TRP by the host, as is seen in the short overlap (line 2). The host's turn, on the other hand, is an indirect request for a detailed explanation because of the unusual nature of the animal. Note that there is one verb in Japanese for glide and fly, which is *tobu*. Conversely, the first *ne* (line 3) produced by the host does not follow a complete piece of information, so we can infer that the host uses *ne* in this case solely as a request for acknowledgement. This particular function of *ne* can be translated as 'are you with me?' or 'are you listening?' and is acknowledged by the guest's *aizuchi*. However, the second *ne* (line 4) follows a propositional content that expects the agreement of the guest, even though there is no rising intonation. We can infer that, due to the finalized syntactic structure of the turn, the guest interprets it as a turn-yielding cue and starts his turn.

(9) (FM.2)

1 G:	<i>de</i> and	<i>ko=</i> well	<i>sak- befo-</i>	<i>ano=</i> uhm	<i>saishou ni</i> beginning in	<i>iimashita youni,</i> say-PASTlike					
2	<i>tobimasu</i> fly-PRE	<i>yo</i>	<i>ne..</i> FP	<i>[ano- FP</i>	uhm						
3H:	<i>[sono]</i> that	<i>tobu</i> fly	<i>tte</i> Qt	<i>iu</i> say	<i>no</i> NOM	<i>ga</i> S	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ne/</i> FP	(hai.) yes		
4	<i>sugoi</i> really	<i>tobu</i> fly	<i>n</i> COM	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>yo</i> FP	<i>ne.</i> FP					
5 G:	<i>tobu</i> fly	<i>n</i> COM	<i>desu.</i> COP	<i>atashi</i> I	<i>ga=</i> S	<i>juusannenkande</i> 13-years-during	<i>mita</i> see-PAST				
6	<i>no</i> NOM	<i>ga</i> S	<i>saikou</i> maximum	<i>wa=</i> TOP	<i>hyakugojuumeetoru.</i> 150-meters			<i>momonga</i> flying-squirrel			
7	<i>no</i> of	<i>kihontekin</i> basically		<i>hikou</i> flying	<i>nouryoku tte</i> capacity Qt	<i>no</i> NOM	<i>wa,</i> TOP	<i>atashi</i> I			
8	<i>wa/</i> TOP	<i>ano,</i> well	<i>naganen</i> many-years		<i>mitemashite\</i> see-PAST-CONJ	(eh.) uh-huh	<i>efujuugo</i> F-15				
9	<i>no</i> of	<i>jetto</i> jet	<i>sentouki</i> fighter-plane		<i>nami</i> like	<i>da to</i> COP Qt	<i>omottemasu</i> think-PRE		((continues))		

'G: And, well, befo-, well as I said before, it glides, doesn't it? [Uhm]

H: [That] glides, you see. **(uhm)** It really glides, doesn't it.

G: It does glide.'

The SFP *ne* is used strategically by hosts (and guests), as is shown in the illustrations from the data. Therefore, it can be argued that it replaces the canonical question because it accomplishes the same purpose. In addition, *ne* seeks agreement rather than demands information, and in that sense it constrains the content of the next turn. However, unlike Wh-questions or Yes/No questions, which ask for information and where the weight is in the propositional content, *ne* appeals to the listeners' feelings (Yokota 1994).

4.1.4. Echo questions

Echo questions are repetition of words or phrases that need some clarification. In many respects, this is a strategy that takes the audience into account. The repeated word or words are usually accompanied by rising intonation. The following excerpt is an interview with a guest who works for an organization that provides jobs for the disabled. The guest explains about the philosophy behind her work, stating that she wants them (the disabled) to regain their pride as members of society. In line 3, the host repeats the word *hokori* 'pride', which is also the homonym of the word 'dust'. Although we can assume from the context that the risk of misunderstanding was minimal, the phrase in itself is very vague. The guest interprets line 3 as a question or request to clarify the word by providing a full explanation in subsequent lines.

(10) (MF2)

1G:	<i>hokoritorimodoshi</i> pride-regain		<i>undoo</i> movement	<i>tte</i> Qt		<@@watashi> I	<i>yoku</i> often	
2	<i>itteru</i> say-PRE	<i>n</i> COM	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>keredomo</i> but	<i>ne/</i> FP			
3H:→	<i>hokori/</i> pride							
4G:	<i>hokori</i> pride	<i>o</i> DO	<i>torimodosu</i> regain		<i>undoo</i> movement	(<i>e.</i>) yeah	<i>tte</i> Qt	<i>itteru</i> say-PRE
5	<i>n</i> COM	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ga.</i> but	(<i>hai.</i>) yes	<i>maa</i> well	<i>katsudoo</i> movement of	<i>no</i>	
6	<i>kyatchi fureezu</i> catch-phrase		<i>o</i> DO	(<i>uhn.</i>) yes	<i>harenjiddo</i> challenged	<i>ga</i> S	<i>noozeisha</i> tax-payer	
7	<i>ni to</i> to Qt	<i>iu</i> say	<i>charenjiddo</i> challenged		<i>o</i> DO	<i>noozeisha</i> tax-payers	<i>ni</i> to	<i>dekiru</i> able
8	<i>mihon</i> example	<i>to</i> Qt	<i>iu,</i> say	<i>taihen</i> very	<i>shigekitekina</i> exciting	<i>kyachhifureezu</i> catch-phrase	<i>o</i> DO	(<i>heee</i>) really
9	<i>kakagesaseteitaite</i> hoist-allow-CONJ		(<i>HO</i>) wow	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ne/</i> FP			

'G: I often say that it is a pride-regaining movement, but you see

H: Pride/

G: I call it the pride-regaining movement, (**yes**) but, well, I use the very exciting catch-phrase (**really**) of the (**uh-huh**) challenged, in that it is a model example of how the challenged (disabled) can become taxpayers.'

4.1.5. Requests

Hosts also use requests as information eliciting devices, as in the following two examples. Requests in Japanese can be formed by the addition of verbs of giving and

receiving (*itadaku* and *morau* respectively) in the present tense or in the potential form, which is a more polite option. When the request is addressed directly to someone, it is followed by the formal structure shown in the example (11) where the *ka* particle is added. This extract follows (10) where the guest explained about the motto or catch-phrase of her organization, but did not provide complete information about what she had been asked. In lines 1 and 2 in (11), the host uses the very polite form *ohanashi+itadakemasu+ka* ‘talk+receive+ka’, a very formal way of requesting someone to talk. The host uses the most polite form of the verb ‘to give’ *itadaku*. This is in the potential form *itadakemasu*. As is the case in other languages, the use of the potential or subjunctive form increases the level of formality and politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987).

(11)(yy.MF2)

1H:	<i>sono</i> that	<i>(e.)</i> uhn	<i>okangae</i> thought	<i>(hai.)</i> yes	<i>chotto</i> little	<i>moo</i> more	<i>sukoshi</i> little	<i>ohanashi</i> talk
2	<i>itadakemasu</i> receive-POT	<i>ka?</i> Q						
3G:	<i>eh.</i> yes	<i>ano</i> well	<i>kono</i> this	<i>noozeisha</i> taxpayers	<i>charenjiddo</i> challenged	<i>noozeisha tte</i> taxpayers Qt		
4	<i>iu</i> say	<i>kotoba</i> word	<i>jishin</i> itself	<i>wa</i> TOP	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ne</i> FP	<i>(hai.)</i> yes	<i>watashi ga</i> I S
5	<i>hajime</i> first	<i>no</i> of	<i>((continues))</i>					

‘H: That (yes) thought (yes), could you talk more about it?’

G: Yes, the words ‘challenged tax-payers’ themselves (yes), I am not the first one to ((continues)).’

Indirect requests are reported to be a strategy to mask the power of the questioner (Athanasiadou 1991). In television interviews, power is restricted to the interaction and the status of the participants may not reflect the world outside the interview. The fact that the interviewer in example (11) uses every strategy to soften his request (honorific choice, potential form) is an indication of such action. Athanasiadou further writes that indirect requests “leave the initiative with the respondent” (1991: 110) because he/she can choose and thus is placed at an advantage.

In these five sections, we have seen strategies used by interviewers in Japanese television interviews that directly ask the interviewee. Not all the turns in this section fit the description of a canonical question (some end with the *ne* particle, others are incomplete questions, for example echo questions) but they function in similar ways. Their ending is accompanied either by grammatical completion or by rising intonation unmistakably indicating turn-yielding to the interviewee.

4.2. Indirect strategies

In the present section, indirect strategies are explored within the context of turn-taking. They include turns that contain statements, grammatically unfinished turns (UU) and

postpositions. Within the UU, turn-taking occurs right after grammatical particles, quotative and conjunctive particles. The turn-ends in this study do not show turn-yielding cues that indicate turn-taking, such as grammatical or intonational features. It is of particular interest to investigate turn-taking at this point, as the literature indicates that this phenomenon has been observed in both conversational Japanese (H. Tanaka, 1999, 2001; Mori, 1999) and in television interviews (Furo 2001; L. Tanaka 2004).

4.2.1. Syntactically complete TCUs

Even though less common, declaratives are also used by hosts as information eliciting devices. These have been termed ‘B-events’ (Labov and Fenshel 1977; Pomerantz 1980) and are “declarative utterances in which the speaker formulates some matter as one to which the recipient has primary access” (Heritage and Roth 1995: 10). This type of utterance can be illustrated with the next example from the interview with a university professor (see example (6)), which functions as a question seeking information (Clayman and Heritage 2002). The professor has worked in several libraries compiling and collecting information related to Japanese studies. The host uses the hearsay expression ‘*soodegozaimasu*’ without specifying the source of information. In line 3, the guest takes over and stresses that he typed all the seventy-five thousand letters and elaborates on that process.

(12)(M9)

1H:	<i>waapuro</i> word-processor	<i>de</i> with	<i>ouchininarimashite, nanajugoman</i> type-HON-CONJ 75,000			
2	<i>ji.</i> letter	<i>ouchininatta</i> type-HON-PAST	<i>soo</i> hear	<i>degozaimasu.</i> COP-POL		
3G:	<i>hai.</i> yes	<i>jibun</i> myself	<i>de</i> by	<i>uchimashita</i> type-PAST	<i>mon</i> COM	<i>de #...</i> CONJ

‘H: (He / you) typed 75,000 letters in a word processor.

G: Yes. I typed them myself and...’

Declaratives are sometimes third party attributed statements; Clayman and Heritage (2002) report that a third of the declaratives in their data are in this category. As is observed in (12), the host does not provide the source of her information, a practice related to maintaining neutrality in the interview (Clayman and Heritage 2002). However, the interviews in the present data do not deal with any controversial topics and the hosts do not have to negotiate criticism or to challenge their guests, as is often the case in news interviews. The objective in cultural and educational interviews is solely to relay information to the audience. In that respect, we can assume that the choice of grammatically finished utterances by the host is a strategy to attract the audience, and is less a turn addressed to the guest.

4.2.2. Syntactically unfinished TCUs

It appears that syntactic completion is not a requisite for turn-taking in conversational Japanese (Hayashi 2003; Mori 1999; H. Tanaka 1999, 2001). Interestingly, this characteristic is also observed in the interview context despite the fact that one would expect a greater number of complete questions among the hosts' turns (N. Tanaka 2001; L. Tanaka 2004). Syntactic incompleteness is found in almost one third of the hosts' TCUs and, as attested by a number of other studies (Mori 1999; H. Tanaka 1999, 2001), the relatively free order of constituents in Japanese and its turn 'incremental' nature might explain the low number of grammatically finished turns. This section looks at these points in more detail.

Research suggests that turn-taking in Japanese does not necessarily occur at syntactic completion points and, in fact it, appears that the majority of turn-yielding points occur at semantically (Furo 2001) or pragmatically complete points (H. Tanaka 1999). Turns have been described as being 'incremental' (Hayashi 2003; H. Tanaka 1999) and explained in terms of the Japanese syntactic structure in which word order allows subsequent additions of case or adverbial phrases. In contrast to the English language, where syntax can help project the type of a turn, Japanese turn 'increments' can change the type of a turn, thus delaying projectability (Hayashi 2003; Fox, Hayashi and Jaspersen 1996; H. Tanaka 1999). Turn 'increments' are not restricted to conversational Japanese, but are also observed in the media interview context as illustrated in the following example. The extract is from an interview with a famous writer who was in Manchuria during World War II. It was an experience that profoundly affected her life and her writing. The host asks her guest to explain the reasons why she had gone to China. Note that even though the host does not use a syntactically complete question, the guest elaborates on that topic. There are two missed Transition Relevance Places (TRPs) indicated by the two arrows: After the rising intonation following the last grammatical particle *Manchu e wa* 'to Manchuria' in line 1 and after a brief pause in line 2. A noun phrase ending in a grammatical particle and rising intonation can function as a question (H. Tanaka 1999). However, in this example, the TRP is missed despite the word *somosomo* 'to begin with' at the start of the turn, which foretells the content of the host's intended question. The host expands her turn with the addition of noun phrases, *goshujinsama ga* 'your husband', *sono tooji* 'that time' and the overlapped modifier clause *shoogakkoo no sensei* 'primary school teacher'. Without waiting for the host to finish her turn, the guest begins an account on her trip to Manchuria. This is an indication that the guest anticipated a question based on the semantic content of the host's turn.

(13) (FF.2)

1H:→	<i>ano=</i> uhm	<i>somosomo</i> to-begin-with	<i>Manshu</i> Manchuria	<i>e</i> to	<i>wa/↑</i> TOP	<i>eeto=</i> uhm
2→	<i>goshujinsama ga...↑ (hai.)</i> your-husband S yes	<i>sono</i> that	<i>tooji</i> time	<i>sore</i> that	<i>[shoogakkoo</i> primary-school	<i>no</i> of
3	<i>sensei]</i> teacher					
4 G:	<i>[ano=</i> well	<i>shoogakkoo</i> primary-school	<i>no</i> of	<i>kyooshi</i> teacher	<i>degozaimashita</i> COP-POL-PAST	<i>node</i> because

((continues))

H: Well-, to begin with, (you went) to Manchuria? Uhm. your husband... (yes) at that time that [he (was) a primary school teacher]

Y: [Well], because he was a primary school teacher ((continues)).'

As in this example, guests do not necessarily wait for a grammatical completion to start their turn. Note that in example (13) the turn initial word *somosomo* and the following NP *Manchu e wa* indicates that the host wants to know why the guest had gone to Manchuria. However, the introduction of a new noun phrase *goshujinsama ga* delays the projectability of the turn, because *goshujinsama* is a new semantic entity. In this context, projectability of the turn is facilitated by turn-type pre-allocation, which ensures that guests interpret hosts' turns as doing 'questioning'. In other words, it can be argued that due to the expectation that hosts ask questions and guests answer them, participants act on some kind of 'anticipated' moves according to the roles they are performing.

A similar 'increment' is seen in (14). The guest is a photographer and here they talk about a photograph of an animal that is being shown to the audience. Questioning could have been accomplished successfully after the rising intonation that follows the particle *wa* in line 1. However, the host continues talking after the guest's *aizuchi*. The host's turn ends in a question marked with the complementizer *wake*, which stresses the 'reason' or the 'explanation' for the missing information.

(14)FM2-1)

1H:	<i>kono</i> this	<i>ezoe</i> Ezoe	<i>momonga</i> flying-squirrel	<i>to</i> Qt	<i>no</i> of	<i>deai</i> encounter	<i>tte</i> Qt	<i>iu</i> say
2	<i>no</i> COM	<i>wa/↑</i> TOP	<i>(hai.)</i> Yes	<i>saisho</i> beginning from	<i>kkara</i>	<i>atta</i> be-PAST	<i>wake</i> COM	
3	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ka?</i> Q						

H: The encounter with this Ezoe flying-squirrel, (yes) did it happen at the beginning (of your career)?'

Grammatical particles at Turn-ends

On many occasions, a grammatical particle with rising intonation is enough to elicit talk because it can function as a question (Nitta 1995), as is illustrated in the next example. The guest, a university professor, talks about a famous nineteenth century English diplomat who was also a Japanese specialist. Because his family name is phonetically identical to a common Japanese surname, the host wants to clarify if both names are spelled in exactly the same way. In this extract, the host asks for the spelling of the name without elaborating a question. Note that the turn includes only the name Satow, the quotation particle *tte*, the noun *saigo* 'last' and the locative particle *ni*. By inference from the context, it is logical to conclude that the host wants to know the spelling of the name even though no specific reference is made to the verb *kaku* 'to write'.

(15) (M9)

1H:→	Satoo Satow	tte Qt	saigoo last	ni? LOC				
2 G:	es s	ei ei	tei t	daburu double	yuu u	tte Qt	iu say	[tsuzuri spelling
3	o O	kakimasu write	node]. because					
4 H:								[daburu double
5	yuu u	ga S	tsuiteru]. has-PRE but	demo Ernest	Aanesuto Satow ¹¹	Satoo		((continues))

'H: The last (letter of) the name Satow is (which one?)

G: [Because it is written]with a t, t and double-u.

H: It has (is written with) [a double-u] but Ernest Satow ((continues)).'

As is shown in (15), rising intonation in similar environments can have the same interrogative function as a question. However, it is difficult to know why turn-taking occurs after a rising intonation in example (15) but not in examples (13) and (14). Undoubtedly, the host in (13) and (14) could elicit information in the same way as in (15) without needing to use incremental phrases or provide a complete question. A closer look at the content of the three examples sheds some light on a possible reason for the choices. In (15), the semantic content is narrow. It is explicit because the host mentions not only the family name but also adds the word *saigo ni* 'at the end'. However, the turn in example (14) is more ambiguous. The host's turn contains the name of the animal, which is the topic of the talk, and the word *deai* 'meeting'. Also, information about a 'meeting' can include not only the time but also the place, the circumstances, how it occurred and other similar parameters. Therefore, the guest's only response is an *aizuchi* at the first TRP. In (13), the host uses the adverb *somosomo* 'in the first place' initially and adds the noun phrase *Manchu e wa* 'to Manchuria'. While it can be contended that the adverb *somosomo* restricts the question's content, it is nevertheless not as specific as in (15). The question in (13) could have been expanded in many ways, ranging from the period of the guest's stay, to who went there, how long she stayed and many other possibilities. This may explain the guest's delay in answering.

Quotative particles at turn-ends

In English one cannot expect a TRP after a relative pronoun because the semantic content would be missing. However, in Japanese this is not only possible due to postpositional order, but it also occurs frequently. Quotations in Japanese are indicated by the quotative particle *to* (which can be translated as the English 'that') and are routinely used by hosts at turn-ends. The next excerpt is an interview with the writer presented in (13), who received a literary prize very early in her career. Despite this initial success, she had failed to have any of her works published for many years. Receiving such a prestigious

¹¹ Ernest Satow (not Sattow) was a renowned English diplomat in Japan and author of *A Diplomat in Japan*.

literary award and much media attention contributed to the guest's illusion of accomplishment. However, the situation proved to be different, as we learn from the interview.

(16) (FF.2)

1 G:	<i>desukara</i>	<i>watakushi ga</i>		<i>sakkaku</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>okosuno</i>		
	therefore	I	S	illusion	O	raise		
2	<i>mo</i>	<i>muri</i>		<i>no</i>	<i>nai</i>	<i>jookyoo</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>wa</i>
	also	impossible		COM	be-NEG	situation	COP	TOP
3	<i>atta</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>desu</i>	<i>kedo</i>	<i>ne.</i>			
	be-PAST	COM	COP	but	FP			
4 H:→	<i>ma=</i>	<i>ima</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>natte</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>sakkaku</i>	<i>datta</i>	<i>to.#</i>
	well	now	Qt	become	TOP	illusion	be-PAST	Qt
5 G:	<i>eh.</i>	<i>ano=</i>	<i>chotto</i>	<i>omoichigai</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>shiteorimashita.</i>	<i>hai...</i>	
	yes.	Well	little	mistake	DO	make-PAST	yes	

'G: That is why, the situation was such that it was impossible for me not to get that illusion, you see.

H: Well, now, you (think, you can say) that it was an illusion.

G: Yes. Well, I was a little mistaken. Yes...'

In line 4, we see the turn initial discourse marker *ma*, which functions in a similar fashion to the English 'well'. In this context it is used before a request for clarification (Schiffrin 1987: 120). The vowel lengthening and flat intonation convey the host's reluctance to agree with the guest and mitigate the guest's negative words of self-deprecation. Then, turn-yielding occurs after the quotation particle *to*, which is normally followed by verbs like *omou* 'think' or *iu* 'say', as is indicated by the arrow and the #, which indicates grammatical incompleteness. The ending of the turn could add a slightly different connotation according to the choice of the verb ending. The type of construction can be 'incremented' by the addition of the verb root, the honorific auxiliary verb and the question particle: *to omoi+ninarimasku+ka*. Interestingly, turn-yielding can occur after every segment. This particle *to* in turn-ending position can be explained as a mitigation strategy. As Hayashi (1997) reports, one of the uses of *to* in turn-final position casts the speaker "in the role of 'reporter' of some thought or situation, thereby evading or diffusing responsibility for the consequence of the utterance" (1997: 579).

Conjunctive particles at turn-ends.

Other common turn endings are marked by conjunctive particles such as *kara* 'because', *kedo* 'but' or conditional forms that indicate grammatical incompleteness. Endings such as the one in example (17) are very common in the data and have been the focus of other studies on colloquial Japanese (Hayashi 2003; Mori 1999). To illustrate these particles, an example from an interview with a professional photographer is shown next. In (17), one of his photographs is shown while the interview proceeds. In line 2, indicated by the arrow, the host's turn ends with the particle *keredomo* 'but', which does not mark following contrastive actions as is found in English contexts (Schiffrin 1987) or

disagreement as in Japanese conversations (Mori 1999). This ending has been reported to occur in other environments with the understanding that a turn-end particle leaves the hearer to decide what action is to be taken next (Park 1998). In line 3, the guest takes his turn without any question or request being uttered; however, he explains how and when the photograph was taken. By ending his turn with *keredomo* 'but', the interviewer frees the guest to elaborate on any aspect of this photograph provided it is relevant to the host's comment and within the topic of the talk (N. Tanaka 2001).

(17) (MM.2)

1 H:	<i>suzumebachi</i> wasp	<i>no</i> of	<i>masani</i> exactly	<i>kono-</i> this	<i>shunkan</i> moment	<i>o</i> of	<i>kiritotta</i> cut-PAST	
2→	<i>youna</i> like	(eh.) yes	<i>migotona shashin</i> wonderful photograph		<i>desu</i> COP	<i>keredomo,</i> but		
3 G:	<i>eh.</i> uhm	<i>tonde=</i> fly	<i>kamera</i> camera	<i>ni</i> to	<i>mukattekite,</i> come-direct	<i>osoraku</i> probably	<i>desu</i> COP	
4	<i>ne/</i> FP	<i>me</i> eye	<i>no</i> of	<i>mae</i> front	<i>ni</i> in	<i>aru</i> be	<i>kamera</i> camera	<i>ni</i> to
5	<i>taishite</i> against	<i>koo=</i> well	((continues))					

'H: It is a wonderful photograph, (yes) a snapshot of a wasp, but...

G: Uh-huh. It was probably flying towards the camera you see, and was like against the camera in front of it ((continues))'

Syntactic non-completion in turn-ends is a phenomenon observed by sociologists and ethnographers alike (Lebra 1976; Kabaya 1993; Kindaichi 1990). Linguists have explained it as a politeness strategy because grammatically unfinished turns impose less on the listeners and, as such, are 'negative' face strategies (N. Tanaka 2001; Mizutani 1981). Scholars in Japan have speculated that using declaratives sounds too harsh and forceful in the Japanese context, where harmony and group consent are highly valued. Therefore, speakers tend to leave their sentences unfinished. Turns that are syntactically unfinished appear most frequently in conversational Japanese. For example, adverbial particles in turn-end positions are quite common, and because they occur before predicates they play an important role in projecting them (H. Tanaka 2001). N. Tanaka (2001), who conducted a comparative English–Japanese study on pragmatic uncertainty, explains this phenomenon as a safe option for "the interviewer to keep her perlocutionary intent negotiable" (2001: 159). By keeping their turns syntactically unfinished, interviewers have a choice of completing them or yielding the floor. They can appeal to the audience or talk to the interviewee, and in the latter case they want to do it in a "less imposing manner" (N. Tanaka 2001: 159).

Postpositions

As opposed to English, Japanese allows a free movement of its constituents with the exception of the predicate. This reordering of elements is referred to as Scrambling (Haraguchi 1973), as cited in Shibamoto 1985; Inoue 1978) and is widely found in

spoken conversation (Hayashi 2003). It is said that postpositions are used as an afterthought, or when the speaker thinks that crucial information is missing (Hinds 1976). At other times, postpositions are repetitions of noun phrases that emphasize the postposed constituent. The guest in the next example is a university lecturer in mathematics. He explains that the birth of mathematics was in India, geometry in Rome, integral and differential calculus in England, and computing in America. The host adds that the next form of mathematics will originate in Asia. Observe that the noun phrase containing Asia *asia no hoo ni* is postposed after the copula and SFP *desu ne*. In this case, the postposition clarifies the ambiguity of the expression by specifying the location.

(18) (FM.1)

(lines omitted)

1 G:	<i>de</i> And	<i>kootogaku</i> high-school	<i>no</i> of	<i>zenki</i> 1 st –semester	<i>ga</i> S	<i>maa</i> well	<i>igirisu</i> England
2	<i>no</i> of	<i>biseikibun.</i> integral-calculus	<i>kooki</i> 2nd-semester	<i>ni</i> in	<i>naruto</i> become	<i>amerika</i> America	
3	<i>no konpyuuta</i> of computer	<i>deshoo/</i> COP-HORT					
4 H:	<i>ha</i> Uh-huh	<i>ha</i> uh-huh	<i>ha</i> <i>ha.</i>	<i>naruhodo/</i> I-see	<i>sosuto</i> then	<i>mamonaku,</i> seen	
5→	<i>chikazuitekuru</i> near-come	<i>wake</i> NOM	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ne.</i> FP	<i>Ajia</i> Asia	<i>no</i> of	<i>hoo ni,</i> direction to
6 G:	<i>ee=</i> yes	<i>chikazukenakyaikenai</i> near-must		<i>tte</i> Qt	<i>iu</i> say	<i>no</i> COM	<i>ga,</i> S <i>watashi</i> I
7	<i>no</i> Of	<i>negai</i> hope	<i>na</i> COP	<i>n</i> COM	<i>desu.</i> COP		

‘G: and you learn uhm integral calculus (originated) in England. In second semester it is computers (originated) in America, isn’t it?!!

H: Uh-huh, uh-huh. I see. Then very soon is nearing, isn’t it? To Asia.

G: Yes, yes. That it has to come near is my hope.’

In other examples, postpositions are used to emphasize a point, as in the excerpt below. The host is interviewing a writer featured in (13) and (16). Despite receiving a literary prize, she was not able to publish for many years. Here the host comments on the writer’s resilience in continuing to write. Note that the word *gyakuni* ‘on the contrary’ is repeated after the copula and the SFP, emphasizing that she could have given up writing. This repetition clearly stresses the preceding conditions mentioned by the host.

(20) (F3)

1G:	((continued))	<i>shujin</i> Husband	<i>mo</i> also	<i>orimashitashi,</i> have-HUMB-CONJ	<i>katei</i> family	<i>to</i> Qt	
2	<i>iu</i> say	<i>mono</i> NOM	<i>ga</i> S	<i>atte/</i> be-CONJ	<i>sore</i> that	<i>ga</i> S	<i>watakushi no</i> I of <i>yui’itsu</i> only

3	<i>no</i> of	<i>seishin</i> spiritual		<i>no</i> of	<i>sasae</i> support	<i>data</i> COP	<i>to</i> Qt	<i>omoimasu/</i> think-PRE	
4	<i>totemo</i> very	<i>kansha shite orimasu</i> grateful Be-HUMB			<i>no.</i> FP	<i>hai.</i> yes			
5 H:	<i>ma.</i> Well	<i>mochiron</i> of-course	<i>goshujinsama</i> husband-your		<i>no</i> of	<i>sono</i> well	<i>rikai</i> understanding		<i>toka</i> and
6	<i>ironna</i> various	<i>kazoku</i> family	<i>no</i> of	<i>rikai</i> understanding		<i>mo</i> also	<i>atta</i> be-PAST	<i>to</i> Qt	
7	<i>omoimasu</i> think-PRE		<i>ga.</i> but	<i>gyakuni</i> On-the-contrary		<i>iueba</i> say-COND		<i>(hai.)</i> yes	<i>ha/</i> yes
8	<i>moo</i> uhm	<i>uchi</i> house	<i>mo</i> also	<i>aru</i> be	<i>n</i> COM	<i>dashi/</i> COP-CONJ		<i>katei</i> family	<i>mo</i> also
9	<i>aru</i> be	<i>n</i> COM	<i>dashi/</i> COP-CONJ	good	<i>ii</i> COP-NEG	<i>janai</i> COM		<i>no</i> Qt	<i>tte</i>
10→	<i>atashi</i> I	<i>yamechau</i> quit	<i>tte</i> Qt	<i>(ha./)</i>	<i>koto</i> COM	<i>iu</i> say	<i>mo</i> also	<i>aru</i> be	<i>to</i> Qt
11	<i>omou</i> think	<i>n</i> COM		<i>desu ne/</i> COP FP	<i>gyakuni.</i> on-the-other-hand				
12 G:	<i>demo</i> but	<i>shufu</i> housewife		<i>desu</i> COP	<i>kara.</i> because	<i>anoo</i> well	<i>((continues))</i>		

‘G: I had a husband and I had a family. And they were my only spiritual support. I am very grateful, indeed.

H: Well, of course you had the understanding of your husband and that of your family, but on the other hand, you could well have said **(yes)** I already have a house and a family, I will quit **(yes)** on the other hand *((continues))*.’

It appears, though, that not all postpositions are used to clarify or emphasize a point. The next example does not satisfy either condition. The guest is a *rakugo*¹² performer and the host asks him when was it that he felt his technique had improved. The host uses the canonical question in lines 1–2, but there is a slight pause after the particle *ka*, and he adds a phrase *kore wa ii zo* ‘this is good’. Note that the postposition has a ‘quotation’-like quality. It ends in the SFP *zo*, which is used exclusively by men in informal situations and gives a very forceful and strong feeling. It is also used in self-directed speech and in this situation it appeals to the guest’s emotional and psychological side.

(21) (MM.1)

1H:	<i>sono=</i> uhm	<i>jibun</i> oneself	<i>no..</i> of	<i>hanashi</i> talk	<i>ga</i> S	<i>i</i> go-	<i>yokunatta</i> good-become	<i>na/</i> FP
-----	---------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	------------------------	----------------	-----------------	---------------------------------	------------------

¹² *Rakugo* is a humorous traditional one-person performance in front of an audience based on a monologue and body gestures.

2	<i>to</i> Qt	<i>omotta</i> think	<i>no</i> COM	<i>wa</i> TOP	<i>itsu</i> when	<i>goro</i> about	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ka?..</i> Q	<i>kore</i> this
3	<i>wa</i> TOP	<i>ii</i> good	<i>zo...</i> FP						

‘H: Uhm, when did you start feeling that your storytelling became very good? This is great !!’

In this example, there is no possibility of creating a misunderstanding nor is there emphasis on a particular word. One explanation for this type of postposition is that it can be a very effective way of avoiding *ka* questions in turn-ending position (Oshima 2001). Whether the interviewer chose to add this quotation-like phrase consciously or not is beyond the scope of the present study. However, participants in a public communicative event would be more aware of their speech patterns and try to adhere more strictly to the politeness rules of the society they live in.

4.3. Overlapping

Turn-taking can occur with perfect timing when speakers interpret TRPs correctly. However, the precise and orderly transfer of the floor can be disrupted if the next speaker starts his/her turn while the present speaker is still talking, creating an overlap. This has been called ‘terminal overlap’ (Jefferson 1973) or ‘rush-through’ (Schegloff 2000). It occurs because turn-end is imminent and participants recognize this. Schegloff (2000) writes that speakers in English initiate a ‘rush-through’ immediately after a pitch peak, which is the place where a new TCU can commence. In (22), the host and guest are talking about land mines in areas of conflict, which the guest’s organization is helping to locate and destroy. The host’s turn starts with the word *ja* ‘then’, which is a discourse marker used to signal the end of the present topic by summarizing what has been said so far. It is also used to signal change of activity and to show disagreement. In the example, *ja* is used to introduce a sub-topic. In previous lines, the guest explained that any weight over five kilograms would trigger the land mine. In lines 1 - 3, the host asks whether human beings could be killed by these land mines. To finish the turn, the host uses the copula *desho* accompanied by the SFP *ne* at the end of his turn; however, this section overlaps with the guest’s turn. The guest starts her turn immediately after the host inserts the explanatory *n* without waiting for the host’s turn to finish. A potential TRP can be observed after the topic marker *wa* in line 2, which is pronounced with vowel lengthening.

(22) (MF.2)

1 H:	<i>ja,</i> then	<i>kore</i> this	<i>de</i> and	<i>ano,</i> uhm	<i>hito</i> person	<i>no</i> of	<i>inochi</i> life	<i>o</i> DP	<i>ubau</i> take
2	<i>dake</i> only	<i>no chikara</i> of force	<i>wa-</i> TOP	<i>aru</i> be	<i>n</i> COM	<i>[deshoo</i> COP-HORT	<i>ne/</i> FP		
3 G:	<i>[soo</i> yes	<i>desu</i> COP	<i>ne/]</i> FP	<i>ano</i> well	<i>tatoeba</i> for-example		<i>jirai</i> mine	<i>no</i> of	<i>baai</i> case
4	<i>osoroshii koto</i> horrible	<i>((continues))</i> COM							

'H: Then, this uhm has enough force to take away a person's life, [isn't it?]

G: [Well, yes], uhm the horrible thing about mines is ((continues))'

A very similar example can be seen in (23), where overlapping occurs under exactly the same circumstances as in the previous excerpt. The topic in the following illustration is about a flying-squirrel and its environment. The guest explains that the animal's diet consists mainly of pine and cedar cones. A photograph of the animal is shown and the host comments and asks a question. As in the previous example, the interviewee's turn overlaps with the copula. Given that the grammatical structure of a question containing the explanatory *n* in Japanese follows a rigid order (where the verb appears in the dictionary form followed by the *n*, the copula and finally the question particle), it is not surprising that overlapping occurs at these points.

(23) (FM.2)

- 1 H: *kawaii/ te ni motte taberu n [desu ka?]*
 Cute hand in have-CONJ eat-PRE COM COP Q
- 2 G: *[eh.] te ni motte/ kou futatsu mittsu me*
 Yes hand in have-CONJ like two three bud
- 3 *ga tsuitemasu*
 S be- PRE

((continues))

'H: It is so cute. Does it eat holding (the food) [in its paws?]

G:[Yes,] it holds (the food) in its paws and there are two or three buds ((continues))'

However, other endings after the insertion of the explanatory *n* are possible, as is illustrated below. Naturally, this is not an exhaustive list and other possibilities exist.

- (i) *te ni motte taberu n da to*
 hand in have-CONJ eat-PRE COM COP Qt
- shirimasen deshita*
 know-NEG COP-PAST

'I did not know that it holds (the food) in its paws to eat.'

- (ii) *te ni motte taberu n da to*
 hand in have-CONJ eat-PRE COM COP Qt
- kikimashita*
 hear- PAST

'I heard that it holds (the food) in its paws to eat.'

In any case, the high percentage of overlapping suggests that turn-type pre-allocation in the interview is one of the main reasons for these to occur. This strongly suggests that the turn-type pre-allocation is a very important aspect in the way guests understand hosts' turns, even though questioning is not particularly expressed.

Scholars have commented on the frequency of overlapping in Japanese (Hinds 1976). Constant overlapping in informal conversation has been described as a sign of interest and participation in the interaction (Murata 1994). It has been associated with the 'collaborative' style of communication (Coates 1996; L. Tanaka 2004), and many argue that overlaps are not turn-taking violations in Japanese conversation (Hinds 1976; Murata 1994).

5. Discussion

This study looked at interviewers' TCUs immediately prior to turn-yielding in order to understand how turn-taking is managed in the interview exchange. Most importantly, it explored how interviewees recognize turn-yielding cues when interrogativity is not present and why it is that interviewers' turns overwhelmingly end in non-questioning forms. An important finding was that interviewers use a range of strategies such as the SFP *ne* and syntactically unfinished turns to elicit information as these are considered to impose less on the listener than *ka* questions. In fact, the explicit *ka* questions tend to be used as fallback when other strategies fail. A wide variety of less forceful, strategically used information-eliciting strategies are observed in the data. Combined with the permissiveness of turn-final syntactic incompleteness and turn-type pre-allocation, interviewees can 'predict' what kind of information they are expected to give at every turn without a question occurring at turn-end position. Moreover, the use of the SFP *ne* in turn-final position, which is a distinctive feature of Japanese communication regardless of formality or setting, seems to function in the same manner as a syntactic question (Cook 1990; S. Maynard 1989; H. Tanaka 1999 and others). Its ambiguous characteristic works effectively in eliciting information and it is a safer option in terms of politeness, as it does not impose on the listener as a question does. Moreover, because of its versatility, *ne* can be used strategically to regulate and control turn management.

The fact that turn-taking at syntactically incomplete turns is so common (30.9%) in the present data indicates that this 'unfinished' quality is a feature participants are comfortable with. Syntactic non-completion has been reported to be conspicuous in spoken Japanese (Kabaya 1993; Kindaichi 1990; Mizutani and Mizutani 1987; Mori 1999; Okamoto 1985; Oishi 1971; H. Tanaka 1999; L. Tanaka 2004) and it can be argued that it also applies to televised interviews. Turn-yielding occurs after quotation or grammatical particles, after conjunctive or conditional forms, and after connective particles when observing interviewers' TCUs, all of which precede predicates. For one thing, the turn-type pre-allocation ensures that guests interpret those unfinished turns as 'questions' or requests for information. This is clear when guests' turn-ends are observed; syntactically complete turns are more frequent than incomplete TCUs (L. Tanaka 2004). This feature, as well as the Japanese 'delayed' projectability, strongly suggests that turn-type pre-allocation is of utmost importance in the interview context.

Because of its syntactic characteristics, Japanese is described as showing 'delayed' projectability (Fox et al. 1996; Hayashi 2003; H. Tanaka 1999), which is emphasized by the fact that Japanese is a postpositional language in which a turn can change in its course with the addition of 'increments'. In other words, in Japanese conversation it is difficult for the next-speaker to 'predict' the type of turn-end the present speaker will produce, in particular, because most of the interviewers' turns are multi-unit. As stated in the introduction, interviewers' turns are expected to end in some

form of questioning in the interview context (Clayman and Heritage 2002). Hence, interviewees must wait until an element of interrogativity, such as a question word or a discourse marker that precedes a question, is uttered by the interviewer to signal imminent turn completion. Some examples in the present data show ‘mid-turn’ projection when a question word or some other interrogative token appears early in the host’s turn. In (24) the question word *sonnani* ‘that much’ projects the end of the host’s turn. This is reinforced by the word *wake* ‘reason’, after which the guest starts her turn overlapping with the host’s turn ending. The guest, a psychologist, is asked whether her everyday life is very structured. She answers that, on the contrary, she has a very disorderly and unpredictable life. The overlapping suggests that the interviewee could predict the type of question the interviewer was going to ask because of the question word *sonnani* appearing early on.

(24) (FF.3)

1H:	<i>ah</i> oh	<i>ja</i> so	<i>sonnani</i> that-much	<i>seikatsu</i> life	<i>jikan</i>	<i>ga</i> time	<i>kisokutadashii</i> S	<i>tte</i> regulated	Qt
2	<i>iu</i> say	<i>wake</i> reason	<i>[janai</i> be-NEG	COM	<i>n</i> COP	<i>desu</i> Q	<i>ka?]</i>		
3 G:	<i>[ah!</i> oh	<i>watashi</i> I	<i>wa</i> TOP	<i>moo</i> well	<i>mechakucha</i> disorderly and	<i>de/</i> yes	<i>(hai.)</i> uhm	<i>ano=</i>	
4	<i>moo ((continues))</i> well								

‘H: Oh, so it is not that your life is regulated, [is it?]

G: Oh. I am really disorderly (yes) and uhm, well ((continues)).’

It can be argued that ‘delayed’ projectability in Japanese does not necessarily apply to Wh-questions. Numerous examples in the present data show that questions are projected rather early or midway in the interviewers’ turns, when items such as adverbs or discourse markers appear turn-initially or turn-medially. However, turn-taking in the interview cannot be defined by turn projectability and turn-type preallocation only. Communication is a multi-faceted process in which participants communicate through a range of syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and suprasegmental cues that are beyond the scope of this paper.

One of the main concerns of this study was the reason why interviewers used a greater number of eliciting devices that did not have the interrogative syntax. It is known that question design has an influence on interviewees’ conduct, as seen in the use of conducive questions, the deployment of preference or the use of preface questions (Clayman and Heritage 2002). As suggested by Athanasiadou (1991), the choice of questions is restricted when there is a hierarchical relation between participants. Given that power within the interview setting is unequal regardless of the real status of the participants, it is fair to expect that any open demonstration of authority by the interviewer would have to be masked. Athanasiadou (1991) argues that the hierarchy of the participants is closely related to the choice of question type in English. Information-seeking questions can be asked between people of equal status. However, indirect questions are used when there is a status difference between speaker and listener. Similarly, Oshima (2001) reports on the preference for declaratives ending in rising

intonation and SFPs like *ne* and *yo* over *ka* questions in informal conversation. Although she states that *ka* questions are more common in 'conversation polie' (formal conversation), she speculates that formal endings of verbs 'neutralize' the inherent 'negativeness' of *ka* interrogatives (Oshima 2001). The 'inherent negative' effect of the interrogative *ka* explains why they are avoided when asking someone of higher status (or age), even in informal conversation (Oshima 2001). If indeed questions in English carry a command function as well as express requests for information (Athanasiadou 1991), the low number of *ka* questions in the interview is an indication that the same can apply in Japanese. Because of this additional function, the use of questions between people of differing status can be problematic and speakers opt to use other strategies to avoid conflict. In the present study, hosts face a similar dilemma when interviewing older people or guests with higher status outside the interview context. Given that seniority (in terms of age and status) is of utmost importance in Japanese society, it is not strange that hosts prefer other information-eliciting strategies to questions. Although hosts possess the power and control within the interview situation, clearly, they face difficulties when they are younger than their guests. Moreover, the real status difference between the host and the guest is a factor that can and does affect the linguistic style of both participants.

Another device that does not have the syntactic structure of a question, yet functions as a question, is the SFP *ne*, which is a very important and crucial aspect of questioning in an interview context. Yokota (1994) writes that questions carrying greater ambiguity are the most frequently used in argumentative political discourse. A similar aspect is observed in the present study with the use of the turn-final SFP *ne* as a questioning device. The use of SFPs as a questioning strategy can be explained in terms of their lesser degree of imposition. The illocutionary force of a question, for example, demands an answer and consequently is a potential FTA. However, SFPs have hedge-like characteristics, and therefore are less of an imposition on the listener (Brown and Levinson 1987; Cook 1990; H. Tanaka 2000). This reinforces the formality in the interview and at the same time calls on the 'affective' ground of the listener (Cook 1990). In this way the interview can be conducted in a non-aggressive manner; guests do not feel they are being 'questioned', but rather requested to talk. Although the incidence of the SFP *ne* does not guarantee turn-yielding because it also appears in non-final positions, its use nevertheless ensures smooth and collaborative turn management.

To conclude, the permissive syntactically unfinished turn-ending in Japanese communication facilitates turn-taking without the explicit use of interrogatives. As shown by Mori (1999) and others (Ford and Mori 1994; Ono and Yoshida 1996; H. Tanaka 2001), clausal markers and grammatical and quotative particles occur normatively in turn-end position in everyday Japanese speech. The fact that this is also observed in the present data indicates that this phenomenon is a characteristic of Japanese communication in a wide range of situations.

This study is based on a small body of data and future research incorporating a larger corpus, not only of interviews but also of other 'institutional' events where questions regulate the turn-taking, would help deepen our understanding of the complex interaction in formal settings.

6. Conclusion

This paper has shown characteristics of hosts' interviewing strategies. Most of the interviewers' TCUs prior to turn-yielding are syntactically unfinished and questions comprise less than one third of the total turns. It appears that interviewers favour the use of syntactic unfinished turns and the SFP *ne* for eliciting information. This might be due to the fact that questions function not only to ask but also to command. For that matter, they are carefully used in situations when the status of the participants is unequal, as in all 'institutional' settings. Moreover, the high frequency of overlapping suggests that because *ka* questions are not normally used by the host, guests must do more 'guess' work in order to interpret turn-yielding cues. Despite the absence of interrogatives turn-finally, turn-taking is successfully accomplished because participants are aware of their duties and obligations in the interview.

Appendix

List of abbreviations and conventions

COM	sentential complementiser (<i>no, koto, to</i>)
COND	conditional affix (<i>-ba, -tara, -to</i>)
CONJ	conjunctive affix (<i>-te, -de</i>)
COP	copula (<i>da, na, dearu, desu</i>)
DESID	desiderative affix (<i>-tai</i>)
EXCL	exclamation
GEN	genitive case (<i>no</i>)
HON	honorific
HORT	hortative (<i>daroo, deshoo</i>)
HUM	humble
INST	instrumental
LOC	locative
NEG	negative form
NP	noun phrase
O	direct object
ONMT	onomatopoeia
PASS	passive affix (<i>-rare</i>)
PAST	past tense
PL	plural suffix (<i>-tachi, -ra</i>)
PROG	progressive (<i>-teiru</i>)
PRE	present tense
POL	polite
Q	question particle (<i>ka</i>)
Qt	quotation marker (<i>to, tte</i>)
S	subject marker (<i>ga</i>)
SFP	sentence final particle
T	title (<i>-san, -chan, -kun, -sama</i>)
TOP	topic marker (<i>wa</i>)

Data transcription conventions

The following conventions suggested by Du Bois, Schuetze-Coburn, Paolino and Cumming (1990) were used for the transcription of the data.

Hyphen	(-)	Truncated word
Comma	(,)	Continuing intonation unit, usually signaled by intonational, semantic and/or syntactic factors
Full-stop	(.)	Completed intonation unit
Question mark	(?)	Question
@ mark	@ @	Laughter
Square brackets	([])	Simultaneous speech
Two dots	(..)	Brief pause, 0.2 seconds or less
Three dots	(...)	Medium pause, 0.3- 0.6 seconds
Three dots plus number	(...(0.7))	Long pause with number indicating duration in seconds
Single brackets	(sneeze)	Indicates type of vocal noise
Double brackets	((gaze))	Indicates comment by researcher
Capital X	(X)	Indicates indecipherable syllable
Single brackets Bold	(yes)	Aizuchi
Equal sign	(=)	Vowel lengthening
Capital letters	TEXT	marked quality
Oblique line	/	Rising intonation
< >	<text>	possible utterance
*Hush sign	(#)	grammatically unfinished utterance
*Symbol devised for this study		

References

- Athanasiadou, Angeliki (1991) The discourse function of questions. *Pragmatics* 1.1: 107–122.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell, and Paul Drew (1979) *Order in the court: The organization of verbal interaction in judicial settings*. London: Macmillan.
- Bilmes, Jack (1999) Questions, answers, and the organization of talk in the 1992 vice presidential debate: Fundamental considerations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 32.3: 213–242.
- Brown, Penelope, and Steven Levinson (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bull, Peter (1994) On identifying questions, replies, and non-replies in political interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 13.2: 115–31.
- Button, Graham (1992) Answers as interactional products: Two sequential practices used in job interviews. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 212–231
- Clayman, Steven (1993) Reformulating the question: A device for answering/not answering questions in news interviews and press conferences. *Text* 13: 159–188.
- Clayman, Steven (1988) Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems* 33.5: 479–92.
- Clayman, Steve (1992) Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news interviews discourse. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. pp. 163–98.
- Clayman, Steven, and John Heritage (2002) *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coates, Jennifer (1996) *Women talk*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.

- Cook, Haruko M. (1990) The sentence-final particle 'ne' as a tool for cooperation in Japanese conversation. In Koji Hajime (ed.), *Japanese and Korean Linguistics Vol 1*. Stanford: Stanford Linguistics Center, pp. 29–45.
- Coulthard, Malcolm (1985) *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Essex: Longman.
- Drew, Paul (1992) Contested evidence in a courtroom cross-examination: The case of a trial for rape. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 470–520.
- Drew, Paul, and John Heritage (1992) *Analyzing talk at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drummond, Kent, and Robert Hopper (1993) Back channels revisited: Acknowledgement tokens and speakership incipency. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26. 2: 157–177.
- Ford, Cecilia, and Junko Mori (1994) Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: A cross linguistic study of interactional grammar. *Pragmatics* 4.1: 31–61.
- Ford, Cecilia, and Sandra A. Thompson (1996) Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 134–84.
- Fox, Barbara, Hayashi Makoto, and Robert Jasperson (1996) Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 185–238.
- Furo, Hiroko (2001) *Turn-taking in English and Japanese. Projectability in grammar, intonation and semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Gnisi, Augusto, and Marino Bonaiuto (2003) Grilling politicians. Politicians' answers to questions in television interviews and courtroom examinations. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 22.4: 385–413.
- Gnisi, Augusto, and Clotilde Potencorvo (2004) The organization of questions and answers in the thematic phases of hostile examination: Turn-by-turn manipulation of meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36.5: 965–995.
- Greatbatch, David L. (1986a) Aspects of topical organisation in news interviews: The use of agenda shifting procedures by interviewees. *Media, Culture and Society* 8: 441–445.
- Greatbatch, David L. (1986b) Some standard uses of supplementary questions in news interview. In J. Wilson & B. Crow (eds.), *Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics Vol. 8*. Jordanstown, Northern Ireland: University of Ulster, pp. 86–123.
- Greatbatch, David L. (1988) A turn-taking system for British news interviews. *Language in Society* 17: 401–430.
- Greatbatch, David L. (1992) On the management of disagreement between news interviewers. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 268–301.
- Goody, Esther N. (1978) *Questions and politeness strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harre, Rom, and Grant Gillet (1994) *The discursive mind*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Have, Paul ten (1999) *Doing conversation analysis. A practical guide*. London: Sage.

- Hayashi, Makoto (1997) An exploration of sentence-final uses of the quotative particle in Japanese spoken discourse. In H. Sohn and J. Haig (eds.), *Japanese and Korean Linguistics*. Vol. 6. Stanford: CSLI, 565–581.
- Hayashi, Makoto (2003) *Joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Heritage John (1984) *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Heritage, John (1985) Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis Vol. 3*. New York: Academic, pp. 95–119.
- Heritage John (1995) Conversation Analysis: Methodological aspects. In U. Quastoff (ed.), *Aspects of oral communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 391–418.
- Heritage, John (2002) The limits of questioning: Negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1427–1446.
- Heritage, John, and David L. Greatbatch (1991) On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In D. Boden & D.H. Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and social structure*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 93–127.
- Heritage, John, and Andrew L. Roth (1995) Grammar and institution: Questions and questioning in the broadcast news interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28.1: 1–60.
- Hinds, John (1976) *Aspects of Japanese discourse*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Honda, Atsuko (2002) Conflict management in Japanese public affairs talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34.5: 573–608.
- Hutchby, Ian (1996) *Confrontation talk: Arguments, asymmetries, and power on talk radio*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Inoue, Kazuko (1978) *Nihongo no bunpoo kisoku* (The rules of Japanese grammar). Tokyo: Taishuukan.
- Itakura, Hiroko (2001) *Conversational dominance and gender: A study of Japanese speakers in first and second language contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jefferson, Gail (1973) A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica* 9.1: 47–96.
- Jucker, Andreas (1986) *News interviews: A pragmalinguistics analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kabaya, Hiroshi (1993) Taigu hyoogen ni okeru shooryaku (Ellipsis in polite expressions). *Nihongogaku* 12.9: 27–33.
- Kamio, Akio (1994) The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 21.1: 67–100.
- Kindaichi, Haruhiko (1990) *Nihongo* (Japanese) Vol. 1 and 2. Tokyo: Iwanami shinsho.
- Labov, William, and David Fanshel (1977) *Therapeutic discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lebra, Takie Sugiyama (1976) *Japanese patterns of behaviour*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

- Macaulay, Marcia (1996) Asking to ask: The strategic function of indirect requests for information in news interviews. *Pragmatics* 6.4: 491–509.
- Makino, Seichi, and Michio Tsutsui (1992) *A dictionary of basic Japanese grammar*. 11th edition. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Martin, Samuel (1975) *A reference grammar of Japanese*. London: Yale University.
- Masuoka, Takashi (1991) *Modaritii no bunpoo* (The grammar of modality). Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Masuoka, Takashi, Yoshio Nitta, Takao Gunji, and Satoshi Kinsui (1997) *Bunpoo* (Grammar). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- McGloin, Naomi H. (1998) *Hai* and *ee*: An interactional analysis. In N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, S. Sohn and S. Strauss (eds.), *Japanese and Korean Linguistics*. Vol. 7. Stanford: CSLI, 105–120.
- Maynard, Douglas (1992) On clinicians co-implicating recipients' perspective in the delivery of diagnostic news. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 331–358.
- Maynard, Senko (1995) Interrogatives that seek no answers: Exploring the expressiveness of rhetorical interrogatives in Japanese. *Linguistics* 33.3 (337): 501–530.
- Maynard, Senko (1989) *Self-contextualization through structure and interactional management*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Mizutani, Osamu (1981) *Japanese: The spoken language in Japanese life*. Tokyo: Japan Times.
- Mizutani, Osamu, and Nobuko Mizutani (1987) *How to be polite in Japanese*. Tokyo: Japan Times.
- Murata, Kumiko (1994) Intrusive or co-operative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 385–400.
- Mori, Junko (1999) *Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Japanese. Connective expressions and turn construction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nakada, Seichi (1980) *Aspects of interrogative structure: A case study from English and Japanese*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Nakajima, Etsuko (1997) Gimon hyoogen no yoosoo (An aspect of interrogative expressions). In Gendai nihongo kenkyuukai (Modern Japanese research group). *Josei no kotoba. Shokubahen*. (Women and Language. At the workplace). Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobo, pp. 59–82.
- Nitta, Yoshio (1995) *Nihongo no Modaritii to ninshoo* (Japanese modality and personal pronouns). Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobo.
- Nylund, Matts (2003) Asking questions, making sound-bites: Research reports, interviews and television news stories. *Discourse Studies*. Vol 5.4: 517–533.
- Ono Tsuyoshi, and Yoshida Eri (1996) A Study of co-construction in Japanese: We don't finish each others' sentences. In N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki and S. Strauss (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* Vol 5. Stanford: CSLI, pp. 115–129.
- Oishi, H (1971) *Hanashi kotobaron* (Spoken Language). Tokyo: Shueisha.
- Okamoto, Shigeko (1985) Ellipsis in Japanese discourse. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of California.

- Oshima, Hiroko (2001) Les particules finales japonaises: Etude de *ka*. *Faits des Langues* 17: 273–284.
- Park, Yong-Yae (1998) A discourse analysis of contrastive connectives in English, Korean, and Japanese conversation: With special reference to the context of dispreferred responses. In J. Andreas and Y. Ziv (eds.), *Discourse markers: Descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 277–300.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1980) Telling my side: “limited access” as a “fishing” device. *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 186–198.
- Roth, Andrew, and David Olsher (1997) Some standard uses of “what about”-prefaced questions in the broadcast news interview. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 9.1: 3–25.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50.4: 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel (1984) On questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures on social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 28–53.
- Schegloff, Emanuel (1993) Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26.1: 99–128.
- Schegloff, Emanuel (2000) Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society* 29, 1, Mar: 1–66.
- Schiffrin, Deborah (1987) *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shibamoto, Janet (1985) *Japanese Women’s Language*. Florida, Orlando: Academic Press.
- Shinzato, Rumiko (2002) Cognition, epistemic scale, and functions of the old Japanese question particle *ka*. *Linguistics* 40.30: 553–578.
- Takagi, Tomoyo (1999) “Questions” in argumentative sequences in Japanese. *Human Studies* 32: 397–423.
- Tanaka, Hiroko (1999) *Turn taking in Japanese conversation. A study on grammar and interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tanaka, Hiroko (2000) The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1135–1176.
- Tanaka, Hiroko (2001) Adverbials for turn-projection in Japanese: Towards a demystification of the telepathic mode of communication. *Language in Society* 30: 559–587.
- Tanaka, Lidia (2004) *Gender, language and culture: A study of Japanese television interview discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tanaka, Noriko (2001) *The pragmatics of uncertainty: Its realisation and interpretation in English and Japanese*. Tokyo: Shumpuusha.
- Teramura, Hideo (1982) *Nihongo no shintakkusu to imi I*. (Meaning and syntax in Japanese). Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Tsuchihashi, Mika (1983) The speech act continuum: An investigation of Japanese sentence final particles. *Journal of Pragmatics* 7: 361–387.
- White, Sheila (1989) Backchannels across cultures: A study of Americans and Japanese. *Language in Society* 18: 59–76.

West, Candance (1984) *Routine complications: Trouble with talk between doctors and patients*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

West, Candance, and Don Zimmerman (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, Mass.: Newbury House, pp. 102–117.

Wilson, Thomas (1991) Social structure and the sequential organization of interaction. In D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and social structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 22–43.

Yamada, Tomiaki (1995) Kaiwa bunseki no hoohoo (Conversation analysis methodology). In T. Inoue, C. Ueno, M. Oosawa, S. Mita and S. Yoshimi (eds.), *Tasha, kankei, komyuunikeeshoon* (The others, relations, communication). Tokyo: Iwanami, pp. 121–136.

Yokota, Mariko (1994) The role of questioning in Japanese political discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* Vol.5.2: 353–382.

Zimmerman, Don and Deidre Boden (1991) *Talk and social structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Zimmerman, Don, and Candance West (1975) Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In Barry Thorne and Nancy Henley (eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, pp. 105–29.