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Abstract

This study investigates uses of three Japanese response tokens, i.e. *nn*, *huun*, and *soo*, which are commonly used in Japanese conversation in casual settings. These response tokens are often treated as an undifferentiated collection of *aizuchi* or Japanese backchannels, and subsequently, sufficient attention has not been given to the differences between individual response tokens. Furthermore, studies of *aizuchi* has focused mainly on the use of *aizuchi* as a means to signal the recipient role, such as listening to or having understood what the primary speaker is saying, as well as showing a stance, such as agreement or interest. As a consequence, current understanding of Japanese response tokens does not sufficiently capture their significance as interactional property in Japanese talk-in-interaction.

Using ‘conversation analysis’ (CA) as the framework, the present study examines uses of the three aforementioned response tokens in close reference to the sequential context in which they are situated. The data set of the current study consists of seven audio-recorded casual Japanese conversations between female native speakers of Japanese. Detailed examination of these three response tokens demonstrates that individual response tokens indeed achieve different actions, indicating the producer’s various stances in reference to the current talk, which, at the same time, proffers various implications for subsequent actions. Findings of this study empirically demonstrate that Japanese response tokens are not merely a signal of recipient role, but they also indicate the producer’s real time analysis of the current talk, which accordingly furnishes a context for the subsequent talk. In other words, Japanese response tokens are deeply linked to a crucial aspect of talk-in-interaction, namely, a turn-by-turn and moment-by-moment organisation of interaction where “a context of publicly displayed and continuously updated intersubjective understanding is systematically sustained” (Atkinson and Heritage 1984: 11). Through the investigation of the response token *in situ*, the current study attempts to shed some light on Japanese
response tokens’ interactional relevance to the locally achieved, temporally unfolding Japanese talk-in-interaction.
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Transcription Conventions

This thesis adopts a simplified version of the transcription conventions by Gardner (1995), which is developed based on Gail Jefferson’s system (See transcription notations in Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974; Jefferson 1984a; Atkinson and Heritage 1984; among others) and presents intonation in more detail.

[ ] the point where overlapping talk starts
] the point where overlapping talk stops
= “latched” talk or contiguous talk with no gap or overlap between the computer of one utterance and the beginning of another
(0.0) length of silence, which is measured in tenths of a second
(.) a very short pause or micropause
. a falling terminal contour, a ‘final’ intonation.
; a continuing contour with slight fall
_ level pitch
, a continuing contour with slight rise
? a rising contour
' a contour that rises more than in a continuing contour, but less than the sharp rise of the question mark contour
xxx the contour of the syllable moves initially at level tone
x:x the contour of the syllable falls and then rises
xx: the contour of the syllable rises and then falls
° softer than the surrounding talk
∞ very quiet talk
word stress in talk
CAPS a louder voice than surrounding talk
: drawl or the lengthening of a sound
↑↓ a particularly marked shift in pitch
> < faster than surrounding talk
< > slower than surrounding talk
creaky voice

- cut-off

hh audible aspirations
.hh audible inhalations

(h) plosive quality, as in talk in laughter
$words$ laughing or smiling while talking, which can be detected audibly

( ) an inadequate hearing

(( )) commentary by transcriber

➔ a feature of interest

## Abbreviations in transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>various forms of the 'be' verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunctive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>final particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>quotative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>subject marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Aims and scope

This study investigates three Japanese response tokens\(^1\), i.e. *nn*, *huun*, and *soo*, which are frequently observed in Japanese conversation, particularly in casual settings. In studies of Japanese conversation, response tokens are often referred to as *aizuchi* or Japanese backchannels\(^2\). Most studies of *aizuchi* are concerned with the use of *aizuchi* as a whole and sufficient attention has not been given to the differences between Japanese response tokens. In the tradition of conversation analysis (CA), which takes the position against the collective treatment of these objects, response tokens are investigated as differentiated objects (Gardner 1995, 2001; Goodwin 1986; Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1984a; Schegloff 1982; Sorjonen 1996; among others). Investigations of response tokens in other languages using CA have presented fruitful insights into the use of response tokens, revealing their “fine-grained organisation” (Heritage 1989: 1)

---

\(^1\) I will use the term ‘response tokens’, which is used by Gardner (1995, 2001), Heritage (1989), Silverman (1990) among others, to refer to conversational objects with no or low semantic content “whose primary functions are not to make reference to the world, but to provide some information on the course the talk is taking” (Gardner 2001: 14), such as ‘continuers’ (Schegloff 1982), ‘acknowledgement tokens’ (Jefferson 1984a), and ‘newsmarks’ (Jefferson 1981).

\(^2\) The widely used term ‘backchannel’ was introduced by Yngve (1970), covering various utterances from brief vocalisations such as *uh huh* and *ok* to short comments or questions.
30) and accomplishment in talk-in-interaction, which may not be captured by treating them as “an undifferentiated collection” (Heritage 1984a: 335).

In addition, response tokens are often non-lexical or low in semantic content, which makes it difficult to say what they actually mean without referring to the sequential context where they are situated. In other words, response tokens are “almost purely sequential” and “they gain much of their interactional significance from their specific placements in sequences of talk” (Heritage 1989: 29). The methodology of CA, which is deeply concerned with sequential organisation of talk, has demonstrated to be an effective methodology to investigate response tokens (cf. Gardner 1995, 2001; Goodwin 1986; Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1984a; Schegloff 1982; Sorjonen 1996; among others).

This study closely examines the aforementioned three Japanese response tokens, i.e., *nn*, *huun*, and *soo*, as differentiated objects and explicates their accomplishments in Japanese talk-in-interaction, using the methodology of CA. These response tokens are chosen as an initial step to differentiate Japanese response tokens, as they are among the most frequently used response tokens in everyday casual Japanese conversation. Furthermore, by investigating these response tokens in close reference to their local sequential contexts where they achieve their interactional purposes, the current study attempts to shed light on their interactional relevance to the unfolding talk-in-interaction in the language.

### 1.2 Review on Japanese response tokens

As mentioned above, the target tokens of this thesis, i.e., *nn*, *huun*, and *soo*, are often grouped into a class of behaviour called *aizuchi* or Japanese backchannels together with other brief responses (cf. Chen 2001; Horiguchi 1988, 1997; Imaishi 1992; Komiya 1986; Kubota 2001; Kurosaki 1987; LoCastro 1987; Matsuda 1988; Maynard 1986, 1989; Mizutani 1983, 1984, 1988; Ohama et al. 1998; Sugito 1989; Szatrowski 1993; among others). *Aizuchi* is a rather vague and broad term to cover a
wide range of verbal and non-verbal activities, which appear to achieve various actions in conversational exchanges. In addition to brief response vocalisations such as *hai, e e, mn, huun, hee, soo, honto* etc., the following are also referred to as *aizuchi* in the literature: repeat of the prior talk (Horiguchi 1988, 1997; Komiya 1986; Kurosaki 1987; Matsuda 1988; Maynard 1987; Mizutani 1984; Ohama et al. 1998; Sugito 1989; Szatrowski 1993), formulation/restatement of the prior talk (Horiguchi 1988, 1997; Matsuda 1988; Mizutani 1984; Ohama et al. 1998), collaborative completions (Mizutani 1984; Matsuda 1988), brief questions (LoCastro 1987), nonverbal expressions such as head nodes (Matsuda 1988; Maynard 1987; Sugito 1989), head shake (Maynard 1987) laughter (Kurosaki 1987; Matsuda 1988; Sugito 1989; Szatrowski 1993), smile (Matsuda 1988; Maynard 1987), and other facial expressions (Matsuda 1988).

Although there is an inconsistency as to what is to be regarded as *aizuchi*, a baseline criterion for *aizuchi* seems to be agreed on as displaying continued attention and/or some sort of understanding of what is said in the prior talk. In addition, what seems to be crucial is that *aizuchi* is produced by the party who is assuming the role of the recipient. Maynard (1986, 1987, 1989) notes that *aizuchi* does not constitute a speaking turn. Horiguchi (1997) refers to this point as one of the characteristics of *aizuchi*, noting that *aizuchi* occurs during the other speaker’s speaking turn. Based on the literature on *aizuchi*, Horiguchi (1997: 42) concludes that the *aizuchi* is defined as an expression with which the recipient conveys that he or she has shared the information delivered by the primary speaker while the primary speaker is assuming the speakership.

*Aizuchi* is reported to have several functions. Showing continued attention and/or understanding of the prior talk are often claimed as functions of *aizuchi* in the literature (Horiguchi 1988, 1997; Komiya 1986; Kurosaki 1987; Matsuda 1988; among others). In addition, Maynard (1986: 1095) lists the following as functions of *aizuchi*.

---

3 Schegloff (1982), in his discussion on *uh huh* in English, makes distinction between a claim and a showing or displaying understanding. Schegloff argues that *uh huh* may be taken as a ‘claim’ of
While these are recognised as functions of *aizuchi* by other scholars (see, for example, Horiguchi 1997; Szatrowski 1993; Matsuda 1988), Maynard (1989:171) further adds another function of “[m]inor addition, correction, or request for information” to those listed above. Other functions found in the literature are to display a negative stance toward what is said by the primary speaker (Horiguchi 1988, 1997; Matsuda 1988) and to indicate closure of conversation (Szatrowski 1993). In contrast to the functions listed so far, Ohama *et al.* (1998) argue that the function of *aizuchi* is not merely a display of the role of the listener. They investigate the use of *aizuchi* in direction-giving discourse and conclude that *aizuchi* in the discourse has a more active function in controlling the development of discourse rather than merely displaying the role of the listener by displaying a continued attention or understanding (Ohama *et al.* 1998).

So far, I have presented an overview of the studies of *aizuchi*. In most studies of *aizuchi*, the focus appears to be on the usage of *aizuchi* as a whole rather than on the usage of individual objects. There are, however, some studies that look into the differences between the items in *aizuchi*, which I will now summarise.

For instance, Ohama *et al.* (1998) investigate *aizuchi* occurring in direction-giving discourse by observing the type of information delivered in talk preceding the occurrence of *aizuchi*, e.g. indicating the rough direction, indicating the start point, indicating the change of the direction or movement, etc. Ohama *et al.* (1998) examine repetition, formulations (*iikae*), questions\(^4\), as well as six frequently used *aizuchi* tokens, which are often low or empty in semantic content, ‘show’ or ‘display’ understanding because it can be seen as passing up an opportunity to initiate repair and thus indicating the absence of problem and not because it has a direct semantic meaning as such. However, in the studies on Japanese *aizuchi*, little empirically based argument is presented as to how *aizuchi* or response tokens, which are often low or empty in semantic content, ‘show’ or ‘display’ understanding.

\(^4\) Ohama *et al.* (1998) note that, although a question is not *aizuchi* in a strict sense, it is included in their analysis as it behaves like *aizuchi*. 

---

4. Ohama *et al.* (1998) note that, although a question is not *aizuchi* in a strict sense, it is included in their analysis as it behaves like *aizuchi*.
expressions, i.e. *hai, ee, a, aa, a hai, and wakarimashita*, which are used by direction-seekers. According to Ohama *et al.* (1998), functions of *aizuchi* in direction-giving discourse are summarised as follows: (i) *hai* occurs frequently at the beginning and in the middle of direction-giving and encourages the expected development of direction-giving, (ii) *ee* only occurs at the beginning of direction-giving, and indicates that the direction-seeker is ready to hear the direction and/or encourages the direction-giver to commence explanation, (iii) *a, a hai,* and *wakarimashita* ‘I understood’ occur at the completion of direction-giving and in a discourse closing environment, and encourage the termination of discourse, and (iv) *aa,* repetitions, formulations, and questions indicate that the direction-seeker is not satisfied with the information provided and encourages the direction-giver to provide further important or necessary information. Ohama *et al.* (1998) conclude that the function of *aizuchi* is to control the development of the discourse.

Chen (2001) also investigates the relation between different *aizuchi* expressions. Chen (2001) argues that *hai, ee, un* and their reiterated form, e.g. *hai hai,* are used when the recipient receives merely a fragment of information that is not enough to understand what the speaker is saying, while other *aizuchi* tokens, including *nn* and its reiterated form, are used when the recipient receives a chunk of information and understands what the speaker says.

A similar distinction between *aizuchi* is made by Imaishi (1992), who divides *aizuchi* into (i) encouragers (*sokushin-gata*), which signal the recipient’s understanding of the content of the talk without showing his or her attitude towards it, and (ii) completers (*kanketsu-gata*), which display the recipient’s attitude toward the content of the talk. Imaishi (1992) claims that the intonation plays an important role in identifying a place where *aizuchi* occurs and states the following two intonation contours as inviting *aizuchi*: a rising intonation contour, and falling intonation mapped onto the
last syllable that is preceded by a brief pause\textsuperscript{5}. She also notes that it is not relevant to produce *aizuchi* at a place marked with level intonation.

There are also some studies that attempt to differentiate between some of the minimal responses in Japanese (e.g. Kitagawa 1980; McGloin 1998), which do not limit the usage as so-called *aizuchi* but also include those used in response to a polar question. Kitagawa examines *hai* and *ee*, which are generally regarded as a close equivalent of the English *yes*, and argues that *ee* signals that the speaker “is of the same mind with the addressee in regard to the comment just made to him by the addressee” (1980: 110), whereas *hai* “is a polite signal to the addressee to indicate that the speaker has heard (and understood) what the addressee said to him” (1980: 110). Kitagawa notes that “*hai* projects the sense of ‘I hear you’, and *ee* the sense of ‘I am with you (so go on)’” (1980: 115), when they are used as backchannels. As McGloin (1998) claims, however, Kitagawa’s arguments are based on intuitive data invented by the researcher and thus limited in scope.

McGloin (1998) investigates the use of *hai* and *ee* in actual interaction, using professor-student dyadic conversations. McGloin points out that *hai* is used in an environment where there is some type of break in the discourse, which may be a break between non-action and action or “an organizational break such as different phase of an interaction” (1998:115), and claims that it indicates the speaker’s willingness to take the interactional action implicated by the talk to which it responds. As for the use of *ee*, McGloin (1998) notes that *ee* indicates the speaker’s alignment with the coparticipant. She also investigates *ee* occurring in the speaker’s own statement rather than as a response to other speaker’s statement, and argues that this use of *ee* indicates “the speaker’s desire for speaker-listener co-alignment in conversation” (McGloin 1988:118).

\textsuperscript{5} Imaishi (1992) notes that the latter intonation contour tends to occur at a place marked with a conjunctive particle. Similar observation is made by Sugitoo (1993), who states that the recipient tends to produce *aizuchi* in response to falling intonation which is regarded as marking a phrasal or sentential juncture.
Finally, I will review Kushida’s study (2002), which investigates the use of *un* and *soo* occurring after collaborative completions using the methodology of Conversation Analysis (CA). Unlike the *aizuchi* studies reviewed earlier, Kushida (2002) examines these response tokens as differentiated objects and argues that *un* and *soo* are systematic alternatives to redistribute the speakership that wavered by collaboratively completing some talk. According to Kushida, immediately after collaborative completions, *soo* is always employed by a party who did not speak sufficiently after the onset of collaborative completion, whereas *un* is overwhelmingly used by a party who has produced sufficient talk to accomplish the purpose of the collaborative completion. Kushida observes that the producer of *soo* tends to continue with further talk after producing *soo* and the subsequent talk following the *soo* is designed to acknowledge the contribution of the other speaker’s talk in the collaborative completion. Based on these observations, Kushida proposes that *soo* is used to acknowledge that what the other speaker has said is what the *soo* producer has planned to say but did not say sufficiently in the preceding collaborative completion, in other words, *soo* treats what the other speaker has said as something that was said on behalf of the producer of the *soo*. In contrast, *un* is used to receipt other speaker’s talk as showing understanding of what the *un* producer has already said sufficiently and can be used when the *un* producer proceeds with further talk that approves or disapproves the understanding (Kushida 2002). Kushida (2002) states that *soo* is a procedure to share the speakership between the *soo* producer and the other speaker, while *un* is a producer to create the status of two separate speakers.

In this section, I have reviewed some studies on Japanese response tokens. As sketched earlier, Japanese response tokens are often studied as a part of a broader and rather vague perspective called *aizuchi* or backchannel behaviour (cf. Chen 2001; Horiguchi 1988, 1997; Imaishi 1992; Komiya 1986; Kubota 2001; Kurosaki 1987; LoCastro 1987; Matsuda 1988; Maynard 1986, 1989; Mizutani 1983, 1984, 1988; Ohama *et al.* 1998; Sugito 1989; Szatrowski 1993; among others). While the concept of *aizuchi* or backchannels “captures a basic intuition about the brief turns”
(Drummond and Hopper 1993: 162), such a treatment tends to neglect the distinctions between individual tokens and is likely to overlook the “diversity and complexity” (Heritage 1984a: 335) of the accomplishment achieved by different response tokens. As demonstrated by studies on response tokens in CA, objects that are apparently very similar indeed achieve different actions (e.g. Kushida 2002, for Japanese response tokens; Gardner 1995, 2001; Jefferson 1984a; Schegloff 1982; Sorjonen 1996, for response tokens other than Japanese). Although some attempts have been made to explore the distinctions between items within aizuchi, much of the accomplishment of individual response tokens still remain to be explicated. Furthermore, the literature of aizuchi has focused mainly on the use of aizuchi as a means to display some stance on the part of the listener toward what is said by the primary speaker. Whereas it is noted that aizuchi has a certain influence on the progress of conversation (Horiguchi 1988; Komiya 1986; Mizutani 1983; Maynard 1987, among others), little empirical explication has been provided in regard to this matter. It is essential to examine the actual instances of individual objects in close reference to their local sequential context in order to empirically reveal this ‘reflexive’ aspect, i.e. the consequence “in maintaining and altering the sense of the activities and unfolding circumstances in which they occur” (Heritage 1984b: 140), as well as the differentiated accomplishment of Japanese response tokens.

1.3 Response tokens in Conversation Analysis

This section will review some studies, which investigate response tokens in languages other than Japanese using the methodology of Conversation Analysis (CA). These studies, as well as Kushida’s work (2002) discussed earlier, show that CA is an effective and viable approach to response tokens that is different from that in Japanese aizuchi studies. As will be sketched below, studies in CA give more attention to the differences between response tokens (Gardner 1995, 2001; Goodwin 1986; Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1984a; Sacks 1992; Schegloff 1982; Sorjonen 1996; among others).
Sacks (1992) discusses utterances like *mm hm* and *uh huh* and observes that they are placed overwhelmingly at grammatical completion points in storytelling. Sacks points out what *mm hm* at least does is to say that “the story is not yet over, I know that” (Sacks 1992: 9). Sacks uses the term ‘continuer’, suggesting that *uh huh* is not merely saying to ‘go on’, but can be seen as “noting that while the speaker is now about to pause, he intends to go on” (emphasis in original) (1992: 411). Sacks (1992: 411) states:

one doesn’t want to think of “Uh huh” as simply saying ‘go on,’ but as anticipating the other’s intention to go on, and saying something a bit more elaborate; something like: I see that you’re reaching a point where … you’re going to stop at a syntactic node in your talk, e.g., the possible end of a sentence. At that point I could start talking if I chose, by virtue of the kind of rules that operate in conversation, where a listener can treat a possible sentence as a total utterance and start talking. I also see that you want to go on, and I’ll let you (emphasis in original).

Schegloff (1982) makes a similar claim to Sacks, arguing that vocalisations such as *uh huh, mm hm, yeah*, and others such as head nod are used as ‘continuers’. Schegloff (1982: 81) notes,

Perhaps the most common usage of ‘uh huh’, etc. (in environments other than after yes/no questions) is to exhibit on the part of its producer an understanding that an extended unit of talk is underway by another, and that it is not yet or may not yet be (even ought not yet be), complete. It takes the stance that the speaker of that extended unit should continue talking, and in that continued talking should continue that extended unit.

He goes on to state that such understanding and stance are exhibited “precisely by passing an opportunity to produce a full turn at talk” (Schegloff 1982: 81). Schegloff also argues that *uh huh* and other similar objects can be taken as claiming understanding not because they have a direct semantic meaning as such, but because of their precise placement where repair for understanding problem can be initiated. In other words, these objects may be used to pass up an opportunity to raise an
understanding problem. This accordingly is taken as an indication of the absence of such problems, which may be hearable as claiming understanding. Furthermore, Schegloff claims that *uh huh* and other similar objects can be taken as indicating agreement in some cases, precisely because the use of these objects can be regarded as passing up repair initiation that foreshadows an imminent disagreement.

Jefferson (1984a) discusses the use of *yeah* and *mm hm*. Jefferson points out systematic deployment of these tokens by conversation participants. Jefferson argues that *yeah* exhibits the producer’s “preparedness to shift from recipiency to speakership” (1984a: 200), while *mm hm* proposes the producer’s understanding that “his co-participant is still in the midst of some course of talk, and shall go on talking” (1984a: 200).

Participants’ orientation to distinctions between response tokens are also demonstrated by Goodwin (1986), who investigates continuers and brief response type assessments used during the other speaker’s extended talk. Goodwin argues that the speaker of the current extended talk treats continuers and assessments differently in their subsequent talk. He argues that, in contrast to a continuer, which “frequently bridges the end of one unit and the beginning of a next” (Goodwin 1986: 207), a subsequent unit after a response type assessment is not proffered, or even “held off”, until the assessment reaches its completion. Goodwin notes that continuers and assessments are alternative actions that are available for the recipients to deal with the other speaker’s extended talk. To be more precise, with continuers, recipients “can attend to individual units as emerging elements of a larger structure that is not yet complete”, whereas with assessments, recipients “can comment on the specifics of what is being, and has been, said without treating it as a preliminary to something else” (Goodwin 1986: 214). Such actions taken by recipients of current extended talk do not only proffer their different stance toward the current talk, but also have “consequences for speaker’s actions as well as their own” (Goodwin 1986: 210).

Gardner’s work on the uses of *mm* demonstrates the flexibility of response tokens (1995, 2001). Gardner proposes that the response token *mm* canonically serves
as 'neutral acknowledger' and claims that its producer has adequately received the prior talk without any problem and has nothing substantial to add to the prior talk. According to Gardner, *mm* as a neutral acknowledger is characterised as being placed between *mm hm*, which is a 'classic continuer', and *yeah*, which typically does 'acknowledging or affirming work', although it is relatively closer to the latter (Gardner 1995, 2001). In addition, it is shown that *mm* used in this way typically has falling intonation and functions primarily to complete a sequence. Gardner also demonstrates the flexibility of response tokens and effects of intonation contour. He argues that the continuer *mm hm*, which typically has a fall-rising contour, and the acknowledgement *yeah*, which typically has a falling contour, can be "transformed into the other...by acquiring the typical intonation shape of the other" (Gardner 2001: 129). Furthermore, Gardner suggests that the token *mm*, which is a canonical neutral acknowledger, can also serve like a continuer when it is delivered with fall-rising intonation. *Mm* with this particular intonation contour indicates receipt of the turn-so-far and requests more "to make full sense of what they are saying" (Gardner 2001: 253). Gardner further notes that *mm* used in this way typically occurs in an environment of 'incipient trouble' and can be seen as a kind of 'pre-trouble' token. Another intonation contour, namely, a rise-falling contour, makes *mm* an assessment token, indicating "an added sense of heightened involvement in the talk, which may be an alignment with sympathy, surprise, complaint, humour etc. in the other party’s talk" (Gardner 2001: 250).

Heritage (1984a) examines the token *oh* produced as a response in various types of sequences in the environments of informings and repair. According to Heritage (1984a: 299), *oh* generically proposes a "change-of-state", namely, "that its producer has undergone some kind of change in his or her locally current state of knowledge, information, orientation or awareness". As a response to an informing or other-initiated repair, *oh* marks "a change of state of knowledge or information" (Heritage 1984a). Heritage (1998) further explores *oh* in another sequential environment, namely, in turn-initial position in response to a question. Heritage (1998)
suggests that *oh* in this environment proposes a “change of state of orientation or awareness”. It is argued that *oh*-prefacing in this sequential environment indicates “that the inquiry being responded to is problematic as to its relevance, presuppositions, or context” (Heritage 1998: 296). In addition to this, Heritage (1998: 314) argues that *oh*-prefaced responses to a question project reluctance to advance the topic that is raised by the inquiry, pointing out that the producer of *oh*-prefaced response “does not engage in a significant continuation of the topic or issue raised by the inquiry”. In Heritage (2002), *oh* occurring in yet another environment, i.e. *oh*-prefaced responses to assessments, is examined. Heritage (2002: 201) argues that a “change of state of orientation” proposed in response to assessments “is a systematic way of indicating that a speaker has independent access to and already holds a position on the matter at issue”. Thus, *oh*-prefaced (dis)agreement claims “epistemic independence”, through which its producer “conveys that the opinion that follows the *oh*-preface is independent of the ‘here and now’ of current experience and the prior speaker’s evaluation” (Heritage 2002: 201).

Sorjonen (1996) investigates Finnish response tokens *niin* and *joo* that are used as a response to a repeat. According to Sorjonen, these response tokens are associated with two different sequential environments, more precisely, *niin* occurs in a context where a larger sequence and/or activity is still in progress and not yet complete, while *joo* occurs in a closure relevant environment. It is pointed out that the subsequent talk following these response tokens takes different trajectories. *Niin* is followed by a continuation of the larger on-going activity/sequence or by an initiation of a new sequence that delays the resumption of the larger activity, whereas *joo* is followed by a shift of the activity and topic (Sorjonen 1996). Sorjonen argues that *niin* provides a confirmation, treating the repeat to which it is oriented as a display of uncertainty. On the other hand, *joo* treats the repeat as a “non-problematic registration of prior talk” (Sorjonen 1996: 320) and reconfirms the correctness of the information in the repeat.

In this section, I have outlined some studies of response tokens conducted by conversation analysts in the ethnomethodological tradition. These studies show the
“diversity and complexity” (Heritage 1984a: 335) of response tokens in accomplishing tasks and objectives in talk-in-interaction. Studies in CA demonstrate that response tokens serve “to provide some information on the course the talk is taking” (Gärdner 2001: 14) by proffering an analysis of the prior talk to which it is oriented. Furthermore, response tokens are shown to be not only relevant to the prior talk to which they are oriented, but also consequential for the subsequent course of unfolding talk. These crucial aspects of response tokens are only captured by examining response tokens as differentiated objects in their local sequential contexts. Studies by conversational analysts have presented fruitful insights into the understanding of response tokens and have proved CA a particularly effective methodology to explore such context-sensitive objects as response tokens. Heritage (1989: 29-30) notes, CA, which focuses “on sequential considerations, [is] perhaps uniquely fitted to shed light on the role of response tokens in talk”. I believe that CA offers an effective set of tools to examine the Japanese response tokens in situ and that the examination of the individual Japanese response tokens in great detail will contribute to further understanding of the significance of response tokens in Japanese talk-in-interaction.

In the next section, I will briefly consider the basic assumptions of the methodology of CA, which I will employ as the framework in this thesis to explore the three aforementioned Japanese response tokens, *nn*, *huun*, and *soo*.

### 1.4 Some basic assumptions and methodological ideas of Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis (CA) was developed out of a school of sociology called ‘ethnomethodology’. CA is concerned with a detailed analysis of ‘ordinary’ conversation, which is “the fundamental form of talk-in-interaction … and a/the primordial site of human sociality and social life” (Schegloff 1987b: 101). CA assumes that conversation or talk-in-interaction is structurally organised. Psathas (1995: 2) notes that CA takes its basic position that “social actions are meaningful to those who produce them and that they have a natural organization that can be discovered and
analysed by close examination”. That is, social actions accomplished through talk are orderly and the participants themselves demonstrate their orientation to this structural organisation of interaction (Heritage 1984b, 1989; Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998). Based on such an assumption, CA views ordinary conversation as an object of analysis in its own right, and deals with “actual, particular social actions and sequences of them” (Schegloff 1980: 151).

Another crucial assumption is that a speaker’s action is ‘context-shaped’ and ‘context-renewing’ (Goodwin and Heritage 1990; Heritage 1984b, 1989). The current action is adequately understood only by referring to the prior talk, i.e. shaped by the context, and the current talk itself creates a context for some next action, which “will inevitably contribute to the framework in terms of which the next action will be understood” (Heritage 1984b: 242), i.e. renewing the context. Participants ‘publicly’ display their understanding of the prior talk in a sequentially next turn, which, at the same time, form a context for the next turn.

Furthermore, CA avoids some prior theoretical assumptions. Heritage (1984b: 243) notes “there is a strong bias against a priori speculation about the orientations and motives of speakers and in favour of detailed examination of conversationalists’ actual actions”. This is in clear contrast with research in traditions of discourse analysis or social psychology where data is used to test a propositional hypothesis (Hopper 1989). CA’s basic approach is to identify recurrent patterns of interaction and describe or explicate the ‘machinery’, ‘orderliness’, or ‘regularity’ that is “methodically produced and oriented to by the participants as normative organization of action” (Heritage 1988: 131). A case that is ‘deviant’ from the recurrent patterns should not be dismissed in the course of analysis but should be analysed to determine what this case shows about the general orderliness, i.e. so-called ‘deviant case analysis’ (cf. Schegloff 1968, 1996b; Heritage 1984b: 248-253).

CA stresses the value and use of recorded naturally occurring talk-in-interaction as data for the analysis in order to reach details of conversational interaction, which otherwise cannot be attained. Heritage (1989:23) notes “[f]rom the
outset, conversation analysts have aimed at grasping the organised procedures of talk as they are employed in real-worldly contexts between persons in real relationships whose talk has a real consequentiality and accountability”. CA involves detailed transcription of recorded conversations, which gives an analyst “a kind of access to the ‘lived reality’ of the interaction that is not available in any other way” (ten Have 1999: 77) and “works as a major ‘noticing device’” (ten Have 1999: 78).

In summary, CA is characterised as a highly-data driven empirical method of investigation, which examines the sequential organisation of actions that participants accomplish though talk.

Now, I will briefly outline a fundamental feature of conversational organisation, namely, the system of turn-taking, proposed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). This model has two components called the ‘turn construction component’ and the ‘turn allocation component’. In reference to the former component, turns are composed of what Sacks et al. (1974) call ‘turn-constructional unit’ (TCU), which varies syntactically, such as sentence, clause, phrase, and lexical items. TCUs are projectable, that is, a recipient can anticipate or know what it will roughly take for the current unit to complete. The first possible completion of a TCU constitutes an initial transition-relevant place (TRP) where a speaker transfer may potentially occur. A possible completion of a TCU can be determined only within the context in which it occurs. Not only syntax, but also intonational and pragmatically aspects play an important role in determining a possible completion of an utterance (cf. Ford and Thompson 1996; Schegloff 1996a; Selting 2000; Tanaka 1999).

As for the turn allocation component, there are two ways in which the next speaker is selected at a TRP. One way is that the current speaker selects the next speaker, for example, by using address terms, or by producing a first pair part of an ‘adjacency pair’, e.g. a question, or by gazing at the other party. The other way is the case where next speaker selects him- or herself as the next speaker, i.e. self-selection. The following is the basic set of rules of turn-taking (Sacks et al 1974).
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Rule 1: For any turn, at the initial transition-relevance place (TRP) of an initial turn-constructional unit (TCU):

(a) If the current speaker selects the next speaker, the current speaker should stop speaking and the selected party should take the next turn.

(b) If no one is selected as the next speaker by the current speaker, any one may or may not self-select as the next speaker. First starter has the rights to the next turn.

(c) If no speaker selection is made, the current speaker may (but need not to) continue, unless another speaker self-selects.

Rule 2: At the initial TRP of an initial TCU, if neither rules 1(a) nor (b) has operated and rule 1(c) has been applied, then at the next TRP, rules 1(a)-(c) reapply, and recursively at each next TRP, until speaker change is effected.

According to Sacks et al. (1974), rules 1(a) – (c) are ordered: these rules constrain each other, affecting application of these rules, not only from higher ordered rules to lower ordered rules but also in the other direction. That is, higher ordered rules are also constrained by the existence of lower ordered rules. For instance, in order to assure that rule 1 (a) is methodically applied, the current speaker has to design the current turn to select the next speaker before the first TRP of the initial unit as, otherwise, rule 1 (b) may be applied.

Furthermore, this turn-taking model is ‘context-free’ in that it is capable of accommodating any conversations with variations of situations or the parties without changing the system and, at the same time, it is ‘context-sensitive’ in that the application of the rules are managed according to the local circumstances in conversation (Sacks et al. 1974: 699-700). Although the turn-taking model proposed by Sacks et al. (1974) is based on English conversation, its relevance and applicability to Japanese conversation is demonstrated in the extensive investigation of Japanese turn-taking conducted by Tanaka (1999). She concludes that “however different the
local linguistic or cultural differences may be between Anglo-American and Japanese conversation, the basic workings of the turn-taking remains essentially the same” (Tanaka 1999: 59).

1.5 Data

The conversations analysed in the current study consist of seven tape-recorded dyadic conversations between friends in non-experimental settings. The conversations were recorded in the Tokai and Kanto regions in Japan in 2001 and 2002. The conversations took place in various places, such as at the house of one of the participants, at a café or in a car. The taped conversations would have occurred regardless of tape-recording. I did not specify the duration of recording nor of conversation itself so the duration of the recorded conversations varies from ten minutes to thirty minutes, which is the maximum duration of a side of the cassette tape that I provided⁶. The total duration of the conversations is approximately 180 minutes.

There are twelve participants in total: one of them was in three different conversations with different friends. The participants are all female native speakers of Japanese and were in their mid-twenties to early thirties at the time of recording. I should say, therefore, that the use of response tokens investigated in this thesis may be regarded as limited in terms of gender and age. Despite this limitation, however, the current study presents a wide variety of actual instances of the target response tokens in casual Japanese conversation.

The audio-taped conversations were all transcribed by the author. The transcription systems used in this thesis is a simplified version of Gardner’s conventions (cf. Gardner 1995), which is based on the transcription system developed by Gail Jefferson (see, for example, notations in Atkinson and Heritage 1984; Jefferson 1984a; Sacks et al. 1974) with some innovations developed by Gardner himself to capture intonation in more detail. Gardner’s version was adopted for this

⁶ I told the conversation participants not to be bothered to change the side of the tape when it reached the end.
study as it effectively and delicately captures the different intonation contour mapped on to the target response tokens, which are mono-syllabic (for details of transcription conventions, see pages viii-ix). As the conversations are in Japanese, word-by-word and/or morpheme-by-morpheme glosses are provided immediately under the utterances produced by the conversational participants in each fragment. Translation of the utterances into English is also provided\(^7\). The names of the participants and those that are referred to in conversation are changed to pseudonym to ensure the anonymity of the participants. As for romanisation of Japanese scripts, the modified Hepburn system is adopted in this thesis with an exception that fu is spelled hu. Long vowels are written in double letters such as aa.

### 1.6 Organisation of the thesis

In this chapter, I have reviewed some studies on response tokens in Japanese and in the tradition of CA. It was pointed out that response tokens in Japanese tend to be investigated as a group of aizuchi or backchannels, and thus unique aspects of individual tokens are not sufficiently captured. In contrast, the CA studies investigate response tokens as differentiated objects in their local sequential context and demonstrate that response tokens indeed achieve a wide variety of tasks. Some relevant aspects of the methodology of CA and description of data used in this study were also outlined.

This chapter will be followed by four analysis chapters where I will investigate the target response tokens, \( nn, huun \) and \( soo \) with close reference to the sequential contexts they are used. Chapters 2 and 3 will be devoted to explore the token \( nn \). In Chapter 2, I will investigate \( nn \) occurring in the middle of not-yet-complete talk or within-ICU. The within-TCU \( nn \) will be investigated, focusing on the following two environments where it is frequently observed: (i) in response to turn-beginnings, and

---

\(^7\) Ten Have (1999: 94) recommends to include “both morpheme-by-morpheme glosses and a translation” in a case where the system of the original language is very different from that of the language of publication.
(ii) in the middle of on-going TCUs at non-turn-beginnings. It will be argued that deployment of minimal response \( mn \) in constantly provided turn-entry opportunities at the beginning and during the construction of a turn serves as continuers, which indicates that the producer passes up more substantial talk at the turn-entry opportunity and thus the relevant TCU should be continued by its original speaker. The analysis will also reveal aspects of the interactive construction of Japanese TCUs.

Chapter 3 will examine \( mn \) that is deployed at a possible completion of the current talk, i.e. \( mn \) at possible TRPs. It will be argued that \( mn \) deployed at possible TRPs serve to acknowledge receipt of other speaker’s talk without projecting further talk in its own right, i.e. the receipt \( mn \). It will be shown that the subsequent talk following the receipt \( mn \) demonstrates an orientation to closing, or moving away from, the talk to which it responds. It will be argued that the receipt \( mn \) indicates its producer’s minimal involvement in developing the current talk.

In Chapter 4, I will discuss the response token \( huan \), which occurs in the context of telling/informing. It will be suggested that \( huan \) indicates the producer’s epistemic stance of no independent access or prior knowledge of the current state of talk, as well as the producer’s understanding of the current state of talk that the telling/informing is possibly complete. \( Huan \) is commonly deployed as freestanding. It will be argued that freestanding \( huan \) functions to invite the telling/informing party to produce further talk by furnishing a sequential context for expansion of the telling/informing as well as showing the producer’s orientation to staying in the telling/informing activity. I will also examine instances where \( huan \) is immediately followed by subsequent talk by its producer, i.e. the non-freestanding case.

Chapter 5 will investigate the last token of the three, i.e. \( soo \), which is lexically more substantial compared to the other two, i.e. \( mn \) and \( huan \). It will be argued that \( soo \) does not only demonstrate an affiliative stance toward what is said by the other speaker, but also indicates that the affiliative stance is based on the producer’s independently formed perspective or understanding of the discussed matter. Furthermore, it will be
shown that *soo* implicates its producer’s orientation to staying in or progressing the matter under discussion.

The final chapter will summarise the main findings and discuss implications of some aspects of Japanese response tokens and Japanese talk-in-interaction. Some implications for future research will also be presented.
2.1 Introduction

The first response token to be investigated in this thesis is *nn*. This is among the most commonly used response tokens in Japanese conversation, particularly, in casual/informal settings. In my data set, *nn* is found to occur roughly in two different environments in terms of the progress of the talk to which it is oriented, that is, in the middle of some talk in progress and at a place where some talk is possibly complete. A similar observation is reported by Chen (2001) in reference to the placement of *nn*. Chen (2001) reports that *un* and its reiterated form, e.g. *un un*, can be used when its producer receives merely a fragment of information that is not sufficient to understand what the primary speaker is saying, and that *nn* and its reiterated form can be used when its producer receives sufficient information and understands what the primary speaker is saying\(^1\).

In this study, *nn* in these environments will be examined separately. I will first examine *nn* occurring where the talk to which it is oriented is still in progress, i.e. *nn*

---

\(^1\) In Chen (2001), what is referred to as *nn* in this study appears to be divided into two different tokens, i.e. *un* and *nn*, although no particular discussion or explication is provided as to the distinction between *un* and *nn*. 
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Nn at Non-Transition-Relevance Places

occurring at non-transition-relevance places (non-TRPs), focusing particularly on nn deployed while a turn constructional unit (TCU) to which it responds is under construction, i.e. the within-TCU nn. In the current data set, nn at non-TRPs is overwhelmingly deployed freestanding without being immediately followed by its producer’s subsequent talk. Nn occurring at or around a possible completion of the talk to which it is oriented, i.e. nn deployed at possible TRPs, will be examined in Chapter 3. In contrast to nn at non-TRP, nn deployed at possible TRPs is commonly produced both freestanding and non-freestanding. As demonstrated by studies of response tokens in CA, the tasks accomplished by response tokens are closely related to the local sequential context where they are situated (cf. Schegloff 1982; Gardner 2001; Heritage 1984a, 1998, 2002; among others). It will be shown that nn serves to achieve different tasks in these environments.

In this chapter, I will first briefly discuss nn deployed at possible grammatical completions of TCUs in extended talk in Section 2.2. Then, I will investigate the within-TCU nn in Section 2.3, focusing on the following two environments where nn is frequently observed: (i) in response to incremental turn-beginnings, and (ii) in the middle of on-going TCUs at non-turn-beginnings. It will be shown that the within-TCU nn works as a continuer, which shows that the current talk should be continued by its speaker toward a possible completion. I will also discuss instances where a continuer nn appears to further claim some sort of recognition or understanding of what the primary speaker has said in Section 2.4. The observation will demonstrate interactive construction of TCU in Japanese and a crucial contribution of nn to it.

2.2 At possible grammatical completions in extended talk

Continuers, which are typically mm hm and uh huh in English, show its producer’s understanding of the current state of talk that it is not yet complete and thus should be continued by passing up opportunities to take a fuller turn at talk

2 In the current data set, all instances of the within-TCU nn and most of the rest of nn at non-TRPs, i.e. nn at grammatical possible completions, are produced freestanding.
(Schegloff 1982; Sacks 1992). It is reported that, in English, continuers occur overwhelmingly at possible grammatical completions of TCU s in extended talk (cf. Goodwin 1986; Schegloff 1982; Sacks 1992; among others). As shown in fragment (1) below, \textit{nn} is also frequently observed in such a context, i.e. at possible grammatical completions of extended talk, serving as continuers\textsuperscript{3}. Note that possible grammatical completions here do not constitute possible TRPs since they are not possibly complete in terms of intonation, and more importantly, as an action.

Fragment (1) presents instances of \textit{nn} placed at possible grammatical completions in a multi-unit storytelling. During the storytelling, normal turn-taking is suspended so that the story-teller can produce more than one TCU. In the portion below, Tae talks about one of her friends, who got married recently. \textit{Nn} is constantly produced by the story-recipient, Saya, throughout the course of the telling. The target instances of \textit{nn} are marked by an arrow.

\begin{verbatim}
(1) [TS: 252]
1 Tae: [kotoshi : (0.2) sa (. ) sono- (0.3) cho kusetsu na kai ko this.year FP that directly close person
2 wa sono naru da kedo[; ,
TOP that two.peopleBE CONJ
‘this year (0.2) you know (. ) that- (0.3) people who are close are only those
2 two people, but’
3 Saya: [nn: ;
4 Tae: [.hh sugoi no.=do yoobi ni ne .;= amazing FP Saturday on FP
‘.hh it’s amazing. on Saturday, you
2 know?’
5 Saya: =nn : .
6 Tae: chuu gakkoo no ; dookyuusee* no* (0.2) ko no ouchi ni junior.high.school GEN classmate GEN person GEN house to
7 asobi ni itta no . = nan[ka ]kinari shooshukakatte ,= play to went FP uhm suddenly summoned .and
‘((I/we)) went to the house of a classmate from junior highschool, uhm
2 ((because)) ((I was/ we were)) suddenly called’
8 Saya: → [°° nn °° ,
9 Saya: → =nn : .
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{3} That the token \textit{nn} can be used as continuers in Japanese is also suggested by other studies (e.g. Szatrowski 1993).
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10 Tae: [bukatsu ga issho datta ko na n da kedo, =
club.activity SUB same was person BE NM BE CONJ
‘(it) was someone who was in the same club activity ((at school))’

11 Saya: naï

12 Tae: de atashi wa (0.2) hisashiburini atta n da kedo:= mae nanka
and I TOP after.long.time saw NM BE CONJ before uhm

13 chigau ko no <kekkonshiki> de : [minna wa =
different person GEN wedding at everyone TOP
‘and I met ((them)) for the first time after a long time, but before, uhm, at a
wedding of a different person, as for everyone’

14 Saya: [ naï :

15 Tae: =kyonen ikkai attoru rashii no , =
last.year once met seem FP
‘seem to have met last year once’

16 Saya: naï

17 Tae: de sono yobaretako no ouchi ni ittara _;__,
and that invited person GEN house to went-CONJ
‘and when ((I/we)) went to the house of the person who invited ((me/us))

18 Saya: naï

19 Tae: nanka ↑↑ sono ko mo↑↑ kekkonsuru: tte koto o
uhm that person also marry QT NM OBJ

20 kiiteta n da kedo _;__,
heard NM BE CONJ
‘uhm, ((I)) heard that the person is also getting married, but’

21 Saya: =ō naï :

22 Tae: moo kekkon shitete ;
already is.married.and
‘((she)) is already married and’

23 Saya: naï :

24 Tae: onaka ni ne rokkagetsu no akachan ga ite _;__,
belly in FP six.months GEN baby SUB exist.and
‘is six months pregnant and’

25 Saya: naï : [ ;

26 Tae: [ shiki ga nigatsu na n da tte ; , =
ceremony SUB February BE NM BE QT
‘the ((wedding)) ceremony will be held in Februrary, I heard’

27 Saya: =ō hee : [ ;

28 Tae: [ dakara nanka sugoi sa doresu ga : ()
therefore uhm very FP gown SUB
‘so, uhm, the wedding gown ((is)) very’

29 Saya: (soo [ da yo ne);= meda]tsu yo ne ; , =
BE FP FP prominent FP FP
‘((that)) is so, isn’t it? ((it)) is prominent’
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30  Tae:  [  
width SUB
ha ba ga : ]

‘its width ((is))…’

The story is initiated in line 4, prefaced with an assessment, sugoi no ‘((it’s)) amazing’. This assessment serves as a ‘story-preface’, which provides the prospective recipient with some idea what it will roughly take to complete the telling (cf. Sacks 1992; Schegloff 1992b, for story-preface). The potential recipient Saya does not provide a go-ahead response, at least not verbally, at this point. Moreover, Saya ‘rushes through’ (Schegloff 1982) to the story proper following the story-preface. Saya provides a sort of go-ahead in line 5 by claiming her recipiency with nn shortly after Tae provides a time frame, doyoobi ni ‘on Saturday’, which is accompanied by a final particle ne⁴. This is followed by a continuation of the story.

The first nn that is produced around possible grammatical completion appears in line 8 at a place marked with the final particle no attached to the final predicate, itta ‘went’. Although the TCU to which the nn is oriented is grammatically complete, it is not treated as a possible end of the story, as Tae’s talk has not yet fulfilled what the story preface has projected, i.e. something that is ‘amazing’. The instances of nn in lines 9 and 11 are also conceivable as being placed at possible grammatical completions, namely, at completions of the additional increments that are hearable as being oriented to the prior TCU, i.e. ‘post-predicate additions’ (Tanaka 1999).

A new TCU is initiated in line 12, which is prefaced by de ‘and’. Another nn (line 16) is placed at a possible grammatical completion of the TCU that is marked with the final particle no accompanying the predicate atteru rashii ‘((it)) seems that ((they)) have seen ((each other))’. This, again, is not hearable as a possible completion of the story. Note also that the final particle is delivered with a rising non-final intonation contour.

⁴ In this thesis, ‘final particles’ refer to a class of particles that are used at the end of a phrase which may or may not be a TCU-final position. In general, those particles that appear at the end of a sentence are referred to as shuujoshi ‘sentence-final particles’ and those that occur sentence-internally as kantoojoshi ‘interjectional particles’. The term ‘final particles’ includes both types of particles in this study.
Another TCU, which is a ‘compound TCU’ (Lerner 1991; Lerner and Takagi 1999), is launched in line 17, prefaced by *de* ‘and’. This compound TCU actually constitutes the climax of the story, which is that the friend whom she had heard is getting married had actually already been married and is even six months pregnant and will have the wedding ceremony in February. This corresponds with the story-preface that was produced at the beginning of the story, *sugoi no* ‘((it’s)) amazing’. The story is hearable as possibly complete at the end of this lengthy compound TCU that is marked with the quotation particle *tte* ‘I heard’ (line 26). This is treated as such by the story-recipient Saya, who demonstrates her understanding that the story is possibly complete by providing another response token *hee*, which is a sort of assessment and displays the speaker’s surprise to what has been told.

The above instance has shown *nn* produced at possible grammatical completions during an extended talk. By proffering *nn* rather than producing a more substantial turn, the producer of *nn* shows her understanding that the extended talk, i.e. the story, is still in progress and thus the teller should continue toward its possible completion, i.e. the continuer usage. Indeed, the teller continues with the on-going story following *nn*.

### 2.3 Within-TCU *nn*

In the current data set, *nn* is also frequently observed in the middle of a TCU where it is not possibly complete in any sense, i.e. grammatically, intonationally, and/or as a conversational action (See, for example, Ford and Thompson 1996, Sacks *et al.* 1974, and Schegloff 1996a for discussion of possible completion). Section 2.3 will investigate *nn* deployed in such a context, i.e. while a TCU is still in progress. I will first examine instances of *nn*, occurring in response to initiation of a turn, and then moves onto those occurring at other places in the middle of a TCU, i.e. at non-turn-beginnings.
It will be shown that *nn* is proffered at brief turn-entry opportunities, which are furnished during incremental construction of TCUs. I will argue that *nn* deployed at these opportunities also serve as a continuer, which shows its producer’s understanding of the current state of talk and that the TCU to which the *nn* is oriented should be continued toward a possible completion by its speaker.

### 2.3.1 In response to turn initiation

*NN* is commonly observed in response to a turn-beginning that is followed by a brief halting of the delivery of the subsequent word. Such turn-beginnings may consist of ‘appositionals’ (Sacks et al. 1974: 719) or ‘pre-placed appositionals’ (Schegloff 1987a: 74), which do not have substantial meaning in their own right but work as ‘turn-entry devices’ or ‘pre-starts’ (Sacks et al. 1974: 719). Frequently observed appositionals in the current data set are *nanka* ‘uhm, well’ and *ano* ‘uhm, well’ and are often accompanied by final particles *ne* and *sa*.

Turn-beginnings do not necessarily consist of appositionals. *NN* is also found in response to a turn-beginning marked with a brief pause that is created by delaying the delivery of the subsequent word after the initial bit of the turn.

As will be shown below, a brief pause immediately after initiation of a turn provides the prospective recipient with turn-entry opportunities. By deploying *nn* in these positions, its producer shows recognition of the start of a more substantial talk and alignment as a recipient of the initiated talk and thereby indicating that the talk should be continued by its speaker.

---

5 *Nanka* and *ano* are often observed in the spoken Japanese and commonly referred to as ‘fillers’ (cf. Maynard 1989; Cook 1993; Yamane 2002; among others). Maynard (1989:30) notes that fillers include ‘phrases or brief comments’, e.g. *nanka*, and ‘mere empty utterables’, e.g. *uuuun*. According to Maynard (1989: 30), fillers are categorised into ‘language-production-based fillers’, which appear “when smooth speech is either cognitively or productively hindered”, and ‘socially motivated fillers’, which is used “to fill a potential silence” and create the impression that verbal interaction is still maintained. In addition, Maynard claims that fillers also serve to show hesitancy and uncertainty and to make utterance softer or less imposing. Cook (1993:33) investigates the filler *ano* and argues that it is “an affective marker which aligns the speaker and the addressee” and serves to obtain “the addressee’s cooperation”.

---

27
2.3.1.1 Lengthy turns with multiple TCUs or a lengthy TCU

A brief pause may be observed following the beginning of the first TCU of a multi-unit turn or the beginning with a sole but lengthy TCU, as shown below. Fragment (2) illustrates \( m n \) occurring in response to \( nanka \) ‘uhm’ accompanied by the final particle \( ne \) at the beginning of a storytelling. Note that \( nanka \) is deployed at the initiation of a single but rather lengthy TCU (lines 4-26). The target TCU to which the \( mn \) is oriented is initiated following a silence of 3.0 seconds (line 3) with a major shift in topic.

(2) [MY: 383]

1 Maki: (h)hnh hhn=
2 Yuri: =\( oo \)(soo so)\( oo \)
3
4 Yuri: .hhh (,)nanka ne ::,
\text{uhm} \ FP
‘uhm, you know?’
5 Maki: \( \rightarrow \) \( nn \) [: ;
6 Yuri: [kinoo denwakakatte kita tomodachi ga sugoi sa : ;
yesterday telephoned and came friend \( \text{SUB} \) terribly FP
‘the friend who called me yesterday, you know’
7 Maki: \( nn \) : =
8 Yuri: =((claring throat/ cough?)) ano ((company name)) no k\( \text{on} \) ni na n
\text{uhm} \ BE \ NM
9 * da ke[do*; 
\text{BE} \ CONJ
‘uhm the one from ((company name)), but’
10 Maki: \( [>\uparrow \text{NN} : \text{nn} : ; \)

((lines 11 to 24 omitted))

25 Yuri: sore\( o \) (0.4) \( o \) nanka sooyuu* \( $\text{hanashi} \ ni\$ \) natte sa\( \_c \) (1.0)
\text{it OBJ uhm such story to become and FP}
26 (ma)itt\( a \) h. hnh [hnh
\text{was troubled}
‘it, uhm the story became like that and, you know, (1.0), ((I)) was troubled’
27 Maki: [hnn hhn
28 (Yuri): ((sniff))
In line 4, Yuri initiates a turn with *nanka ne*, which is immediately responded to with *nn* by the coparticipant (line 5). The *nn* does not just occur somewhere after turn-initiation but at a turn-entry opportunity that is provided shortly after the initiation of the turn. Immediately after initiation, a very brief gap is created after the final particle *ne* (line 4). This disrupts the ‘progressivity’ (cf. Schegloff 1979; Lerner 1996) of the current talk. Disruption of the progressivity furnishes an opportunity where the prospective recipient may enter the turn space (Lerner 1996). Furthermore, the final particle is prosodically marked with a stress, a sound stretch, and a slight rising intonation contour, which may be hearable as inviting some response from the prospective recipient. Note also that the final particle *ne* itself is reported to invite an acknowledgement from the coparticipant when used turn-internally (cf. Tanaka 2000).

In this context where a turn-entry opportunity is provided, Maki produces a minimal response *nn* with which she acknowledges Yuri’s speakership incipiency and thereby shows alignment as a recipient of the projected talk. Following the incremental beginning, which is responded to by the *nn*, Yuri proceeds to proffer the telling, which consists of a rather lengthy TCU (lines 6-26).

The next fragment illustrates a case where *nn* occurs after a turn-beginning that consists of *nanka* and another final particle, *sa*. Similar to *ne*, the final particle *sa* is frequently used in a context where coparticipants’ attention is sought (Squires 1994). Immediately prior to the excerpt below, Maki asks Yuri for her own e-mail address, which is subsequently supplied by Yuri.

(3) [MY: 1275]
1 (0.3)                      
2 ?:. phh                 
3 (0.3)                     
4 Maki: *nanka sa:* [ano(.) shii oo jee pii] na no ka toka sa: =  
                uhm FP uhm BE NM Q or FP  
                ‘uhm, you know, uhm, ‘co.jp’ or, you know,’  
5 Yuri: ≫ ["nn":;]       
6 Maki: =enu ii jee [pii na no >ka toka] sokoraHEN GA KEKKOO =  
                BE NM Q or around.there SUB quite  
                ‘ne.jp’ or, those things are quite’
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7 Yuri:  
   [ soo : : : ]; wakan nai yo :=  
   know NEG FP
   ‘soo ((it is)) confusing,

8 Maki:  
   = sa : waKANNA]kutte, [.hh  
   FP not.know.and
   ‘confusing and’

9 Yuri:  
   = ne : : ] [°nn : : o ;  
   FP
   ‘isn’t it’

10 Yuri:  
   >watashi mo nanka< purobaidaa kaeta toki ni  
   I also uhm provider changed time at
   sono hen ga gochagocha ni°natte sa : °;  
   it around SUB messy to become.and FP
   ‘As for me, also, uhm, when I changed the provider, these things became  
   confused and, you know’

12 (0.2)

13 Maki:  
   >de atashi mittsu ↑ meeru adoresu motten da yo ne:,  
   and I three email address have NM BE FP FP
   ‘and I have three email addresses, you know’

14 Yuri:  
   °è nande°ç  
   why
   ‘huh what for?’

15 Maki:  
   sono- jibun no ; ie no pasokon no to ;  
   uhm self of home of computerNM and
   sorekara yahuu no to ;  
   and yahoo NM and
   ‘uhn- my home computer one and yahoo one and’

17 Yuri:  
   aa : ; [ hottomeeru mitai na yatsu?=  
   oh hotmail like BEthing
   ‘oh one like hotmail?’

18 Maki:  
   [ nn : .

19 Maki:  
   =>soo soo soo sooo<sore to kore to?  
   it and this and  
   soo soo soo that and this?’

20 ()

21 Maki:  
   ya dakara dandan $ wakanna(h)ku na(h)tte kite (shimatta)$=  
   uhmso gradually not.know become.and come
   ‘uhm so ((it)) has gradually become confusing’

Nanka ‘uhm’ prefaces a turn in which Maki says that she often gets confused with her email address whether it is ‘co.jp’ or ‘ne.jp’, which seems like an excuse why she had to ask for her own email address. It is notable that the final particle sa attached to nanka is lengthened and delivered with a non-final falling contour, which slightly
delays the delivery of the subsequent words and thus creates a brief turn-entry opportunity. Yuri provides *nn* in response to this incremental beginning, overlapping with another appositional *ano* ‘uhm’ (line 1) that is produced following *nanka sa*. *Nanka sa* does not have a substantial meaning and it is not projectable at this moment what the trajectory of the turn is going to be. What is projectable by *nanka sa*, however, is incipiency of a turn. By responding to it with a minimal response *nn* and thereby passing up the opportunity to take a more substantial turn, its producer shows alignment with the initiated talk as a recipient, acknowledging the initiation of a new turn by the other speaker. After the *nn*, Maki continues the projected talk (line 4).

Another point to note regarding this instance is that, the turn initiated with the incremental beginning appears substantially brief, compared to example (2) above. Nonetheless, I suggest that this can be regarded as an instance that illustrates the deployment of an incremental beginning at the initiation of a turn with a lengthy TCU or with multiple TCUs. I argue that the initial design of the turn may have been longer but the turn is terminated or discontinued in line 8 for some interactional reason. Notice that the end of the TCU is marked with a non-final intonation contour, i.e. slight rising intonation, and audible inhalation (line 8), which can be regarded as a good indication of non-finality and that there is more to come. The TCU may have been discontinued by its producer in an attempt to successfully resolve the substantial overlap with other speaker’s talk in lines 6-9. Indeed, Maki’s increased volume (lines 6 and 8), i.e. ‘perturbations’ (Schegloff 2000), suggests that Maki treats the overlap as problematic. After Maki stops talking, Yuri takes the turn, proffering her own similar experience (lines 10 and 11). Maki, however, does not respond to this but produces further talk with a new TCU (line 13), which seems to be a continuation of her own prior talk. Note that Yuri’s talk is prefaced with *de* ‘and’, which is reported to be a device that is deployed when resuming suspended talk (Lee 1997). These observations

---

Schegloff (2000) argues that the speaker may withdraw from the competition for the turn space in order to achieve sequential implicativeness, or at least to ensure that his or her talk is sequentially consequential.
suggest that the turn with incremental beginning may be initially projected as a longer turn but shortened due to the competitive overlap.

While the instances above illustrate the case where *nn* is oriented to initiation of a turn in first position, the instance below illustrates that a brief pause may be inserted following initiation of a turn in other position. For instance, in fragment (4) below, *nn* is oriented to an incremental beginning for a second positioned multi-unit turn. In this fragment, the target *nn* (line 3) is proffered after a form of hesitation marker, *nnto* ‘well, uhm’, that is accompanied by the final particle *ne*. Immediately prior to the portion below, Miho tells that she met a man at a party and she liked him. In line 1, Yumi requests an elaboration, asking what kind of party it was.

(4) [3B: 321]

1 Yumi: e h? .hh (.) e nanno konpa de,
   huh huh what party at
   ‘huh?, huh? at what party?’
2 Miho: nn : to ne : ;=
   uhm FP
   ‘uhm, you know?’
3 Yumi: ➔ =nn : .
4 (0.2)
5 Miho: shuninsan ga ne : ;
   chief SUB FP
   ‘my chief is, you know?’
6 Yumi: nn : ;
7 Miho: haruna san ga : ; (.) > nanka<tenisu no ne : ; saakuru ni
   ((name)) SUB uhm tennis GEN FP club to
8 itteru n da wa ne?
   go NM BEFP FP
   ‘Haruna uhm goes to a tennis club, you know’
9 Yumi: nn : nn : nn : nn : [nn :
10 Miho: [>honde nanka soko de : ; nanka (.) shiriai ni
   and uhm there at uhm acquaintance to
11 natta hito?
   becameperson
   ‘and uhm there those who became acquainted?’
12 Yumi: nn : ;
13 (0.2)
14 Miho: `with a coach or something like that’

15 Yumi:

In the ensuing turn, Miho proffers a response, which is prefaced with a turn-initial item *nto ne* (line 2), which does not have any substantial meaning or does not deliver any information in reference to what is asked for by the question. The turn-initial item is again followed by slight halting of the progressivity of the initiated turn. *Nn* is proffered in response to this incremental initiation of the answer (line 3), acknowledging alignment as a recipient. Following the *nn*, Miho continues with the answer, which is constructed in the form of a multi-unit turn.

In the instances above, *nn* is produced in response to turn-beginnings that consist of turn-initial items with low semantic content, such as *nanka* or *nto*. *Nn* may also be deployed in response to turn-beginnings with a more substantial meaning. For instance, in fragment (5), *nn* occurs in response to a turn-beginning where the final particle *ne* is inserted after the initial bit of talk, *soo ie ba* ‘speaking of that’. The portion below starts with the very last part of a stretch of talk where Yumi and Miho are talking about the stomach flu that was common that year. The target *nn* is in line 4.

(5) [3B: 64]

1 Yumi: *soo soo_ = sugu haichau*toka itte itteta*. soon vomit or QT was saying

   ‘*soo soo, ((they)) said that ((they)) throw up soon after ((eating?))’

2 Miho: *hu _;___;_; un\

3 Yumi: =>*soo< ie ba ne : ; so say if FP

   ‘that reminds me, you know?’

4 Miho:⇒*nn : ;

5 Yumi: *imooto ne : ;=

   sister FP

   ‘((that)) my sister, you know?’

6 Miho: ↑*nn : ;

7 (0.9)
In line 3, Yumi initiates an announcement, which consists of a single but lengthy TCU, that her sister may be pregnant. The telling is prefaced by *soo ie ba* ‘speaking of that’, which indicates that what follows is occasioned by something in the prior talk, although the telling does not particularly exhibit topical coherency with the prior talk regarding the flu. Following the final particle *ne* attached to the initial item, the progress of the TCU is halted and brief but sufficient room is created for the coparticipant to proffer *nn*. By minimally responding to the beginning with *nn* in line 4, Miho shows her recognition of the start of more substantial talk and aligns as a recipient with the initiated turn. Following the *nn*, Yumi progresses with the projected turn.

In Section 2.3.1.1, I have examined *nn* deployed shortly after the other speaker initiates talk that consists of multiple TCUs or a sole but lengthy TCU. Final particles *ne* and *sa* inserted following turn-initial items serve to create a break between the turn-initial item and the subsequent constituents of the TCU, i.e. ‘sequential adjacency’ (Lerner 1996). In addition, these final particles are often followed by a brief halting of the delivery of the subsequent item is produced, i.e. ‘serial adjacency’ (Lerner 1996). In this way, the ‘progressivity’ (cf. Schegloff 1979; Lerner 1996) of initiated talk is disturbed shortly after initiation, which provides the coparticipant with a brief turn-entry opportunity. *Nn* is frequently proffered in these brief but sufficient turn-entry opportunities created by the speaker of the initiated talk at turn’s initiation. By producing a minimal response *nn* in such a place, its producer acknowledges the initiation of more substantial talk and shows alignment as a recipient of the projected turn.

---

7 According to Lerner (1996), progressivity can be considered as being constituted by the co-occurrence of the following two features of talk, namely, ‘serial adjacency’ and ‘sequential adjacency’. The former “proposes that talk ought to be continuous to a next transition-relevance place”, while the latter “proposes that the words that are produced reveal reflexively that they represent progress for the turn-so-far toward a (next) possible completion” (Lerner 1996: 257-258). Lerner (1996) further states that “the impedance of progressivity provides an opportunity—a restricted opportunity—for another speaker to talk prior to the next (now delayed) word”.
talk and thereby encourages continuation. These brief pauses are often found shortly after beginnings of a multi-unit turn or a turn with a lengthy TCU, as shown in the instances above. A brief entry opportunity may be utilised at the initiation of a lengthy turn by its producer in order to secure speakership by receiving the coparticipant’s alignment as a recipient.

2.3.1.2 Turn-beginnings in problematic environments

There are cases where turn-entry opportunities are provided shortly after initiation of a relatively brief turn. The following instances will show that the speaker of a new turn may provide a turn-entry opportunity shortly after initiation in order to accomplish speakership/recipiency alignment in environments where the initiation of some talk may potentially be problematic. Nn produced in such environments also shows its producer’s alignment as a recipient for the projected turn and thereby encourages continuation of the projected turn.

A turn-entry opportunity may be provided at the initiation of a turn that is vulnerable to turn-competition or overlapping talk. Observe fragment (6), where a new TCU is initiated following overlapping talk. Note that the initiated turn consists of a single TCU. The fragment is taken from a conversation between Kyoko and Hikaru in a car. The target \textit{nn} is produced in line 9.

(6) [HK: 277]

1 Hika: \textit{de(h)}[ :}
and
2 Kyo: \textit{anmari konde} \textit{tara ne;} [kore dokka de <migi ni> (0.2)= much crowded if FP this somewhere at right to
3 Hika: [nn :
4 Kyo: \textit{ittari hidarini ittari (shi[te) go.or left to go.or do.and ‘if the traffic is too busy, ((you can)) go to the right or to the left somewhere and’}
In line 2, Kyoko initiates a turn in the middle of rather lengthy topic talk by Hikaru about their mutual friend. In this turn, Kyoko makes a suggestion how Hikaru can drive to avoid the busy traffic on the road. Before Kyoko’s talk reaches a possible completion, Hikaru takes the turn, indicating her doubt whether the traffic is busy (line 5). This seems like a disagreement with what Kyoko has said, particularly with Kyoko’s perspective on the traffic condition, *anmari kondetara* ‘if it’s too busy’ (line 2). Note that Hikaru’s talk is prefaced with *demo* ‘but’, which indicates “the recipient’s disagreement or reservation in fully agreeing with the prior speakers” (Mori 1996: 118). Hikaru’s talk (line 5) overlaps with talk by Kyoko (line 6), who continues her own unfinished talk to complete it.

A new TCU is initiated in line 8 after a brief silence in line 7 at a possible completion of Hikaru’s turn. Kyoko initiates the turn with *tabun* ‘probably, perhaps’ accompanied by the final particle *ne*, which is lengthened and marked with a non-final falling contour. This is followed by a brief turn-entry space. In this opportunity,
Hikaru proffers *nn* with which she indicates her recognition of the start of a more substantial TCU and alignment as a recipient. This is followed by Kyoko’s continuation of the projected talk, proffering a possible account for the busy traffic in front of them.

The context where the incremental beginning (line 8) is produced is potentially problematic. Notice that the talk to which Kyoko’s initiated talk is oriented, i.e. Hikaru’s talk in line 5, overlaps with Kyoko’s prior talk. The overlap may potentially impair the hearing of Hikaru’s turn. In addition, the delay in responding to Hikaru’s talk, i.e. the 0.4 second silence in line 7, may be hearable as Kyoko’s having trouble understanding what Hikaru has said, which was in overlap with Kyoko’s talk. According to Pomerantz (1984b), when no immediate response is upcoming from the recipient of some assertion, the speaker may treat it as an indication of some trouble and attempt to remedy it in pursuit of a response. That is, Kyoko’s talk in line 8 may be vulnerable to Hikaru’s proffering further talk to remedy the absence of a response from Kyoko. This may potentially endanger further overlapping talk. By briefly halting the further progress of the projected talk in such a context, Kyoko claims her speakership incipiency and, at the same time, provides Hikaru with an opportunity to acknowledge her speakership. By producing *nn* in this context, Hikaru acknowledges the start of a more substantial TCU and shows alignment as a recipient with the projected talk.

The next fragment presents a case where *nn* orients to a beginning of a turn that is initiated in the middle of the construction of the current turn. Yuri’s talk in line 1 is triggered by a story delivered by Maki immediately prior to it about the sudden increase of her husband’s grey hair. Competition for a turn occurs when Maki comes in (line 5) while Yuri’s turn is nowhere close to a possible completion. The target *nn* occurs in line 7 after resolution of the competitive overlap.
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(7) [MY: 222]

1 Yuri: demo yoku sa;=sugoi kuroo shita hito ga sa ; = but often FP terrible hardship had person SUB FP ‘but, often, you know, those who had a terrible hardship, you know’

2 Maki: =nn ;

3 Yuri: hi-ichi hitoban de sa ; ; ( . ) kaminoke one one night in FP hair

4 ga [shi(raga) ni naru tokayuu] no wa [( ] are wa] SUB gray hair to become or say NM TOP that TOP ‘one over one night, you know, that their hair turns to grey is, that is,’

5 Maki: [ sooso_o so.=>dakara hora< ] [ sugoi- ss ] soonan therefore terrible- disaster ‘soo soo so. therefore’

6 shite toka sa [ ; ; have or FP ‘with a disaster or, you know’

7 Yuri: → [°nn : ° ;

8 Maki: nanka ; ; sooyuutoki ni sugoi kyoohu o nanika uhm such time at terrible fear OBJ something

9 taikenshita [ toki ni ; ] hontoni ( . ) hontoni ichinchi de= experienced time at really really one day in ‘uhm, at such a time, when ((one)) has experienced some terrible fear, really, really, within one day’

10 Yuri: [ nn : ; ;

Maki pre-emptively comes in to Yuri’s turn space with the token soo soo soo (line 5), claiming an affiliation with Yuri’s talk (see Chapter 5 for the detailed examination of soo). This results in a competitive overlap with the current turn by Yuri. Note that the overlapping talk in lines 4 and 5 is marked with what are called ‘hitches’ and ‘perturbations’ (cf. Schegloff 2000), i.e. a word cut-off and increased volume. As Yuri stops talking (line 4), Maki emerges as the sole speaker and the overlap resolves (line 5). Shortly after becoming the sole speaker, Maki creates a turn-entry opportunity by inserting a final particle sa (line 6), which is often followed by a brief turn-entry opportunity. Slightly overlapping with the sa, Yuri produces nn. By producing the nn in this context, Yuri indicates that she does not proffer more substantial talk with which she may further compete for the turn, and thereby shows her alignment as a recipient. Following the nn, Maki continues with the talk.
In the instances I have shown in Section 2.3.1 so far, \(nn\) is placed at a turn-entry opportunity following final particles \(ne\) and \(sa\). As will be shown by fragments (8) and (9) below, a turn-entry opportunity can also be created without these final particles. Turn-entry opportunities may be created following a sound stretch and a non-final intonation contour mapped onto the final syllable of the turn-initial item, which also serve to delay the delivery of the subsequent increment and halt the progressivity of talk. \(nn\) may also be proffered at such places.

In fragment (8), \(nn\) is proffered in response to a beginning of a turn that is initiated in the middle of the other speaker’s talk. A turn-entry opportunity is created following the turn-initial item \(de\) ‘and’ (line 4) that is lengthened and delivered with a non-final intonation contour. This instance presents a rather interesting case where an immediate shift from the primary speaker to a recipient is demonstrated by \(nn\). The target \(nn\) occurs in line 5. The fragment starts with a resumption of a suspended telling.

(8) [HK: 152]

1 Hika: sorede \(ne\),
and \(FP\)
‘and, you know?’
2 Kyo: \(nn\);
3 Hika: nan da kke .hhh
what \(BE\) \(FP\)
‘what were ((we talking about))?’
4 Kyo: \(de\);
and ‘and’
5 Hika: \(\rightarrow\) ‘\(nn\):’
6 Kyo: ntto akai fairu o [( ) (fairu o)
uhm red file \(OBJ\)
‘uhm, a red file ( ) (file)’
7 Hika: [aa soo. moTTETTE : ; soo dakara=:.hhh\(aa\)
oh bring.and therefore oh
8 chigau no ka$na(h): shi$+kamo ne$=.hhh nanka (0.4) $atashi wa
different \(NM\) \(FP\) moreover \(FP\) uhm \(I\) \(TOP\)
9 ikkai no :;
first.floor \(GEN\)
‘oh soo, I brought ((it)), soo therefore, oh maybe not, and, you know, uhm,
first floor...’
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10   Kyo:  \textit{n:n::=}

Kyoko displays her recipiency with \textit{n} in line 2 following a resumption of a suspended telling. The resumption of the telling is not achieved smoothly, possibly due to a lengthy suspension of the telling\textsuperscript{8}. In line 3, Hikaru indicates having trouble remembering what the story was up to. Kyoko comes in in line 4 with an initial item \textit{de} ‘and’, which appears to be used to link what follows to the suspended telling that Hikaru is struggling to resume. Initiation of a turn in the middle of the other’s construction of a turn can be problematic, as it may lead to a competitive overlap if the current speaker persists on continuing talking. The initial item \textit{de} ‘and’, which is lengthened and marked with a non-final falling contour, is followed by a brief opportunity for Hikaru to enter the turn-space. Hikaru responds to this with \textit{nn}, indicating that she is not competing for the turn with more substantial talk and showing her alignment as a recipient for the talk initiated by Kyoko.

In fragment (9), \textit{nn} is proffered in a brief gap that occurs following the turn-initial item \textit{tte yuu ka} ‘I mean’\textsuperscript{9}, which is marked with a non-final falling intonation contour. The fragment is part of lengthy topic talk about a man who Miho has met at a party recently. Prior to the portion below, Miho tells that the man was saying that he would like to do things with a larger number of people rather than seeing someone particular. Yumi responds to this by proffering her candidate understanding that the man must like getting together with a larger group of people. Miho’s talk at the beginning of the fragment (lines 1 and 4) is produced in this context. The target \textit{nn} occurs in line 10.

\textsuperscript{8} The telling was suspended for approximately 100 lines of talk
\textsuperscript{9} Hayashi (1994) notes that \textit{tte yuu ka} is frequently used in Japanese conversation to overtly project upcoming repair.
In lines 1 and 4, Miho tells that the man declined her invitation to go out for a drink with her. Yumi responds to this by partially repeating what Miho has said, which is hearable as a ‘newsmark’ (Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1981). Newsmarks treat the prior talk as some sort of news and project further talk in reference to the news (cf. Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1981). This, however, is not followed by further talk by Miho (cf. line 6). In line 7, Yumi self-selects and initiates a question, which requests a further elaboration on what Yumi has said in lines 1 and 4. Overlapping with this, Miho comes in with tte yuu ka, which projects an imminent repair (Hayashi 1994). Although the turn-beginning item is not accompanied by a final particle, the last syllable is
prosodically marked with a stress, a sound stretch and a slight falling contour, and is accompanied by a subsequent brief pause. The turn-entry opportunity created in this way is utilised by Yumi, who proffers *nn*, acknowledging the initiated turn and showing her alignment as a recipient. Considering that Miho’s talk (lines 8-9) is initiated in a context where Yumi attempts to pursue further talk with the newsmark (line 5) and the question (line 7), Yumi may be encouraging Miho to progress with the projected talk by claiming an alignment as a recipient and demonstrating her preparedness to hear what Miho has to say.

A further point to note in reference to this instance is that Miho’s talk following the beginning to which the *nn* responds is not oriented to the immediately prior talk in line 7, i.e. it does not provide an answer to the question in line 7. But rather, Miho’s talk is oriented to her own earlier talk in line 4, which was responded to with a partial repeat (line 5). What Miho seems to be doing in the initiated turn is to modify what she has said in line 4, i.e. backing down from a rather straightforward declination stated earlier (line 4) to an indirect one (lines 11-12). It may be argued that the turn-entry opportunity is provided here to secure the attention of the coparticipant before moving on with the projected turn, which does not deal with the immediately prior talk but with the earlier and thus sequentially distant talk.

In Section 2.3.1.2, I have discussed the case where *nn* is proffered in response to initiation of a turn in potentially problematic environments. It was shown that the speaker of a new turn may create a turn-entry opportunity in these environments by delaying the delivery of subsequent increments of a projected turn. As is the case with beginnings of a turn with a lengthy TCU or multiple TCUs, *nn* deployed in these turn-entry opportunities indicates the coparticipant’s acknowledgement of the start of more substantial talk and the alignment with the projected talk as the recipient. It is suggested that turn-initial entry opportunities and *nn* in response are utilised to forestall some potential interactional problems, e.g. overlapping talk or a lack of engagement with the projected talk, by establishing speakership and recipiency in these environments.
However, due to the interactional nature of conversation, a claim of speakership at the turn-beginning does not necessarily guarantee the achievement of alignment of the prospective recipient. Consider fragment (10) below. In this fragment, the speaker of a new turn does not receive *nn* in response to the turn-initiation (line 9) but encounters resistance from the coparticipant, who produces more substantial talk instead of *nn* (line 10). The portion below starts with the last bit of Yuri’s multi-unit storytelling.

(10) [MY: 692]

1  Yuri: atashi ttara nanimo shitenai toka henni jikoken’o ni oochijiru
               I nothing do-NEG or strangely self.hate into fall

2  kara jinsee>tsumaranaku nar(h) n [ da(h) to omo(h)tte].ghh.hh
      CONJ life boring become NM BE QT think.and

   ‘I yield to self-hatred strangely ((thinking)) that ((I)) don’t do anything, ((and
   this)) makes ((my)) life become boring, ((so)) I thought and’

3  Maki: [ nhh hah hah ]

4  Maki: =a demo ne : ; sore wa ne : ; aru kamoshinnai.= datte sa : ;
       oh but FP it TOPFP exist may becauseFP

   ‘oh but, you know?, it may be true. Because, you know,’

5  Yuri: [ nn : : ;]

6  Maki: =datte yappari omou kedo : ;
       becauseafter.all think CONJ

   ‘because, after all ((I)) think, but …’

7  Yuri: =”nn : : ;;

8  (1.0)

9  Yuri: de ne : ;
       and FP

   ‘and, you know?’

10 Maki: =ikura kaisha de sa : ; = >ta[toeba o] kirawaretetari toka =
        how.much company at FP for.example be.disliked or

   ‘how much, at a work place, for example, ((someone)) is disliked or’

11 Yuri: [ “nn : : ;;

12 Maki: =nantoka o shitatte sa : ;
        something do-CONJ FP

   ‘even if something like that happened, you know’

When Yuri’s multi-unit storytelling comes to a possible completion (line 2), Maki proffers an affiliative response to this storytelling (line 4). At the first possible completion, Maki ‘rushes through’ (Schegloff 1982) to the next TCU (line 4). The
second TCU takes the form of a ‘compound TCU’ (Lerner 1991, 1996). The first component is marked with the conjunctive particle kedo ‘although, but’ (line 6) and is responded to with a continuer \textit{nn} (line 7). However, this is not followed by a continuation of Maki’s talk but by a silence (line 8). When this silence reaches the ‘standard maximum silence’ of one second (cf. Jefferson 1989), Yuri attempts to take the turn and produces \textit{de} ‘and’ accompanied by the final particle \textit{ne} (line 9)\textsuperscript{10}. By delaying the production of the subsequent increment, Yuri provides Maki with an opportunity to enter the turn space to acknowledge her speakership. As demonstrated above, this opportunity is often used by coparticipants to display their alignment as a recipient by proffering \textit{nn}. In this instance, however, Maki confronts Yuri’s initiated turn by proceeding with her own turn with another component of her projected compound TCU, instead of showing alignment by producing \textit{nn}. Yuri fails to secure the turn. Yuri accordingly abandons her initiated turn and aligns herself as a recipient by proffering \textit{nn} (line 11).

In Section 2.3.1, I have examined instances of \textit{nn} occurring in response to initiation of a turn. Some of the turn-initial items are relatively substantial in meaning and others are not. Regardless of these differences, turn-beginnings followed by brief turn-entry space and \textit{nn} proffered in response accomplish a crucial interactional work that is closely related to turn-taking organisation. An effective way to secure speakership is to ensure that the coparticipant aligns as the recipient of the initiated talk at its beginning. By briefly halting the progress of the projected talk shortly after the initiation, the speaker provides a coparticipant with an opportunity to acknowledge the speakership incipiency and to display the participant’s alignment as the recipient. By minimally responding to this with \textit{nn} and thereby indicating recognition of the start of more substantial talk, the producer shows an alignment as a recipient and thereby indicates that the other speaker should continue with the initiated talk.

\textsuperscript{10} The use of \textit{de} ‘and’ suggests that Yuri may have designed the initiated turn as a continuation of her prior talk, i.e. storytelling, which immediately precedes Maki’s turn.
Based on these observations, I suggest that what is achieved by *nn* in response to turn-beginnings is similar to what is accomplished by a ‘summons-answer sequence’ (cf. Schegloff 1968) in that they both deal with the issue of “participants’ alignment to each other’s communicative availability” (Nofsinger 1991: 135) for further talk. Like an answer to a summons, *nn* in response to a turn-beginning displays availability for the initiated talk. The instances of *nn* deployed in response to a turn-beginning illustrate the participants’ collaborative achievement of the important task of establishing speakership/recipiency alignment at turn-initiation.

### 2.3.2 During a construction—at non-beginnings

Incremental construction of talk is not only observed at turn-beginnings but also frequently found in the middle of TCUs. In the data set at hand, *nn* also frequently occurs at turn-entry opportunities provided in the middle of TCUs by briefly halting the delivery of the subsequent component or increment. These turn-entry opportunities often occur following grammatical particles/suffixes and turn-internal final particles *sa* and *ne*. Turn-entry opportunities may also be provided following other TCU components or increments, which are not accompanied by these particles/suffixes.

In Section 2.3.2, I will examine *nn* occurring around places marked with (i) grammatical/syntactic particles and suffixes (other than final particles) and (ii) final particles *ne* and *sa*, where *nn* is frequently observed in the current data set. *Nn* occurring following TCU constituents that are not accompanied by these particles/suffixes will be also examined. It will be shown that the speaker of the on-

---

11 Needless to say, *nn* in response to a turn-beginning works on a different level from an answer to a summons. That is, the former is preliminary to a projected *turn*, while the latter is to a projected *sequence*.

12 Similar observation is made by Hayashi (2003: 101), who states that “[i]n Japanese, ...turns are incrementally constructed, and the temporal progression of an ongoing turn is routinely halted (albeit briefly) when a co-participant produces an acknowledgement token”.

13 Mizutani (1988) also reports that conjunctive particles, such as *kedo, kara*, and case particle, such as *ga*, as well as places marked by a final particle *ne*, constitute one of the contexts where *aizuchi* or Japanese ‘backchannels’, including *nn*, occur frequently.
going TCU furnishes constant opportunities for the recipient to enter the turn-space and monitors the recipient’s understanding of the progress of the on-going talk. By producing \( nn \) at these opportunities, recipients pass up opportunity for more substantial talk and display their understanding that the current talk is not yet complete and should be progressed towards a possible completion.

2.3.2.1 Grammatical/syntactic particles

One of the environments where \( nn \) is proffered during TCU construction is a brief turn-entry opportunity provided after grammatical/syntactic particles and suffixes. These particles and suffixes are normally post-positionally placed and specify “case relations and other functional relations that would be represented in English by prepositions, subordinating conjunctions, and coordinating conjunctions” (Kuno 1973: 4-5). At the same time, they project a further increment or component within the TCU (Tanaka 1999). In what follows, I will first examine cases of (i) conjunctive particles and suffixes, and then move to (ii) case and focus particles.

Conjunctive particles and suffixes

A juncture between components of a ‘compound TCU’ (Lerner 1991; Lerner and Takagi 1999) is one of the environments where continuer \( nn \) is frequently observed. Compound TCUs in Japanese are structurally different from, for instance, their English counterparts (cf. Ford and Mori 1994; Lerner and Takagi 1999; Tanaka 1999; among others). In English, a compound TCU is normally constructed with a pre-positioned device, placed at the beginning of a preliminary component, which accordingly allows relatively early recognition of the compound TCU format. In contrast, Japanese compound TCUs are typically constructed by attaching a conjunctive particle at the end of a component, which makes the realisation of a compound TCU relatively delayed (Hayashi 2003; Lerner and Takagi 1999; Tanaka 1999). Furthermore, whereas English compound TCUs take a two-part format of
preliminary and final components (Lerner 1991), Japanese conjunctive particles can project an indefinite number of components without passing through a clear transition relevance place (Tanaka 1999). In addition, Japanese conjunctive particles can be employed turn-finally as well as turn-internally, and thus can be used to terminate the current TCU or to extend it further (Tanaka 1999). The finality or non-finality of conjunctive particles can sometimes be ambiguous as the speaker may continue to produce the subsequent component (Mori 1996; Tanaka 1999). This constantly requires the recipient to judge whether a conjunctive particle is produced turn-finally or turn-internally. According to Tanaka (1999a: 195), 'contextual linkages' and final intonation may serve to inform the possible finality of a conjunctive particle.

Bearing the above notes in mind, let us now turn to examine \textit{nn} occurring at a conjunctive particle/suffix of compound TCUs. Fragments (11)-(14) illustrate \textit{nn} that occurs following conjunctive particles/suffixes marked with a non-final falling intonation contour. In fragment (11), \textit{nn} occurs at a component juncture marked with the conjunctive particle \textit{kedo} ‘although, but’ (line 2). The portion below is taken from a lengthy stretch of talk where Saya is talking about a get-together to which she was invited. In line 1, Saya asks a question, enquiring if Tae likes the liver of anglerfish, which was served in a hotpot at the get-together. The answer to this question takes the form of a compound TCU.

(11) [TS: 476]
1 Saya: \textit{=kimo toka\ tte suki : ? =}
   liver or QT like
   ‘((do you)) like liver or something like that?’
2 Tae: \textit{=atashi wa ankimo suki da kedo : ; =}
   I TOP anglerfish.liver like BE CONJ
   ‘I like the liver of anglerfish, but’
3 Saya: \textit{=sore o tabete jinmashin ga deta kamoshirenai. =}
   it OBJ eat.and rash SUB appear may
   ‘after eating it, ((I)) might have had a rash’
4 Tae: \textit{=nn : ;}
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In the answer, Tae first says that she likes it, *atashi wa ankimo suki* ‘I like anglerfish liver’, to which the conjunctive particle *kedo* ‘although, but’ is attached. The conjunctive particle turns the on-going TCU into a first component of a compound TCU, which, at the same time, projects a further component that is yet to be produced before reaching a possible completion. Saya proffers *nn* at a turn-entry opportunity created by a brief halting of the delivery of the subsequent component following *kedo*. By producing the *nn*, Saya indicates that she is passing up more substantial talk at this opportunity and thereby displays that the on-going talk is not yet complete and should be continued by the speaker of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. This is, indeed, followed by a continuation of the on-going talk with a further component by Tae, who is the (original) speaker of the talk (line 4). When the on-going TCU reaches a possible completion, which is marked with a terminal falling contour in line 4, Saya responds to it with *a honto* ‘oh really’, registering the prior talk as something remarkable, i.e. a ‘newsmark’ (Jefferson 1981; Heritage 1984a). After this, Saya resumes the storytelling, which was temporary suspended by an insertion of the question-answer sequence.

In the next fragment (12), two instances of *nn* are found at a juncture of components marked with the conjunctive suffix *te* ‘and’. Here, Yumi is naming the real estate agencies she used when she was searching for an apartment.

(12) [2B: 393]
1 Yumi: [nde, .hhh ironna tokoro,= and various place ‘and various places’

2 Rumi: =oo nn : oo.
In line 3, Yumi lists the names of real estate agencies she visited, *nissho itte minimini itte* ‘(I) went to Nissho and (I) went to Minimini and’. The conjunctive suffix *tte* ‘and then’ is used here, turning the on-going TCU into a component of a compound TCU, which accordingly projects an occurrence of a further component. In addition, the conjunctive suffix *tte* is delivered with a non-final falling contour. *Nn* occurs at places where the on-going talk projects a further component within the TCU, encouraging the other speaker to continue the talk.

Fragment (13) shows *nn* used at a juncture marked by the conjunctive particle *tara* ‘if then’.

(13) [9A: 1420]
1 Saki: *maademo* otona to issho no monoga taberu yooni well but adult with same GEN thing SUB can.eat so.that
2 nattara: [raku da yo ne become-CONJ easy BE FP FP ‘well, ((if)) ((she)) becomes to be able to eat same things as adults, then ((it)) is easy, don't you think?’
3 Mina:➔ [nn: ;]
Like the cases above, *nn* in this fragment is deployed in an environment where the on-going TCU is marked as a preliminary component of a compound TCU that requires a further component to be possibly complete. Also, the conjunctive particle is delivered with a sound stretch and a non-final intonation contour, which briefly halt the delivery of the subsequent component and creates a brief turn-entry opportunity.

The next fragment (14) illustrates the use of *nn* at a place marked with the particle *ka* ‘or’, which is used to do the listing here. What is different from the instances of conjunctive particle shown above is that the particle *ka* here joins two noun phrases rather than clauses. In other words, the particle *ka* in this fragment projects occurrence of a further noun phrase. The fragment starts with Maki’s question, asking about the movies currently showing at a movie theatre (line 1). After some ‘inserted’ or ‘insertion’ sequences (Schegloff 1972), Yuri initiates an answer to the question in line 19. The target *nn* occurs in line 20.

(14) [MY: 959]
1 Maki: =meeeki mae pikaderii tte ima nani yatteru?
   (name) QT now what is showing
   ‘what is currently shown at Mee-eki-mae Piccadilly?’
2 Yuri: ^0(ah)^0
3
   ((lines 4 to 18 omitted))
19 Yuri: =° etto ne : °; harii pottaa ka : :=
          uhm FP Harry Potter or
          ‘uhm, “Harry Potter” or’
20 Maki: ➔ =nn :
21 Yuri: musuko no heya. kore wa [kannu
       son GEN room this TOP Cannes
       ‘The son’s room’. This ((won)) a Cannes…’
22 Maki: [ ah

Following *etto ne : ‘uhm’* in the answer, Yuri provides one of the movies, *harii pottaa* ‘Harry Potter’ (line 19), to which the particle *ka* ‘or’ is attached. The particle is delivered with a sound stretch and a non-final falling intonation contour. The
deployment of *ka* here projects that another noun phrase, i.e. the title of a movie, is coming up before the answer reaches a possible completion. This is responded to by Maki with *nn* (line 20), showing her understanding that the talk to which the *nn* is oriented is not yet complete and should be continued. Following this, Yuri continues the current TCU with another relevant component (line 21).

So far, I have shown the role of *nn* as continuers at places marked with conjunctive particles/suffixes. An important point to be stressed here is that the deployment of *nn* is closely related to some prosodic features. Notice that, in the above instances, the conjunctive particles to which the continuers are oriented are delivered with a slightly falling continuing contour, which is denoted by a semicolon `:`.

In addition, fragments (15) and (16) below demonstrate that *nn* may be deployed following conjunctive particles that are delivered with a slightly rising intonation contour and with a level pitch contour, respectively. In fragment (15), *nn* is placed immediately after a conjunctive particle *kedo* ‘although, but’ (line 5) delivered with a non-final rising intonation contour, which is denoted by a comma ‘,’. The portion below is part of rather lengthy storytelling delivered by Hikaru.

(15) [HK: 162]

1 Hika: =nan* ka*: *okyakusan to uchiawase suru: koo koshitsu uhm customer with meeting do uhm individual.room

2 ni natteru tokoro * de_: *

   to has.become place BE-and  
   ‘uhm, at a place which is like a separate room where ((we)) have a meeting with a customer’

3 Kyo: nn[: nn: ;

4 Hika: ) [ da\[
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7 Kyo: [nn: [nn: ;
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Hika: =gokai tte nanka eigyoobu no: (.) =jimusho na no ne, fifth.floor QT uhm sales.section GEN office BE FP FP ‘the fifth floor, uhm, is the office for the sales section, you know?’

The target conjunctive particle *kedo* is produced in line 5. As the *kedo* is not hearable as possibly complete in this context and the intonation contour mapped onto it demonstrates its non-finality, it is likely to be designed as being turn-internal and thus projects at least one further component before the TCU becomes possibly complete. The conjunctive particle is responded to by Kyoko with *nn* (line 6), which is followed by a continuation of the on-going TCU by Hikaru.

In fragment (16), a conjunctive particle, *tara* ‘if then’, is pronounced with a level pitch contour (line 4), which is denoted by an underscore ‘_’. The fragment is taken from a storytelling by Tae about her friend who is getting married soon. The target *nn* occurs in line 5.

(16) [TS: 195]
1 Tae: [nanka : (1.0) shiki da*ke* a- *chigau* uhm ceremony only no kaigaiue*dingu :* ry[okoo no tsuideni : ? [ageyoomitai= overseas.wedding travel GEN incidentally hold like ‘uhm, ((they’re having)) only the ((wedding)) ceremony, ah-, no, ((they’re having)) a wedding overseas, having a ceremony while travelling or something’]
2 Saya: [nn : ; [nn : ; ]
3 Tae: =na kanji de : (.) mukoo no oya ni aisatsu ni it tara : = BE feeling BE-and over.there GEN parentto greeting to go CONJ ‘like that and, when ((they)) went to see the parents,’
4 Saya: ➔ =nn [ : ; ]
5 Tae: [nanka .hchoonan da shi: <shi[ki wa agete = uhm eldest.son BE and ceremony TOP hold ‘uhm, ((because)) he is the eldest son, the ((wedding)) ceremony’]
6 Saya: [nn : ]
7 Tae: =morawa nai to ko*maru> toka it[te* _ receive NEG CONJ be.in.trouble or say.and ‘should be held, otherwise ((they)) will be in trouble or something like that, ((that’s what they were)) told’]
8 Saya: [nn : : ;]
A continuer \( nn \) is produced at a boundary marked with the conjunctive particle \textit{tara}, which is hearably incomplete and locally projects a further component. After the \( nn \), the speaker of the on-going TCU to which the \( nn \) is oriented progresses the talk with the subsequent components towards a possible completion.

The above instances suggest that a place marked with conjunctive particles/suffixes, which contribute to the local projection of the on-going talk, is a typical context for recipients to show their understanding of the current state of talk, i.e. the current TCU is not yet complete and more talk is coming before reaching a possible completion. It has also been shown that \( nn \) tends to occur at junctures of components that are marked with some intonation contours, i.e. falling, rising, and level non-final intonation contours. Conjunctive particles/suffixes with these intonation contours mapped onto them are often lengthened and regularly followed by a brief pause, which temporarily halts the delivery of the subsequent component and creates turn-entry opportunities where \( nn \) is often produced. Put differently, conjunctive particles/suffixes marked in these intonation contours project an immediate occurrence of a turn-entry opportunity where \( nn \) may be proffered.

Indeed, conjunctive particles that are immediately followed by the subsequent component and thus not accompanied by these entry opportunities tend not to be responded to by \( nn \). Observe fragment (17), for instance, which contains three occurrences of conjunctive particles, namely, \textit{ba} ‘if then’ in lines 3 and 10 and \textit{temo} ‘even if’ in line 6, which are shown in boldface. \textit{Ba} in line 3 is responded to with \( nn \) but the others are not.

(17) [9A: 366]

1 Mina: \textasciitilde bunben \textasciitilde shitsu \textasciitilde mo \textasciitilde :=
\textit{delivery.room also}
‘((as for)) the delivery room also’

2 Saki: \( =nn := \);

3 Mina: so\ast no \ast *(0.4) \textit{jokeyoo sae yuruse ba} :=
\textit{uhm situation only allow CONJ}
‘uhm, (0.4) only if the situation allows’

4 Saki: \( =nn := \);
The first conjunctive particle *ba* ‘if then’ is marked with a sound stretch and a continuing falling contour, which halts briefly the delivery of the subsequent component and thereby creates a turn-entry opportunity for the recipient to come in. In contrast, the conjunctive particle *temo* ‘even if’ (line 6) and the other *ba* (line 10) are not accompanied by turn-entry opportunities but immediately followed by subsequent due components. Although these conjunctive particles, i.e. *temo* in line 6 and *ba* in line 10, accomplish the same projecting task as the one in line 3 in terms of the local projection of the current talk, namely, projecting a further component before reaching a possible completion, they do not receive *nn*.

Above, I have examined instances of *nn* occurring in the environment that is marked with conjunctive particles or suffixes. It has been pointed out that *nn* does not occur at all junctures with conjunctive particles but occurs overwhelmingly at those marked with non-final intonation contours accompanied by subsequent brief turn-entry opportunities.
Case and focus particles

Another syntactically marked context where \textit{nn} frequently appears is after case or focus particles. These particles contribute to the local projection of a turn in Japanese (cf. Tanaka 1999). Tanaka (1999a: 155) states that these particles “have the general property of retroactively specifying the grammatical nature of the component immediately preceding the particle and simultaneously projecting some ensuing component (e.g. a predicate or nominal component depending on the particle), though not necessarily following on immediately after the particle”. For instance, the case particle \textit{o} marks the immediately preceding noun phrase as a direct object, and, at the same time, can project at least one further component of the predicate to occur before the next possible completion of the current TCU, although the projected predicate component may or may not immediately follow the case particle \textit{o} (cf. fragment (19) for an example of the particle \textit{o}). In this way, like the conjunctive particles and suffixes, case and focus particles play a crucial role in constructing and projecting the unfolding of a turn in Japanese conversation.

I will first examine the instances of case particles. As was the case with conjunctive particles/suffixes observed above, \textit{nn} tends to occur following case particles that are accompanied by a subsequent turn-entry opportunity. Fragment (18) illustrates \textit{nn} produced immediately after the case particle \textit{ga}, which marks the preceding noun phrase as the subject.

(18) [TS: 187]

1 Tae: nanigeni kotoshi rasshu no yoo na ki ga shite kita.
unintentionally this.year rush GEN seem BEfeeling SUB do.and came
'somehow, ((I)) started to feel like it will be a ((wedding)) rush this year'

2 Saya: ho : nto ippai aru : ?
really many there.is
'really, are there many?'

3 Tae: NA : Nka ne : , sugoi tandai no toki no nakayoshino
uhm FP amazing junior.collage GEN time GEN close GEN

4 t[om]odachi ga : ; =
friend SUB
'uhm, you know?, a close friend ((of mine)) from the junior college ((is))'
The case particle *ga* (line 4) is attached to a lengthy noun phrase that consists of four nouns connected by a genitive particle, *tandai no toki no nakayoshi no tomodachi* ‘a close friend from high-school’ (lines 3-4). As well as marking the immediate preceding noun phrase as the subject, the particle *ga* provides the coparticipant with a resource to anticipate the trajectory of the on-going talk. More precisely, the particle *ga* projects the occurrence of a predicate component before reaching a possible completion. Placement of *ga* indicates that the TCU-in-progress is in the middle of a construction and requires a predicate component to be completed. In such a context, *nn* is produced by the coparticipant (line 6). Notice that the *ga* is marked with a sound stretch and a slightly falling contour with subsequent brief pause, which disturbs the progressivity of the on-going talk and accordingly creates an opportunity for turn-entry. The *nn* is proffered at this brief turn-entry opportunity, indicating that the current talk is not yet complete and should be continued by its speaker.

The fragment (19) illustrates the case of the object marker *o*. Maki is talking about e-mail correspondence with a friend whom Yuri also knows.

(19) [MY: 47]

1 Maki: [tabun] minna nomanai; anmashi osake nomenai probably everyone not.drink much sake cannot.drink

2 kara tte yuu hanashi (0.2) CONJ QT say story OBJ 'probably that they don’t drink, because ((they)) cannot drink sake much, that kind of thing'

3 Yuri: °nn : °

4 Maki: yatta wake. did NM ‘((we)) talked’
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5 Yuri: a hh soo yuu koto [datta no] ne, nde (0.4)°nde° ichioo := oh such thing was NM FP and and tentatively ‘oh it was like that, and (0.4) and for the time being ..’

The talk-in-progress (lines 1-2) emerges as a noun phrase by the use of tte yuu hanashi ‘a story as such’ (line 2). There is a brief intra-turn silence before the object marker o is attached to the noun phrase. As was the case with the particle ga in the preceding example (19), the particle o takes a predicate component before reaching a possible completion. The particle o is marked with a level intonation contour and room is created subsequently for the coparticipant to enter the turn-space. Yuri produces nn in this environment, passing up an opportunity to produce more substantial talk and gives the turn back to the speaker of the on-going TCU. The nn is followed by Maki’s further talk with a terminal predicate, yatta ‘did’, and a verb nominaliser wake delivered with a terminal falling intonation contour, which completes the TCU. Following this, speaker-transition occurs and Yuri takes a fuller turn (line 5).

So far, I have discussed the case of nn occurring at places that are marked with case particles. As mentioned earlier, focus particles also serve as a resource for the coparticipant to locally project unfolding TCUs. Nn is also frequently observed at brief turn-entry opportunities provided after focus particles. Fragment (20) presents the case where nn occurs following the focus particle wa, which is often referred to as a ‘topic marker’. Wa has similar projectability properties to case particles and typically projects a predicate component (Tanaka 1999). The fragment is taken from a stretch of talk where the participants talk about the cost of living.

(20) [2B: 981]
1 Yumi: ato kakaru no * wa :*;
remainder cost NM TOP
‘other thing that costs ((money)) is’
2 (.)
3 Rumi:⇒ °nn [: : ° ;
4  Yumi: [＞yappa shokuhi da yo↑ne,=
            after.all food.expenses BE FP FP
‘after all, food, isn’t it?’

In line 1, Yumi initiates a TCU with a noun phrase kakaru no ‘thing that costs’, which is further marked by wa. The use of wa here projects a predicate element. Rumi produces nn at a turn-entry opportunity created following the wa. The not-yet-complete TCU to which the nn is oriented is continued by its speaker, Yumi, with the predicate element (line 4).

Thus far, I have examined instances of nn occurring at grammatical particles such as conjunctive, case, and focus particles. It was shown that nn is deployed where the talk to which it responds is overtly incomplete and the local progress of the unfolding turn is projected by these grammatical particles. The observations have demonstrated that the continuer nn is typically proffered at a brief turn-entry opportunity created by the producer of the on-going talk immediately after these grammatical particles.

As will be shown below, however, the current data set presents quite a large number of instances where the onset of nn overlaps with these grammatical particles. In other words, the producer of nn does not always wait until turn-entry opportunities which may be provided following these particles. I assume such cases can be regarded as demonstrating coparticipant’s constant monitoring and anticipation of the trajectory of the TCU-in-progress. Fragments (21) and (22) below illustrate the case of an early placed nn. Fragment (21) is part of conversation between Hikaru and Kyoko in a car. In line 1, Hikaru asks for a confirmation about the route they are taking. The target nn is deployed in line 6 overlapping with the stretched last syllable of the conjunctive particle kedo ‘although, but’.

(21) [HK: 59]
1   Hika: >kore massugu<iken da yo ne ;= 0kono(michi)}
                this straight can.go-NM BEFP FP this road
‘((we)) can go straight ((along)) this, right? ((along)) this (road)’
In line 2, Kyoko initiates a response to Hikaru’s talk. The target mn is proffered in line
6 at a place marked with the conjunctive particle kedo, which projects at least one
further component before the current TCU reaches a possible completion. Although
the mn is initiated after the emergence of the kedo, the mn is deployed before the
occurrence of an actual turn-entry opportunity that is created following the kedo by
briefly halting the delivery of the subsequent component.

Nn may also be deployed overlapping with a case or focus particle. Fragment
(22) illustrates mn deployed slightly overlapping with the case particle de ‘in’. The
portion below is part of a stretch of talk where Yumi talks about the financial situation
of the time when she was living alone.

(22) [2B: 1049]
1 Rumi: so da yo ne:
   BE FP FP
   ‘((that)) is so, isn’t ot?’
2 Yumi: [datte atashi ichinenkan de:
   because for one year in
   ‘because, in one year,
3 Rumi: \[\text{mn}: o;\]
4 Yumi: kaettekita toki ni: oya to: oneechan ni
   returned time at parents and elder sister to
5 shakkin shite te:
   owe money and
   ‘when ((I)) came back ((from overseas)), ((I)) owed my parents and my sister
   some money, and’
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6 Rumi: 

The target *nn* occurs in line 3, at a place marked with at the case particle *de*, where the current TCU is clearly incomplete. As was the case of fragment (21), the *nn* occurs at a place where the particle is fully emerged but the subsequent turn-entry opportunity has not yet been provided.

Above, I have shown the case of an earlier placed *nn*. During the construction of TCUs, the recipient is required to constantly parse how the on-going TCU is likely to develop, or whether it is possibly complete or not. In order to do that, various resources such as syntactical, contextual, prosodic, and sequential information are available for, and required by, the participants. Recall that an intonation contour mapped onto grammatical particles/suffixes regularly suggests the occurrence of immediate turn-entry opportunities. Although, there are various resources that enable the coparticipant to anticipate the progress of the current talk, the anticipatory placed *nn* in the cases above misses out part of the information in reference to the construction of the TCU, i.e. a prosodic resource. It is quite remarkable that the overlapped grammatical particles are often indeed followed by brief turn-entry opportunities where a continuer seems relevant. This suggests that coparticipants monitor the on-going talk carefully with the available resources and anticipate a continuer relevant place before it actually occurs. It seems reasonable to assume that the anticipatory proffered *nn* exhibits a stronger understanding of the progress of the current talk, as they suggest the coparticipant’s constant and careful monitoring of the unfolding talk.

2.3.2.2 Final particles *ne* and *sa*

*NN* is also frequently observed following final particles *ne* and *sa* that are used TCU-internally. Final particles are different from other grammatical particles, such

---

14 Final particles *ne* and *sa* are prevalent in Japanese conversation and can occur at initial, internal, and final positions of a TCU and/or turn (cf. Cook 1990, 1992; Maynard 1993; Squires 1994; Tanaka 2000;
as case, focus, and conjunctive particles, in terms of the projectability properties inherent in them. While the case, focus, and conjunctive particles provide syntactical resources for the coparticipant to project the unfolding of the current TCU, TCU-internal final particles do not contribute much to project the progress of the relevant TCU. Shibatani (1990: 334) notes that the TCU-internal final particles or kantoojoshi ‘interjexional particles’ “occur freely within a clause and whose presence or absence does not affect sentence formation”.

Although final particles do not substantially contribute to the projection of a TCU, they do exhibit interactional significance in reference to turn construction in Japanese. Previous studies on aizuchi or Japanese backchannels have pointed out the frequent occurrence of Japanese backchannels, including nn, at places accompanied by final particles (e.g. Maynard 1987, 1989, 1993; Mizutani 1988). Tanaka (2000: 1155) closely observes the use of ne in reference to the local interactional context and argues that ne produced in internal positions marks a possible “acknowledgement-relevance place” where “a recipient may proffer an acknowledgement”. Likewise, Tanaka (2000: 1140) suggests that sa also serves to “solicit acknowledgements in turn-internal positions”. Although ne and sa are different from each other in some respects\(^1\), they are often interchangeable, especially at internal positions, and provide relevant opportunities for the recipient to enter the turn-space during TCU construction.

Fragments (23) and (24) below illustrate the case where nn is deployed following the TCU-internal final particle ne. In fragment (23), two instances of nn are proffered at places marked with ne, which is attached to the case particle de in line 1 and the conjunctive particle noni ‘although’ in line 4. The portion below is part of

\(^{15}\) As to the differences between ne and sa, for instance, Squires (1994: 23) notes that the use of ne “invites the hearer to participate in the feelings of the speaker even if the hearer does not share the information with the speaker”, and by using sa, “the speaker claims that the information expressed is in the speaker's territory and marks it as such”.

among others). Ne can also occur alone in a turn, occupying the entire turn (cf. Cook 1992; Tanaka 2000).
topic talk where Tae talks about a retired Japanese man living in Thailand, who was on TV.

(23) [TS: 395]

1 Tae: =kiteta n da kedo :, =.hhh sugoi no : ; soko de ne : ; = have.come NM BE but amazing FP there at FP ‘((he)) has come ((to Thailand)) but, ((it’s)) amazing, you know, there ((in Thailand)), you know

2 Saya: =nn

3

4 Tae: IMA sono ojiichan rokujuuroku sai na noni ne :, = now that grandpa sixty.six.years.old BE although FP ‘although the old guy is now 66 years old, you know’

5 Saya: =nn

6 Tae: ima nijuu yon sai no onnano hito to shiriatte : = now twenty.four.years.old of female person with get.acquainted.and ‘now ((he)) has met a 24-year-old lady and’

7 Saya: =nn =° nn =° ;

8 Tae: >sono hito< tsurego ga ite ; ; (.) de kekko : n*shi*ta n that person stepchild SUB exist.and and got.married NM dat te,= ninen mae [ ni, BE QT two.years before at ‘the lady has a child by her former marriage, and ((they)) got married two years ago’

Both instances of nn are oriented to the particle ne that are deployed where the current talk is not possibly complete in any sense. Note also that the ne in lines 1 and 4 are both delivered with a sound stretch and a slightly rising intonation contour mapped onto them, and followed by brief halting of the progressivity of the on-going talk. The nn is produced in brief turn-entry opportunities following these final particles. By deploying nn, the producer passes up more substantial talk and returns the turn back to the speaker of the on-going TCU, and thereby shows her understanding that the on-going TCU should be continued by its original speaker with subsequent due increments.

In fragment (24), nn is deployed following ne attached to the conjunctive particle tara ‘if-then’. The fragment is taken from a conversation between Hikaru and
Kyoko in a car. Kyoko refers to the traffic jam in which their car gets caught. Kyoko’s talk (line 2) is inserted in the middle of the construction of a lengthy telling by Hikaru, which results in a temporary suspension of the telling.

(24) [HK: 277]

1  Hika: de(h) : and
2  Kyo: ↑ anmari kondet tara ne::; kore dokka de < migi ni> (0.2) = much crowded if FP this somewhere right to ‘if the traffic is too busy, you know, ((you can)) go to the right’
3  Hika: ➔ [nn :.
4  Kyo: =ittari hidarini ittari (shi[te)
   go.or left to go.or do.and
   ‘or to the left somewhere and’
5  Hika: > kore demo<(.)↑↑ konden↑↑ no kana : .
   this but is.crowded NM FP
   ‘but ((I)) wonder if this is congested’
6  Kyo: [te mo ii yo.
   also good FP
   ‘((you)) can do that, you know’.
7

*Ne* is produced following the conjunctive particle *tara* ‘if-then’ where the current TCU is not yet possibly complete in any sense (line 2). The placement of *ne* with a slightly falling intonation contour briefly halts the progressivity of the talk and creates a brief turn-entry opportunity for the recipient to come in. *Nn* is proffered in this environment where such an opportunity is provided, showing that the current TCU should be continued by its original speaker toward a possible completion by passing up more substantial talk.

Fragments (25) and (26) below illustrate instances where *nn* is deployed at a place marked with the TCU-internal final particle *sa*. Fragment (25) presents three instances of *sa*, which are followed by *nn*. The portion below is part of stretch of talk where Yuri tells Maki her opinion regarding the type of a man who she should choose to have a peaceful marriage.
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(25) [MY: 933]

1. Maki:  
   =aa : [sorya soo da yo].  
   oh that-TOP so BE FP  
   ‘oh that is true, I’m telling you’

2. Yuri:  
   [( ) hooseki to ] jssho de sa : ;  
   jewellery with same BE-and FP  
   ‘( ) ((it’s)) same as jewellery and, you know’

3. Maki: → *NN: ; ; =*

4. Yuri: =sugoku dekoratibuni dezainsaretete sa : ;=  
   very decorative is.designed.and FP  
   ‘the design is very decorative and, you know’

5. Maki: → *NN: ; ; =*

   uhm at.a.glance gorgeous BE CONJ fact TOP rubbish diamond GEN

7. atsumari tte yuu no yori wa sa : ;=  
   collection QT say NM than TOP FP  
   ‘uhm, ((it)) looks very gorgeous at a glance, but actually ((it)) is made up with  
   waste diamonds, rather than that, you know’

8. Maki: → *NN: ; ; =*

9. Yuri: mo hontoni *jimi:* na daiya no ikko no yubiwa na n$ da  
   really plain diamond GEN one GEN ring BE NM BE

10. k(h)edo : $; hh demo kono$ ookis(h)a wa ; ; kaw(h)an(h)ai  
    CONJ but this size TOP change-NEG

11. [ mitaina ] hoo ga ii n daroo na to  
    like SUB good NM BE FP QT  
    ‘although the ring has one really simple diamond, but the size never changes  
    or something like that would be better, I thought’

12. Maki: [$nh hhn:$];

    that-TOP so BE FP but  
    ‘that is true, I’m telling you, but’

The final particle *sa* is attached to the conjunctive form of copula *de* (line 2), to the  
conjunctive particle *te* ‘and’ (line 4), and to the focus particle *wa* (line 7), respectively.  
The deployment of *sa* at these places creates a brief halting of progressivity before the  
subsequent increment is produced. *Nn* is proffered in these turn-entry opportunities,  
showing that the TCU should be continued toward possible completion by the original  
speaker. All three instances of *nn* are indeed followed by a continuation of the  
subsequent due increments.
In fragment (26), *sa* is placed in the middle of a request turn, attached to a noun phrase, *roodoobuzaringu no hon* ‘a book of “the lord of the rings”’.

(26) [MY: 1191]

1 Maki: =roodoobuzaringu no shishakai ga yaru [ no. ((name)) GEN preview SUB is.held FP ‘there will be a preview of “the lord of the rings”’

2 Yuri: [ a .hh soo. = oh

3 roodoobuzaringu no hon sa : ; = ((name)) GEN book FP ‘oh soo. the book of “the lord of the rings, you know”

4 Maki: ➔ =nn : ;=

5 Yuri: =kashite : ? lend ‘((could you)) lend me ((the book))’?

6 Maki: a ii yo [ ; oh good FP ‘oh, sure’

The final particle *sa* is produced at a place where grammatical particle is not present. Due to the lack of grammatical particles, “the type of a forthcoming increment of talk within a local sequential context” (Tanaka 1999: 178) may not be projected. However, what is recognisable at this point is that the current talk is not yet complete and requires further talk before reaching a possible completion. *Nn* is proffered in a brief entry-opportunity created following the final particle. With this *nn*, the producer passes up substantial talk and, thereby, shows that the producer of the current TCU should continue with further talk. Following the *nn*, the speaker continues with the TCU-in-progress. The conversational action of the turn is projected immediately following the *nn*, which is a request to lend her a book.

As shown above, final particles *ne* and *sa* that are used in the middle of a TCU serve to indicate an immediate opportunity for turn-entry where recipients can utilise

---

16 The prevalence of non-presence of grammatical particles in Japanese conversation is widely recognised. This phenomenon is often treated as ‘ellipsis’ or ‘omission’ of particles (e.g. Alfonso 1966; Kuno 1973; Maynard 1989), or, relatively recently, as an independent grammatical entity of the ‘zero particle’ (e.g. Hasegawa 1993; Lee 2002).
to display their understanding of the current state of talk, namely, that the TCU is not yet complete and should be continued by the original speaker. It should be noted, however, that *mn* does not necessarily occur at all the opportunities created by TCU-internal *ne* and *sa*\(^\text{17}\), as shown in fragment (27) below. Although three instances of TCU-internal *ne* are found during the construction of the first component of a compound TCU (lines 1 and 3), the first two instances of *ne* do not receive *mn*.

(27) [2B: 15]

1 Yumi: atashi ne = saisho ne : ; (0.3) goma : n (0.3) jaku de ne : ;
   FP beginning FP fifty.thousand less at FP
   ‘I, at the beginning, you know, (0.3) for less than fifty thousand ((yen)), you
   know’

2 Rumi: \(\Rightarrow\) nn [: .

3 Yumi: [sagashi\*tete : * ,= was.searching.and
   ‘was looking for ((an apartment)) and’


During the first component of a compound TCU, Yumi deploys *ne* three times. Note particularly that the second *ne* is marked with a falling intonation contour and accompanied by a subsequent brief pause, which provides the coparticipant with a turn-entry opportunity where *mn* is often proffered. However, Rumi does not come in to proffer *mn* in this opportunity\(^{18}\). This suggests that TCU-internal final particles are not always responded to with *mn* by recipients.

In Section 2.3.2.2, I have examined *mn* occurring in environments that are accompanied by TCU-internal final particles, *ne* and *sa*. These final particles are typically delivered with a non-final intonation contour mapped onto them, such as slightly falling and slightly rising intonation, and are usually followed by a brief gap before subsequent increments are produced. As a consequence, these final particles briefly halt the progressivity of the on-going TCU and thereby create turn-entry

\(^{17}\) Similar observations are also made by other scholars (e.g. Maynard 1989; Tanaka 2000).

\(^{18}\) It is difficult to say why the second *ne* is not responded to with *mn* with the resource available, i.e. audio-taped data. Video data may be helpful to explain what is going on at this point as it provides more comprehensive information such as non-verbal response and gaze.
opportunities. That is, deployment of TCU-internal final particles indicates an immediate turn-entry opportunity, where recipients potentially produce *nn* to display their understanding that the current TCU is not yet complete and should be continued by the other speaker.

As noted previously, TCU-internal final particles do not contribute much to project the type of an upcoming component in the TCU and are not usually required to make sense of what the primary speaker is saying. In other words, insertion of TCU-internal final particles is additional or optional in the construction of TCUs. In relation to this, it can be argued that a halting of progressivity of on-going TCU by deploying TCU-internal final particles is a more explicitly way of marking a turn-entry opportunity, compared to those following grammatical particles (cf. Section 2.3.2.1). In this regard, the use of final particles at TCU-internal positions can be regarded as more strongly inviting the other speaker to enter the turn space of the on-going talk. Further, as argued by other scholars, final particles *ne* and *sa* serve to invite the coparticipants' acknowledgements when they are deployed turn-internally (e.g. Tanaka 2000; Squires 1994; Cook 1992). It is suggested that turn-entry opportunities following TCU-internal final particles can be seen as a good and relevant environment for the continuer *nn*.

### 2.3.2.3 TCU constituents without particles

In the previous discussions, I have examined *nm* occurring at places marked with grammatical particles/suffixes and final particles. It has been argued that the brief disruption of the progressivity of the on-going TCU, which is occasioned following these particles, creates an opportunity for others to enter the turn space. In some cases, however, such opportunities are created at places that are not accompanied by these particles. *Nn* is also frequently deployed at these turn-entry opportunities.

Fragment (28) presents a case where turn-entry opportunity is created by a sound stretch within a grammatical phrase, i.e. before reaching a grammatical
boundary. In the portion below, Mina and Saki are talking about the weather distribution in the areas they live in.

(28) [9A: 643]

1 Mina: =>nanka ↑kaaten ga hiite atta mitai (ni)< pish ↑otto naku naru uhm curtain SUB close was like clearly QT disappear
2 tte [ yutteta[( )° QT was saying ‘uhm, ((the rain)) disappears like being divided by a curtain, ((so they)) said’
3 Saki: [°n° [° dakara° densha : [ : ni notte kuru desho= therefore train on ride.and come BE ‘n, so ((we)) come by a train, you know?’
4 Mina:➔ (nn : ;
5 Mina: nn : ;
6 Saki: =totsuzen ame ga zaatto $ huttari toka : ahh ahh.$= suddenly rain SUB heavily fall or ‘suddenly the rain comes down hard, or
7 Mina: =suru no ° o? happen FP ‘((it)) does?’

In line 3, Saki initiates a turn at a place where a possible completion of the prior TCU is projectable. The second word of the TCU initiated by Saki, densha ‘train’, has a lengthened last syllable (line 3). Although the continuation of sound is maintained, sound lengthening delays the delivery of the subsequent word, i.e. it disrupts the ‘serial adjacency’, which creates an ‘unprojected opportunity’ for the other speaker to enter the turn space (cf. Lerner 1996). Mina’s nn is proffered here.

In fragment (29), nn occurs at a place marked by a sound stretch and a rising intonation contour. The fragment starts with Tae’s lengthy TCU, which is accomplished by using conjunctive particles/suffixes. The target nn occurs in line 10 where the on-going talk is not possibly complete in terms of grammar and as a conversational action.

(29) [TS: 72]

1 Tae: nn : ; ↑↑ [nanka demo sono ko sa := uhm but that person FP ‘nn : : uhm but she’
Saya: [oo(nn :)oo

3 Tae: sugoi hh sukina ko ga (,) ita

very attracted person SUB there was NM BE CONJ

'did someone whom she was attracted to very much, but'

4 Saya:

5 Tae: nanka katee no aru hito de ; [ nanka moo =

uhm family SUB exist person BE-and uhm

'uhm the person has a family and uhm'

6 Saya:

7 Tae: sono hito to mo wakaretai te yuu no mo atte ; =

that person with also want.to.separate QT say NM also there.is

'she wants to break up with him and'

8 Saya: =nn : ;

9 Tae: nanka mo chantoshita ; [ ona : idoshi gurai no (,) sukina hi*to=

uhm decent same.age about GEN favourite person

'uhm, well, a decent person, who is about the same age ((as her)) and who she
likes’

10 Saya: ➔

11 Tae: =ga : * , hh dekinai to wakarerare*na : i

SUB cannot.make CONJ cannot.break.up

12 toka it[te* ,= demo (0.2) sono mada (,) maeno >kare no =

or said.and but that not.yet former boyfriend GEN

'if ((she)) cannot find ((someone like that)), ((she)) said that ((she)) won’t be
able to break up ((with this person)), but (0.2) her ex-boyfriend…'

The target nn occurs at a place where the last syllable of the adjective chantoshita
‘decent’ is stretched and marked with a rising intonation contour. The sound
lengthening and the intonation contour, which cause a slight delay in delivering the
next word due, create an opportunity for the other speaker to enter the on-going talk.
In addition, note that the word chantoshita ‘decent’, which precedes the turn-entry
opportunity, is a key concept what Tae is saying and is marked with a stronger rising
intonation, i.e. a ‘try-marker’ (Sacks and Schegloff 1979). This try-marking intonation
mapped on to the pivotal word appears to have worked well to elicit a response from
the coparticipant. The nn is proffered at this opportunity, acknowledging this pivotal
word and encouraging the continuation of the on-going talk.

In Section 2.3.2, I have discussed the usage of nn occurring in the middle of a TCU,
focusing on those deployed around places that are marked with (i)
grammatical/syntactic particles and suffixes, (ii) final particles, and (iii) some prosodic features mapped onto TCU constituents that are not accompanied by these particles or suffixes. It was demonstrated that \(nn\) tends to occur in an environment where a turn-entry opportunity is furnished by briefly halting the delivery of the subsequent component or increment. \(Nn\) deployed in such an environment displays that, while acknowledging an opportunity to enter the turn space, the speaker is not taking up the opportunity but rather passing it, and thereby indicates that the original speaker of the not-yet-completed talk to which the \(nn\) is oriented should continue to a possible completion.

### 2.4 Claim of recognition

In Chapter 2, I have examined instances of \(nn\) deployed at non-TRPs and argued that they serve as continuers. As demonstrated in the instances above, the continuer \(nn\) typically occurs in brief turn-entry opportunities created by a disruption of the progressivity of the talk-in-progress. The continuer \(nn\) is often minimal to fit in these brief gaps and typically has a weak falling contour. There are cases, however, where \(nn\) occurring at a non-TRP is delivered in a more prosodically salient form, e.g. \(nn nn\) \(nn\), which I will briefly discuss in this section. It will be argued that, in some cases, the continuer \(nn\) may further claim recognition of some kind of additional information in other speaker's talk.

This type of \(nn\), i.e. the prosodically salient \(nn\), is often observed in a context where some additional information is inserted in the middle of on-going talk. For instance, in fragment (30), \(nn\) is placed in response to a same turn self-repair that is initiated in the middle of extended talk providing more elaborated information. The fragment is part of a rather long multi-unit storytelling delivered by Hikaru. The self-repair is initiated in lines 7 and 8 with an expression, \(tte yuu ka\) 'I mean I would say', which is frequently used to acknowledge upcoming repair (Hayashi 1994).
Chapter 2

Nn at Non-Transition-Relevance Places

(30) [HK: 246]

1 Hika: でまそ↑↑kō made wa↑↑yo(,)katta no yo ; ; [de kachoo=
and well there until TOP was.good FP FP and section.chief
‘and, well, ((it)) was okay till then, you know, and the section chief’

2 Kyo: 

3 Hika: =ga ne,nanka aa:ma .hh saisho KAGOSHIMA NI; [ isshoni=
SUB FP uhm oh well beginning ((name)) to together
‘thought that, you know, uhm, oh, well, at the beginning, ((thought that)) they
are returning to Kagoshima, together’

4 Kyo: 

5 Hika: =kaeru n da to omotta rashikutte ; =
return NM BE QT thought seem.and
‘((it)) seems like ((the section chief thought like that)), and’

6 Kyo: =nn : nn ; =

7 Hika: =aa son dat tara : *:* ; * ma : * ; (0.2) shooganaina : tte
oh so BE CONJ well no.choice FP QT
‘oh if that is the case, well (0.2) there is no choice or, you know, from
Kagoshima, ((he/she)) cannot tell ((them)) to commute ((from there)), .hhhh
if that is the case, there is no choice, that ((is what))’

10 Kyo: ➔

11 Hika: =omotta kedo: =toka [itte ; = i↑mooto san to ko↑cchi ni no↑koru=
thought CONJ or say and sister with here in remain
‘((he/she)) thought or something ((so I heard)), and, remaining here with
((his/her)) sister...’

12 Kyo: 

The repair initiation is followed by additional information and recycling of the word
preceding the repair initiation (lines 8 and 9). The n is produced precisely at the end
of the additional information or the repair. As Jefferson (1973) argues, the timing is
crucial when demonstrating recognition or understanding of what the primary speaker
is saying by using a token that does not particularly display understanding.
Furthermore, it is notable that the n does not have the typical contour shape of the
continuer n. While the continuer n is typically produced with a slightly falling
contour, this n is marked with a rise-falling contour. By marking the n as
prosodically salient as well as deploying it precisely following the self-repair that
provides elaboration, Kyoko may accomplish more than just a display of her understanding that the on-going talk is yet to be completed and should proceed, and further claims her recognition of what has been said. After the \( nn \), the disruption of the progressivity or ‘sequential adjacency’ (cf. Lerner 1996) of the on-going talk due to the insertion of self-repair ends and the speaker resumes to progress the current talk by recycling the words that preceded the repair initiation, \( sondattara shooganai na ‘if that is the case, there is no choice’ \) (lines 7 and 9). What the \( nn \) appears to be doing here is to claim recognition or understanding of the additional information provided by the other speaker as well as encouraging the speaker to continue the on-going talk with the next increment that progresses the talk toward its possible completion.

The continuer \( nn \) may be delivered in a reiterated form, which is conceivable as another case of prosodical salience, as illustrated in fragment (31) below. Here, the target \( nn \) is placed following an additional description proffered in talk. In the fragment, the participants are in the car and talking about a confusing intersection.

(31) [HK: 106]

1 Hika: kocchi ga itte ii no kana: toka wakannaku nacch[au yo, this.side SUB go.and okay NM FP or know-NEG become FP ‘(I) become confused if I can go or not, you know’

2 Kyo: [kocchi this

3 (. ) kkawa kara sa;kaette iku toki aru = ichini:kyuu side from FP return.and go time exist BE-NEG Route129

4 gawa [ni_ side to ‘from this side, you know, there are times that ((we)) go back, you know, to the side of Route 129’

5 Hika:➔ [nn: nn: nn[ : ;

6 Kyo: [sono toki toka:_ =[hidarini uin kaadashiteru= that time or left to is.indicating ‘in such a case, ((although I)) am indicating to the left’

7 Hika: [nn:: ;

\( ^{19} \) Muller (1996: 136) argues that a recipient may “signal an understanding that goes beyond a display of ‘de dicto’ recognition and assume a more differentiated stance, e.g. a ‘de re’ recognition of the place, person or event current speaker is talking about (‘Yes, I know what/whom you are talking about’)” by making an acknowledgement token “prosodically salient”.
In line 2, Kyoko initiates a TCU, providing background information. The TCU reaches a possible completion marked with a TCU ending item *jan* (line 3), which is used to evoke “solidarity or common ground” (McGloin 1999: 467). This, however, does not constitute an actual completion as Kyoko continues the TCU with an additional increment. Terminally overlapping with the additional increment, Hikaru produces a reiterated *nn* (line 5). By reiterating *nn* and making the token prosodically more salient, Hikaru may claim the recognition is established as well as showing that the speaker should progress the on-going talk with the next word(s) due toward a possible completion. Note that Kyoko advances the on-going talk following the reiterated *nn*.

Displays of recognition of some object may be elicited by the primary speaker. Here, the speaker invites a response in the middle of talk by deploying a rising intonation contour on some object in talk, i.e. a ‘try-marker’ (Sacks and Schegloff 1979).

(32) [3B: 302]

1  Yumi: ↓*hun : n_* => a demo< (0.4) *nani shiteru hito?*  
   oh but *what is.doing person*  
   ‘↓*hun : n_* = oh but (0.4) what does he do?’

2  (0.7)
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3 Miho: n: to ne, isu tokano ne: = dezain o shi- shiari toka: *(0.2)
uhm FP chair or GEN FP design OBJ do.or or
ato ne: nanka(.) kaguya: san?
and FP uhm furniture.store
‘uhm, you know, ((he)) designs chairs or something or, *(0.2) and uhm a
furniture store?’

4 Yumi: nn: nn: [nn :

5 Miho: ↓[nn : : ↑ de ( ) isu no dezain o shiteru.
at chair GEN design OBJ is.doing
‘nn : : at ((a furniture store)), ((he)) is designing chairs’

good BE-NEG
‘↑huu : : n _ ((that’s)) good’

7 (0.2)

At the beginning of the excerpt, Yumi produces a question. Miho initiates the answer
in line 3 following a silence of 0.7 seconds. In the answer, Miho employs a ‘try-
marking’ intonation contour, i.e. a terminal rising contour, on the noun kagu ya san
‘furniture store’ (line 4), seeking the establishment of recognition (Sacks and
Schegloff 1979). Miho stops after the noun marked by try-marking intonation, and this
creates a space where Yumi enters the turn-space possibly to produce a response.
Kaguyasan ‘furniture store’ to which the nn is oriented is in some sense additional to
what Miho has said in the answer. Yumi responds to this with a reiterated nn, claiming
recognition and thereby encouraging the progress of the on-going talk. Following the
nn, Miho proceeds with the on-going talk, producing the subsequent words.

To sum up, Section 2.4 has discussed instances of nn that is made prosodically
salient. It was shown that this type of nn is often deployed in environments where
additional information is inserted or where establishment of recognition is requested.
In these environments, the continuer nn may be made prosodically salient to further
acknowledge the recognition of some kind of additional information provided by the
primary speaker.
Chapter 2

2.5 Summary

In Chapter 2, I have investigated *nn* deployed at non-TRPs, particularly focusing on those occurring within a TCU. The intonation on *nn* has a strong tendency to terminally fall slightly, but not strongly. This demonstrates a certain similarity to English where continuers typically have terminal slight rise in pitch, not strong falls, which are more associated with acknowledgement (cf. Gardner 2001). *Nn* is frequently deployed at brief turn-entry opportunities constantly provided by the incremental turn construction and temporarily halting of the progressivity of the ongoing talk, and works as a continuer, indicating that the current TCU should be continued by its original speaker.

I have shown that *nn* may be deployed in response to turn-beginnings that are accompanied by subsequent brief turn-entry opportunities at the initiation of a multi-unit turn or turn that consists of a lengthy TCU, and at the initiation of turn in potentially problematic environments. I have argued that *nn* in response to these beginnings achieves a crucial interactional task of establishing participants’ alignment of speakership/recipientship at the beginning of a turn. Furthermore, it has been shown that the producer of on-going talk also furnishes turn-entry opportunities during its construction. Coparticipants utilise these opportunities to display their understanding of the current state of talk, more precisely, that the relevant TCU is still in progress and should be continued by its speaker. I have also shown that, in environments where additional information is inserted or where the establishment of recognition is sought, a prosodically more salient *nn* may be deployed to acknowledge some kind of additional information provided by the primary speaker as well as to encourage a continuation of the current talk.

*Nn* is frequently used away from TRPs compared with English continuers, but nevertheless the analysis suggests that there is a strong orientation to partial grammatical completion and to intonation units, particularly ones with a non-final intonation contour.
Some researchers have suggested that the use of *aizuchi*, or Japanese backchannels, is closely related to the incremental projection of the on-going turn in Japanese (Hayashi 2003; Fox *et al.* 1996). The ‘delayed’ or ‘limited’ projectability of on-going turn-shape in Japanese (cf. Hayashi 2003; Tanaka 1999), which is attributable largely to the structure of the language, may require constant monitoring of the progress by the participants. During the construction of a TCU, its producer constantly furnishes turn-entry opportunities to provide a place for a coparticipant to display understanding of the progress of the TCU. At the same time, the coparticipant utilises these places to display understanding of the current state of the on-going talk and acknowledge its progress. The investigation of *mn* at non-TRPs has demonstrated a crucial contribution of the response token *mn* as part of the interactive and collaborative construction of TCUs in Japanese conversation.

The findings of Chapter 2 are summarised as follows:

### Summary of the findings: *Nn* at non-TRPs

**Basic function:**
- Indicating the producer’s understanding that the talk to which the *mn* is oriented is not yet complete and thus should be progressed by its original producer, i.e. continuers.

**Typical environment:**
- Brief turn-entry opportunities provided at the beginning and during the construction of a turn.

**Typical subsequent course of talk:**
- Continuation of the talk to which the *mn* is oriented.

**Actions that may be achieved:**
- Displaying alignment as a recipient of an initiated turn-at-talk.
- Inviting the speaker of the talk to which the *mn* is oriented to continue.
- Acknowledge some kind of additional information provided by the main speaker when made prosodically salient.
CHAPTER 3

Nn at Transition-Relevance Places

3.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapter, I have investigated *nn* occurring at non-transition-relevance places (non-TRPs), and shown that it is used as a continuer, displaying the producer’s understanding in reference to the current state of talk, or more precisely, that a turn is just initiated (in case of turn-beginnings) or that the current talk is not yet possibly complete (in case of non-turn-beginnings), and thus the talk should be continued by its original speaker toward a possible completion. This chapter will examine *nn* occurring at places where the current talk is possibly complete, i.e. *nn* at possible transition-relevance places (TRPs). *Nn* in this environment appears to do different work from a continuer. What *nn* appears to do at possible TRPs is to claim adequate receipt of the prior talk.

In this chapter, I will first demonstrate that *nn* deployed at possible TRPs claims the producer’s adequate receipt of the prior talk, which does not require any further talk to make sense of what the primary speaker has said. This will be followed by

---

1 I would like to note that the analysis of the receipt *nn* in this chapter is greatly indebted to the insightful work of Gardner (1995; 2001) on the minimal response token *mm*, which is commonly used in Australian English conversation.
discussions on the trajectories of talk following the \(nn\). While \(nn\) at non-TRPs is overwhelmingly followed by other speaker’s talk that continues the talk-in-progress, \(nn\) at possible TRPs is commonly followed by talk by the producer of \(nn\) as well as by other speaker. I will examine both cases where subsequent talk following \(nn\) is produced by the other speaker, i.e. the producer of the talk to which the \(nn\) is oriented, and where subsequent talk is produced by the producer of \(nn\). It will be shown that the receipt through the token \(nn\) indicates its producer’s stance of low commitment to, and orientation to moving away from, the talk to which the \(nn\) is oriented.

3.2 Adequate receipt at possible completion

I will first examine some instances of \(nn\) at issue, which is deployed at or around possible TRPs, in other words, at or around a possible completion of the prior talk. Fragment (1) illustrates a straightforward case where \(nn\) is deployed at a possible completion, which is marked with a falling terminal contour. In the portion below, Rumi talks about how she will move her belongings into a new apartment if she moves out of her parents’ house. Rumi’s talk in line 1 is initiated after closure of the prior sequence.

(1) [2B: 538]

1 Rumi: hikkoshiyasan ni tanonde ; ; ((sniff?)) \(>demo\) hikkoshiitte
mover to ask.\(and\) but moving QT
2 ittemo jibunchi kara mottekerumonowa jibun no
say-CONJ my.house from bring thing TOP myself GEN
3 kuruma de hako beru gurai jan ne[ ; ;
car can. by carry about BE-NEG FP
‘((I will)) ask a mover, but for things that are moved from my ((current))
house, ((these things)) can be moved using my car, you know,’
4 Yumi:
5 Rumi: de ato (.) dengiyaasan ni chokusetsu socchi
and rest electric.appl.store to directly there
6 ni [ mottettemora( )]
to bring.\(and\)
‘and the rest can be delivered by the electric appliance store directly there ((to
the new apartment))’
In line 1, Rumi first mentions that she will hire a mover. This idea, however, is immediately revised and Rumi starts talking about an alternative way of moving (lines 1-6). While Rumi’s talk is still in progress, Yumi comes in preemptively with an assertion that Rumi does not need to ask for a mover (line 7). Rumi abandons the TCU-in-progress and immediately displays her affiliation with this assertion by partially repeating the assertion with an additional final particle ne (line 9). In line 10, \textit{nn} is deployed latching to Rumi’s talk. The placement of this \textit{nn} makes a sharp contrast with the continuer \textit{nn}, which is canonically deployed in the middle of talk-in-progress. Note that the target \textit{nn} is deployed at a place where Rumi’s talk is possibly complete and marked with a terminal falling contour, which constitutes a possible TRP where speaker-change potentially occurs (cf. Sacks \textit{et al.} 1974). Furthermore, the \textit{nn} in line 10 is followed by lengthy silences rather than continuation of the talk to which the \textit{nn} is oriented.

Above, I have presented a rather straightforward instance of \textit{nn} at a possible TRP. It was shown that the \textit{nn} is deployed at a place where the talk to which it is oriented is possibly complete without any further talk. In addition, the talk to which the \textit{nn} is oriented is not continued further after being responded to by the \textit{nn}. Thus, the \textit{nn} discussed in the above fragment is quite different from the continuer \textit{nn}, which is typically deployed at a brief turn-entry opportunity in the middle of on-going talk and claims that the speaker of the current talk should continue towards a possible completion (cf. Chapter 2). What the \textit{nn} in line 10 above appears to be doing is
‘acknowledgement work’ (Gardner 2001), rather than inviting the other speaker to progress unfinished talk. Acknowledgement use of response tokens is “more retrospective” and is different from continuers in that the tokens “are not, primarily, in the business of handing the floor back to the prior speaker, but of making a claim to adequate receipt of the prior turn” (Gardner 2001: 34). I suggest that *nn* at possible TRPs serves primarily to claim that the prior talk is adequately received and no continuation or additional talk is further required to make sense of what has been said, i.e. the receipt *nn*.

Fragment (2) shows another straightforward instance of *nn* claiming adequate receipt. While *nn* in the previous fragment is followed by a lengthy silence, *nn* in this fragment is followed by its producer’s initiating a new sequence after a brief silence. The portion below is taken from a conversation between Hikaru and Kyoko, which is tape-recorded in a car. Hikaru and Kyoko are talking about an intersection that has very confusing traffic lights.

(2) [HK: 139]
1  Hika: 
2    [nn:;=soo soo soo:. > saisho n toki ni na:nka yoku beginning GEN when at uhm well
3                      wakannakutte mae no kuruma ni tsuitetta tte kanji datta not.know front GEN car to followed QT feeling was
4          *yo [ atashi*. FP  I
5      ‘nn soosoosoo, when ((I drove there)) for the first time, ((I)) wasn’t sure ((how I should go)) and ((therefore)) it was like ((I just)) followed the car in front ((of me)), you know, I ((did)).
6 4  Kyo:    [hhn hah hah ((unaudible laughter)) .hhh°° demo soo
7                      nacchau yo [ ne°°]; has.become FP  FP
8      ‘but that happens, doesn’t it’
9 6  Hika:→  [°nn : :°;
10  (0.3)
11 8  Hika: >kore o< kugutte ; ; this OBJ go.under.and
12     ‘((we)) go under this and ‘
13 9  (.)
10 Kyo:  `nn`; kugutte zutto massugu  
go.under.and throughout straight  

`nn`: go under ((this)) and ((go)) straight down’

Up to line 3, Hikaru tells Kyoko about her own experience with the confusing intersection they have been talking about. This is responded to by Kyoko with laughter, which demonstrates ‘appreciation’ (Jefferson 1978) for the telling. This is followed by an affiliative commentary, demo soo nacchau yo ne ‘but that happens, you know’. In line 6, Hikaru proffers `nn` in an overlap with the combined final particles yo ne, which projects an imminent possible completion, claiming adequate receipt of Kyoko’s talk. After the receipt `nn`, Kyoko does not elaborate or continue further with the talk to which the `nn` is oriented. After a silence of 0.3 seconds (line 7), Hikaru initiates a new sequence and shifts the topic away from the telling to the route they are driving.

In the two instances above, non-continuation of the talk to which the receipt `nn` is oriented is clearly indicated by a lengthy silence and initiation of talk by the producer of the `nn`. In the next fragment, a receipt `nn` is immediately followed by talk by the speaker of the talk to which the receipt `nn` is oriented. It is shown below, however, that the talk following the `nn` is not a continuation of the talk to which the `nn` is oriented. Fragment (3) includes the last part of a storytelling sequence where Saya talks about one of her friends who is getting married in a couple of months. Immediately prior to the portion below, Tae asks Saya where the wedding reception is going to be held and Saya provides the answer (data not shown). At the beginning of the excerpt, Saya produces a confirmation request by proffering her candidate understanding about the place. This is responded to by Tae with a sort of affiliation (line 2). The target `nn` is produced in line 5 in response to an assessment.

(3) [TS: 243]

1 Saya:  ge : , = hanamizuki tte :: ii n da yo ng :: =  

eh ( (name) ) QT good NM BE FP FP  

‘eh? Hanamizuki is good, isn’t it?’
In line 4, Saya proffers an assessment, "ii na ‘I envy you’, which is hearable as being designed to propose closure of the storytelling. Tae responds to this with a quiet *nn*. The assessment is syntactically possibly complete and, more importantly, constitutes a complete action, i.e. pragmatically complete. Although the assessment is not marked with a terminal intonation contour, a rather long sound stretch following the assessment may suggest that the speaker is not moving on to produce further talk and thus has nothing more to say. In this context where the assessment is hearable as possibly complete, Tae produces *nn*, claiming adequate receipt of the assessment. In the subsequent turn after the *nn*, the other speaker, i.e. the speaker of the assessment, takes the turn (line 6), which, however, is not a continuation of the prior assessment but initiates a new sequence. In addition, a shift in volume in Saya’s talk (line 6) suggests its disalignment from the preceding talk.

So far, I have shown instances where the talk that is responded to by *nn* is no longer continued after the *nn*. As shown below, however, the receipt *nn* may be followed by a further continuation of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. Consider fragment (4), where *nn* is followed by a last bit of talk that completes the talk to which

---

2 Goldberg (1978) observes the occurrence of amplitude shift when disaffiliating from the immediately prior talk.
the \( mn \) is oriented. Here, the target \( mn \) occurs in line 8 at a place where possible completion of the current talk is projectable.

(4) [9A: 723]

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \text{ Miho: } \text{aa : } \text{demo; } \uparrow \text{takakute}\uparrow \text{sa : ; (.)}[ \text{ano : } \text{sao no ichi ga. =} \\
& \text{oh but } \text{high. and } FP \text{ uhm pole GEN position SUB} \\
& \text{‘oh but ((it)) is high, you know, uhm ((I mean)) the position of the ((laundry)) pole’} \\
2 & \text{ Saki: } [\cdots (\cdots) \\
3 & \text{ Saki: } =\text{nn }[\ : \ ;] \\
4 & \text{ Mina: } [\text{pin de tomerarenai mon* de moo*; (0.2) [ochitara ne], =} \\
& \text{peg with can.not.fix NM BE fell if FP} \\
& \text{‘((I)) cannot peg out ((the laundry)), so well, (0.2) if ((the laundry)) falls, you know’} \\
5 & \text{ Saki: } [\text{aa : : : ;}] \\
6 & \text{ Mina: } =\text{o* shooganai na : *to omotte; ano manma }\text{°} \\
& \text{no.other.way FP QT think. and that intact} \\
& \text{‘((there is)) nothing you can do ((about it)), I think, and, ((I leave them)) as they are’} \\
7 & (0.2) \\
8 & \text{ Saki: } \Rightarrow \text{ °nn : : ;} \\
9 & \text{ Mina: } \text{°°(sh- shite).°°} \\
& \text{do. and} \\
& \text{‘((I)) leave’} \\
10 & (1.2)
\end{align*}
\]

Although the place where the \( mn \) is produced is not possibly complete in terms of grammar or intonation, a possible completion is projectable as sufficient information is provided to anticipate what the speaker is saying. In addition, a brief silence (line 7) in this context may indicate that Mina has nothing more to say and her talk is possibly complete. Following the \( mn \), Mina produces a very quiet brief bit of talk, which does not add much to what she has said but merely completes it (line 9). This is followed by a silence of 1.2 seconds (line 10). If the \( mn \) (line 8) was produced as a continuer, it would be sequentially relevant to produce a response that demonstrates the recipient’s, i.e. Saki’s, understanding that the talk is possibly complete on Mina’s completion of her talk, i.e. after the small bit of talk in line 9. However, no such response is provided.
but a silence occurs in line 10. It seems thus reasonable to assume that the *nn* in line 8 is used to claim adequate receipt of what Mina has said, rather than claiming an understanding that the current talk is not yet complete and encouraging to progress it.

In fragment (5), *nn* occurs at a place where the prior talk is possibly complete both grammatically and as an action, but not in terms of intonation. The speaker of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented ‘rushes through’ (Schegloff 1982) to the additional increment, which overlaps with the *nn*.

(5) [2B: 316]

1 Rumi: motoyama choo. (0.4) takai na.: (name) expensive FP

‘Motoyama-choo (0.4) ((it’s)) expensive’

2 (0.3)

3 Yumi: ta*kai yo ne,= [hitoride kurasu] ni wa ne := expensive FP FP alone live forTOP FP

‘((it’s)) expensive, isn’t it?, to live alone, you know’

4 Rumi:→ ↓[ *nn : : o ].

5 (5.0)

6 Yumi: isso no koto miwa chan to hutari de ; rather GEN thing ((name)) with two.people with

‘you might as well ((live)) with Miwa…’

The assessment, *takai na ‘((it’s)) expensive’* in line 1, is responded to by Yumi with an affiliation, *takai yo ne ‘((it’s)) expensive, isn’t it’* (line 3). The *nn* is placed precisely at the end of the combined final particles, *yo ne*. The *nn* occurs at a place where the current talk is possibly complete grammatically and as action but not in terms of intonation. Note the slight rising continuing contour mapped onto the final particle *ne*, which occurs presumably because Yumi rushes through to an additional increment, *hitori de kurasu ni wa ne ‘for living by yourself’, i.e. ‘post predicate addition’* (Tanaka 1999). Although the talk is not possibly complete in terms of intonation, the fact that Yumi rushes through to the next component, indeed, suggests that the speaker herself understands that the place where the *nn* is deployed is a possible completion and, thus, constitutes a possible TRP. In short, the *nn* is deployed at a possible TRP where the talk to which it is oriented is projectable as possibly complete. I suggest that the *nn* is
designed to claim adequate receipt of Yumi’s response but it results in an overlap due to the production of an additional increment, which does not add much to what the *nn* claims adequate receipt of. Note that no further response is proffered by Rumi after the additional increment.

In the two instances above, I have argued that the *nn* claims adequate receipt of the prior talk rather than being used as a continuer although further increments are produced after, or in overlap with, the *nn*. It was shown that the further increments are discontinued after a possible completion and, more importantly, are not responded to by the producer of the *nn*. There are, however, cases where *nn* at a possible TRP is followed by a further expansion of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented and the extended increments are responded to by the producer of *nn*. *Nn* in these cases may appear different from the instances discussed so far and thus may be seen as potentially problematic to be regarded as a receipt *nn*. For example, consider fragment (6), which is part of a rather long troubles-telling in which Mina talks about her worries about her baby daughter’s slower growth compared to other children of similar age. Prior to the portion below, Saki tells Mina not to worry too much.

(6) [9A: 954]
1 Mina: soo, kurabecho ikan no da. 
   compare no.good NM BE
   ‘soo, ((I)) shouldn’t compare’

2

3 Saki: ➔ oun.
4 Mina: [ wakacchairu kedo ne : , [( )
   know CONJ FP
   ‘((I)) know that, but ((cannot help it)), you know ( )’

5 Saki: [ ima chikara o
   now strength OBJ

6 takuwaeteru n da mon ne :,
   is.saving NM BE NM FP
   ‘now ((she is/ you are)) saving strength, right?’

At the beginning of the fragment, Mina produces a commentary that wraps up what she has been saying (line 1). In line 3, *nn* is proffered in response to this commentary. The
NN is deployed at a place where the commentary is possibly complete grammatically, intonationally, and as a conversational action. In other words, the NN occurs at a place where the talk that it is oriented to is possibly complete without any further talk. Overlapping with the NN, Mina extends her prior TCU with an additional increment marked by the conjunctive particle kedo ‘although’ (line 4). At a possible completion of the increment, Saki proffers a substantial response to Mina’s talk (lines 5 and 6).

This instance may appear to show that the NN is deployed as a continuero to encourage further talk and the producer of NN proffers response talk when the talk reaches a possible completion. However, as will be discussed later in this chapter, NN used in this way can be accounted for as an instance of receipt NN being deployed in order to ‘pass up some relevant response’ rather than as a continuero. It will also be shown that the subsequent talk following a receipt NN is quite different from what follows continuedro. I will address this issue in more detail in Section 3.3.2.

In Section 3.2, I have argued that NN deployed at or around possible TRPs serves primarily to claim adequate receipt of the prior talk that is possibly complete without a further continuation or elaboration. NN at or around possible TRPs, therefore, has been shown to be quite different from the continuero NN, which encourages development or progress of the not-yet-complete prior talk. In the sections below, I will show that the receipt NN achieves various actions in different sequential contexts where it is deployed.

### 3.3 Trajectories of talk after NN: Subsequent talk by the other speaker

I will now investigate the trajectories of talk following the receipt NN. As noted earlier, subsequent talk after a receipt NN can be produced by the producer of NN or by the other speaker, i.e. the recipient of the NN. In Section 3.3, I will discuss cases where the other speaker produces the subsequent talk, focusing on two types of trajectories, which are regularly observed in the data set. One type is the case where the current sequence/activity is closed and the other speaker initiates a new one, as illustrated by
most of the instances that has been discussed so far, or returns to a larger activity\textsuperscript{3}. The other type has the other speaker expanding the talk to which \textit{nn} is oriented. Cases where the producer of \textit{nn} proffers subsequent talk will be discussed in Section 3.4. Investigations on the trajectories of talk will reveal that a claim of adequate receipt with \textit{nn} implicates the producer's minimal commitment to the talk to which it is oriented.

### 3.3.1 Closure of a relevant sequence/activity

\textit{Nn} is frequently observed in a context where some activity is possibly complete and no particular action is projected as a sequentially relevant next action. \textit{Nn} used in this context tends to be followed by closure of the current sequence/activity. The closure may be followed by the other speaker’s initiating a new sequence/activity or resuming a suspended activity if relevant.

Fragment (7) illustrates the case where a receipt \textit{nn} is deployed in response to a preferred response that demonstrates agreement or affiliation with the talk produced earlier by the producer of \textit{nn}\textsuperscript{4}. The fragment is part of a stretch of talk where the participants are talking about possible locations where Rumi may search for an apartment. The target \textit{nn} occurs in line 7.

\begin{verbatim}
(7) [2B: 209]
1 Rumi: demo ; (0.7) doose (0.2) chikakuni sumu n nara : moo tokoton
     but at.all near live NM CONJ thoroughly
2 chikai no ga ii n da wa.
     near NM SUB good NM BE FP
     ‘but (0.7) if ((I)) live close at all, ((I)) would like ((to live)) as close as possible’
3 (0.2)
4 Yumi: nn ; =
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{3} The term ‘activity’ refers to “a course of action which is topically coherent and/or goal-coherent and which may be achieved across a sequence or series of sequences” (Sorjonen 1996: 280).

\textsuperscript{4} See, for example, Pomerantz (1984a) and Sacks (1987) for discussions on preference for agreement.
At the beginning of the fragment, Rumi makes an assertion that she likes to live nearby. Rumi’s talk is possibly complete and marked with a terminal falling contour (line 2). In this context, the recipient may produce a response to this assertion. However, Yumi simply produces *nn* with a slight delay (lines 3 and 4). The use of a minimal response *nn* with the delay in this context where a more substantial response is expected⁵ may indicate some problem, possibly an upcoming disagreement (Pomerantz 1984a, 1984b) or problem of understanding (Pomerantz 1984b). In the ensuing turn, Rumi expands the prior TCU with an additional increment, elaborating on what she has meant by *dekirudake chikai* ‘as close as possible’ by specifying it as *juppun toka jiugohun de kaerechau mitai na sa* ‘like (I) can go home within ten or fifteen minutes’. Yumi provides reiterated *nn* at a place where it is possible to recognise what Rumi is saying. Yumi’s recognition or understanding of what Rumi is saying is suggested by the precise timing (Jefferson 1973) and prosodical salience (Müller 1996), i.e. reiterated

---

⁵ Studies show that displays of a stance or perspective make it sequentially relevant for the coparticipant to show agreement or disagreement as a response (cf. Pomerantz 1984a; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Mori 1996, among others).
form, of the token (cf. Chapter 2). Latched to this, Yumi displays her affiliation with Rumi’s assertion with an assessment, *sore ga ii yo ne* ‘that’s good, isn’t it?’ (line 6).

The target *nn* is produced in line 7 in response to this affiliative talk. The *nn* receives the affiliative response in third position, minimally expanding the sequence, i.e. ‘post-expansion’ (Schegloff 1990). Minimal post-expansions do not project any further talk in the sequence beyond itself and are designed to propose closure of a relevant sequence (Liddicoat 2001). The sequence to which the target *nn* (line 7) is oriented is closed and followed by a silence of 3.0 seconds (line 8). After the 3.0 second silence, Yumi proffers a telling about her friend, which initiates a new sequence with a shift in topic.

*Nn* may be used to receipt a turn that proposes a closure of a sequence and/or activity. In the next fragment, for instance, *nn* is placed in a ‘sequence closing sequence’ (cf. Liddicoat 2001). In line 1, a question is proffered in reference to a storytelling that was delivered earlier in conversation by Tae about her friend who is pregnant. The target *nn* is produced in line 12.

(8) [TS: 315]

1 Saya: ["ge" moo : (.) moo medatsu : ?] already already prominent 'eh?, already, ((is her pregnancy)) already prominent'

2 Tae: (.)

3 Saya: *nn* : : ; *chotto wakaru* : ?= nanka (.) [kvonen toka wa = a.little can tell uhm last.year or TOP

4 Tae: [("nn* : : ;")]

5 Saya: ‘*nn* : : ; ((you)) can tell a bit, uhm last year or so’

6 Tae: =zenzen wakannakatta rashii n da kedo [:, not.at.all could.not.tell seem NM BE CONJ

7 Saya: =>nanka< kurisumasu sugite gurai kara sugoi (.) uhm christmas past around since very

‘uhm, since about a little past Christmas, very’

---

*Liddicoat (2001: 90) notes that these minimal post-expansions can be referred to as ‘sequence closing thirds’.*
In line 3, Tae initiates a response to the question in the ensuing turn. At a possible completion after *chotto wakaru* ‘(you) can tell a bit’, which is marked with a rising terminal contour, Tae rushes through to the next TCU to provide more elaborated information (line 3). The TCU is turned into a preliminary component of a compound TCU by the conjunctive particle *kedo* ‘although’ (line 5). Saya proffers a continuer *nn* (line 6) here, which is followed by a continuation of the on-going TCU with a further component. In the middle of the subsequent component, Saya pre-emptively produces a sort of assessment *hee* ‘wow’ (line 8), which suggests Saya’s recognition of the trajectory of the on-going talk. Overlapping with this, Tae continues her talk to a possible completion, which is delivered with a terminal falling intonation contour (line 9). There is a silence of 0.4 seconds before Saya takes the turn producing a quiet *sokka* ‘I see’, which appears to be designed to propose closing of the larger activity of storytelling as well as marking receipt of the answer.

In the subsequent turn, Tae produces a quiet *nn* (line 12), claiming adequate receipt of the prior talk. This action indicates that the producer is not taking up an opportunity to produce substantial talk with which she may resists the proposed closure, and accordingly demonstrates alignment with the action of the prior turn, i.e. a closure proposal. Note also that alignment with the prior talk is demonstrated in terms of the volume. There is a silence of 0.8 seconds before Saya produces a very quiet
assessment, which “ratifies the prior speaker’s alignment with the proposed closing” (Liddicoat 2001: 104). This is immediately followed by Saya’s initiating a storytelling about someone she met recently.

A receipt *nn* may be produced in an environment where the recipient has already proffered a stronger or more substantial response, as illustrated by fragment (9). The fragment is preceded by a multi-unit telling delivered by Mina about plum blossoms she went to see with her family (data not shown). The telling did not receive a response from the recipient that would demonstrate the sequential implicativeness of the story but only acknowledgements (See Jefferson 1978 for discussion of the sequential implicativeness of stories). Mina proffers an additional telling component, which includes an assessment, *samui* ‘cold’, in line 1.

(9) [9A: 139]

1 Mina:  
   minna de itte ki tara maa* sa : mui samui. 
   everyone with go.and come CONJ cold cold
   ‘we all went there, and ((it was)) very cold’
2 (1.2)
3 Mina:  
   (oo ne go oo)=
4 Saki:  
   mada ume no kisetsu wa ne (h) [(h)]
   still plum GEN season TOP FP
   ‘((it’s)) still the season of plum blossoms, you know’
5 Mina:  
   [nn: chotto a.little
6 samui [ yo ne hh hh hhh ] yudan shite tara sa:mukutesa.=
   cold FP FP be.unprepared go-CONJcold and FP
   ‘nn ; ((it’s)) a bit cold, isn’t it? .hh hh hhh as ((we)) went unprepared, ((it was)) cold, and’
7 Saki:  
   [ chotto sa(h)mui yo ne(h) ]
   a.little cold FP FP
   ‘((it’s)) a bit cold, isn’t it’
8 Mina:  
   =hu[yu no kooto* kite kya] yokatta °to omotta.°*
   winter GEN coat wear.and go-CONJ was.good QT thought
   ‘((I)) should have worn a heavy coat, ((I)) thought’
9 Saki:  
   [°° nn °° °°
10 Saki:  
   °nn : : ° °=
11 Mina:  
   =a: no ( ) ↑rando aru jan.=
   uhm ((name)) exist BE-NEG
   ‘uhm, there is ( ) Land, right?’
Following a silence of 1.2 seconds, Saki demonstrates her affiliation by proffering her candidate understanding of what Mina said in the prior turn. This turn consists of a topic noun phrase accompanied by the final particle *ne* (line 4), which achieves a possibly complete action by itself in the context. In the ensuing turn, Mina produces *nn* and an assessment, *chotto samui yo ne* ‘(it’s) a little cold, isn’t it?’, which may be seen as completing the prior talk that consists of a topic noun phrase with no predicate. Terminally overlapping with the combined final particles *yo ne*, Saki repeats Mina’s talk. Upon completion of the repeat, Mina takes the turn, proffering further on-topic talk (line 6). At a place where the extended talk is possibly complete, Saki produces a quiet lengthened *nn* (line 9). This substantially overlaps with Mina’s talk as Mina continues beyond the first possible completion. At the next possible completion, which is marked with a lower volume (line 8), Saki again proffers a quiet *nn*, claiming adequate receipt of the prior turn. This is followed by Mina’s turn with a shift in topic, which initiates a new telling activity.

What should be noted here is that the talk that is responded to by the *nn* in lines 9 and 10 does not add much to what has already been said and what Saki has already shown her affiliation with. A minimal response may have been chosen here to simply claim a receipt of Mina’s talk as Saki has already shown her stronger affiliation and understanding toward it. In other words, by deploying *nn* in this environment, the producer simply marks adequate receipt of the other speaker’s extended talk that has little topical development. Note also that the instances of *nn* at issue here are produced with a reduced volume. This can be seen as another indication that *nn* may display the producer’s lower involvement in what the teller is saying, showing that there is nothing more to say about it.

So far, I have shown instances where the other speaker initiates a new sequence/activity. The other speaker may also return to earlier talk to resume a suspended activity after closure of the sequence to which the *nn* is oriented, as shown in fragment (10). The target *nn* is placed in third position following an answer to a question (line 7). Immediately prior to the portion below, Tae delivers a multi-unit
story about one of her friends who is getting married in a couple of months time. In lines 1, Saya asks a question in reference to the story.

(10) [TS: 213]
1 Saya: deru: no: ? = ( ) $ ehh hhhh =
  ‘are ((you)) going to attend ((the wedding reception))? ’
2 Tae: > de(reru) yo<. yoKYOO ↑ SURU N↑=
   can attend FP entertainment do NM
   ‘I am. ((I)) will be doing a performance’
3 Saya: .hhh qa ↑ soo na no : $ [ hitori]
   oh BE FP alone
   ‘oh is that so?’
   ‘by yourself?’
4 Tae: = DA KARA ( ) ] [ nanka] demo [ : ;
   BE because
   uhm but
   ‘uhm, but’
5 Saya: [nn .
6 Tae: a . h ↑ n : n, tomodachi to hutari de : $=
   oh no friend with two people with
   ‘oh no, with my friend, two ((of us))’
7 Saya: = nn : : ;
8 (. )
9 Tae: > nanka demo <; (. ) to ↑ modachi wa anmari yobazuni ↑ hoton* do*
   uhm but friend TOP not much invite NEG almost
   ‘uhm, but, ((they are)) not inviting many friends, and almost...’
10 Saya: nn : ;

In line 1, Saya asks if Tae is going to attend the wedding reception. Tae answers this, mentioning that she will even be doing a performance at the reception (lines 2 and 4). Saya responds to the answer with a ‘newsmark’ (Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1981), aa soo na no ‘oh is that so?’, marking the prior talk as some sort of news and showing her preparedness for further talk. Following the newsmark, Saya continues with another question regarding the performance, asking if she is doing it alone, i.e. hitori ‘by yourself’ in line 3. Simultaneously with the onset of the question, Tae proffers further talk, nanka demo ‘well, but’ (line 4), which results in an overlap with Saya’s question. The overlap is resolved when Saya stops talking, presumably because the question reaches its end. Shortly after this, Saya claims recipiency by producing a very brief nn.
(line 5), aligning herself as a recipient and thus encouraging Tae to continue the talk that she has started (cf. Chapter 2). Tae, however, attends to the question that Saya asked in the overlapping talk and produces an answer (line 6). The answer is prefaced by \( a \), which can be seen as an equivalent of ‘oh’ in English\(^7\). Saya proffers receipt \( n \) at a place where the answer is possibly complete in the context with sufficient information provided to achieve its purpose. Note that Tae’s talk to which the \( n \) is oriented is marked with terminal rising intonation (line 6). The \( n \) minimally expands the question-answer sequence and proposes its closure. Indeed, the question-answer sequence is closed and Tae resumes her suspended earlier talk by recycling it, cf. \( nanka demo ‘well, but’ in lines 4 and 9.

In Section 3.3.1, I have discussed the case where the receipt \( n \) is followed by closure of a relevant sequence/activity. It has been shown that \( n \) is likely to be followed by sequence/activity closure when used in a sequential context where some activity is possibly complete, e.g. where a preferred or relevant response has been provided, a closure of some activity has been proposed, and a stronger or more substantial response has already been produced. By merely claiming adequate receipt with \( n \) in such a sequential context, the producer can pass up an opportunity for a possible expansion of the relevant activity. This may result in demonstrating alignment with possible closure proposed by the prior turn or proposing a possible closure of the relevant activity.

### 3.3.2 Expansion of the prior talk

In contrast to the case of the sequence/activity closure above, a receipt \( n \) may also be followed by an expansion of the talk to which it is oriented. It appears that turn-expansions tend to occur after receipt \( n \) that is deployed in environments where

---

\(^7\) In reference to ‘oh’ used at the beginning of a response to a question, Heritage (1998: 296) argues that it “can indicate that the question to which it responds is inapposite in some way”. The \( a \) prefacing the answer here may indicate the ‘unexpectedness’ or ‘inappropriateness’ of the question in terms of its positioning. The question is initiated immediately after the newmark, which results in overlapping with the coparticipant’s further talk and its suspension. This can be considered as a problematic situation.
some response is projected as sequentially relevant by the prior talk. In Section 3.3.2, I will discuss the use of \textit{nn} in such environments, more specifically, (i) at a place where display of (dis)agreement is relevant, (ii) at a possible telling completion, and (iii) at topic initiation. \textit{Nn} used in these environments is commonly followed by turn-expansion in the current data set. It will be shown that expansions may be initiated when \textit{nn} is treated as somewhat problematic by the speaker of the talk to which the \textit{nn} is oriented, for a response to the prior talk. It will be also suggested that the producer may utilise \textit{nn} to pass up some sequentially relevant response.

### 3.3.2.1 Where display of (dis)agreement is relevant

Displays of a stance or perspective make it relevant for the coparticipant to show agreement or disagreement (cf. Pomerantz 1984a; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Mori 1996)\footnote{Normally, agreement and/or affiliation are oriented to by conversational participants as a preferred action (cf. Pomerantz 1984a; Sacks 1987). A major exception, however, is the case of ‘self-deprecation’, where agreements are dispreferred and disagreements are preferred (cf. Pomerantz 1984a).}. \textit{Nn} deployed in such a sequential context tends to be followed by turn-expansion, as shown in the following fragments.

In fragment (11), \textit{nn} is deployed at places where an affiliative response is sought as a preferred response. In line 1, Yumi makes an assertion that she prefers to live near a station, which does not receive agreement from Rumi, who points out a disadvantage of living near a station (line 3).

\begin{verbatim}
(11) [2B: 779]
1 Yumi: tashi eki chikaku ga ii mo : n. () yappari.=
   station near SUB good FP after.all
   ‘I prefer ((a place)) close to the station, after all’
2 (Rumi): (=\textit{nn} : : : o=)
3 Rumi: (=\textit{nn} : : =) takai mon eki chikai*to : *
   expensive FP station near CONJ
   ((it’s)) expensive, if ((it’s)) close to the station’
4 (2.0)
5 ?: oo ( oo
\end{verbatim}
In line 7, Yumi proffers a demo-prefaced reassertion of her original statement by pointing out the inconvenience of living away from a station. According to Mori (1996), demo is used to ‘reemphasize’ the speaker’s original statement in order to pursue coparticipant’s agreement. Rumi, however, does not display either agreement or disagreement, but merely claims adequate receipt with nn (line 8). Following a silence of 0.3 seconds, in line 10, Yumi self-selects and extends her prior talk, proffering a “self-qualification” marked with kedo ‘although’, which “deemphasizes” the preceding self-qualification in pursuit of agreement (Mori 1996). At a possible completion of this extension, it becomes relevant for Rumi to produce a response. In line 11, Rumi first claims adequate receipt with nn. This is further followed by soo da ne, which shows a certain affiliation with the preceding talk⁹. After this response, no further expansion is initiated and the sequence is closed and followed by a lapse of 9.0 seconds.

Fragment (12) also illustrates nn proffered at a place where agreement is expected as a preferred response. In this fragment, however, the producer of nn later shows disagreement. The fragment starts with talk by Rumi who is considering moving out of her parents’ place. The target instances of nn occur in lines 7 and 10.

⁹ See Section 3.4.2.1 for more detailed discussions of receipt nn followed by its producer’s affiliative talk.
(12) [2B: 791]

1 Rumi:  
    הישראלית: ני נל, יויוגואהקה דוקו דארו.  
   里斯: .JPanel  ((name))  에 BE  
   'ני נל' ((this is))  좋은, יויוגואהקה  에 ((in יויוגואהקה)), 里斯 wondered.

2 (Rumi):  
   hh hah hah

3 (0.5)

4 Rumi:  
   date aruite ikeru mo: n.  
   里斯:  because .walk and  갑 go FP  
   'because ((I))  갑 go on foot'

5 (0.4)

6 Rumi:  
   jitensha demo ikechau yo: c  
   里斯:  bicycle even  갑 go FP  
   '((I))  갑 go  by bike, 里斯 know'

7 Yumi:  
   ➔ nn :

8 (0.3)

9 Rumi:  
   kaeri nanka tte kae*rechau yo= saka da mo[n*].  
   里斯:  way back QT  whoosh QT can go back FP  decent  BE  FP  
   'as  for  the way back, 里斯 can really fast, 里斯 know, 里斯 BE  (((it's)))  일 a  景町  
   slope'

10 Yumi:  

11 (0.3)

12 Rumi:  
   ((sniff))

13 (2.0)

14 Rumi:  
   datte goji han ni owat temo sa: ; gojiyonjuugohun ni wa  
   里斯:  because  5:30  at  finish  even FP  5:45  at TOP  
   'because even if ((the work)) finishes at 5:30, 里斯 will be already at home at  
   5:45, 里斯 know'

15 Yumi:  
   [° nn°; ((whispering))  ↑demo sa ie ni iru no  
   里斯:  but  home  at  stay NM  
   'but, 里斯  like  person  home at alone  something  do NM  
   'nn ((whispering))) 里斯, 里斯 know, 里斯 the kind of person who 里斯 likes to  
   stay at home? 里斯 alone at home’

16 Rumi:  
   °[ge:_°=  
   里斯:  uhm

17 >wakannai<  kitto sabishii  to omoun da: =  
   not know  surely lonely  QT  think  NM  
   'uhm, ((I)) 里斯 don't know, ((I’m)) 里斯 sure that ((I)) 里斯 will feel lonely’

In line 1, Rumi introduces a new topic with a statement, which shows her interest in an 
apartment in  יויוגואהקה  that has appeared in a real estate guide. This does not receive
any response from the prospective recipient, Yumi. Rumi selects herself as the next speaker (line 4). The new TCU is prefaced by *date* (line 4), which is used to justify the speaker’s prior assertion that failed to receive a response or uptake at a TRP (Mori 1994, 1996). Again, no response is produced at a possible completion of the TCU and a silence occurs (line 5). Rumi further produces a reassertion with another TCU, *jitensha demo ikechau yo* ‘I can go even by bicycle, I’m telling you’, which contrasts with *aruite* ‘by foot’ in the prior TCU (line 4). In line 7, Yumi responds to this with *nn*, simply claiming adequate receipt. In the subsequent turn following the *nn*, Rumi proffers a further assertion (line 9). The first possible completion of this talk is ‘rushed through’ (Schegloff 1982) by latching an additional increment to the TCU-final *yo* (line 9). This extended TCU again only receives a receipt *nn* (line 10), which demonstrates no particular affiliation.

Following a silence of more than 2 seconds, Rumi self-selects and proffers another TCU prefaced by *datte*, reasserting how close the place is to her workplace by providing another coherent instance (lines 14 and 15). This is finally responded to by Yumi with more substantial talk or, more precisely, a question prefaced by a brief *nn* (lines 16-17). The question actually demonstrates disalignment with Rumi’s series of assertions. That is, while Rumi has been asserting how close the place is to her workplace, which she thinks advantageous, Yumi asks Rumi if she likes to do things at home alone. This question is hearable as disagreement to Rumi’s assertions by suggesting that it is likely that Rumi will spend more time at home coming straight back from work and possibly her life would be limited as a result of living too close to her workplace. Note also that Yumi’s talk in lines 16 and 17 is prefaced by *demo*, which marks a contrast or perspective shift and often indicates weak disagreement (Mori 1996). This fragment suggests that *nn* may be utilised to merely claim adequate receipt when its producer does not support or agree with what the other speaker has said, and to avoid producing a dispreferred response, i.e. a disaffiliative response.

---

10 According to Mori (1994: 155), the use of *datte* justifies the speaker’s stance to make others align with the speaker, rather than making an adjustment on the speaker’s stance to align with others.
In fragments (11) and (12) above, I have shown that *nn* may deployed in a context where display of (dis)agreement is sequentially relevant and such *nn* tends to be followed by expansion of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. Marking receipt with *nn* in this sequential context may be a convenient strategy thorough which its producer can avoid to overtly display agreement or disagreement with the prior talk. However, deployment of turn-expansions after the *nn* suggests that the *nn* used in this context may be treated as problematic. Studies have shown that when a speaker of some talk seeks affiliation or support from the coparticipant, and faces coparticipants’ having difficulty responding to the talk for some reason, the speaker may deploy some remedial practices, such as modifying, upgrading, reasserting, or justifying the initial statement, in pursuit of an affiliative response (cf. Pomerantz 1984b; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Mori 1994, 1996). Turn-expansions following *nn*-receipt may indicate that the *nn* is treated as problematic for the way the prior talk is responded to.

Furthermore, it may also be argued that *nn* used in this context is treated as a weak agreement by coparticipants, which may foreshadow a potential disagreement. Gardner (2001: 99-100) argues that the semantic emptiness of English *mm* allows *mm* to “become imbued with the meaning of a prior action (or actions)”, and thereby is hearable as doing agreement when responding to “something that sets up expectation for an agreement or disagreement response as the conditionally relevant second pair part”. By the same token, *nn*, which is also semantically empty, may be hearable as doing agreement being ‘imbued’ by the talk to which they are oriented, when deployed in the environments shown in the above instances. However, the agreement that is shown by a receipt *nn* would be, at most, “same evaluation” (Pomerantz 1984a). Note that same evaluations not only occur in agreement turns and sequences but also potentially endanger disagreement turns and sequences (cf. Pomerantz 1984a)\(^\text{11}\). That is, the producer of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented may treat the *nn* as a preface to a

---

\(^\text{11}\) Indeed, the current data set presents some instances where the producer of *nn* subsequently proffers disagreement with the talk to which the *nn* is oriented (See Section 3.4.2.2 for detailed analysis of this case).
potential disagreement. Turn-expansions may be deployed by the other speaker in pursuit of a preferred response, i.e. agreement.

To sum up, $\text{nn}$ may be utilised to receive some talk to which the recipient does not wish to overly express agreement or disagreement to the prior talk. However, $\text{nn}$ used in this way may be treated as problematic by the coparticipant. Turn-expansions following the $\text{nn}$ may be deployed by the other speaker to pursue a sequentially more relevant and/or more preferred response.

### 3.3.2.2 At possible telling completion

$\text{Nn}$ may be deployed in an environment where the primary speaker attempts to move out of a telling sequence and such $\text{nn}$ is often followed by turn-expansion. $\text{Nn}$ used in this environment is also regarded as another instance where the $\text{nn}$ is treated as being problematic in the way the prior talk has been dealt with. In fragment (13), $\text{nn}$ is produced at places where a telling is possibly complete. In the portion below, the participants are talking about Maki’s donation of used clothes to the people in Afghanistan. Immediately prior to the portion below, Maki proffers a telling about how she donated them ((data not shown)). The target instance of $\text{nn}$ occurs in line 10.

(13) [MY: 455]

1 Yuri: 
   [ (e :) makichan ] jaa (. ) kamotsu no : ;
   ((name)) then freight GEN
2 $\text{>sono<}$ taaminaru eki made okuta (ta (no))
   that terminal station until sent FP
   ‘Maki-chan, then, did ((you)) send ((them)) to the freight terminal station?’
3 Maki: [ $\text{>soo soo soo soo<}$ . $\text{nn}$ : (.)
4 $\text{HU$TA$HAko}$ okutte demo nise : n i kura datta kara ; ;
   two. boxes sent. and but two. thousand something was CONJ
   ‘$\text{soo soo soo soo}$ . $\text{nn}$ : (.) ((I)) sent two boxes, but ((the cost)) was two
   thousand and something ((yen)), so’
5 Yuri: $\text{?nn ; ; ?}$
6 Maki: =maa (. ) sono bun kihu shita to omoe ba ng ;
   well that par donation did QT think if FP
   ‘well, if ((I)) consider that bit as having been donated, you know’
7 Yuri: $\text{?nn ; ; ?}$
At the beginning of the fragment, Yuri produces a confirmation request by proffering her candidate understanding of what she has heard (lines 1 and 2). Maki confirms this with *soo* (see Chapter 6 for the usage of *soo*). Maki proffers further talk about the donation, which is constructed as a ‘compound TCU’ (cf. Lerner 1991; Lerner and Takagi 1999) with the first component marked with the conjunctive particle *kara* ‘because’. Following this first component, Yuri produces a continuer *nn* (line 5), showing her understanding that the talk is still in progress and the speaker should continue with the subsequent component (cf. Chapter 2). Maki continues with her talk (line 6), which turns out to be another non-final component with the conjunctive particle *ba* ‘if-then’ accompanied by the final particle *ne*. This is responded to by another continuer *nn* (line 7). In line 9, after a silence of 0.3 seconds, Maki initiates a new TCU, instead of completing the current compound TCU with the final component. The new TCU demonstrates an orientation to the prior TCU by prefacing it with *de* ‘and’ and by proffering coherent talk with the prior TCU, i.e. positive aspects of the donation. This only receives *nn*, which merely acknowledges adequate receipt of the prior talk (line 10). Following the silence of 1.4 seconds (line 11), Maki produces a
new TCU with a slight shift in topic from positive things about making the donation to what she did the preceding day in relation to the donation. This is initially responded to by Yumi with \textit{nn}, but later with more substantial talk (line 15 and 17).

In storytelling, participants demonstrate their orientation to receiving a relevant response in reference to the story at its completion (cf. Jefferson 1978; Sacks 1973; Schegloff 1992b). At a possible completion, it is sequentially relevant to display appropriate appreciation of the upshot of the story as well as showing understanding that the telling is possibly complete. Furthermore, Jefferson (1978: 228) has shown that participants are oriented to demonstrating that stories can generate “topically coherent talk” and are implicative for subsequent talk. Jefferson (1978) demonstrates that, when no appropriate response is forthcoming, the teller adds further components and increments to the story in an attempt to obtain such responses from the recipient. The turn-expansion following the \textit{nn} by Maki in fragment (13) is considered as being occasioned by pursuit of a more appropriate response to what she has been saying in order to complete the telling. In other words, the instance of \textit{nn} in question may be treated as inappropriate responses to a telling, which expects a response that demonstrates sequential implicativeness of the telling as sequentially relevant.

In short, \textit{nn}, which merely claims adequate receipt, may be deployed in a context where a telling is possibly complete. However, \textit{nn} used in this way tends to be treated by the teller as being problematic for a response to a telling.

\textbf{3.3.2.3 At a topic initiation}

Whereas the instances of \textit{nn} examined in fragment (13) were deployed in an environment where the primary speaker is working on moving out of a telling, the examples below illustrate a case where \textit{nn} is used at the initiation of a new topic. The primary speaker seems to be having trouble getting the current talk taken up for further development by the recipient, who merely claims adequate receipt of the newly initiated talk. In fragment (14), receipt \textit{nn} is used to receive an announcement that
introduces a new topic. The target \textit{nn} is produced in line 13. The portion below is preceded by closure of the prior activity.

(14) [MY: 560]

1 (0.9) Yuri: ((clearing throat))
2 (9.4) ((Yuri and Maki humming))
3 (7.0) Maki: kyoo sa \\
4 ‘today, you know’
5 (0.2) Yuri: \textit{nn} \textit{nn}
6 (2.0) Maki: uchi no buchoo genba ni iku no yo; home GEN department.chief construction.site to go ‘my boss is going to the construction site, you know’
7 (0.2) Yuri: \textit{nn} \\
8 (2.2) Maki: kono tenki ga wa$ru(h)i noni$s. this weatherSUB bad despite ‘despite this bad weather’
9 (0.2) Yuri: \textit{nn} \\
10 (2.2) Maki: kekkoo kawai soo.=sakki (. ) nanka > hikatteta shi (ne) quite pity earlier uhm was.flashing also ‘((I feel)) quite sorry, earlier uhm ((it)) was flashing, you know’
11 kaminari natteta shi ne, thunder was.rumbling also FP ‘(that) was thunder, you know’
12 Yuri: soo da yo ne : = are >[ kaminari datta yo [ ne : . BE FP FP that thunder was FP FP ‘((that)) is so, wasn’t it, that was thunder, wasn’t it’
13 Maki: \textit{nn} \\
14 \textit{nn} \\

Following lengthy silences (lines 1-5), Maki initiates a TCU with a temporal expression accompanied by a final particle, \textit{kyoo sa ‘today, you know’} in line 6. After this, Maki stops talking. This creates room for Yuri to enter the tum space, possibly to display alignment as a recipient. This is followed by a very soft \textit{nn} with a rising
terminal contour\textsuperscript{12}. After a silence of 2.0 seconds, Miki continues her initiated talk. Maki’s announcement reaches a possible grammatical completion (line 10). Although Maki’s talk is possibly complete in terms of grammar, there is a sense of incompleteness, as the talk does not demonstrate its relevance as to why it is produced here. Notice also that a non-terminal intonation contour is used here. Maki can talk more in reference to the announcement, such as why she reports about her boss at this moment in the conversation. \textit{Nn} is produced by Yuri in line 11, possibly to pass up an opportunity to produce a more substantial response in order to wait and see where the talk is going. The \textit{nn} is followed by an extension of the prior talk with an additional component marked by a conjunctive particle \textit{noni} ‘in spite of’. With this additional increment, Maki elaborates on what she has said, associating the announcement with something currently happening, i.e. bad weather. By doing so, she adds to the announcement of the relevance of having been told this at that moment in conversation.

The increment in line 12 is marked with ‘within-speech laughter’, which invites the recipient to laugh together (Jefferson 1979). According to Jefferson (1979), in order to decline the invitation to laugh, recipients should produce talk that pursues the topic. Maki, however, fails to have Yuri to take up the talk for further development or to establish laughing together, but instead receives only a very quiet receipt \textit{nn} (line 13). The silence in line 14 may suggest that the \textit{nn} is not treated as a continuer, which is regularly followed by further talk with a brief or no gap (cf. Chapter 2). The reduced volume of the \textit{nn}, as well as lack of topical pursuit or laughing together, indicate the producer’s lower level of commitment to take up Maki’s talk. After the silence of 2.2 seconds in line 14, Maki extends the prior talk, this time, with a new TCU with an assessment (line 15). This is latched to by further talk, which demonstrates a slight

\textsuperscript{12}This \textit{nn} has a different intonation contour from the continuer \textit{nn} used in response to turn-initial items, which typically has a slight falling contour (cf. Chapter 2). This \textit{nn} may be proffered in a more prosodically marked way to show more commitment to the initiated talk after having not been fully engaged in the conversation during the lapse (lines 1-5), which is suggested by background sounds such as humming or turning pages of something like a newspaper. An alternative account may be that Yuri initiates a repair for a problem in hearing what Maki has said, as \textit{nn} is frequently used as repair initiator when delivered with a rising intonation contour. However, a lack of a repair and Maki’s progressing with the talk she has initiated suggest that Maki does not treat the \textit{nn} as a repair initiation.
shift in the topic away from her boss to the weather, i.e. a ‘stepwise’ topic shift (Jefferson 1984b; Sacks 1992). Maki finally succeeds in receiving a more substantial response from Yuri in line 17, which refers to the shifted topic, i.e. bad weather, rather than to the original announcement made at the beginning regarding Maki’s boss.

As will be shown in the fragment (15) below, however, expansion of the prior talk does not always succeed in having the talk taken up. Immediately before the portion below, the participants talk about plays that Yuri is planning to go to. At the beginning of the fragment, Yuri mentions that she wonders if her boyfriend will be able to make it, which demonstrates a shift in topic. This is followed by a repair sequence (lines 3 and 4), which addresses a problem that results from the unexpressed subject.

(15) [MY: 1173]
1 Yuri: tte (ikeru) no kana:°(demo kore)°
   QT can.go NM FP but this
   ‘I wonder, if ((he)) can make it (though, to this)’
2       (2.0)
3 Maki: kare ga ?
   he SUB
   ‘your boyfriend?’
4 Yuri: nn : : ;
5       (1.4)
6 Yuri: hayaku tenkin kimare ba ii °noni°.
   soon transfer decide CONJ good FP
   ‘((I)) hope ((his)) transfer will be decided soon’
7 Maki: ➔ nn : : :
8 Yuri: [ dekire ba nagoya ka tookyoo de atte ho°shii°.
   possible if ((name)) or ((name)) BE hope
   ‘if possible, ((I)) hope ((it)) will be Nagoya or Tokyo’
9       (1.4)
10 Yuri: nagoya dat tara demo tab(un
   ((name)) BE CONJ but probably
   ‘if ((it)) is Nagoya, but probably’
11 Maki: [ä-
12       (3.4)
13 Maki: ah kore wa chotto ooobo shinakuccha .
   oh this TOP a.little apply must.do
   ‘oh, ((I)) should apply for this’
At the completion of the repair sequence (lines 3 and 4), a response to Yuri’s talk in line 1 becomes relevant as a next action. However, there is no response provided and a silence follows (line 5). In line 6, Yuri takes the turn, proffering further talk with a slight shift in topic. At a possible completion delivered with a terminal falling contour, Maki produces a receipt \textit{nn} (line 7). Slightly overlapping with the \textit{nn}, Yuri extends her talk with further on-topic talk. This does not receive any response at a possible completion, which results in a silence (line 9). The silence is terminated by Yuri, who self-selects and produces more on-topic talk. This, actually, is abandoned in the middle of the construction immediately after Maki’s \textit{a} (line 11), which appears to demonstrate ‘noticing’ or ‘change-of-state’ (Heritage 1984a). Following a silence of 3.4 seconds, Maki produces a turn with an abrupt topic change to a movie preview that she seems to have found in whatever she is looking at. Yuri’s abandoned topic about her boyfriend, which has been responded to with a mere claim of receipt, is never taken up again in the conversation (or at least, during the recording), nor is it ever taken up by the coparticipant for further development.

The two fragments above have shown that \textit{nn} may be deployed in response to talk that introduces a new topic, which expects a more substantial response as a sequentially relevant action. For instance, an announcement or reporting sequentially implicates registering the prior talk as some sort of news or, alternatively, a claim of prior knowledge as a relevant next action (cf. Heritage 1984a; Schegloff 1988). It may be also relevant to produce some response that takes up the new topic for further development. Use of a receipt \textit{nn}, which merely marks adequate receipt of prior talk, in these contexts suggests the producer’s stance of low interest in developing the newly introduced topic. The expansions of the turn to which the \textit{nn} is oriented may have been done in an attempt to pursue a more preferred response, which takes up the new topic for development or demonstrates some sort of interest in the initiated topic.

In Section 3.3.2, I have discussed cases where the primary speaker expands the talk to which a receipt \textit{nn} is oriented. It has been shown that such \textit{nn} is deployed in a context
where more than just a claim of receipt is sequentially relevant. I have presented cases where a receipt *nn* is deployed (i) in response to talk that demonstrates its producer’s perspective or stance of some matter, (ii) at a completion of a storytelling activity, and (iii) in response to an announcement or talk that introduces a new topic. In these environments, a more substantial response instead of a simple claim of receipt is sequentially relevant. As noted earlier, displays of stance or perspective of some matter make it relevant for the coparticipant to show (dis)agreement (cf. Pomerantz 1984a; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Mori 1996). As for an announcement, it sequentially implicates registering the prior talk as some sort of news as a relevant next action, e.g. newsmarks or, alternatively, a claim of prior knowledge (cf. Heritage 1984a; Scheglof 1988). In a storytelling activity, a response that demonstrates a sequential implicativeness of the storytelling is relevant at completion of a telling in order to move into turn-by-turn talk (Jefferson 1978).

I suggest that a receipt *nn* may be produced to fill some slot when its producer does not wish to provide a more relevant response for some reason. The producer may wish to avoid an explicit dispreferred response such as a disagreement, or may not wish to talk about some newly introduced topic. Alternatively, the producer may simply have nothing to say about what the primary speaker has said. In any event, the receipt *nn*, which primarily claims an adequate receipt of the prior talk, appears to be an effective way of doing this work of passing up some sequentially relevant response. It should be noted, however, a receipt *nn* used in this way is often treated problematic for a response to the prior talk by the other speaker, i.e. the producer of the prior talk, and tends to be followed by turn-expansions that pursue a more preferred and/or relevant response. Thus, it is also suggested that expansion following a receipt *nn* is fundamentally different from the continuation of unfinished talk that typically occurs following a continuer *nn*.

In summary, Section 3.3 has investigated trajectories of talk, focusing on the case where the other speaker takes the turn following a receipt *nn*. It has been shown that a
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receipt *nn* tends to be followed by closure of the relevant sequence/activity when it is deployed in environments where some activity is possibly complete. A display of adequate receipt through the use of *nn* in these environments implicates the producer’s alignment with, or proposal of, a possible closure of the current sequence/activity. I have also examined instances where a receipt *nn* is followed by expansion of the talk to which they are oriented. In such cases, the receipt *nn* is proffered in sequential contexts where a more substantial response is relevant rather than a simple claim of receipt. It has been argued that *nn* used in this way may be treated as problematic in terms of the way the prior talk is responded to, and turn-expansions are deployed by the speaker of the prior talk in pursuit of a more preferred and/or relevant response. Thus, the turn-expansions following a receipt *nn* are quite different from a continuation of unfinished talk that typically occurs following the continuer *nn*. What the receipt *nn* does in these contexts is a ‘retrospective work’ (Gardner 2001) of acknowledging adequate receipt rather than encouraging the continuation of the current talk, which the continuer *nn* typically does.

What these observations suggest is that the receipt *nn* does not project further talk in its own right. In this regard, a receipt through *nn* can be regarded as indicating the responding party’s low involvement in the talk to which the *nn* is oriented.

### 3.4 Trajectories of talk after *nn*: Subsequent talk by the *nn* producer

Now I will turn to the case where the producer of *nn* proffers subsequent talk after *nn*. In the subsequent talk, the producer of *nn* is found (i) to shift the orientation away from the talk to which the *nn* is oriented, or (ii) to proffer responsive talk to, and thus continue with, the talk to which the *nn* is oriented, regardless of whether the subsequent talk is proffered immediately after the *nn* or not. A. Regarding the former case, subsequent talk proffered by the *nn* producer does not continue with the talk to

---

13 In the current data set, when the producer of *nn* proffers subsequent talk, it is often produced immediately after the *nn* without any pause, i.e. *nn* tends to be non-freestanding.
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which *nn* is oriented but moves away from it. As for the latter case, there are two types of responsive subsequent talk, namely, affiliative subsequent talk and disaffiliative subsequent talk.

### 3.4.1 Moving away from the current talk

In Section 3.4.1, I will discuss cases where the producer of a receipt *nn* proffers subsequent talk that is not oriented to the prior talk to which the *nn* responds, but moves away from it. As a consequence, a sequential disalignment occurs between *nn* and its subsequent talk. In these cases, *nn* serves to minimally mark an adequate receipt of the prior talk before moving away from it.

#### 3.4.1.1 Initiation of a new sequence

As shown in fragment (16) below, the producer of *nn* may initiate a new sequence/activity with a shift in topic. The fragment is taken from a conversation between Miho and Yumi at a café. The target *nn* is produced in line 3 in third position following an affiliative response (line 2) to an assessment (line 1).

(16) [3B: 192]

1 Miho: waa nanka <oishi soo>kore. wow somehow delicious seem this ‘wow this looks delicious’
2 Yumi: =nn:
3 Miho: ➔
4 (1.0)
5 Miho: kore wa nani ni t- kore wa kore ni $ do$re ni this TOP what to this TOP this to which to
6 tsukere [ba ii no]$(_.)
7 Yumi: [ sukoon ] . scone
In line 1, Miho proffers an assessment, perhaps referring to the dishes served at the
table. In the next turn, Yumi responds to this assessment with a freestanding final
particle *ne*. By deploying *ne* as a response to the assessment, Yumi demonstrates that
she has the same stance as Miho regarding the assessment proffered in the preceding
turn\(^{14}\). Miho acknowledges receipt of this affiliative response, i.e. a preferred response,
with *nn* in line 3. The *nn* receives the response in third position, minimally expanding
the sequence. The receipt *nn* closes the relevant sequence. After a second of silence,
Miho self-selects and initiates a new sequence/activity with a shift in topic (lines 5-6).

### 3.4.1.2 Taking up earlier talk

The producer of a receipt *nn* may take up some earlier talk after acknowledging
the receipt of the prior talk with *nn*, which is much more commonly found in the data
set at hand than the case discussed above, i.e. fragment (16). The talk that is taken up
following a receipt *nn* may have been produced immediately preceding the talk to
which the *nn* is oriented or may have occurred much earlier in conversation. As will be
shown below, the subsequent talk following *nn* demonstrates a shift away from the
prior talk to which the *nn* is oriented.

Fragment (17) illustrates a case where the producer of *nn* returns to talk that was
produced some sequences earlier. After producing a receipt *nn*, its producer resumes
an activity that was still in progress but suspended due to insertion of talk by the
coparticipant. The portion below is extracted from a rather long stretch of talk where
Yumi and Yuka talk about their friends from a nurses’ school they both attended. Yuka
lists some people whom she knows the contact details of. The target *nn* occurs in line
16.

\(^{14}\) According to Cook (1992: 516), *ne* occurring alone in a turn indicates “feelings shared between the
speaker and addressee”. Tanaka (2000: 1163) proposes the role of freestanding *ne* as topic-management
device, which “can be employed toward reconfirming, registering and/or consolidating a point which
has just been established, before moving on to a next topic”. 
(17) [2A: 459]
1 Yumi: °ato shiran deshoo°.
   the.rest not.know BE
   ‘((you)) don’t know about the rest, right’
2 Yuka: .hhh ato wa ne minna (0.4)renrakusaki shitton da yo ne,
   the.rest TOP FP everyone contact.address know NM BE FP FP
   ‘hhh as for the rest, you know, ((I)) know the contact addresses of everyone,
   you know’
3 Yumi: (3.0)
4 Yuka: at- (0.2) yasuda shittoru deshoo.
   ((name)) know BE
   ‘I know ((the contact address of)) Yasuda, right?’
5 Yumi: yasuda san te are kara hikkoshite nai= kyone[nkara].
   (name)) QT that since move.house not last.year since
   ‘as for Yasuda, ((she)) hasn’t moved since then?, since last year’
6 Yuka: [nn : .]
7 Yuka: nn : .=
8 Yumi: =e h hikkoshite nai n da.
   move.house not NM BE
   ‘eh, ((she)) hasn’t moved’
9 Yuka: (0.2)
10 Yuka: dem- mgeru mo kuru shi yasuda =
   email also come also ((name))
11 ta[ma : ni₄]
sometimes
   ‘email comes, too, from Yasuda, sometimes’
12 Yumi: [↑nn : :↑] =⇒ a soo na n da<,= 
   oh BE NM BE
   ‘nn : : oh ((that)) is so’
13 Yuka: =°n° saikin mendokusai tte kaite atta kedo ne(h)=
   recently trouble QT write there.was but FP
14 ne(h)ngajoo ni(h) [hah hah .hhh=
   new.years.card in
   ‘((it)) was written that ((she was)) lazy recently, though, you know, in the new
   year’s card ((from her)) hah hah .hhh’
15 Yumi: [hah hah
16 Yumi: =atashi nengajoo mo *dashitenai.= koto[shi wa*.]
   I new.years.card also not.send this.year TOP
   ‘I haven’t even sent a new year’s card, this year’
17 Yuka: → [° nn : ° .]= de .hh (1.3)
   and
18 <yumiko mo> shittoru desho[:;= datte (.) <meeru:> de-
   ((name)) also know BE because email
   ‘nn : and .hh (1.3) ((I)) also know Yumiko’s ((contact detail)), right, because
   email...’
In line 2, Yuka produces a statement that she knows the contact details of the rest of the friends, i.e. those who were not mentioned earlier before this fragment. There is a rather long silence of 3.0 seconds (line 3) following this. Yuka self-selects as the next speaker and elaborates on her prior talk, proffering the name of one of the people she knows (line 4). This is hearable as projecting a list of people whom she has referred to as minna ‘everyone’ in the prior turn (line 2). Yumi responds to Yuka’s talk in line 4 with a question about the person mentioned by Yuka. This is followed by a stretch of on-topic talk about the person (lines 5-16).

In line 16, Yumi says that she did not send a New Year’s card to this person, which is presumably occasioned by a word in the preceding talk, i.e. nengajoo ‘a New Year’s card’ (line 13). Yumi’s talk in line 16 is responded to by Yuka with a receipt nn. Following the nn, Yuka returns to the earlier activity of listing people. Orientation to the earlier talk is displayed by the use of de ‘and’ immediately after the nn (line 17). Furthermore, Yuka employs the same syntactic structure as the earlier talk, which is being oriented to, i.e. yasuda shittoru deshoo ‘I know ((the contact details of)) Yasuda’ (line 4) and yumiko mo shittoru deshoo ‘I also know ((the contact details of)) Yumiko’ (line 18). In this example, the producer of nn displays an adequate receipt of the prior talk before moving away from it in order to proceed to the next action, i.e. resuming a suspended action.

The speaker may return to talk immediately preceding the other speaker’s turn to which the receipt nn responds, as illustrated by fragments (18) and (19) below. Fragment (18) is part of a rather lengthy storytelling delivered by Maki about her

---

15 The use of de ‘and’ is one of the practices that the teller employs when resuming a suspended telling as it displays a link between some earlier talk and what follows (Lee 1997).
husband’s grey hair. The target *mn* is produced in line 11 in response to a formulation of the point of the story that is proffered in the middle of the telling.

(18) [MY: 192]

1 Maki: nanka ni- i[ch]i ni shuukan gurai[mae ni >(zutto)< nanka uhm one two weeks about before at throughout uhm

2 sagashite agete betsuni nai yo: tokaitteta n da kedo;= search and give and not particularly no FP or was saying NM BE CONJ ‘uhm about two one or two weeks ago, uhm ((I)) looked for ((grey hair for him))) and was saying that there wasn’t any particularly or something, but’

3 Yuri: =nn ;

4 Maki: ↓hh $k(o(h)n$ kinoo sa : $; this yesterday FP

‘hh this, yesterday, you know’

5 Yuri: =nn ;

6 Maki: [.hh sono : (.) konshuu isshuu kan sugoi gekimu de : ; = uhm this week one week very hard work BE ‘hhh uhm this week was very busy and’

7 Yuri: =nn ;

8 Maki: de.hh (0.2) kinoo sagashi tara aru wa aru wa tte yuu and yesterday search CONJ exist FP exist FP QT say

9 guraini sa : ; = about FP ‘and when ((I)) looked for ((grey hair)) yesterday, ((it was)) like ((I)) keep finding one after another, you know’

10 Yuri: =sonnani naru no, [°totsuzen° such become FP suddenly ‘((does it)) happen like that? suddenly’

11 Maki:⇒ [\[nn : _ nanka sonna(.) sonnasa : ; = isshuukan uhm such such FP one week

12 gotoki de sa : ; = only BE FP ‘mn : uhm like that, like that, you know, in only one week, you know’

13 Yuri: =°nn :°;

14 Maki: kaminoke tte shiroku naru mon na n da toka;= shikamo koo hair QT white become NM BE NM BE or moreover uhm

15 hora; haeteru : (.) sono hae hajime no mijikai yatsu ga : ;= growing uhm grow beginning GEN short thing SUB ‘the hair becomes grey, moreover uhm the short one that just came out’

16 Yuri: =nn ;
In lines 1 and 2, Maki produces a preliminary component marked with the conjunctive particle *kedo* ‘although’. Yuri responds to this with a continuers *nn* (line 3), which is followed by a continuation of Maki’s talk. This is marked with a laugh token (line 4), which may indicate the imminent climax of the story (cf. Goodwin 1984). However, the climax does not immediately follow this, as Maki inserts a parenthetical utterance in line 6, which adds an extra piece of background information (cf. Goodwin 1984). Yuri responds to this with a continuers *nn* (line 7). In line 8, the story climax is produced and is marked with a sound stress. Note that the word *kinoo* ‘yesterday’ (line 4), which is used prior to the parenthetical utterance, is recycled. Yuri responds to this with a formulation (line 10), demonstrating her understanding of the point of the story. The formulation is produced pre-emptively at a place where Maki’s talk is not yet possibly complete in terms of either syntax or intonation, although what Maki is saying is recognisable. Maki responds to this with a receipt *nn*, which is immediately followed by her returning to the talk that immediately precedes the formulation and continuing the telling.

In fragment (19), a receipt *nn* is deployed in response to less substantial talk compared to the fragment (18). In the portion below, the target *nn* (line 8) is produced following some brief talk that demonstrates an affiliation with the prior talk. The fragment starts with a commentary (lines 1-2) toward Mina’s multi-unit talk, which was produced immediately prior to the fragment, about the toy that her baby daughter is playing with.

(19) [9A: 87]

1 Saki:  **oo**hu~: un°= demo ima no omocha tte yoku dekiteru   

2 yo ne :,=  but now GEN toy QT well made  

FP FP  

‘hu::un but toys Nowadays are well designed, aren’t they’  

3 Mina: =deki(t eru).  

made  

‘they are’  

4 (1.2)
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Mina shows her affiliation with Saki’s commentary with a partial repetition (line 3). There is a silence of 1.2 seconds before Mina states that she does not use many of these well-designed toys (lines 5 and 6). As a telling or report, Mina’s talk sequentially implicates a registering of informativeness or a claim of prior knowledge as a relevant next action (Heritage 1984a; Schegloff 1988: 122). What the statement receives here is a display of affiliation, which consists of a copula and sentence-final particles, i.e. da yo ne.

Maki responds to this with a quiet nn. Following the nn, instead of closure, Maki proffers further talk, expanding her statement produced two turns earlier in lines 5 and 6. What is important in this discussion here is that Maki’s subsequent talk is oriented to her own prior talk rather than the immediately preceding talk to which the nn responds.

Fragments (18) and (19) above have shown that the producer of nn may take up the talk that immediately precedes the turn to which the nn responds. In such a case, the nn appears to function like a ‘second pair part’ (Schegloff and Sacks 1973) to the prior turn. This results in the talk constituting an ‘adjacency pair’ (Schegloff and Sacks 1973).
1973) inserted between the subsequent talk and the earlier talk that it takes up. What may be accomplished by the receipt \textit{nn} in this case is to turn the other speaker's talk into a 'first pair part' (Schegloff and Sacks 1973) of a 'side sequence' (Jefferson 1972). That is, by responding to the prior talk with receipt \textit{nn}, the producer may treat the prior talk as something 'subsidiary' (Jefferson 1972) to the on-going talk and closes it as a side sequence. Consequently, the \textit{nn} producer moves away from the prior talk and returns to the talk that immediately precedes the side sequence as a sequentially relevant action. Further, by responding to the other speaker's talk with \textit{nn}, the \textit{nn} producer minimally acknowledges the prior talk rather than discounting it by simply continuing with her own talk.

In Section 3.4.1.2, I have examined instances where the speaker of a receipt \textit{nn} takes up earlier talk. It has been demonstrated that there is a shift in orientation between the receipt \textit{nn} and the subsequent talk. That is, the subsequent talk shifts away from the immediately prior talk to which the \textit{nn} is oriented and proceeds to the next action.

### 3.4.1.3 Redoing/recycling prior overlapping talk

The producer of \textit{nn} may return to the producer's own talk that has overlapped with the other speaker's talk that the \textit{nn} responds to. This is similar to instances discussed in 3.4.1.2 in that (i) the ensuing talk takes up some earlier talk rather than the talk to which the \textit{nn} responds, and (ii) a shift in orientation is therefore observed between the \textit{nn} and its ensuing talk. The difference, however, is that the subsequent talk redoes or recycles earlier talk that failed to secure a position in a sequence.

In fragment (20), redoing of prior overlapping talk is observed. In line 3, Yuka's talk overlaps with Yumi's talk. Yuka reproduces the fully overlapped talk with

---

\footnote{According to Jefferson (1972), a side sequence interrupts an on-going activity, but is relevant to the activity in some sense. Returning to the on-going activity becomes relevant at completion of the side sequence.}
some modification and elaboration in the next turn after a receipt *nn* (line 4). The participants are talking about one of their friends whom they have lost contact with.

(20) [2A: 452]

1 Yumi: =NANI ERI demo asokoni iru n a .hhh(.) chigau
   what ((name)) but there at there is NM oh different
   wa ne : .=[ryoo janai ] wa ne : .=
   FP FP dorm BE-NEG TOP FP
   ‘what, but Eri is there, oh, no, not in the dormitory’

2 Yuka: [hataraitoru].
   is.working
   ‘((she)) is working’

3 Yuka: ➔=nit:0
   BEFP
   ‘((that)) is so, isn’t it’

4 Yuka: ➔=5on : .=5kinen byooin de wa hataraiteru to omou↑yo°
   memorial hospitalat TOP is.working QT think FP
   ‘((I)) think ((she)) is working at the memorial hospital, at least’

5 (0.8)

6 Yumi: 5soo da ne°i.
   BEFP
   ‘for the rest, ((we/you)) don’t know, right’

7 (2.0)

8 Yumi: 5ato shiran desho°.
   remainder not.know BE
   ‘for the rest, ((we/you)) don’t know, right’

The fragment starts with Yumi’s attempt to proffer her speculation about the whereabouts of one of their friends. In line 1, the projected TCU is abandoned in the middle of its construction. This is immediately followed by *a*, which appears to be an equivalent of the change-of-state token *oh* (Heritage 1984a), and audible inhalation (line 1). After a very short silence, Yumi indicates that what she has said or was going to say is not correct, *chigau wa ne* ‘((it’s)) different, isn’t it?’. At a possible completion, which is marked with the final particle *ne* and a terminal falling contour, Yuka comes in, proffering her understanding of what the friend is doing now (line 3). Yuka’s talk fully overlaps with Yumi’s talk, as Yumi expands her turn beyond the possible completion with an additional increment, *ryoo janai wa ne* ‘((it’s)) not a dormitory, is it’ (lines 1-2). Yuka produces a quiet *nn* to receive Yumi’s turn. This is followed by Yuka’s reproducing the overlapped talk in a more elaborated way by adding more
information to the original overlapped talk (line 4). By deploying the \textit{nn} before redoing the talk in overlap, Yuka acknowledges the receipt of the prior talk before proceeding to the next action, i.e., redoing of the overlapping talk.

Fragment (21) below presents a case of recycling of overlapped talk. In the portion below, the participants are talking about the difficulty of telling other people about one’s own domestic discord. The target \textit{nn} occurs in line 4.

(21) [MY: 876]

1 Maki: ne ; anmashi : (.) hokano hito ni hanasu no tte sa ; (.)
FP not.much other people to tell NM QT FP
‘you know, telling other people ((about it)) is, you know’

2 sono: (0.5) \textit{yappa} chotto (0.2) \textit{kanari} teekoo ga aru jana\textit{i}=
uhm after.all a.little very reluctant SUB exist BE-not
‘uhm (0.5) after all, a bit, (0.2) very reluctant ((to do)), right’

3 Yuri: =\textit{nn}: ; =\textit{nn}: [na: ka]\text{\textit{naka}} dekinai yo [ ne : o _
not.easily cannot.do FP FP
‘\textit{nn}: ((it’s)) not easily done, you know’

4 Maki: \rightarrow [.hh [demo : [\textit{nn} : \textit{nn} : ; (.) demo
but
‘but’
\textit{nn} : : but’

5 nakanaka jibun no sa ; (1.0)
not.easily oneself GEN FP
‘((it’s)) not easy, your, you know (1.0)’

6 Yuri: nante yuun daro=
how say BE
‘how ((should I)) say’

The fragment begins with Maki’s talk, of which the possible completion is marked by \textit{jana\textit{i}} ‘isn’t it’, which invites an affiliation or agreement from the recipient. This is responded to by Yuri with \textit{nn} with affiliative ensuing talk (cf. Section 3.4.2.1 for discussion on \textit{nn} followed by affiliative responsive talk). Following the \textit{nn}, Maki attempts to take the turn, which is demonstrated by the hearable inhalation and production of an initial item of the next TCU, \textit{demo} ‘but’ (line 4). However, as Yuri continues talking after the \textit{nn}, the beginning of the next TCU by Maki results in an overlap (lines 3 and 4). Maki stops talking after the initial word, \textit{demo} ‘but’, and the overlapping talk resolves. Terminally overlapping with Yuri’s talk, Maki produces a
quiet *nn* followed by a resumption of her abandoned talk (lines 4 and 5). By deploying the *nn*, Maki claims adequate receipt of the prior talk before redoing the overlapped talk in a new turn space by initiating with the same word she used before, *demo* ‘but’.

Above, I have shown that *nn* may be deployed before the producer of *nn* recycles or redoes her own prior talk that overlaps with the other speaker’s talk. The *nn* in such a case may function to close the other speaker’s prior talk by acknowledging its adequate receipt before the overlapping talk is redone or recycled in a new turn space.

In summary, Section 3.4.1 has examined the case where the producer of *nn* proffers subsequent talk that demonstrates a shift in orientation away from the immediately prior talk to which the *nn* is oriented. I have shown that producers of *nn* may initiate a new sequence with a shift in topic, or may take up earlier talk in the subsequent talk after *nn*. In any case, it has been argued that the receipt through *nn* serves to close the relevant sequence to which the *nn* is oriented before the producer of *nn* subsequently moves away from the prior talk.

### 3.4.2 Continuing with the current talk

In Section 3.4.2, I will investigate cases where the producer of *nn* continues with the current talk to which *nn* is oriented and proffers some responsive talk. Frequently observed patterns in the current data set are that *nn* is followed by subsequent talk that (i) displays agreement with, (ii) provides confirmation of, (iii) collaboratively completes, and (iv) displays disagreement with, the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. It will be shown that, when the producer of *nn* proffers responsive talk, it tends to be relatively brief and has little contribution to the development of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented and is thus oriented to closing the current talk. An exception for this is the case where the *nn* producer displays disagreement, which develops further the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. It will be suggested, however, that disagreement can be regarded as not aligning with, and thus as showing little commitment to, the course of action, or preference, implemented by the talk that is developed. It will be argued that
subsequent responsive talk produced by the producer of \( mn \) typically demonstrates an orientation to moving away from the talk to which \( mn \) is oriented.

3.4.2.1 Agreement

I will first examine the case where the producer of \( mn \) subsequently displays agreement with what is said in the prior talk after claiming its adequate receipt with \( mn \). Agreement following a receipt \( mn \) tends to be brief, as shown in fragments (22) and (23) below. In fragment (22), Yumi and Rumi are talking about where to put a washing machine, i.e. inside or outside the apartment.

(22) [2B: 523]

1 Yumi: \( =a(.) \) nakani : ; sentakki toka okereru tokoro: (.)to, [okenai = \( \) oh inside wash.machine or can.put place and cannot.put \( \) ‘oh ((you)) can put a washing machine inside at some places and you can’t’

2 Rumi: [\( mn : : \).

3 Yumi: =toko ga aru kara [ so(re mo) \( \) place SUB there.is because it also ‘at others, so that ((is)) also’

4 Rumi: \( ((\) naka ga ) ii yo ne[ : . \) inside SUB good FP FP ‘( ) inside is better, don’t you think’

5 Yumi: \( \rightarrow \) [\( \downarrow mn : : \) soto outside

6 da to samui. \( \) BE if cold ‘\( mn : . ((it)’) cold if ((it)) is outside’

7 Rumi: \( n)n↓ : : ; \)

8 Yumi: yuka chan ga sa : ; \((\)name) \( ) \) SUB FP ‘Yuka ((is)), you know, …’

In the middle of Yumi’s turn in lines 1 and 3, Rumi pre-emptively comes in at a completion of a ‘preliminary component’ (Lerner 1991; 1996) that is marked with the conjunctive particle \( kara \) ‘because’. While Rumi collaboratively completes Yumi’s talk, Rumi also displays her stance on the matter that is discussed in Yumi’s talk, i.e. her preference of locating a washing machine inside (line 4), by using combined final
particles *yo ne* (cf. Hayashi 2003; Morita 2002). The use of the combined final particles also invites an uptake or confirmation by coparticipants as a shared perspective (Hayashi 2003; Morita 2002). Yumi responds to this with *nn* and subsequently demonstrates her affiliation by mentioning the contrastive case, i.e. *naka* ‘outside’ versus *soto* ‘outside’, and its disadvantage, i.e. *samui* ‘cold’. This is acknowledged by Rumi with a freestanding *nn* (line 7). After this, Yumi initiates a telling with a shift in topic (line 8).

Fragment (23) illustrates a receipt *nn* followed by an agreement token. This fragment was examined earlier to illustrate the use of *nn* in response to talk that seeks agreement, cf. example (11). In the portion below, Yumi asserts her preference for living near a station. Rumi first shows disagreement, pointing out a disadvantage of living near a station (line 3).

(23) [B: 779]

1 Yumi: tashi eki chikaku ga ii mo : n. (.) yappari.=
   I station near SUB good FP after.all ‘I prefer ((a place)) close to the station, after all’
2 (Rumi): =° >> nn : : °=
3 Rumi: (=nn ; ;)=) takai mon eki chikai*to : *.
   expensive FP station near CONJ
   (mn : ;) ((it’s)) expensive, if ((it’s)) close to the station’
4 (2.0)
5 ?: oo( ) oo
6 (0.4)
7 Yumi: demo sa : ; eki hontoni chikaku nai to sa *huben* jan.
   but FP station really near not if FP inconvenient BE-NEG
   ‘but, you know, if ((it’s)) not close to the station, ((it’s)) inconvenient’
8 Rumi: nn : °; °;
9 (0.3)
10 Yumi: hudan sa kuruma de bakkari ugoku hito wa ii kedo sa : ;
   usually FP car by only move person TOP good CONJ FP
   ‘although ((it’s)) okay for those who usually move by a car, you know’
11 Rumi: →nn : ; ; soo da ne : ,
   BE FP
   ‘*mn : ; ;* ((that)) is so, isn’t it?’
12 (9.0)
In line 7, Yumi takes the turn, reasserting her original talk by stating the inconvenience of living away from a station. Rumi responds to this with \( \text{nn} \), claiming adequate receipt. Following a silence of 0.3 seconds, Yumi expands her prior talk with an additional increment. In line 11, Rumi responds to Yumi’s talk with another receipt \( \text{nn} \) and further claims agreement with \( \text{soo da ne} \) ‘(that) is so, isn’t it?’ This is followed by a lapse of 9.0 seconds and a topic change.

Above instances, i.e. fragments (22) and (23), have illustrated that the producer of \( \text{nn} \) may produce further talk to display agreement with the prior talk to which the \( \text{nn} \) is oriented. The subsequent talk in these instances is relatively brief and contains only one possible completion. The producer of \( \text{nn} \) sometimes goes beyond the first possible completion. The primary concern of such subsequent talk is also to demonstrate agreement in response to the prior talk rather than to advance what the other speaker has said in the prior turn. Observe fragment (24), for instance, where the producer of \( \text{nn} \) extends the affiliative subsequent talk beyond a possible completion. Yuka makes announcement that there will be personnel changes at workplace. The fragment starts with Yumi’s statement that she thinks that Mitchan will be transferred to a different section (lines 1 and 2).

(24) [2A: 769]
1 Yumi: atashi ne; = mata mitchan tokaga ka*wari soona
   I FP again ((name)) or SUB change seem
2 ki ga suru*.
   feeling SUB do
   ‘I, you know, have a feeling that Mitchan is going to be transferred again’
3 Yuka: \( \rightarrow \text{nn} : . = \text{kawaru} \text{ daroo} \text{ e} \text{c}=\text{yon} \text{ kai (shidoosha) ga oo} \text{ kara=} \text{ change} \text{ BE} \text{ FP} \text{ fourth.floor leader SUB} \text{ many because} \text{fourth floor has many (leaders)} \)
4 Yumi: \( \rightarrow \text{nn} : . \)
5 Yumi: \( =\text{nn} : . \)
In line 3, at a place where Yumi’s talk is possibly complete, Yuka marks its adequate receipt with *nn*. Yuka continues to proffer her own perspective that agrees with what Yumi has said, *kawaru daroo ne* ‘((she)) will probably be transferred, you know’ (line 2), regarding the matter that is being discussed in the prior talk. Beyond the first possible completion, which is marked with the final particle *ne* delivered with a terminal contour, Yuka further extends her talk, proffering an account why she thinks Mitchan will be transferred (line 3). This is an additional increment, which is oriented to the immediately preceding TCU, i.e. ‘post-predicate addition’ (Tanaka 1999). What this additional bit of talk seems to be doing is to retrospectively add an account to support her affiliative perspective on the matter under discussion rather than to contribute substantially to the development of the on-going talk. This is responded to by Yumi with a receipt *nn* (line 5). There is a silence of 1.2 seconds before Yuka formulates what she has said in her prior turn, merely recompleting it (line 7).

As fragment (25) illustrates, affiliation or agreement demonstrated by talk following *nn* may be weaker than the instances shown above. The fragment is preceded by a stretch of ‘troubles-telling’ (Jefferson 1984b) concerning Mina’s baby daughter. The target *nn* occurs in line 5.

(25) [9A: 944]

1  Saki:  
\[ ^o \text{daijoobu da yo.} \]
\[ \text{alright BE FP} \]
\[ (((she)) will be okay, I’m telling you’ \]
2  Mina:  
\[ ^o \text{nn : : ;} \]
\[ (6.0) \]
3  Saki:  
\[ \text{datte yoku wakat terushi sa ;} \]
\[ \text{because well understand FP} \]
\[ (((she)) understands well, you know’ \]
5 Mina: \[ \text{nn}: \text{; wakatteru } [\text{to } \text{wa omou}]. \]
   \[ \text{understand } \text{QT TOP think} \]
   ‘nn: ([I]) think ([she]) understands ([but])’

6 Saki: \[ \text{[nn : : :]} ; \]

7 (1.3)

8 (Saki): \[ \text{oo } \text{na : oo} \]
   FP
   ‘right?’

9 Mina: \[ \text{soo.kurabecha ikan no da.} \]
   \[ \text{compare no.good NM BE} \]
   ‘soo ([I]) shouldn’t compare’

In line 1, Saki proffers a summary assessment in reference to the troubles-telling delivered by Mina, *daijoobu da yo* ‘([she]) is okay, I’m telling you’. Displays of some stance or perspective, for instance, with assessment, make agreement or disagreement a sequentially relevant next action (cf. Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Mori 1996; Pomerantz 1984a). Mina responds to this with *nn*. This is followed by a long silence of 6.0 seconds. Saki self-selects as the next speaker and produces further on-topic talk (line 4), expanding her prior talk with an increment that is prefaced with *datte* ‘because’. The *date-*prefaced talk proffers an elaboration on what she has said in her prior turn (line 1). According to Mori (1994:155), *datte* is used when its speaker “is pursuing preferred responses” by “justifying her/his stance to make others align with them”. This suggests that Saki is trying to obtain a more affiliative response. In line 5, Mina responds to this with *nn* and subsequently shows a ‘weak agreement’ (Pomerantz 1984a). The use of the contrastive particle *wa* weakens the agreement, as it implies that the speaker does not fully agree with the rather optimistic view proffered by Saki. This is responded to by Saki with a receipt *nn*, which is proffered pre-emptively in the middle of Mina’s response. The important points here are that the agreement following the *nn* is brief and does not contribute to developing the talk to which it responds and that the agreement is a week one, which in fact shows incipient disagreement.

To sum up, I have discussed instances where the producer of *nn* proffers subsequent talk that demonstrates agreement with the prior talk to which the *nn* is oriented. Recall that the receipt *nn* that is deployed in response to talk that
demonstrates a stance or perspective of some matter tends to be followed by expansion of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented (cf. Section 3.3.2). It is suggested that the producer of *nn* moves toward a closure of the current talk by further providing a response that demonstrates affiliation, i.e. by providing a preferred response, rather than merely claiming adequate receipt with *nn*.

3.4.2.2 Confirmation

Now I will examine the case where the producer of *nn* proffers subsequent talk to confirm what is said in the prior talk, as in fragments (26) and (27) below. Like the cases of agreement after receipt *nn* discussed above, confirmation of the prior talk does not progress the prior talk much. Fragment (26) starts with Saki’s statement that Toyokawa (the name of a city in Japan) is warm. The target *nn* occurs in line 16.

(26) [9A: 568]

1 Saki:  "toyokawa attakai."  
   (city name) warm  
   ‘Toyokawa is warm’

2 (.)

3 Mina:  attakai ka:a?  
   warm Q  
   ‘((is it)) warm?’

4 Saki:  *nn*: ;

5 Mina:  yap^pa upp SOO na no ka na:  
   after all so BE NM Q FP  
   ‘I wonder if it is so after all’

6 Saki:  *nn*: ;

7 (0.7)

8 Mina:  a SOO NA N DA YO NE [:;  
   oh so BE NM BE FP FP  
   ‘oh ((that)) is so, isn’t it’

9 Saki:  [nn : : ]

10 Mina:  =>atashi mo<an^joo ni iru ko(ro) wa yoku-(.)sutoobu  
   I also ((name)) in stay time TOP often heater

11 >tsuketotta ( n da kedo)sa:  
   turn on NM BE but FP  
   ‘I also often turned on a heater when ((I)) was in Anjoo but, you know’

12 Saki:  *nn*: [:;
Mina responds to the statement with a repair initiation in line 3, which suggests an upcoming possible disagreement (Pomerantz 1984a). In line 4, Saki provides an affirmative response to Mina’s repair initiation. Mina takes the subsequent turn, demonstrating a gradual shift towards agreement with Saki’s original statement (lines 5 and 8). After Mina displays her affiliation with Saki’s statement, a soo nan da yo ne ‘oh that is so, isn’t it?’ (line 8), Mina proffers a supportive episode towards the original statement by Saki that Toyokawa is warm (lines 10-13). The episode comes to a possible completion with a summary assessment that aligns with the original statement (line 15). Saki responds to this with nm and further goes on to confirm what Mina has said by partially repeating Mina’s talk. The current activity is closed and Mina initiates a new sequence with a shift in topic (line 18).

In fragment (27), a brief confirmation following nm is expanded with further talk by the producer of the nm. The fragment is extracted from a stretch of talk where the participants are collaboratively figuring out who (of their friends) got married and when it was.

(27) [2A: 608]
1 Yumi: ONAji toshi datta ne_=°[ kitto ne]°, same year was FP certainly FP ‘((they got married)) in the same year, didn’t they, they must have, right’
In line 8, Yumi presents her understanding that both Kumi and Hitomi got married at about the same time. Yuka responds to this with *nn* and a brief formulation, *onaji jiki* ‘the same time’, which confirms what Yumi has said. This talk is possibly complete in this context and marked with a terminal falling contour. A silence of 0.5 seconds follows, as no one takes the turn (line 10). In line 11, Yuka self-selects as the next speaker and extends her prior talk. Although the same speaker, Yuka, extends the brief talk following the silence, what the extended bit of talk does is only to elaborate on what she has just said, i.e. the confirmation. That is, the subsequent talk after the *nn* merely confirms what is said in the prior talk. This is followed by another silence of 1.2 seconds. In line 13, Yumi takes the turn, returning to the on-going larger activity.
The use of the connective *de* ‘and’ at the beginning of the TCU may indicate what follows is designed as a part of the larger activity\textsuperscript{17}.

In Section 3.4.2.2, it was shown that the producer of *nn* may go on to proffer confirmation of the prior talk. The subsequent talk demonstrates understanding of the prior talk, which goes beyond a mere claim of adequate receipt done by receipt *nn*. By doing so and not developing the current talk, the producer of *nn* may propose a possible completion of the current activity and its possible closure. Indeed, the current sequence or local activity to which the *nn* is oriented is not expanded after the *nn* and is closed, as shown in the above instances.

### 3.4.2.3 Collaborative completion

*nn* may be followed by a collaborative completion of the other speaker’s turn to which the *nn* responds\textsuperscript{18}, as shown in fragments (28) and (29) below. At the beginning of fragment (28), Yumi takes up earlier talk regarding a police check Rumi saw at the previous night. In lines 1 and 2, Yumi proffers her speculation that the police was targeting hotrodders. Rumi displays her disagreement by saying that it was Wednesday, implying that it is unlikely that they do it for that reason (line 3). This is accepted by Yumi (line 5). Yumi takes up this talk again in line 15.

(28) [2B: 665]

1 Yumi: are kana; (0.6) ano : : boosoozoku no are kana :.
17 Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) investigate the use of and-prefaced questions in informal medical encounters and argue that the use of and-prefaced questions invokes and sustains an orientation to the larger activity-focused course of action. They also observe that and-prefaced questions occur “in the context of (a) expectable, no-problem responses to the prior question, where (b) the question embodies some forward movement within a larger sequence” (Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 11).
18 Collaborative completion refers to a practice with which “a participant produces an utterance that is grammatically fitted to the ongoing trajectory of another participant’s utterance-in-progress and which brings that other participant’s utterance to completion” (Hayashi 2003: 25). When collaborative completing, the participant may “add continuations to another’s turn when there is a halt in the progressivity of the turn’s talk (as in a word search), or after a TCU has arrived at a possible completion (by furnishing a next increment to that unit), as well as contribute a completion for an emerging unit prior to a possible completion” (Lerner and Takagi 1999: 52).
In lines 15 and 17, Yumi produces her candidate understanding of what Rumi has said earlier. In line 16, overlapping with Yumi’s talk, Rumi coproduces a part of the current TCU, doyoobi (nara) ‘(if) ((it’s)) Saturday’, i.e. ‘choral co-production’ (Lerner 2002). Yumi continues her talk and reaches a possible completion that is marked with the conjunctive particle kedo ‘although’ and the final particle ne (line 17). Although Yumi’s talk consists of only a preliminary component that is marked with a conjunctive particle and thus is not possibly complete in terms of its syntactic structure, what Yumi is saying is recognisable in the context and is marked with a terminal
falling contour. According to Tanaka (1999a), conjunctive particles in Japanese can be used to link some earlier talk produced by the speaker her/himself or by another party, which may not necessarily be produced immediately prior to the component that includes the conjunctive particle. The conjunctive particle *kedo* (line 17) can be linked to earlier talk produced by Rumi in this context, *demo suiyoobi dayo* ‘but it’s Wednesday’ (data not shown), which was produced before the portion above. Furthermore, the terminal falling contour mapped onto *kedo ne* (line 17) suggests that it is deployed turn-finally and does not require any further component to be possibly complete. Accordingly, Yumi’s talk in lines 15 and 17 is regarded as being possibly complete despite it being not possibly complete in terms of syntax.

Overlapping with Yumi’s talk, Rumi comes in and proffers a pre-emptive receipt *nn* (line 18). Shortly after Yumi’s talk has reached a possible completion, Rumi further produces a final component that collaboratively completes Yumi’s talk, *suiyoobi da mon* ‘it’s Wednesday’ (line 18). This subsequent collaborative completion goes beyond the mere claim of receipt marked by the *nn* and demonstrates Rumi’s understanding of what Yumi has said. Furthermore, by this collaborative completion, Rumi confirms an upshot of what has been said in the prior sequence and thus indicates that there is nothing more to add. After a rather long silence of 4.4 seconds (line 19), a new sequence is initiated (line 20).

Fragment (28) has illustrated a case where the producer of *nn* collaboratively completes the other speaker’s talk after a possible completion. In fragments (29), however, the producer of *nn* initiates a collaborative completion before the other speaker’s talk reaches a possible completion. The portion below is part of a lengthy topic talk where Yumi and Yuka collaboratively figure out the chronology of their mutual friends’ weddings. Yumi’s talk at the beginning of the fragment is produced during Yuka’s expanding her telling regarding trouble caused by two weddings held on

---

19 Tanaka (1999a: 199) argues that “a combination of contextual factors and a turn final intonational delivery of a conjunctive particle (or alternatively, some indicator of finality such as a conjunctive particle followed by a turn-final use of a final particle)” indicates that the utterance-in-progress, which may not be syntactically complete, is possibly complete.
the same day. In lines 1 and 3, Yumi introduces another troubled case of another friend, which Yumi describes as *gocha gocha gocha shiteta* ‘was complicated’ (line 1). Yuka responds to this with the response token *soo*, showing her affiliation with this perspective (cf. Chapter 5 for detailed discussions of the use of *soo*).

(29) [2A: 644]
1  Yumi:  [ ANO HEN MO NA]NKA gocha gocha gocha shiteta =
     around.there also uhm was.confused
     ‘((things)) were also confused around there’
2  Yuka:  [ tomodachi no : ]
     friend GEN
     ‘((their)) friend’s’
3  Yumi:  =n [ da yo ne,=k]umi chan to (.)° (tana[ka kun])°
     NM BEFP FP ((name)) and ((name))
     ‘right? Kumi and (Tanaka)’
4  Yuka:  [ soo soo : ]
     [soo soo °soo soo°].
5
6  Yuka:  atopii no karede(h)sho?  hoh hoh°
     atopic.eczema GEN he BE
     ‘the one with atopic eczema, right?’
21 Yumi:  shira(h)nte so(h)jna [koto made(h).]
     do.not.know such thing till
     ‘((I)) don’t know such a thing’
22 Yuka:  [ .nhh .nhh ] .nhh .nh[hh]
23 Yumi:  [.hh=]
24 Yuka:  = .HHH
25 Yumi:  shiran kedo ;
     do.not.know but
     ‘((I)) don’t know ((that)) but’
26 Yuka: ➔ °nn : ° °sonohen chotto° gochago[chashtitayo ne :]
     around.there a.little was.confused FP FP
     ‘nn : :: ((things)) were confused around there, weren’t they’
27 Yumi:  [ n gochagocha shi]teta yo ne,°
     was.confused FP FP
     ‘n ((they)) were confused, weren’t they’
28

In line 6, Yuka produces a confirmation request regarding the groom of the friend by proffering her candidate understanding. This talk by Yuka is designed to invite an
agreement from Yumi by using the TCU final expression desho, delivered with a terminal rising contour. Yumi responds to this with a disclaimer, shirante sonna koto made ‘I wouldn’t know such a thing’, which seems to be disaligning with the prior talk’s invitation of agreement. However, Yumi’s response in line 7 shows alignment in a certain way, that is, it aligns with an invitation to laugh together. Note that Yuka’s talk in line 6 is marked with ‘within-speech laughter’, which is denoted by ‘(h)’ in the fragment, and with laugh tokens after a possible completion of the TCU, i.e. hoh hoh in line 6 (cf. Jefferson 1979).

In line 11, following the laughing together (lines 8-10), Yumi self-selects and takes up her prior talk that was produced in line 7. What is notable is that this talk no longer contains within-speech laughter or laugh tokens. This suggests some shift away from the immediately prior sequence, which is marked with laughter. Yumi’s talk in line 11 is constructed as a preliminary component marked with the conjunctive particle kedo ‘although’. Yuka responds to this with nn and subsequently proffers a collaborative completion, which partially repeats Yumi’s earlier summary-like assessment at the beginning of the fragment. This serves as a formulation of what has been said in the prior sequence and adds nothing substantial to what has been said. In the subsequent turn, Yumi partially repeats Yuka’s talk. This is followed by a silence (line 14) and the resumption of the talk about troubles caused by the two concurrent weddings, which was in progress before Yumi’s talk in lines 1 and 3 (data not shown).

Above, I have examined cases where the producer of nn subsequently completes the prior talk that is produced by the other speaker. It has been shown that collaborative completion following nn does not only demonstrate that the producer of nn understands what has been said in the prior talk, but also serves as a formulation of what has been said in the sequence, adding nothing substantial to the current talk and proffering sequence closure.

So far in Section 3.4.2, I have examined instances where the speaker of nn subsequently shows agreement with, confirms, and collaboratively completes, the talk
to which receipt *mn* is oriented. It has been shown that subsequent responsive talk in these cases tends to be relatively brief and is oriented to moving away from the current talk rather than to progress it. Recall that *mn* tends to be followed by an expansion of the talk to which the *mn* is oriented when deployed alone in a context where some response is projected sequentially relevant by the prior talk (cf. Section 3.3.2). By further providing affiliative responsive talk, which ‘demonstrates’ the producer’s adequate receipt, the producer of *mn* may propose a closure of the current talk.

### 3.4.2.4 Disagreement

In contrast to the instances I have discussed so far in Section 3.4.2, the producer of *mn* may proffer responsive talk that develops the matter or issue that is discussed in the talk to which the *mn* is oriented. In such a case, however, the talk is developed in a disaffiliative way, that is, in such a way as not to align with the preference of the prior talk. Fragments (30) and (31) below are chosen here to illustrate this case where the producer of *mn* proffers disagreements after a receipt *mn*. These disagreements are dispreferred responses and show typical dispreferred turn shapes of delaying, mitigating and/or weakening the delivery of disagreement (cf. Levinson 1983; Heritage 1984b; Pomerantz 1984a; Sacks 1987; Mori 1996).

At the beginning of fragment (30), Rumi produces an assessment regarding the apartment where Yumi used to live (line 1). This makes the coparticipant’s display of (dis)agreement a relevant next action (cf. Pomerantz 1984a; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Mori 1996).

(30) [2B: 514]
1 Rumi:  **hiro katta yo ne;= demo : .**
   was.wide FP FP but
   ‘((it)) was spacious, wasn’t it, though’
2 (0.2)
Rumi’s assessment in line 1 is followed by a brief silence (line 2), which may foreshadow an imminent dispreferred response (Pomerantz 1984a). Indeed, Yumi displays disagreement by mentioning the style of the apartment, *wan dii kee* ‘one room with a dining kitchen’, and what appears to be the size of the dining kitchen, which demonstrates a shift in perspective.\(^{20}\) Note that Yumi’s response is prefaced by the connective *demo* ‘but’, which is often used to mark a shift in perspective when disagreeing (Mori 1996). In the middle of Yumi’s talk, Rumi pre-emptively comes in (line 5), reasserting her prior talk in line 1 with a slight modification. This turn is prefaced by *datte*, which is used to “strengthen the speaker’s assertion and make others change their stance” (Mori 1994: 155). This indicates that Rumi understands Yumi’s response (lines 3 and 4) was not an agreement with her (Rumi’s) original assessment. In overlap with Rumi’s talk, Yumi continues her unfinished talk but abandons it shortly after (line 6). At a possible completion of Rumi’s reassertion in line 5, a response of agreement or disagreement by Yumi again becomes a relevant action. In

\(^{20}\) According to Mori (1996), who investigates the ways Japanese speakers negotiate agreement and disagreement, the disagreeing party often proffers an exception or a limitation of the statement to which they do not agree, or introduces a different perspective of the issue that is being discussed.
line 6, terminally overlapping with Rumi’s talk, Yumi proffers the target receipt *nn*, claiming adequate receipt of Rumi’s talk. Yumi further proffers *demo-*prefaced subsequent talk, which again shows a shifted perspective and demonstrates disagreement. This subsequent talk discusses and develops further the matter that the prior talk deals with.

Another instance of disagreement following *nn* is shown in fragment (31). Here, the producer of *nn* first proffers a ‘partial’ or ‘weakly stated’ agreement (Pomerantz 1984a) before disagreeing. The portion below is taken from a stretch of talk where Kyoko and Hikaru talk about a very confusing intersection. Up to line 6, Kyoko tells Hikaru about drivers who are confused at the intersection.

(31) [HK: 121]

1  Kyo: [ ichiniikyuu ni haitteiku [ hito wa chokushin [ na noni:; Route.129 to enter person TOP straight BE CONJ ‘although those who enter Route 129 ((should)) go straight’
2  Hika: [ mn : : ; ] >[mn: mn: ; =
3  Hika: =soo da [ng; BE FP ‘*mn: mn:* ((that)) is so, isn’t it’
4  Kyo: [.hhhh hidarini uinkaadashite [ chokushin shitekuhito = left to indicate and straight go person ‘.*hhhh some people indicate to the left ((but)) go straight’
5  Hika: [ a massugu_o, oh straight ‘*oh straight?’
6  Kyo: =toka ga i[ru n da yo ng]_ or SUB existNM BE FP FP ‘or something like that, you know’
7  Hika: [aa : ga : aa : ] ; ; ; ; = >demo nanka<machigae: chau no oh oh oh but uhm make mistake NM ‘oh oh oh but uhm that ((those drivers)) get mixed up’
8  wa wakaru yoo [ na ki ga suru. TOP understandable seem feeling SUB do ‘(((that’s))) understandable, ((I)) have a feeling ((like that))’
9  Kyo: → [°mn : : ; °
10  Kyo: wakaru kedo abunai ka[ra; understandable but dangerous CONJ ‘*((it’s))) understandable but ((it’s)) dangerous, so’
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In lines 7 and 8, Hikaru proffers commentary in response to what Hikaru has said, demonstrating her sympathy toward drivers who get confused at the intersection. In line 9, Kyoko pre-emptively deploys the target *nn*, claiming adequate receipt of Hikaru’s talk. When Hikaru’s talk comes to a possible completion, Kyoko subsequently shows disagreement (line 10). Kyoko first proffers a partial agreement to Hikaru’s talk, *wakaru kedo* ‘I understand but’ 21. Kyoko then proffers an ‘account for disagreement’ (Mori 1996), which is marked with the conjunctive particle *kara* ‘because’. Although no subsequent component is produced after the conjunctive particle *kara*, the use of *kara* here creates “an inference of unstated disagreement” without actually asserting disagreement (Mori 1996: 221).

Above, I have discussed instances where the producer of *nn* displays disagreement after marking adequate receipt of the prior talk with *nn*. It is suggested that *nn* in such a context is utilised to delay disagreements or dispreferred responses. As Pomerantz (1984a) argues, a number of practices are deployed by a disagreeing party to delay or mitigate a disagreement. One way of delaying the delivery of a disagreement is by prefacing the disagreement with a weak agreement 22. As discussed earlier, a receipt *nn* may be regarded as a ‘weak agreement’ (Pomerantz 1984a) in sequential contexts where expectations for agreement as a preferred response are set up by the prior talk to which the *nn* is oriented (cf. Section 3.3.2.1). *Nn* may function as a

---

21 Mori (1996) argues that *kedo* in disagreement turns implies partial agreement.

22 Pomerantz (1984a: 72) states that agreements that preface disagreement are “primarily agreement tokens, asserted or claimed agreements, same evaluation agreements, and qualified or weakened agreements”.
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sort of weak agreement that prefaces disagreements. What should be noted here, however, is that the agreement shown by the receipt *nn* is presumably much weaker than other form of partial agreement that may be deployed to preface a disagreement. I would like to suggest here that the receipt *nn* achieves what English *mm* does in similar environments, which is “a more subtle, less abrupt lead up to a disagreement” without “ostensibly” agreeing with the prior talk (Gardner 2001: 150).

Another point that needs to be noted here is that, unlike other sorts of responsive talk that I suggested as closure oriented, disagreements produced after *nn* often develop further what has been discussed in the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. The development, however, is not done in a way that aligns with the preference implemented by the prior talk. Gardner (2001: 148) argues that English *mm* in dispreferred environments is used “as a token to move on from what has been said so far... at a more pragmatic level, in the sense of distancing the force of the same speaker talk that follows the *Mm* from the force of the prior speaker’s talk, whilst maintaining topical continuity”. Similarly, *nn* followed by disagreements can be argued as moving away, or disaligning, from the talk to which the *nn* is oriented in terms of its preference and developing the matter under discussion in a ‘pragmatically’ shifted way. In this regard, it is arguable that the token’s low commitment to, or orientation to moving away from, the current talk is maintained in the case where *nn* is followed by disagreements.

In Section 3.4.2, I have investigated cases where the producer of *nn* subsequently proffers some responsive talk. It was shown that subsequent talk tends to be relatively brief and is closure oriented. I have also shown a rather contrastive case where the producer of *nn* proffers a disagreement, which develops further the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. I have argued that, in this case, the producer of *nn* does not develop talk according to the preference of the prior talk and therefore can be regarded as moving away from the talk to which the *nn* is oriented in terms of the preference.
Before closing this section, I will discuss an instance that is observed in the data set and may be seen as problematic. Observe fragment (32).

(32) [2A: 792]

1 Yuka: ima ne :, =geka gairai, nooge gairai,: .hh (0.3)
   now FP surgery outpatient brain.surgery outpatient

2 shochishitsu : = naika gairai tte°(natta)°. =
   treatment.room internal.medicine outpatient QT became
   ‘now, you know, ((it)) has ((divided into)) surgery outpatient, brain surgery
   outpatient, treatment room and internal medicine outpatient’

3 Yumi: =nn : => nanka demo< gairai no hitotachi: _[.hhh minna =
   uhm but outpatient GEN people everyone
   ‘nm : : uhm but the people in outpatient unit, everyone,’

4 Yuka: °nn°.

5 Yumi: =nanka ne : = hhh kao shutteru hito ga * ookat[ta* :=
   uhm FP face know people SUB was.many
   ‘uhm, you know, ((I)) recognised many people’

6 Yuka: 
   $\downarrow$nn : : =desho ;
   BE

7 =i- gairai >anma °kawa(ra[\n mon)°<
   outpatient much do.not.change FP
   ‘nm : : right? outpatient unit doesn’t change much’

8 Yumi: [kawatte nai yo [ ne : .
   change not FP FP
   ‘((it)) hasn’t changed, has it’


10 (0.7)

In lines 3 and 5, Yumi reports that there were many people she knows in the outpatient unit. The target $mn$, which terminally overlaps with this talk, is produced by Yuka in line 6. Immediately following this $mn$, Yuka makes her assertion, proffering her own knowledge regarding the matter that is discussed in Yumi’s talk.

This instance may appear, at a first glance, to be a case where the subsequent responsive talk develops the matter that is discussed in the prior talk further and thus may possibly be seen as constituting a counter example of my assertion that the subsequent responsive talk demonstrates their producer’s orientation to moving away from the talk to which the $mn$ is oriented. I suggest, however, that this instance can be considered as a case where $mn$ closes the talk to which the $mn$ is oriented before moving
on to the next action (cf. Section 3.4.1). More concretely, in this fragment, the 

nn may be strategically used as a second pair part of Yumi’s report, which closes the telling sequence, in order to present the subsequent talk, i.e. the assertion, in a new sequence. Yuka may design her assertion as a first pair part of a new sequence rather than as an affiliative response proffered in response to Yumi’s report. By doing this, Yuka achieves a presentation of her assertion as the first assessment in the new sequence and thereby establishes a sequential context where the other speaker, Yumi, displays agreement or disagreement to Yuka’s assertion. In the next turn, Yumi indeed demonstrates her affiliation (line 8). This sequence is closed by Yuka’s nn (line 9), which marks adequate receipt of this preferred response. The important point in this discussion is that the nn is strategically deployed in order to close the relevant sequence and thereby present the subsequent talk in a new sequence. Accordingly, there is a sequential disalignment between the prior talk and the subsequent talk.

In summary, Section 3.4 has examined the trajectories of talk following a receipt nn, focusing on cases where its producer proffers the subsequent talk. It was shown that, the subsequent talk produced by the producer of the nn typically demonstrates a move away from the talk to which the nn is oriented, e.g. in terms of sequence or preference, and often makes little contribution to its development. This further supports the characterisation of nn at possible TRPs as marking adequate receipt and projecting no further talk in its own right.

3.5 Summary

This chapter has investigated nn occurring at possible TRPs. I have shown that

nn at possible TRPs claims adequate receipt of the talk to which it oriented without projecting further talk in its own right, i.e. the receipt nn.

23 Yuka also claims her epistemic independence about the matter being discussed by using deshoo, which is an ‘epistemic modality marker’ (McGloin 2002) and indicates that “the speaker has prior knowledge or has expected the proposition/information to be true” (McGloin 2002: 142).
I have also examined trajectories of talk following the receipt \textit{nn}. I first discussed cases where the other speaker, i.e. the speaker of the talk to which \textit{nn} is oriented, produces subsequent talk following the \textit{nn}. It has been shown that the \textit{nn} tends to be followed by closure of the relevant sequence/activity when it is deployed in a sequential environment where some activity is possibly complete. It has been argued that adequate receipt through the use of \textit{nn} in such an environment shows the producer’s alignment with, or proposal of, a possible closure of the current sequence/activity.

I have also shown that a receipt \textit{nn} is often followed by an expansion of the talk to which it is oriented, when it is deployed in a context where more than a simple claim of receipt is sequentially relevant. It was suggested that \textit{nn} in this context serves to pass up a sequentially relevant response. It was also argued that turn-expansion is deployed by the recipient of the \textit{nn} who treats the \textit{nn} as problematic for the way the prior talk is responded to and pursues a more preferred response instead of a simple claim of receipt. Thus, turn-expansions following the receipt \textit{nn} were shown to be fundamentally different from the continuation of unfinished talk that typically occurs following the continuer \textit{nn}.

I have also examined instances where the producer of \textit{nn} proffers the subsequent talk following a receipt \textit{nn}. It has been shown that the producer of \textit{nn} may subsequently initiate a new sequence or return to some earlier talk after marking adequate receipt of the prior talk with \textit{nn}. In such cases, it has been argued that \textit{nn} is utilised to close the relevant sequence before the producer of \textit{nn} moves on to the next action that shifts away from the prior talk to which the \textit{nn} is oriented. It has also been shown that a receipt \textit{nn} may be followed by its producer proffering responsive talk to the prior talk to which the \textit{nn} is oriented. In such a case, subsequent talk was shown to be relatively brief and to be oriented to closure of the current talk. However, in cases that the producer of \textit{nn} proffers disagreement and develops the prior talk, it has been argued that the \textit{nn} serves to move away from the prior talk in terms of preference. On the whole, it was shown that the subsequent talk proffered by the producer of \textit{nn}
typically demonstrates some sort of move away from the talk to which the *nn* is oriented, e.g. in terms of sequence or preference, or is oriented toward a closure of the current talk.

The examination of the trajectories of talk has suggested that receipt through the token *nn* indicates its producer’s minimal commitment to, and orientation to moving away from, the talk to which the *nn* is oriented.

In Chapters 2 and 3, I have examined the token *nn*. Being the most minimal of all response tokens with no semantic content, *nn* was found to be used to receive a wide range of conversational actions in different interactional contexts. What the token *nn* basically does is to respond to the prior talk in a minimal way. This, however, has shown to achieve various tasks depending on the placement and the local interactional context of the token *nn*.

The findings of Chapter 3 are summarised as follows:

**Summary of the findings: *Nn at TRPs***

**Basic functions:**
- Claiming adequate receipt without projecting further talk in its own right and indicating its producer’s minimal commitment to, and orientation to moving away from, the talk to which *nn* is oriented.

** Typical environment:**
- At or around a possible completion of some talk.

** Typical subsequent courses of talk:**
- When the other speaker proffers the subsequent talk:
  - Closure of the relevant sequence/activity when *nn* is deployed in a sequential context where some sequence/activity is possibly complete.
  - Expansion of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented when *nn* is deployed where some response is sequentially relevant.
- When the producer of *nn* proffers the subsequent talk:
  - Closure of and/or shift away from the talk to which the *nn* is oriented.
**Actions that may be achieved:**

- Closing a relevant sequence/activity.
- Passing up a more substantial response that is sequentially relevant.
- Displaying weak agreement.
4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on another response token, *huun*, which occurs frequently in Japanese conversation, especially in informal or casual settings. Despite the fact that *huun* appears frequently in everyday Japanese conversation, there are only a few studies that deal with the function of *huun* (Matsuda 1988; Szatrowski 1993; for example). Matsuda (1988) summarises the functions of *aizuchi*, or Japanese backchannels, from the perspective of teaching/learning Japanese as a second language. She claims that *huun* can be used to display that its producer (i) understands the information that was conveyed by the primary speaker, (ii) is convinced, (iii) agrees vaguely, or has negative feeling and/or doubt, and (iv) has interest and/or concern (Matsuda 1988). As for Szatrowski (1993), the main focus of the study is the investigation of strategies used in invitation sequences in Japanese. Several instances of *huun* are found in Szatrowski’s (1993) conversational data, and she assigns either of the following two functions to them: (i) encouraging the other speaker to continue, or (ii) display of interest.

It should be emphasized that these functions are not exclusive to *huun* but shared by other response tokens, such as *nn* and *hee*. That is, like in the case of *nn*, the token
Huun is also dealt with as part of the overall behaviour of Japanese aizuchi. As a result, these studies present little detailed discussion on this particular token. While these studies may provide us with some idea of how huun is recognised by the speakers of Japanese, detailed empirical analysis is yet to be made in order to sufficiently understand the role of huun in Japanese conversation. This chapter will attempt to shed light on what huun particularly accomplishes in talk-in-interaction by examining its sequential environment and its subsequent course of talk.

This chapter is organised as follows. In Section 4.2, I will investigate the basic environment of huun, and show that huun occurs in a sequential context where a telling/informing activity is possibly complete. Based on this observation, in Section 4.3, it will be proposed that huun claims the producer’s particular epistemic stance toward the matter or issue being discussed, i.e. absence of independent access or prior knowledge, as well as the producer’s understanding of the current state of talk, i.e. an informing/telling activity is possibly complete. This will be followed by Section 4.4, which is devoted to the detailed discussion of trajectories of talk after huun. It will be demonstrated that huun is frequently followed by expansion of the telling/informing to which the huun is oriented. I will argue that huun sequentially provides the telling/informing party with an opportunity to expand the telling/informing to which the huun is oriented, and thereby invites further expansion of the telling/informing. It will be also argued that huun may be utilised by a telling recipient to pass up a recipient response before gradually disengaging from the telling so far.

4.2 Basic environment

Basically, huun occurs at or around a possible completion of a telling/informing activity, where the other speaker delivers news, information, past events, experiences, stories, and so on. A telling/informing can be produced in two different sequential environments, (i) as a second pair part to an information seeking question or (ii) as an informing first pair part. That is, a telling/informing may be initiated as the result of
coparticipant’s request or may be volunteered by the telling/informing party. As shown in fragments (1) and (2), *huun* can be deployed in response to a telling/informing in both sequential environments.

Fragment (1) illustrates *huun* used in response to an elicited telling/informing. In line 1, Yumi initiates a question, asking for the place where Rumi’s sister lives. The target *huun* is produced by Yumi in the next turn after the answer in third position.

(1) [2B:1126]

1 Yumi: oneechan dokoni sunden no?
   sister where is.living FP
   ‘where is your sister living?’
2 (.)
3 Rumi: >ano ne< =obata.
   uhm FP ((name))
   ‘uhm, Obata.’
4 (0.2)
5 Yumi: ➔
   [tn :l
6 Rumi: [oneechan mo*ne ie (ka[ra hanareteru)]*↑nh heh heh↑
   elder.sister also FP home from is.away
   ‘((my)) elder sister is also away from home.’
7 Yumi: [ (chikai) yo ne]
   close FP FP

Rumi responds to the question by simply providing the information that has been asked for, i.e. the place where her sister lives. The *huun* occurs at a place where Rumi’s answer is possibly complete, as the requested information is adequately provided. Note also that the answer is delivered with a terminal falling contour and followed by a brief silence, which indicates that Rumi is not continuing with the answer.

Fragment (2) exemplifies the use of *huun* in response to a non-elicited informing/telling. Here, *huun* is deployed at a possible completion of a volunteered announcement (lines 1-8) of her past event.
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(2) [9A: 119]

1 Mina: sakuʃ ra wa mi ni ikankatta kedo uʃ me wa cherry.blossoms TOP see to did.not.go CONJ JP.apricot TOP

2 mi ni ittā jan ʃ ne :):(.) toyohashi no sa : ;(0.5) e : tto :(.) see to went BE-NEG FP ((name)) GEN FP uhm

3 apita no chikaku.° mukaiyama : [ :
((name)) GEN near ((name))
‘((we)) didn’t go to see the cherry blossoms but went to see the Japanese apricot blossoms, you know, in Toyohashi, you know (0.5) uhm, near Apita. Mukaiyama’

4 Saki:

5 (Saki): =(ha : ha :) nn._=

6 Mina: =° nantoka t[te yuu no]çi°
so.and.so QT say FP
‘or something, you know’


8 Mina: wa mi ni ittā.
TOP see to went
‘((we)) went to see ((that))’

9 Saki: $hu _ : un?

Mina first proffers an announcement of a past event (line 1-2). She goes on with further talk on the whereabouts of the place where she went (lines 2, 3, 6, and 8), to which Saki claims her recognition of the place (line 4, 5, and 7). Huun is proffered by Saki when Mina’s talk is possibly complete (line 8). Note that Mina’s talk is delivered with a terminal falling contour.

Above, I have shown that huun can be used in response to both an elicited and non-elicited telling/informing at their possible completion. The telling/informing to which the huun is oriented in the above instances is achieved rather minimally in the context. In the data set at hand, however, huun is more commonly observed in response to a telling/informing that is extended in various ways.

For instance, in fragment (3), huun is deployed at a possible completion of an extended informing that is originally elicited by the producer of huun. Saki and Mina are talking about a supermarket chain of which the name has been recently changed. In
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lines 1 and 4, Saki produces a question, asking for information about why the supermarket has changed its name.

(3) [9A: 44]
1 Saki: "demo soo ie ba sa : =nahuko? but so say if FP ((name)) 'but, talking about that, you know, Nahuko?'
2 (0.4)
3 Mina: fii(h)ru = ((name)) 'Fiiru'
4 Saki: =nan de fiiru ni kawatta no,= why ((name)) to changed FP 'why did ((it)) change to Fiiru?'
5 Mina: =>are< kookoku miru to kaitte >atta kedo sa : < (.) that advertisement see if was.written CONJ FP
6 shamee ga fiiru ni kawarimashita. =>tte kaitaru yo< = company.name SUB ((name)) to changed QT is written FP '((it)) was written in the advertisement, you know, that the company name has changed to Fiiru, ((it)) is written ((like that))'
7 Saki: =a .shh kawatta dake[ka. oh changed only Q 'oh, ((it’s)) just a ((name)) change’
8 Mina: [(a) soo soo soo = nahuko wa ((name)) TOP nahuko mi*ta de sa : * ; ((name)) seem BE FP 'soo soo soo, ((it)) seems like Nahuko is Nahuko, and’
9 (0.2)
10 Saki: ("nn : [nn : "]
11 Mina: [( ) saisho do:kkka ni^ baishuu sareta no at.first somewhere by was.purchased NM
12 kana : to [ motta n dakedo ] ; FP QT thought NM BE-CONJ 'at first, ((I)) thought that ((it)) was purchased by another company or something, but’
13 Saki: [ nn : nn : ; ]
14 Saki: nn :=
15 Mina: =^soo^ janai mitai. so BE-NEG seem ‘((it)) seems like that’s not the case’
16 Saki: hu : : : [un] BE this child
17 Mina: [((talking to Aki)) ( ) da kono ko ( )
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Mina responds to the question by mentioning that she has read in the advertisement that the name of the company has changed (line 5 and 6). Saki registers the answer in the ensuing turn by formulating what Mina has said, *a kawatta dake ka* ‘oh, ((the name)) has only changed’. The use of a ‘change-of-state token’ (Heritage 1984a), a ‘oh’, at the turn-beginning implies that the answer is somewhat different from what Saki has expected. Besides, the use of *dake* ‘only’ suggests that Saki had expected some other reason than a mere name change, possibly that the supermarket has been purchased by another company, which is, in fact, mentioned later by Mina as what she had speculated (lines 12-13). In line 8, Mina confirms Saki’s formulation with *soo soo soo* (See Chapter 5 for the detailed analysis of *soo*) and further proffers more on-topic talk (lines 8-16). *Huun* is proffered in line 17 at a possible completion of the extended informing, which is marked with a falling terminal contour. This is followed by closing of the extended sequence.

*Huun* is also commonly observed in a lengthy storytelling activity, as illustrated in the next fragment. The portion below is a rather long multi-unit storytelling delivered by Mina that her weight has not been back to normal since having given birth to her daughter. The storytelling is initiated with a ‘preface sequence’ (cf. Schegloff 1992b) where the teller made an announcement in line 1 that her appetite has not decreased (since giving birth to her daughter), and the prospective story-recipient gives a go-ahead with a ‘newsmark’ (Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1981) in line 2.

(4) [9A: 179]

1  Mina: *sho: kuyoku ga ochihen mon de sa* ;
appetite SUB not.drop NM BE FP
‘((because)) my appetite does not decrease, you know’

---

1 See, for example, Goodwin (1984); Jefferson (1978); Sacks (1974); Schegloff (1992b), for the organization of a storytelling.
The story proper comes to a completion in line 68 and receives a mere claim of receipt with *mn* (line 69) from Saki, the story-recipient. After a short silence of 0.2 seconds,
Mina produces a commentary (lines 71 and 73) with a terminal falling contour, which constitutes a possible completion of the telling. However, this does not receive any response (line 74). After a silence of 0.7 seconds, Mina proffers an assessment, pinchi ‘(it’s) a crisis’ (line 75). According to Jefferson (1978), an assessment is commonly used by the storyteller as a ‘telling-ending device’ (cf. also Goodwin and Goodwin 1992). *Huun* occurs in this context following the assessment that marks a possible completion of a lengthy storytelling.

Above, I have shown that *huun* is deployed in response to a telling/informing, which may or may not have been expanded. The concept of ‘activity’ (Heritage and Sorjonen 1994; Sorjonen 1996) seems to be useful when describing the environments of *huun*. As noted earlier in Chapter 3, an ‘activity’ is a topically- and/or goal-coherent course of action, which may be achieved beyond a sequence (Heritage and Sorjonen 1994; Sorjonen 1996). Thus, a telling/informing that is achieved both in a single sequence and across a series of sequences can be referred to as a ‘telling/informing activity’. Consequently, the environment of *huun* is summarised as a place where telling/informing activity is possibly complete.

### 4.3 Lack of prior knowledge and/or independent access

In section 4.2, I have discussed the environment where *huun* occurs. It was shown that *huun* regularly occurs in response to an informing/telling activity. Studies have shown that conversational participants demonstrate their orientation that telling/informing is to be produced for recipients who are not yet informed (Goodwin 1979; Sacks 1973). The participants show whether they are an appropriate recipient of a telling/informing in various ways. For instance, the informing party may employ some practices before initiating a telling/informing to see whether or not an intended recipient is an appropriate recipient for the telling/informing, e.g. story prefaces (cf. Sacks 1974) and pre-tellings or pre-announcements (cf. Terasaki 1976). If no such practices are employed prior to a telling/informing and what is told happens to be
already known to the recipient, the recipient can indicate that he or she already knew what is being told, for example, by a collaborative completion (cf. Hayashi 2003). Therefore, whether being informed or not-informed of some matter being discussed is a fundamental concern in the activity of telling/informing. To repeat, a telling/informing should be addressed to a party who is not yet informed and has no prior knowledge of the issue or matter being discussed.

Based on the observation that *huun* is regularly deployed by telling/informing recipients, I suggest that *huun* primarily claims that its producer is an appropriate recipient of the telling/informing, namely, its producer has no prior knowledge of, or independent access to, the matter or issue that the other speaker discusses. Indeed, the producer of *huun* may even explicitly state absence of or lack of independent access to, or knowledge of, what is being discussed in the telling/informing. This is illustrated in fragment (5) below. The fragment is a later part of a lengthy telling where Yuka tells Yumi about their mutual friend’s unfortunate love affair. In line 1, Yuka initiates an expansion of her possibly complete telling with a further telling component (lines 1-5).

(5) [2A: 310]

1 Yuka: °nn : °. (0.3)de .h mitchan no ie mo ; ;
   ‘and Mitchan’s house also’

2 Yumi: nn [: .

3 Yuka: [ mie ken ni koshichatta [ ka↑ra : ; ]=hhh=
   ‘has moved to Mie prefecture, so’


5 Yuka: =maa hanarechatta kara ne: := toka itte ;
   ‘well, because ((she)) is now away ((from him)), you know, or something like
   that, ((she)) said’

6 (0.7)

7 Yumi: °hu : : un : °,

8 (1.4)

9 Yuka: °ne : °.
   FP

10 (0.7)
In line 7, Yumi, the story-recipient, produces *huun* where Yuka’s extended talk is projectable as being possibly complete. This is followed by silences and the freestanding final particle *ne* produced by the storyteller, which indicates that the teller has nothing more to say about the topic (See Tanaka 2000 for the detailed analysis of freestanding *ne* as a topic closing device). In the subsequent turn, Yumi produces a commentary that explicitly indicates a lack of prior knowledge in reference to the story, *shirankatta sore wa* ‘I didn’t know that’.

Furthermore, that *huun* claims the lack of prior knowledge of, or independent access to, the matter being discussed is also supported by the observation that the telling/informing that is responded to with *huun* is commonly expanded after the *huun*. Note that, as mentioned earlier, a telling/informing should be produced for a recipient who is not yet informed and has no prior knowledge of the issue being told (Goodwin 1979; Sacks 1973). If *huun* did not play such a role, and hence indicated that the producer did have prior knowledge of, or independent access to, the matter being told, this would make the producer of *huun* a knowing recipient. If this were the case, the teller would not proffer further talk on the matter after *huun*, since the telling/informing should be addressed to an unknowing recipient. Thus, that *huun* is commonly followed by a further expansion of the telling/informing to which it is oriented supports my suggestion that *huun* claims the producer’s absence of prior knowledge of, or independent access to, the matter being proffered in the telling/informing.

---

2 Although Yuka’s talk is not possibly complete in terms of intonation, i.e. a slightly falling non-terminal contour, a silence of 0.7 seconds at the grammatical and pragmatical possible completion strongly suggest that Yuka has nothing more to say, and thus, the extended talk is possibly complete.

3 Such *huun*, i.e. *huun* followed by an expansion of the telling/informing to which they are oriented, will be discussed later in Section 4.4.1.
So far, in Sections 4.2 and 4.3, I have outlined the basic environment of *huun* and discussed the epistemic stance claimed by *huun*. It has been demonstrated that *huun* is deployed at or around a possible completion of a telling/informing activity. To put it another way, deployment of *huun* indicates its producer’s orientation to the current informing/telling activity as being possibly complete. This may seem to potentially contradict with the fact that *huun* is often followed by an expansion of the telling to which the *huun* responds (cf. Section 4.4.1). What is meant by the telling being ‘possibly complete’ here is that the activity of telling to which the *huun* is oriented is possibly complete in the sense that no further talk is required to make sense of what the telling/informing party has said, but there is often scope for further expansion of the topic following the telling/informing. It has also been argued that *huun* shows the producer’s lack of independent access to, or prior knowledge of, the issue being discussed in the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented. To sum up, *huun* is suggested to display a particular epistemic stance about the matter or issue under discussion, i.e. no independent access or prior knowledge, as well as the producer’s understanding of the current state of talk, i.e. the informing/telling activity is possibly complete, albeit with potential further expansion of the topic.

Having pointed out *huun*’s basic characteristics above, I will now turn to explore further the accomplishment of *huun*, focusing on the subsequent courses of talk after *huun*.

### 4.4 Trajectories of talk after *huun*: Subsequent talk by the other speaker

In Sections 4.4 and 4.5, I will examine trajectories of talk after the production of *huun*. As far as the current data set is concerned, *huun* is overwhelmingly produced freestanding, i.e. not immediately followed by further talk by the producer of *huun*. In the subsequent turn that follows a freestanding *huun*, the other speaker, i.e. the speaker of the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented, tends to further extend the telling/informing. However, when the subsequent turn has not been produced by the
other speaker, the producer of *huun* may take the subsequent turn. In this case, the producer of *huun* tends to proffer response talk in reference to the telling/informing to which the *huun* responds.

I will first examine the case where *huun* is followed by subsequent talk by the other speaker, i.e. the primary speaker of the telling/informing activity to which the *huun* is oriented, in Section 4.4. I will then move on to Section 4.5, which is dedicated to examining the case where the producer of *huun* produces subsequent talk. It will be argued that *huun* basically works to invite the other speaker to produce further talk by sequentially providing an opportunity to expand the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented, although this does not necessarily obtain successful outcomes.

### 4.4.1 Expansion of telling/informing

Now, let us start examining the case where the other speaker, i.e. a telling/informing party, takes the ensuing turn after *huun*. A frequently observed pattern in the current data set is that the teller/informing party further expands a possibly complete telling/informing after *huun*, as shown below.

Fragment (6) illustrates an instance where an elicited informing is expanded after *huun*. This was discussed earlier as an example of *huun* occurring in the context of an elicited informing, i.e. fragment (1). In line 1, Yumi asks Rumi where her sister lives.

(6) [2B:1126]
1 Yumi: oneechan dokoni sunden no?
   sister where is.living FP
   ‘where is your sister living?’
2 (.)
3 Rumi: >ano ne<,=obata.
   uhm FP (name)
   ‘uhm, Obata.
4 (0.2)
Rumi provides a brief but sufficient answer to the question in the subsequent turn (line 3). Yumi, the initiator of the question, responds to the answer with *huun* (line 5), through which she shows a lack of prior knowledge as well as her understanding that the informing is possibly complete. Terminally overlapping with the *huun*, Rumi provides additional information in line 6, expanding further the informing that was responded to with the *huun*.

In fragment (7), an announcement is expanded after being responded to with *huun*. While the telling/informing in fragment (6) above was elicited by the producer of *huun*, the announcement in this fragment is volunteered by its speaker. At the beginning of the fragment, Yumi makes an announcement that her sister is seeing the doctor for treatment of infertility (line 1).

(7) [3B: 125]

1 Yumi: oneechan ima ne; chiryoo ni itteru.
   elder.sister now FP treatment to is going
   ‘my sister is seeing ((the doctor)) for the treatment now’
   (0.4)

2 Miho: onee(sa/chaa)n?
   elder.sister
   ‘your elder sister?’

3 Yumi: nn :.

4 Miho: \[\text{huun} : n,\]

5 Miho: \[\text{huun} : n,\]

6 (0.3)

7 Yumi: $nahnika earobi toka yahtteru yoh.$
   uhm aerobics or is.doing FP
   ‘((she)) is doing aerobics or something’

Following the announcement, Miho initiates repair, which is confirmed subsequently by Yumi, i.e. a repair sequence (lines 3-4). Miho produces *huun* in line 5 after the
repair sequence, hereby receiving the announcement as well as marking the completion of the repair sequence. In the subsequent turn, Yumi proffers further talk in reference to the announcement (line 7).

It is also common that an extended telling/informing is further expanded after being responded to with *huun* at a possible completion, as shown in fragments (8), (9) and (10) below. In fragment (8), *huun* is deployed at a possible completion of an extended telling and is followed by a further expansion. The portion below is part of lengthy telling by Yuka regarding the mutual friend of the participants. The fragment starts with Yumi’s proffering a candidate understanding of what Yuka has said. The target *huun* is produced in line 21.

(8) [2A: 227]

1 Yumi:  

2 jibun[ n kara yutte ; (ho)]meru-

3 Yuka: [ wazurawashii : ( .) > tte yuu ka:] troublesome QT say Q ‘and things become troublesome, he himself starts talking and’

4 Yuki:  

5 Yuka: ya( .)o chigau n yateper. tabun ; (0.2) hon- ( .) < huseijitsu > ni

6 Yuka: shitaku nai ‘( .)’ want.to.make not

7 Yumi:  

8 Yuka: oohu[ _ ; _ un ] oo,  

9 Yuka: [ ichiioo .]h (. ) sooyuu (. ) omoi o tachikit < ; (0.2) sono

10 Yuka: ko to yaroro tte yuu huu ni kime- (. ) [ ta ko da ka[ra : ; . =

11 Yumi:  

12 Yuka: =hhh (0.9) yappari (. ) ne ;  

13 Yumi:  

14 Yumi: (2.0)
Yuka: zenzen kirai tte wake janai yo ↑ ne[; = yappa] ri = completely dislike QT case BE-NEG FP FP after all ‘(it’s) not the case that ((he)) doesn’t like ((her)) at all, after all, you know’

Yumi: ➔  hu_;___;_  [ u n : ,


(1.1)

Yumi: ➔ hu_;___;_  [ u n : ,

Yuka: oo[nn] oo.

(0.3)

Yuka: tte ittotta yo; QT was saying FP ‘((Mitchan)) was saying ((so))’

(0.4)

Yuka: de .hh (0.7) watashi mo nanka sooyuu : toki ga yappa atta and I also uhm such time SUB after all existed yan. BE-NEG ‘and (0.7) there was time when I had that sort of thing too, you know’

The candidate understanding proffered by Yumi (lines 1-2) contains some problem, which is addressed by Yuka in the ensuing turn. Yuka indicates the trouble source in line 3 by a repeat in an overlap with Yumi’s turn, i.e. ‘repair initiation’ (Schegloff et al. 1977). Yumi stops talking in the middle of her turn (line 2) probably due to the overlap. Following a silence of 0.7 seconds, Yuka first rejects Yumi’s candidate understanding and makes a correction of the trouble source (lines 5 and 6). Slightly after the onset of huun proffered at a possible completion of Yuka’s talk (line 8), Yuka expands her prior talk. Yuka’s talk comes to a possible completion in line 15, which is minimally acknowledged by the recipient (line 17). In line 19, Yuka produces a quiet nn, indicating that she has nothing more to say. A subsequent silence of 1.1 seconds is another strong indication of a possible completion of Yuka’s talk.

Yumi proffers the target huun in this environment. In the subsequent turn after the huun, Yuka produces an additional increment to her prior talk, tte ittotta yo ‘((she)) was saying ((so))’ (line 24). This increment provides another opportunity for the recipient to produce a response. However, Yumi does not produce any response (line
25). After a silence of 0.4 seconds, Yuka proffers further talk and expands the telling. What is shown in this fragment is that an extended telling may be further expanded by the teller after being responded to with *huun*.

The expansion of the telling following *huun*, however, may not always develop the telling in a substantial way. Observe fragment (9), where the teller does not add much to what she has said prior to *huun*, but simply upgrades what is said immediately before the *huun*. The fragment below is part of a very long stretch of telling where Miho talks about the rather disastrous group blind date that she had organised with a man who she met not long before. In the portion below, she talks about the man, who seems to be blaming her for the “quality” of her female friends she had taken to the blind date.

(9) [3B: 878]

1 Miho: =de *kon* : na *hitotachi* [ de *gomen* mitai=
and such people BE sorry such as
‘and sorry about these girls’

2 Yumi: [ (de)

3 Miho: =*na* [ *sooyuuhuinki*] o [ *kamoshidashite>kuru* n=
BE such atmosphere OBJ produce NM
‘such atmosphere is made ((by him))’

4 °[*aa* : (nn) : ]° °[ *aa* : _°

5 Miho: =*da* tte;=* atashi* ni.<=↓ omae no see da *zo* omae no see da
BE QT I to you GEN fault BE FP you GEN fault BE

6 =*zo* o↑ma(h)e no see da *zo*↑.hh ([ ] ) ([ ]
FP you GEN fault BE FP
‘you know, to me, ((it’s)) your fault, your fault, your fault’

7 Yumi: [YANA-] [*yana*

disgusting

8 kanji ya[n. ( ) hehh ze(h)ttai
impression BE-NEG definitely
‘disgusting- ((he’s)) disgusting, definitely’

9 Miho: [ shhh

10 (0.2)

11 Miho: .hhh=

12 Yumi: =.↑hh[h
In lines 7 and 8, Yumi proffers an assessment in reference to the man whom Miho is talking about in the middle of the telling. In line 13, Miho continues her telling, upgrading the assessment proffered by Yumi in lines 7 and 8, i.e. sugoi yana kanji ‘((he is)) very disgusting’. By upgrading the assessment, Miho demonstrates her agreement with the first assessment proffered by Yumi (cf. Pomerantz 1984a for ‘upgraded’ agreements). While demonstrating agreement, Miho also presents the assessment as her own assertion by using an assertive utterance final form, tte. This marks a possible completion of Miho’s telling. Terminally overlapping with Miho’s talk, Yumi proffers huun in line 14. In the ensuing turn, Miho expands her talk, which does not add much to the telling to which the huun is oriented but simply upgrades her prior assessment, i.e. sugo hontoni ‘very really’ (lines 15-16). After a silence of 0.7 seconds, Yumi proffers a commentary (line 18) in reference to what Yumi has said in the telling.

Fragment (10) presents a rather interesting case where huun seems to be used in order to redo a newsmark that failed to receive further talk by the teller. The portion below is a later part of storytelling where Mina recounts a quarrel with her husband. The recount comes to a possible completion in line 19.
(10) [9A: 1329]

1. Mina: chu mono ga ni kai: ka sankai ka at[ta ( )
   such thing SUB twice or three times or existed
   ‘such things have happened twice or three times’

2. Saki: [nn : nn : ;

3. (0.2)

   no good was NM BE
   ‘and ((I)) couldn’t stand it any longer, so’

5. Saki: =nn : ;

6. (0.2)

7. Mina: aru : yasumino hi no hiru : (0.4)
   one day off GEN day GEN afternoon
8. ga : : tte o- (1.1) na i- (0.3) te ; ; [( ) hh hhn
   QT cry -
   ‘one afternoon on a day off ((of my husband)), (0.4) I burst into tears’

9. Saki: [nn : ;

10. Saki: nn ;

11. (.)

12. Mina: naku koto wa yoku aru n da kedo : ;
   cry NM TOP often happen NM BE CONJ
   ‘((it’s)) common that ((I)) cry, but’

13. Saki: =nn [: ;

14. Mina: [monosugoi naite ; ;
   terribly cry and
   ‘((I)) cried a lot, and’

15. Saki: °nn [: ;

16. Mina: °( ( )° ( .) aki no gohan mo zenbu yattoite
   (name) GEN meal also all give
17. tte itte ; ; (.hh) (. ) niijikan gurai ° kieta (da na) ° ; ;
   QT say and two hours about disappeared FP
   ‘I told ((my husband)) to feed Aki, and disappeared for about two hours’


19. Mina: ° de kaetteki tara ; [oret°.
   and return CONJ yield
   ‘and when ((I)) returned, ((he)) gave in’

20. Saki: °nn °;

21. (0.4)

22. Mina: (ah ( .) a [h)

23. Saki: [ hon to ; ;
   really
   ‘really.’

24. (0.7)
25 Saki: ➔ huun : u[$(h): (h)$, \\
26 Mina: ( ) $hhn$
27 Mina: deteku mon : da na to omot$ta (h) hh$°. \\
leave NM BE FP QT thought \\
‘leaving home worked well, I thought’
28 Saki: hhn .ghh .ghh [ .ghh .ghh ] iede. eh huh huh huh \\
29 Mina: oo [ chotto na] oo \\
a.little FP \\
‘a little bit, you know’

After the possible completion, Saki, the story recipient, produces a ‘newsmark’ (Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1981), i.e. honto ‘really’ (line 23), registering what she heard as some sort of news. Newsmarks usually project further talk in reference to the news (See Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1981, for discussions on the trajectories of talk after newsmarks). Saki’s newsmark in line 23, however, does not receive any response such as a reconfirmation or further talk by the teller (line 24). In this context, Saki produces huun (line 25). Following the huun, Mina proffers an expansion of the telling with a further component (line 27). The huun is likely to be used here to redo the newsmark in line 23, which was produced to invite more talk but received none.

So far in Section 4.4.1, I have shown a frequently observed pattern in the data set, namely, tellings/informings that are responded to with huun are expanded further by the telling/informing party. This suggests that huun functions like a sort of newsmark in that it invites further talk by the telling/informing party. I will now consider how an invitation for further talk is achieved by huun, which merely claims that the producer has no prior knowledge of, or independent access to, what is said, and that the producer understands that the telling/informing is possibly complete (cf. Section 4.3). This can be summarised in the following four points.

First, I argue that deployment of huun serves to pass up a more substantial response or action that regularly terminates a telling/informing activity. As shown in the above instances, huun is deployed in a sequential context where some other actions, which are oriented to activity closure, are potentially produced. Consider fragment (6), for instance, where huun is used in response to an elicited informing. Here, in the
sequential position where the *huun* occurs, the party who requested some information may instead simply claim acceptance of the information provided and thereby close the informing sequence, or may move on to some other matter by initiating a new sequence. As for the case of an announcement like fragment (7), the recipient may instead proffer an assessment or evaluation of the announcement, which is generally ‘terminal’ or ‘topic curtailing’ (cf. Jefferson 1981, 1984b).

For the case of an extended telling, as in fragments (8), (9) and (10), the place where *huun* is used is crucial in order to move out of the extended telling successfully. Studies have shown that the participants display their orientation that an extended telling typically achieves a response in reference to the telling at its completion (cf. Jefferson 1978; Sacks 1973; among others). For instance, the recipient should display appropriate appreciations of the upshot of the story and resume turn-by-turn talk, as well as showing understanding that a storytelling is over (Sacks 1973). Furthermore, Jefferson (1978) argues that, at storytelling completion, participants are oriented to demonstrating that the story generates ‘topically coherent talk’ and that the story is implicative for subsequent talk. In addition, according to Jefferson (1978), when an appropriate response to the story is not forthcoming from the recipient, the teller adds further components or increments to the story. In short, in order to move out of an extended telling, the recipients should proffer relevant response talk in reference to the story.

Recall that in fragments (8), (9) and (10), *huun* is deployed at a place where an extended telling is possibly complete and a response by reference to the telling is relevant. However, what is done by *huun* is only to display the producer’s epistemic stance, i.e. the producer has no independent access or prior knowledge of the matter at issue, and the producer’s understanding of the current state of talk, i.e. the telling/informing possibly complete. Accordingly, *huun* is not sufficient to demonstrate the story’s sequential implicativeness for subsequent talk, and it is therefore not an adequate response for moving out the extended telling and resuming turn-by-turn talk. What can be achieved by the *huun* instead is to pass up a place for a
recipient’s response, which regularly moves toward closure of the extended telling. Note also that the *huun* producer can do so without failing to demonstrate understanding that the extended telling is possibly complete and thus such a response may be relevant in the context.

To put this first point briefly, *huun* allows the recipient of a telling/informing, which may be an extended one, to pass up an opportunity to terminate or move out of the telling/informing. Such an action can be regarded as showing an orientation to stay in the telling/informing, rather than moving out of it.

Secondly, I suggest that *huun* allows its producer to demonstrate an alignment to a telling/informing as an appropriate recipient. As noted earlier, telling/informing should be made to a party who does not already know (cf. Goodwin 1979; Sacks 1973). Recall also that *huun* claims the producer’s lack of independent access or prior knowledge regarding the matter being talked about. By claiming such an epistemic stance with *huun*, the producer demonstrates alignment with the telling/informing as an appropriate recipient, i.e. as an unknowing recipient, which may also invite further expansion of the telling/informing.

Thirdly, *huun* is often deployed freestanding. By using *huun* alone in the turn, the producer makes the subsequent turn available for the telling/informing party to continue the telling/informing if desired. That is, *huun* creates a place for further expansion while showing its producer’s orientation to staying in the telling. This is hearable as inviting the telling/informing party to proffer further talk and to stay in the telling/informing, rather than moving out of it.

Lastly, *huun*’s orientation to the expansion of the current telling/informing is further supported by the intonation contour mapped onto *huun*. *Huun* is regularly delivered with a rising terminal contour. Gardner (2001: 193-194) states “there appears to be a near consensus on the broad function of falling versus rising terminal pitch direction in an intonation unit: falling completes, segments, or claims common ground (about which no more need to be said), whilst rising suggests non-completion, more to come, and connecting”. That is, the rising terminal contour mapped onto *huun* suggests
its non-termination, which is consistent with the token’s orientation for further expansion, not termination.

To sum up, I have argued that huun invites the other speaker to talk more about the telling/informing to which the huun is oriented. It has been also argued that the invitation to telling/informing expansion by huun is closely related to its sequential placement. This makes a clear contrast with newsmarks, which also invite further talk, but by marking the prior talk as some sort of news and not just informing (cf. Heritage 1984a; Jefferson 1981). In this regard, it is suggested that huun can be a useful alternative to a newsmark for a recipient of some telling/informing, who is prepared or willing to stay in the informing/telling activity, but does not wish to treat the telling/informing as some sort of news or, to use newsmarks, for some reason (See, for example, fragment (10) above for such an instance).

Before moving on to the next section, I will show an instance of a strategic use of huun in a closing sequence. Prior to the fragment below is a series of clarification and confirmation seeking questions by Yumi regarding unexpected news about their mutual friend delivered by Yuka earlier in the conversation (data not shown). Yumi’s talk in line 1 is produced in a context where the topic talk about the news is possibly complete.

(11) [2A: 140]
1 Yumi: e saikin: atta n da.=soo° yuu no gah°.recently happened NM BE such NM SUB ‘((it)) happened recently, such a thing’
2 Yuka: ° saikin tte yuu ka : : ; (. ) kyonen ichinen : (. ) gurai. °
   recently QT say Q last.year one.year about ‘should I say recently or, ((it was)) last year, for about a year’
3
4 Yumi: ° he_: e°=mitchan shabennai mon ne-
   ((name)) talk-NEG FP FP ‘hee =Mitchan doesn’t talk, does she?’
5 Yuka: ° soo° =soo° =* soo° =soo° ° oo°(nn:) oo°
6 (0.5)
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Yumi’s talk in line 1 takes up the talk about the news for further development. Yuka responds to this by providing more elaborated information. Following a silence of 0.7 seconds, Yumi produces a commentary in reference to the protagonist of the news. Yuka demonstrates an affiliation with what Yumi has said with reiterated soo (See Chapter 5 for the discussion of the token soo). After half a second’s silence, Yuka proffers talk about Mitchan, which may be hearable as thinking aloud. Yumi does not respond to this. Instead, Yumi explicitly claims an absence of her prior knowledge about the news (line 9). In the subsequent turn, Yuka proffers soo soo, which may indicate her orientation toward staying in the topic (See Chapter 5). Following a silence of 1.1 seconds, Yumi proffers huun (line 12).

What is notable in this stretch of talk is that there is not much added to the news after Yuka’s talk in line 2. This may indicate that the talk on the news is ‘possibly exhausted’ and thus implicates closure of the topic talk (cf. Button 1991). The quite lengthy silence (line 11) prior to the huun may also be a good indication that the participants are running out of things to say on the news. By proffering huun in
such a context, the producer may indicate her being willing to stay in the news telling, although she may not have more to say about the telling. The *huun* is followed by further talk about the news.

Section 4.4.1 has discussed a commonly observed subsequent course of talk after *huun*: an expansion of a telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented. I have argued that *huun* furnishes a context for the telling/informing party to expand the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented. The token’s expansion orientation has shown to be achieved in close reference to its sequential placement.

### 4.4.2 Non-expansion of telling/informing

In the preceding section, it was shown that *huun* furnishes a context for the telling/informing party to expand the possibly complete telling/informing to which the *huun* responds. Deployment of *huun*, however, does not guarantee that the telling/informing is always further expanded. There are cases where the other speaker does take the ensuing turn, but not to expand the telling/informing. For instance, the telling/informing party may indicate that there is nothing more to say in reference to the telling/informing by producing a brief additional increment, as illustrated in fragment (12). In such a case where no further talk is forthcoming by the telling/informing party, the producer of *huun* tends to proffer a response to the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented⁴.

(12) [2A: 310]

1 Yuka: °nn : °. (0.3) de .h mitchan no ig mo : ;
   and ((name)) GEN house also
   ‘and Mitchan’s house also’
2 Yumi: nn [:
3 Yuka: [ mie ken ni koshichatta [ ka↑ra : ; ]=.hhhh=
   ((name)) pref.to have.moved CONJ
   ‘has moved to Mie prefecture, so’

⁴ That the telling/informing party has nothing more to say may also be indicated by a silence following *huun*. In such a case, the producer of *huun* also tends to proffer a response in reference to the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented (cf. Section 4.5.1).
In line 7, Yumi, the story recipient, produces *huun* at a place where a possible completion of the current telling activity is projectable. After a silence of 1.4 seconds, Yuka produces a freestanding final particle *ne*, which indicates that she has nothing more to say on the topic (see Tanaka 2000). Instead of expanding the telling, Yuka demonstrates that she has nothing more to say and thus the telling is over. This, in turn, gives the turn back to Yumi to produce a more substantial response in reference to the telling, which was passed up earlier by the *huun*. Yumi indeed proffers a response and turn-by-turn talk resumes.

Although the telling/informing to which *huun* is oriented may not be expanded, the other speaker, i.e. the recipient of the *huun*, may stay as a telling/informing party by initiating a new telling/informing, as shown below. In fragment (13), a new telling is initiated by the other speaker, i.e. the recipient of the *huun*, after a lengthy silence. In line 1, Rumi initiates a question, asking for the location of a place called *Umemorizaka*. The question-answer sequence is expanded after the answer by a repair sequence that addresses a problem in the answer.

(13) [2B: 705]

1 Rumi: <...> tte kiku yo ne doko? umemorizaka( )

‘((we)) hear ( ((the name)) Umemorizaka, don’t we? where ((is it))?’
In line 2, Yumi provides a rough location of the place as an answer to the question. This is responded to with a repair initiation where a candidate understanding is proffered (lines 3 and 5). Yumi confirms the candidate understanding in the subsequent turn (line 6). Overlapping with Yumi’s confirmation, Rumi extends her prior TCU with an additional increment, which appears to be a delayed self-repair, replacing the last word of the prior talk with another word of similar meaning. After a brief silence, Rumi produces huun (line 9) where the expanded informing activity is possibly complete.

The huun, as argued earlier, provides a context for an expansion of the current telling. However, Yumi does not take up the opportunity to extend the informing or to proffer further talk on the topic (line 10). As will be shown later, when no further talk by the other speaker is readily coming up, the producer of the huun tends to produce response talk in reference to the telling/informing (cf. Section 4.5). In this fragment, however, neither party takes the turn following the huun, and a rather long silence of 3.2 seconds occurs (line 10). After the silence, Yumi, the recipient of the huun, does
take the turn, but not to expand the current informing. Instead, Yumi initiates an announcement with a shift in topic.

What this instance shows is that withholding of a more substantial response by the producer of *huun*, which tends to occur when no further talk by the other parity is forthcoming\(^5\), can result in having the other speaker produce more talk. Although the talk by the other speaker may not be an expansion of the talk to which the *huun* is oriented, the producer of the *huun* in this instance may be regarded as having succeeded in staying as the recipient of a telling.

*Huun* may be immediately followed by the initiation of a new telling with a major topic change, as in the following fragment. In fragment (14), the target *huun* occurs in line 12 at a possible completion of a telling activity where Yumi talks about the flu she has had.

(14) [3B: 54]

1. Miho: \( ^{\text{n}} \text{nn} : [ \ : * : * ]^{o} \)
2. Yumi: [de moo tabe]reru dokoro janakut(\( \text{te} \); toire ni = and can.eat even BE-NEG-and toilet to ‘and ((I)) couldn’t eat at all, and, to the toilet’
3. Miho: \( ^{o}\text{nn} : ^{o} \)
4. Yumi: =nankaimo hashitta h. ghhh $ na :nte koto: toka omo[\( ^{o} \text{tte} ^{o} \$ many.times ran what thing or think.and ‘((I)) ran many times, I thought what a thing!’
5. Miho: shita below
6. kara itchau n da : .(0.2) \( \text{ue} \) kara? from have.gone NM BE above from ‘((so you suffered from)) diarrhoea. (0.2) ((was it)) vomiting?’
7. Yumi: \( \text{ue} \) kara. above from ‘vomiting’
8. Miho: a \( \text{ue} \) kara na n da.= oh above from BE NM BE ‘oh vomiting’

---

\(^5\) This issue will be addressed in detail in Section 4.5.1.
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10 Miho: =dome kakkoo minna ichookaze ttete itteta. = <kototsu wa>.
but quite everyone stomach flu QT was saying this year
‘but quite many people were saying that the stomach flu is going around, this
year’

11 Yumi: soo soo = sugu haichau’tokaitte itteta°.
soon vomit or QT was saying
‘soo soo=((they were)) saying that ((they)) vomit soon ((after eating?))’

12 Miho: → hu ~ u~

13 Yumi: =so ie ba ne ;
so say if FP
‘speaking of that’

14 Miho: mn ;

15 Yumi: imooto ne ;=
younger sister FP
‘my younger sister, you know,’

16 Miho: ↑ mn ;

17 (0.9)

18 Yumi: ano: chuusha toka shite sa ; = iroiro :
uhm injection or do and FP various
‘uhm, ((she tried)) injections and all sorts of things...’

A possible completion of the recount is displayed by the teller by referring back to
what she felt or thought when she had the flu (line 4). This is followed by Miho’s
proffering a candidate understanding, which itself is later self-repaired after a brief
silence (line 6). Yumi confirms Miho’s candidate understanding by repeating it (line 7),
and Miho registers it in the next turn (line 8). This is minimally acknowledged by
Yumi with mn (line 9), which also suggests that she has nothing more to say.

Following this, Miho takes the turn and she talks about the type of flu around
that year. This turn appears to be an appropriate response at a telling completion, as it
shows how the preceding telling is understood by the speaker as well as demonstrating
that the telling can generate “topically coherent subsequent talk” (Jefferson 1978: 228).
This talk shifts the focus from Yumi’s particular case to a more general matter. Yumi
responds to this response with soo soo, claiming what is said completely accords with

---

6 According to Lee (1998), at a story completion in Japanese conversation, it is common for the teller to
refer back to the feeling or thought that he/she had at the time when the event, which is being recounted
as a story, happened.
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her independent understanding (see Chapter 5 for the description of soo). Yumi further proffers on-topic talk that shows affiliation with the preceding talk (line 11).

Miho responds to this with huun, which may seem slightly awkward as what precedes the huun is something that Miho is expected to know. Note that what Yumi said in the preceding turn (line 11) is designed as something that agrees with what Miho said in the turn before that (line 10). This suggests that what Yumi said, which the huun responds to, is presumably not a piece of new information for Miho. The use of huun, on the other hand, shows the producer’s epistemic stance of no prior knowledge, as argued previously. It is possible that Miho indeed did not know what exactly the common symptoms of the flu were like around that year. Note that earlier in the fragment, Miho responds to Yumi with a ue kara nan da ‘oh vomiting’ (line 8). The use of the change-of-state token, a ‘oh’, suggests that what Yumi said, ue kara ‘vomiting’ (line 7), was news. What the huun may be doing is responding not to the immediately prior turn, but to the overall informativeness of the sequence, especially about the symptoms of the flu.

In any case, by deploying huun, Rumi subsequently creates an opportunity for further telling if the other speaker has more to say. Immediately following the huun, however, Yumi initiates an announcement of news that her sister may be pregnant, which completely changes the topic from the flu to her sister’s possible pregnancy (data not shown). This new topic is accepted for further development (data not shown).

The two instances above, i.e. fragments (13) and (14), have illustrated that huun may not be followed by further expansion of the telling/informing, but instead by the initiation of a new telling with a shift in topic. Although the topic is shifted from the one to which the huun is oriented, these instances can be seen as the producer’s having succeeded in staying in the role of the recipient in the activity after inviting the other speaker to talk more.

Unlike the instances shown so far, huun may be followed by a complete change of activity, as illustrated in fragment (15) below. The fragment was presented earlier in
the discussion of the environment as fragment (3). At the beginning of the fragment, Saki initiates a question about a chain supermarket.

(15) [9A: 44]

1 Saki:  "demo soo ie ba sa :=nahuko? but so say if FP ((name)) ‘but, talking about that, you know, Nahuko?’
2  
3 Mina: fiiru= ((name)) ‘Fiiru’

4 Saki: nan de fiiru ni kawatta no, why ((name)) to changed FP ‘why did ((it)) change to Fiiru?’

5 Mina: =>are< kookoku miru to kai te>atta kedo sa : <; (.) that advertisement see if was.written FP ‘((it)) was written in the advertisement, you know, that the company name has changed to Fiiru, ((it)) is written ((like that))’
6 Saki: =a .shh kawatta dake ka. oh changed only Q ‘oh, ((it’s)) just a ((name)) change’

8 Mina: [(a) soo soo soo :=nahuko wa ((name)) TOP

9 nahuko mi tai de sa :* ; ((name)) seem BE FP ‘soo soo soo, ((it)) seems like Nahuko is Nahuko, and’

10 (0.2)
11 Saki: (*nn : [nn : *)
12 Mina: [( ) saisho do: kka ni baishuu sareta no at.first somewhere by was.purchased NM

13 kana : to [ motta n dakedo ] ; FP QT thought NM BE-CONJ ‘at first, ((I)) thought that ((it)) was purchased by another company or something, but’

14 Saki: [ nn : nn : : ];
15 Saki: nn :=
16 Mina: =soo janai mitai. so BE-NEG seem ‘((it)) seems like that’s not the case’
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17 Saki: ➔ hu : : : [un_i
18 Mina: )) (talking to Aki)) ( ) da kono ko ( ) BE this child
19 ((Playing with Aki for 11 seconds))

Mina’s answer to the question comes to a possible completion in line 16 (cf. fragment (3), for more detailed description of Mina’s answer). Saki, the initiator of the question, receives the answer with *huun* in the next turn (line 17). By receiving the answer with the *huun*, Saki provides Mina with an opportunity to further expand the informing if Mina has more to say. However, Mina does not take the opportunity and simply moves out of the informing activity by starting to talk and play with her child. This shifts to a completely different activity (lines 18 and 19). The informing about the supermarket is closed here. In this instance, the telling/informing party appears to utilise the available opportunity to move out the telling/informing activity by simply initiating a new activity.

In Section 4.4, I have discussed instances where the other speaker, i.e. the recipient of *huun*, takes the subsequent turn after *huun* but does not expand the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented. It has been shown that the telling/informing party may use the subsequent turn after *huun* to demonstrate that she has nothing more to say on the topic and thus proposing a closure of the telling/informing. This tends to be followed by response talk by the *huun* producer. I have also discussed the case where a new telling/informing is initiated after *huun*. In such a case, although the subsequent talk is not an expansion of the telling/informing to which *huun* responds, it is suggested that the producer of *huun* has succeeded in staying as the recipient of an informing/telling. It has been also shown that a telling/informing to which *huun* is oriented may be closed by the telling/informing party, who initiates a completely different activity in the subsequent turn. These observations suggest that although *huun* provides an opportunity for the telling/informing party to expand a telling/informing if there is more to say, it may not always achieve to get the telling/informing expanded.
4.5 Trajectories of talk after *huun*: Subsequent talk by the *huun* producer

Although they are relatively small in number, the data set at hand contains instances where the producer of *huun* produces the subsequent talk after *huun*. This section will focus on such instances. I will first discuss instances where the producer of *huun* produces subsequent talk after *huun* where no talk by the other speaker has been forthcoming, i.e. freestanding cases. This will then be followed by examination of instances of *huun* where its producer immediately moves on to subsequent talk after *huun*, i.e. non-freestanding cases.

4.5.1 Absence of forthcoming subsequent talk by the other speaker after *huun*

When further talk by the other speaker has not been forthcoming, the producer of *huun* tends to produce a response in reference to the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented, as illustrated below. In fragment (16), the producer of *huun* produces an assessment in reference to the telling following no upcoming expansion of the telling after *huun*. Here, *huun* is placed at a possible completion of a lengthy multi-unit telling delivered by Miho.

(16) [3B: 1306]

1 Miho: ＊*huun*:＊( ) > mata sokode< (0.2) again there

2 doo shiyoo ; sonna hito $iru(h)$ kana(h)$ how do such person exist FP ‘and then, ((I would think)) what I should do, ((I wonder)) if there is such a person’

3 Yumi: nhh ↑hhn [↑hhn

4 Miho: [dare- dare tsukre- (. ) tsu↑retette who who bring and

5 sa : ; = ma[t a nanka sonna koto iware tara *sa : * ; = FP again uhm such thing is told if FP ‘who- who ((when I)) bring ((someone)) and if I was told such a thing again, you know’
In line 5, Miho produces a conjunctive particle tara ‘if’, which turns the current TCU into a ‘preliminary component’ of a ‘compound TCU’ (cf. Lerner 1996; Lerner and Takagi 1999). The use of the final particle sa, which is marked with a sound stretch and a non-final falling contour, disrupts the ‘progressivity’ (cf. Schegloff 1979; Lerner 1996) of the ongoing talk, and thereby furnishes an opportunity for the other speaker to come in to complete the TCU in progress (cf. Lerner 1996; Lerner and Takagi 1999). Indeed, Yumi comes in with her candidate understanding of what Miho is saying, which collaboratively completes Miho’s talk (line 7). The collaborative completion displays Yumi’s strong understanding of what Miho has said as well as her sensitivity to a possible completion of the telling. The way that the final component is constructed, i.e. an assessment, mucha mucha shitsuree yan ne “((he is)) very rude, isn’t he”, indicates Yumi’s understanding of the upshot of the telling, which is that the attitude of the man at issue is socially intolerable or unacceptable. The collaborative completion is responded to with a quiet nn by Miho (line 8). After a silence of 0.7 seconds, Miho takes the turn (line 10), extending her telling with a commentary that
wraps up her rather long talk about the man, which, in fact, does not affiliate with Yumi’s understanding displayed immediately preceding this.

Yumi proffers *huun* in line 12 following the commentary that marks a possible telling completion. By responding to the telling with the *huun*, Yumi provides Miho with an opportunity to proffer further talk if she wishes. Miho, however, does not seem to take up the opportunity to proffer further talk. Indeed, the rather lengthy silences occurring after the *huun* (lines 13 and 15) clearly indicate that no further talk is forthcoming. In this context, Yumi takes the turn and produces a response to the telling, which is relevant at a telling completion (line 16).

In contrast to the above instance, the producer of *huun* may produce the subsequent talk after a relatively brief silence following *huun*, as shown in fragment (17). This fragment is part of a telling activity, which was initiated by an announcement proffered earlier by Mina that she went to see almond blossoms.

(17) [9A: 498]
1 Mina: "ittekitaittekitai." went went ‘((we)) went, ((we)) went’
2 Saki: nani iro no hana na no? what colour GEN blossoms BE NM ‘what colour are the ((almond)) blossoms?’
3 Mina: pinku. (0.2)nanka ne†momo no hana† ni sokkuri pink uhm FP peach GEN blossoms to look.alike
4 dat†ta was ‘pink, well, ((they)) looked exactly like peach blossoms’
5 Saki: [aa-()] ho : n†to : . oh really ‘oh really’
6 Mina: [nn : = sakura no [hana o (1.3) kyodai ni cherry. GEN blossoms OBJ huge to ‘nn, ((they are something)) like gigantic’
7 shita yoo na kanji de [sa :; did seem BE impression BE FP ‘cherry blossoms, you know’
8 Saki:→ [hu : : †un?
When Mina’s telling reaches a possible completion in line 1, Saki produces a question, enquiring about the colour of almond blossoms (line 2). In the subsequent turn, Mina first provides the minimal answer, pink ‘pink’, which is further followed by additional information (lines 3-4). This is responded to by Saki with a newsmark, aa honto ‘oh really’, registering what Mina said as something remarkable or some sort of news to be talked about more. Mina minimally acknowledges this with nn and proffers an additional increment, which elaborates on what she said in her prior turn. Saki produces huun terminally overlapping with Mina’s talk.

This huun occurs at a place where what Mina has been saying is recognisable and thus a possible completion is projectable. Indeed, Mina does not continue after the final particle sa (line 8). The huun invites the teller to produce further talk. Mina, however, does not extend her talk (line 10). What is notable here is that the silence following the huun is substantially shorter here than the previous instance, i.e. fragment (16). Despite this, the absence of forthcoming talk by the teller is strongly suggested here. Note that the huun is lengthened like many of the instances discussed so far. This provides the other speaker with an extended opportunity to proffer further talk. However, there is no sign of the teller proffering further talk during or following the huun. In this context where no further talk seems to be forthcoming, Saki proffers a commentary in reference to the issue that has been discussed in the telling (line 11).

So far, I have shown that the producer of huun proffers response talk in reference to the telling when no further talk by the other speaker is forthcoming. As noted earlier, participants show their orientation that an extended telling typically achieves response talk in reference to the telling at its completion (cf. Jefferson 1978; Sacks 1973; among others). Although huun serves to pass up response talk in the
context, it does not cancel the relevancy of response talk but only defers it temporarily. Therefore, in cases where further expansion is provided, response talk becomes relevant after completion of the expansion. Likewise, in cases where no further expansion is provided, response talk still remains as a relevant action to be done by the producer of *huun*. The instances above are regarded as the case where the producer of *huun* moves on to proffer response talk that was once passed up with *huun* but becomes relevant again, as no expansion has been forthcoming by the telling party.

As shown in the next instance, however, the producer of *huun* may instead proffer another *huun*, when there is no upcoming further talk after the first *huun*. The second *huun* seems to redo the invitation for the other speaker to produce further talk.

In fragment (18), Yumi is talking about her own experience of finding an apartment.

(18) [2B: 397]
1  Yumi: *hunde .hh ironna tokoro,
      then various place
     ‘and ((I went to)) various places’
2  Rumi: *’nn : o.
3  Yumi: nisshoo itte ; [minimini itte ; =
      ((name)) go.and ((name)) go.and
     ‘((I)) went to Nisshoo and ((I also)) went to Minimini, and’
4  Rumi: [*’nn : o.
5  Rumi: =nn :.
     other see to went NM FP
     ‘((I)) wonder if I ((also)) went to other places to see’
7  Rumi: =nisshoo to minimini wa zettai chigau bukken ga
      ((name)) and ((name)) TOP absolutely different property SUB
8  haitten no,= on[naji toko : ;]
     is.included FP same place
     ‘do Nissho and Minimini have totally different places? or same ones’
9  Yumi: [onaji bukken] mo [haitteru.]
     same property also be.included
     ‘same places are also included.’
10 Rumi: [aru n da] yo [ne :.
     existNM BE FP FP
     ‘there are, aren’t there?’
11 Yumi: (0.2)
12 Rumi: ➔ hu~ unl,
The first *huun* occurs in line 13 in a context where the telling activity is possibly complete. This invites the other speaker to produce further talk. Yumi, however, does not take the next turn (line 14). After a rather lengthy silence of 1.8 seconds, Rumi proffers another *huun* (line 15). This seems like a redoing of the prior *huun* and reinvites the other speaker to produce further talk. Slightly after the onset of the *huun*, Yumi proffers further talk, extending the telling. The second *huun* is left unfinished.

In Section 4.5.1, I have discussed instances where *huun* is not followed by further telling by the other speaker and the producer of the *huun* takes the subsequent turn, instead. It has been shown that the producer of *huun* tends to produce response talk in reference to the telling to which the *huun* is oriented, when no further talk by the other speaker is forthcoming. The deployment of *huun* does not cancel the relevance of response talk at a telling completion but it temporarily defers it. Response talk is a relevant action to be done by the producer of *huun* in the context where no further expansion has been produced by the telling party.
4.5.2 Immediate subsequent talk by the other speaker

As far as the data set at hand is concerned, most instances of *huun* are deployed freestanding, as in all the instances I have shown so far. There are, however, some instances where the producer of *huun* continues the turn immediately after the *huun*, i.e. non-freestanding usage. This section will investigate such *huuns*. In the current data set, the following two types of subsequent talk are found to be produced immediately after *huun*: (i) brief on-topic talk and (ii) more substantial talk with a slight shift in topic. The former case, i.e. *huun* plus brief talk, appears to function like a freestanding *huun* in that it invites an expansion of the telling/informing to which it is oriented, while the latter case, i.e. *huun* plus substantial talk, may be utilised to move away from the current telling without producing response talk. Below, I will first discuss the case of *huun* that is immediately followed by brief talk. This will be followed by examination of *huun* with more substantial talk.

**Huun plus brief talk**

Fragments (19) and (20) below illustrate the case where *huun* is immediately followed by brief same speaker talk. These are the only instances found in the current data set. The brief talk following *huun* appears to be designed to invite the other person to talk more about the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented. Fragment (19) is part of telling where Miho talks about a man whom she met not long ago and is interested in. The target *huun* occurs in line 8. Immediately prior to the portion below, Miho says that she likes him but he is not interested in her. In line 1, Yumi initiates a question asking what he does for a living.

(19) [3B: 279]
1 Yumi: ↓huun : n = >a demo<(0.4)(e)nani shiteru hito? oh but what is doing person
   ‘huun=oh but (0.4) what does ((he)) do?’
2      
(0.7)
In the ensuing turn, Miho initiates an answer to the question. Miho’s answer comes to a possible completion in line 6. Note that the possible completion is marked with a terminal falling contour. **Huan** is proffered by Yumi in the subsequent turn. Yumi goes on further with an assessment, **ii Jan** “((that’s)) good”. Although an assessment can be used to wrap up and close a telling/informing activity (cf. Jefferson 1981, 1984b), the assessment here is hearable as an assertion that the man in question may be a good potential boyfriend, presumably due to the use of **jan**. According to McGloin (2002: 148), **jan**, which is a variant of **janai**, is “an expression which carries a strong emotion, thereby evoking listener involvement” and “tends to have an effect of strongly impressing a piece of information on the listener, persuading the listener or justifying one’s viewpoint”.

Studies have shown that a display of stance or perspective towards some matter commonly makes agreement or disagreement by the coparticipant a relevant next action (cf. Pomerantz 1984a; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Mori 1996). Thus, presentation of the stance following the **huan** here makes it relevant for the teller to respond to the stance displayed by the producer of the **huan**. By adding this brief talk
to the *huun*, the producer not only invites the other speaker to talk more but also may guide the direction in which the telling may be expanded rather than leaving it up to the teller.

The other instance, i.e. fragment (20), shows that *huun* with subsequent brief talk may not be followed by an expansion of the telling. In line 1, Tae initiates information seeking question regarding Saya’s friend who lives overseas but is temporarily back in Japan.

(20) [TS: 3]

1 Tae: ee sono ko wa itsu kaecchau no: =
   that person TOP when return FP
   ‘eh? when is the person going back?’
2 Saya: ichigatsu no matsu: tte itteta : =
   January GEN end QT was.saying
   ‘((she)) said the end of January’
3 Tae: ➔ =^oo hu :^oo ,= * moosugu jan°,=
     soon BE-NEG
     ‘*huun* it’s quite soon, you know’
4 Saya: =^oo nn : : °;
5 (2.0)
6 Tae: ^mu< koo wa oyasumi na no ima.
     over.there TOP holiday BE FP now
     ‘eh? is ((it)) holiday over there now’
7 (0.2)
8 Saya: =^oo nn ; = na no kana; ° anmari $ kuwashii koto [( )]$ °
     BENM FP not.much detail thing
     ‘nm ; : I wonder ((if it is so)), ((I’m not sure about)) details’
9 Tae: [ kyoo nan nichi
today what date
10 dak ke : =
     BE FP
     ‘what was the date today?’

At a possible completion of the answer, Tae produces *huun*. This is immediately followed by a brief commentary (line 3), *moo sugu jan* ‘((it’s)) quite soon’[^7]. As in the

[^7]: Although subsequent talk is marked with *jan* in both of the instances observed in the data set, i.e. fragments (19) and (20), it is not evident whether there is any significant relation between *huun* and the
previous fragment, this brief talk is marked with *jan* and seems to be designed as an assertion rather than being oriented to closing the informing activity. In the subsequent turn, Saya does not proffer further talk, but merely produces a receipt *nn*. The rather lengthy silence of two seconds is a good indication of no occurrence of further talk by Saya. After the silence, Tae, the producer of *huun*, takes the turn and initiates another question, asking for more information about the person at issue. Saya responds to this question by showing a lack of knowledge (line 8). Tae gives up on pursuing this topic and initiates talk with a shift in topic (line 9). By responding to the informing with *huun*, the producer may indicate her orientation to staying in the informing activity. The topic pursuing question (line 6) initiated by the producer of *huun* after no upcoming further telling may also support this observation.

The instances above have shown that *huun* may be immediately followed by brief talk that is designed to invite further talk. It has been demonstrated that *huun* accompanied by brief talk also shows an orientation to further expanding the telling/informing activity and thus functions like the freestanding *huun*.

**Huun plus substantial talk**

*Huun* may be immediately followed by more substantial talk. As will be shown below, substantial talk following *huun* often demonstrates a stepwise shift in topic away from the issue or matter being discussed in the telling (See Jefferson 1984b; Sacks 1992, for discussion on stepwise transition of topic in conversation). It is also notable that the subsequent talk seems to request more information on the topic, although there is some shift in topic. Fragment (21) and (22) are chosen here to illustrate such cases.

---

occurrence of *jan*. I assume that there is a high probability of occasions where brief talk following a non-freestanding *huun* is not accompanied by *jan.*
Fragment (21) is part of a telling where Yuka talks about a mutual friend, who has been having hard time lately. In the portion below, Yuka tells Yumi how the relationship between the mutual friend and her boyfriend ended.

(21) [2A: 1146]
1 Yuka: [mitai de : °yappa]ri°;° soshitara moo .hh (0.7) *moo*° (.)
   seem BE after.all then
2 renraku tatta : = °tte tetta°.
   contact cut QT was.saying
   ‘it seems ((so)), after all? then ((she)) stopped contacting ((him)), ((so she))
   was saying’
3 (1.7)
4 Yumi: zuruzuru °da mon neî [((aso)ko mo ne°; (.)]
   drag BENM FP there also FP
   ‘((they)) somehow continued to stay together, you know? they ((did)), didn’t
   they?’
5 Yuka: [°nn : ° .]
6 Yumi: naga kat°ta kedo(mo) °.
   was.long although
   ‘((they)) had been ((together)) for quite a long time, though’
7 Yuka: °de : nanka yappa° (. ) chigau hito ni°;sasaete morattotta
   and uhm after.all different person by was.supported
8 tte ittotta°.(0.5)sugoi chikara ni natte kureta kara; °ren’ai kanjoo
   QT was.saying very help to became CONJ love feeling
9 toka sooyunoo nai kedo : = .hh ° sugoi nanka (0.2) ji
   or such NM no CONJ very uhm good
10 tomodachi da *yo:* toka itte°.
   friend BE FP or say and
   ‘and, well, after all, ((she)) said ((she)) was supported by someone else. (0.5)
   ((he)) was very helpful, so although ((she)) doesn’t have any feelings of love
   or something like that ((for him)), well, ((he)) is a very good friend or
   something, ((she)) said’
11 (0.3)
12 Yumi: n= demo sa mae no (ano) (0.2) tsukiatteta ko mo
   but FP beforeGEN was seeing guy also
13 tomodachi datta: °koto° nai°?
   friend was thing BE-NEG
   ‘huun but, you know, the guy ((she)) was seeing before was also a friend,
   wasn’t he?’
14 (0.3)
The target *huun* (line 12) is produced by Yumi at a possible completion of a telling component (lines 7-10), which was added after a commentary by Yumi (lines 4 and 6). Immediately after the *huun*, Yumi continues with further subsequent talk. This subsequent talk demonstrates a slight shift in topic away from the telling to which the *huun* is oriented. More precisely, whereas the focus of the telling preceding the *huun* has been their mutual friend’s breaking-up with her unsupportive boyfriend and having a friend who stood by her in difficult times, Yumi’s subsequent talk focuses on the fact that a person who the mutual friend used to be seeing also started off as a “friend”.

Although a topical connection between the talk preceding and following the *huun* and that following is indicated by recycling the word *tomodachi* ‘friend’, which appears in the preceding talk, i.e. an “embedded repetition” (Jefferson 1978: 221), there is a certain topic shift in the subsequent talk. In addition, the topical disalignment between the telling preceding the *huun* and the subsequent talk is also suggested by the use of a connective, *demo* ‘but’, which marks a ‘contrast or shift in perspectives’ (Mori 1996) at the beginning of the subsequent talk.

Another point to note is that what the subsequent talk following the *huun* appears to be doing is to invite further information on the topic, although it is stepwisely shifted. Following the *huun*, Yumi proffers her candidate understanding of the friend in question and marks it with a rising terminal intonation contour, inviting Yuka to respond. After a silence of 0.3 seconds, Yuka minimally confirms it (line 15). Yumi responds to this with a further expansion of her prior TCU (line 16). This may be deployed seeking a more substantial response that takes up this shifted but related topic. Yuka indeed proffers a more substantial response by proffering her candidate
understanding of the man referred to in Yumi’s talk as *tomodachi* ‘friend’ (lines 13 and 16).

Fragment (22) presents another instance of immediate subsequent talk with a topic shift. The portion below is part of a storytelling where Mina talks about her weight change since she gave birth to her daughter. The target *huun* is produced in line 11 at a possible completion that is marked with a ‘proto-typical telling ending device’ (Jefferson 1978), i.e. an assessment.

(22) [9A: 244]

1  Mina: \( \uparrow \text{de} \downarrow \text{mo} \uparrow \text{sa} \downarrow \text{ni} \uparrow \text{kiro} \downarrow \text{kurai} \uparrow \text{shika} \downarrow \text{ettenakute} \downarrow \text{Eh} \downarrow \text{tte} \)
   \( \text{but} \quad \text{FP 2 kg about only not.reduced.and QT} \)

2  kangohusan ni ittara ; (.) \( \text{nn} ; ; \) kangohusan sonnamon da
    nurse to say-CONJ nurse such NM BE

3  \( \text{tte itte} : \text{ne} ?= \)
    QT said.and FP
   ‘but, ((I had lost)) only 2 kg and said “what?” to the nurse, and then the nurse said yeah it’s normal, you know’

4  Saki: \( \text{=} \text{nn} ; ; ; \)

5  (0.2)

6  Mina: honde hachi \( \text{tkiro} \) otosanaikan noni ;
   and \( \text{8 kg have.to.lose CONJ} \)
   ‘and ((I)) have to lose 8 kg, but’

7  Saki: \( \text{n[n ; ; ; ]} \)

8  Mina: \( \text{[ yonkiro shika] ochite nai } \text{no}. \quad \text{4 kg only lost NEG FP} \)
   ‘((I)) reduced only 4 kg.

9  (0.7)

10 Mina: *pin*echi.
     pinch
     ‘((it’s)) a crisis’

11 Saki: \( \text{=} \text{ptk .hh} \downarrow \text{huun} , \text{=} \text{unde} \quad \text{=} \text{sugu} \text{taberaru} \text{mono} , = \text{gohan} \)
    give.birth.and soon can.eat NM meal

12 \( \text{to[ka tte ;} = \text{QT} \)
   ‘and could you eat soon after ((giving birth)), meal or something like that?’

13 Mina: \( \text{[ah _ > tабeta< .} \)
     oh ate
     ‘oh ((I)) ate’

14 (0.7)
Latch to the \textit{huun}, Saki produces a question, asking if it is possible to eat right after giving birth (line 11). Although this is topically related to the telling to which the \textit{huun} is oriented, it again demonstrates a certain shift in topic from the telling. What Mina has been saying in the telling is that she put on more weight in her pregnancy than she should have and the weight she has lost after childbirth was not as much as she had expected, which results in the current state that she has only lost half the weight that she should lose. On the other hand, the subsequent talk following the \textit{huun} shifts the topic to the ability to eat immediately after giving birth.

Indeed, the way the answer is constructed also indicates its speaker’s, i.e. the teller’s, understanding of the question as not fitting properly in the context. Heritage (1998) closely investigates the use of the change-of-state token \textit{oh} in turn-initial position in response to a question. According to Heritage (1998: 307), “the \textit{oh}-preface registers a fugitive and inexplicit indication that, from the respondent’s point of view, the question was not aptly or appropriately asked at that point”. The answer in line 13 agrees with the turn-shape of such an \textit{oh}-prefaced response that is suggested by Heritage (1998). To be more precise, the answer is “minimal” and “unelaborated” and followed by withholding of on-topic talk, which strongly indicates the reluctance to talk about what is raised by the inappropriate inquiry (Heritage 1998: 313-314). To repeat, the teller treats the question initiated immediately following the \textit{huun} as not being appropriate in the context.
Further, as in the fragment (21), the talk following the *huun* is not only topically shifted but also asks for more information on the topic. Saki’s question in line 11 is first responded to with a minimal response (line 13). Following a silence of 0.7 seconds, Saki proffers a formulation of the response, which is followed by a more elaborated response on the topic from Mina (line 16).

Above, I have shown the use of *huun* immediately followed by substantial subsequent talk, which demonstrates a stepwise shift in topic. By immediately producing subsequent talk with a topic shift, the producer may get away from proffering a response in reference to what has been said in the telling so far. As discussed earlier, a freestanding *huun* tends to be followed by expansion of the telling by the other speaker, i.e. the recipient of *huun*. This readily creates another place for the producer of *huun* to produce a response in reference to the telling when the telling extension is possibly complete. In other words, a response becomes relevant again at a possible completion of the expansion, and thus withholding of a response with the freestanding *huun* is only temporary. On the contrary, by immediately proceeding to further talk that shifts the topic away from the telling immediately after the *huun*, the producer of the *huun* or the telling recipient can progress the telling in a shifted direction from the original telling to which the *huun* is oriented. This accordingly allows the recipient to get away from proffering a response, at least, in reference to the original telling. This usage of *huun* may be adequate for the telling recipient who may wish to move away from the current telling for some reason, for example, because the recipient has some trouble responding. By immediately proceeding to further talk with a slight shift in topic, the producer of *huun* gradually shifts the topic away from the telling to which the *huun* is oriented, which may end up as a topic that is quite different from the original telling, i.e. a stepwise shift of topic. As a consequence, the producer of *huun* may avoid producing a response to the original telling.

It has been also shown that the subsequent talk following the *huun* does not only stepwisely shift the topic but also seems to request more information on the topic. This suggests that the substantial subsequent talk following the *huun* also shows some
orientation to further development of the topic, although there is some stepwise shift from the telling/informing that precedes the *huun*.

### 4.6 Summary

This chapter has explored the accomplishment of *huun* in Japanese conversation by examining in close reference to the sequential environments where it is used and the subsequent trajectories of talk. It was shown that *huun* occurs at or around a possible completion of an informing/telling activity. Based on this observation, I have argued that *huun* shows the producer’s certain epistemic stance toward the matter or issue being discussed in the telling/informing, i.e. absence of independent access or prior knowledge, as well as the producer’s understanding of the current state of talk, i.e. the informing/telling activity is possibly complete, albeit with potential further expansion of the topic.

Then, I investigated trajectories of talk after *huun*. As far as the data set at hand is concerned, *huun* is overwhelmingly deployed as freestanding, where the producer does not continue further talk immediately after the *huun*. I have pointed out the frequently observed pattern following *huun*: where the other speaker expands the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented. It was argued that *huun* invites the telling/informing party to produce further telling/informing by sequentially providing an opportunity where the telling/informing party may expand the telling/informing as well as showing the producer’s orientation to staying in the telling/informing. The invitation to expand the telling/informing by *huun* was shown to be closely related to its sequential placement.

I have also discussed instances where *huun* is not followed by a telling/informing expansion. It was shown that the producer of *huun* tends to proffer recipient talk, which was passed up or withheld by deploying *huun*, when no further talk by the other speaker is forthcoming despite the invitation to do so. Although they are few in number, I have examined instances where the producer of *huun* continues
immediately after *huun*. It was shown that *huun* plus brief response talk works like *huun* deployed alone in the turn in that it demonstrates orientation to expanding the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented. I have also discussed the case where the producer of *huun* continues with further substantial talk, which demonstrates a stepwise shift in topic. It was shown that the subsequent talk does not only stepwisely shift the topic but also seems to request more information on the topic, which suggests that the substantial subsequent talk shows some orientation to further development of the topic. It was argued that in this case the producer of *huun* may continue straight to further talk in order to progress the telling in a shifted direction form the original telling to which the *huun* responds. That is, the recipient gradually disengages from the topic in the original telling. In doing so, the producer of *huun* may be able to stay in the telling activity but with a shifted topic. Furthermore, the producer of *huun* may be able to avoid producing recipient talk in reference to the original telling.

The findings of Chapter 4 are summarised as follows:

**Summary of the findings: *Huun***

**Basic function:**
- Indicating the producer’s epistemic stance, i.e. absence of independent access or prior knowledge, and the producer’s understanding of the current state of talk, i.e. the informing/telling activity is possibly complete.

**Typical environment:**
- At or around a possible completion of a telling/informing activity.

**Typical subsequent courses of talk:**
- Further expansion of the telling/informing.
- The producer of *huun* proffers response talk to the telling/informing when no expansion has been forthcoming.

**Actions that may be achieved:**
- Inviting the other speaker to expand the telling/informing.
- Showing alignment with a telling/informing as an appropriate recipient.
• Passing up a sequentially relevant response.
• Moving away from the current telling/informing without producing a response.
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5.1 Introduction

This chapter will be devoted to the discussion of soo, the final token of the three that are investigated in this thesis. Soo belongs to the paradigm for the demonstrative so ‘it, that’, which refers to what was just said (cf. Alfonso 1966). In this regard, soo may be considered lexically more substantial compared to the other two tokens, mn and huun. Nevertheless, like the other response tokens, it is still difficult to say what the response token soo means or does without referring to their local sequential context, especially when it is used by itself without being accompanied by copulas and/or final particles. The current study focuses on soo that is deployed without any other accompanying elements such as final particles or copulas, in order to explore the accomplishment achieved by soo itself without the influence of other accompanying items.

Unlike the other two tokens, soo can be accompanied by various forms of copula and/or final particles, eg. soo (da) ne, soo (da) yo, soo janai (cf. Mizutani 1984; Matsuda 1988; Sztarowsky 1993; Horiguchi 1997; Chen 2001; among others). One of the functions of these accompanying items appear to have is to show the producer’s various stances or attitudes towards some propositional statement or state of affairs. For example, ne and yo generally invite the involvement of the listener (Izuhara 1993; Mizutani and Mizutani 1987). Soo (da) ne and soo (da) yo can also indicate its producer’s affiliation with what is said in the prior talk, but their affiliative work may be achieved by cognitively inviting the involvement of the listener using ne and yo. In contrast, soo does not indicate such an involvement.
It has previously been pointed out that *soo* indicates an affiliative stance of its producer by some *aizuchi* studies (Horiguchi 1997; Matsuda 1988; among others). For example, Matsuda (1988) notes that a group of tokens including *hai, mn, soo desu ne* and *soo* (including its reiterated form such as *soo soo*) are used to express affiliation. However, as in the case of the other two response tokens, i.e. *nn* and *huun*, the focus is on the general functions of *aizuchi* in these.

Kushida (2002), however, treats *soo* as a differentiated object rather than as a part of *aizuchi* and provides detailed observations on this token in a specific environment, i.e. *soo* occurring after possible completions. According to Kushida, *soo* is always deployed by a party who did not produce sufficient talk in the preceding collaborative completion. He argues that *soo* is used after a collaborative completion to acknowledge that what the other speaker has said is what the *soo* producer has planned to say but did not say sufficiently in the preceding collaborative completion. In other words, *soo* treats other speaker’s talk as something that was produced on behalf of the *soo* producer (Kushida 2002).

In this chapter, I will attempt to explicate the accomplishment of *soo* in a wider range of environments, paying close attention to the local sequential context where *soo* occurs as well as to the trajectories of talk following *soo*.

I will first discuss the environment of *soo* in relation to the construction of the talk to which it is oriented in Section 5.2. It will be shown that *soo* is deployed at or around a place where the talk to which it is oriented is possibly complete, or where it is recognisable what the other speaker is saying in the context. In Section 5.3, I will argue that *soo* displays not only its producer’s affiliation with the prior talk but also its producer’s epistemic independence about the matter that is discussed in the talk to which the *soo* is oriented. In Sections 5.4 and 5.5, I will examine trajectories of talk after *soo*, occurring in the following two different sequential contexts, namely, *soo* produced (i) after responsive talk as a third positioned turn (Section 5.4) and (ii) after non-responsive talk as a second positioned turn (Section 5.5). It will be shown that in both sequential contexts there is a strong tendency that *soo* is followed by talk that is
on-topic and deals with the matter that was discussed in the prior talk. I will suggest that *soo* implicates its producer’s orientation to staying in or progressing the matter under discussion (Section 5.6).

**5.2 Basic environment**

*Soo* can be used alone occupying a whole turn, i.e. the freestanding case, or being immediately accompanied by subsequent talk by the producer of the *soo*, i.e. the non-freestanding case\(^2\). Furthermore, *soo* is found to be used both in a single form, i.e. *soo*, and in a reiterated form, e.g. *soo soo soo*\(^3\). In any case, *soo* is regularly placed at or around a place where the turn-constructional unit (TCU) or talk to which it is oriented is possibly complete or where what the other speaker is saying is projectable in the context.

Let us first look at fragment (1), which illustrates a case where the token occurs at a place where the current talk is possibly complete grammatically, intonationally and pragmatically. Miho’s talk in line 3 is produced in response to news that is delivered by Yumi that her sister, who had been undergoing treatment for infertility, is expecting a baby.

(1) [3B: 85]

   so was.good FP or say  
   ‘nn: so ((we)) say that was good or something’

---

\(^2\) Unlike the continuers *nn* and the token *huun*, which are overwhelmingly deployed freestanding (cf. Chapters 2 and 4), the token *soo* does not show any strong tendency that either usage, i.e. freestanding or non-freestanding, is more frequent than the other.

\(^3\) As far as the current data set is concerned, there seems to be a tendency that the shorter the instance of *soo*, the more likely it is that the producer of *soo* will immediately continue with further talk after the *soo*, i.e. non-freestanding *soo*. What seems to be playing a part in this is the turn-taking operation. According to the turn-taking rules proposed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 704), “the first starter acquires rights to a turn” when a ‘current speaker selects next’ technique is not involved. Single *soo* or fewer reiterations of *soo* may be deployed when the producer has more to say, i.e. *soo* is used non-freestanding, as it allows the producer to proceed to the subsequent talk relatively early.
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2 Miho: [sore ga] it SUB 'that’s'

3 Miho: sore ga ichiban no chiryoo da yo.
it SUB best GEN treatment BE FP

4 Yumi: soo soo so. de ichiban: sore ga ii toka itte: ;=

and best it SUB good or say and

'soo soo so.' said that’s the best and'

5 Miho: [=(::)]

Reiterated soo occurs in line 4 where Miho’s talk is possibly complete. Note that Miho’s talk (line 3) is grammatically possibly complete and marked with a final particle yo. A rising terminal contour mapped onto the final particle yo indicates that the talk is also intonationally possibly complete. Furthermore, the turn is recognisable as being possibly complete as an action in the context, i.e. pragmatically possibly complete.

While fragment (1) above has illustrated soo placed precisely at a possible completion without overlap or delay, soo in the data set frequently occurs in an overlap with the talk to which it is oriented. For instance, in fragments (2) and (3), soo occurs slightly before a possible completion of the current turn, i.e. ‘transition space’ (Sacks et al. 1974; Schegloff 1996a) or ‘pre-possible completion’ (Schegloff 1996a).

(2) [9A: 422]

1 Mina: =.hh hoc[n’yamonde sono a*to na*]

therefore that after FP

‘therefore, after that, you know’

2 Saki: [.hh honto girigi]ri da mon n[e]i Really very.close BE NM FP

‘really close, isn’t it?’

3 Mina:→ [ sso : * (. .)

4 *sono ↑ ato * taihen datta n daroo kedo*. (0.2) hima

that after hard was NM BE CONJ not.busy

5 ↑ dat*ta mitai da yo**, =h[j↑ma > cchuu * ka sono*<]; (0.3)

was seem BE FP not.busy QT-say or uhm

‘sso.: after that I guess it was busy, though. It didn’t seem busy, I’m telling you. should I say not busy or, uhm...’

6 Saki: [ o hu : un o, ]
Soo is placed in line 3 terminally overlapping with the final particle \textit{ne} (line 2), which constitutes an ‘utterance-final element’ (Tanaka 1999) of the talk to which the \textit{soo} responds. In other words, the \textit{soo} is occurring slightly preceding the point where Saki’s talk is possibly complete.

In fragment (3), a reiterated \textit{soo} is initiated slightly before the TCU to which it is oriented (lines 3-4) reaches the first possible completion.

(3) [3B: 914]

1 Miho: \textit{=nanka sooyuu ; = nanka (1.1) nanka}\n\textit{uhm such uhm uhm}

2 \textit{sooyuu (.) [< kamoshidashi ]iteru > mono nn[ ; \ such is.producing thing ‘uhm, such, uhm, (1.1) uhm the atmosphere ((the is)) creating, nn:’}

3 Yumi: \textit{[ ima made to sa;]; [ chigau shigeki ga now till from FP ‘from before, you know’ ‘((you)) can get different’}
\textit{different stimulation SUB moraeru n ja[nai kitto]. can.get NM BE-not surely ‘((kind of)) stimulation, I guess’}

4 \textit{‘oh and uhm ((you)) are attracted’}

5 Miho: \textit{[ soo . ] \textit{= a sorede nanka[:; hika]reru n ja[nai. ‘oh therefore uhm is.attracted NM BE-not surely FP anshinkan toka wa tabun [ nai to omou.= sug])goi itsumo= sense.of.security or TOP probably no QT think very always ‘nn; =surely, you know, there won’t be any sense of security or anything, I think. always...’}

6 Yumi: \textit{[ nn : ; tashikani ne, surely]

7 Miho: \textit{[ soo . ] [ nn : ; = tashikani ne, surely]

The reiterated \textit{soo} is initiated immediately after the onset of \textit{janai}, which constitutes a ‘turn-final predicate component’ (Tanaka 1999) and thus a pre-possible completion. That is, the \textit{soo} is proffered where an imminent possible completion is projectable. The \textit{soo} results in a more substantial overlap, however, as Yumi extends the talk with an
additional increment, *kitto* ‘surely’, i.e. ‘add-on’ (Schegloff 1996a) or a ‘post-predicate addition’ (Tanaka 1999)

While *soo* may be orientated to a possible completion, as illustrated by the preceding fragments, I notice that *soo* is also frequently deployed pre-emptively well before a possible completion of the current TCU in the current data set, presumably based on the speaker’s inference or recognition of what the trajectory of the current talk is going to be, i.e. ‘recognitional overlap’ (Jefferson 1983). For example, observe fragment (4), where two groups of reiterated *soo* are proffered in the middle of a TCU. Note that these groups of *soo* are oriented to the talk in lines 13 and 15, which formulates what the producer of *soo* has said earlier, *atashi wa ieba yuu koto kiku to omotten datte* ‘as for me, ((my mother)) thinks that I will obey her if she tells ((me)) to’ (lines 2-3). Prior to the portion below, Rumi tells Yumi that her mother objects to Rumi moving out of her parents’ place while she did not when her sister moved out.

(4) [2B: 1158]
1 Yumi:  
2 Rumi:  
3 Yumi:  
4 Rumi:  
5 Rumi:  
6 (.)  
7 Rumi:  
8 Yumi:  
9 Rumi:  
10 (.)
The first group of *soo* in line 14 is placed at a completion of a preliminary component of a ‘compound TCU’ (cf. Lerner 1991, 1996), which is marked with a conjunctive particle *tara* ‘if’. This place does not constitute a possible completion in terms of any of the three aspects, i.e. grammatical, intonational, or as an action, but projects the occurrence of a further component. However, notice here that the preliminary component to which the first group of *soo* is oriented corresponds closely with the earlier talk that is produced by Rumi, the producer of the *soo*, i.e. *atashi wa ieba* (line 2) and *Rumichan wa iwaretara* (line 13). As the producer of the original talk, it is likely that Rumi recognises that the other speaker is formulating what she has said earlier.

The second group of reiterated *soo* (line 16) is proffered shortly after the first where Yumi’s talk is still in progress, more specifically, at a place marked with a quotation marker *tte* followed by the verb *yuu* ‘say’ (line 13), which indicates that the preceding part is an ‘attributed’ speech or thought (Lerner and Takagi 1999). In this context, the occurrence of an ‘attributing predicate’ (Lerner and Takagi 1999) is highly projectable. Indeed, Yumi continues with an attributing predicate component, *atama ga aru* ‘there is a thought’ (line 15).

Although these groups of *soo* are placed in the middle of the construction of the current talk, the producer of *soo* may be able to reasonably recognise what the other speaker is saying in this particular context with the background information of the
earlier talk on which the current talk is based, as well as with the highly projectable trajectory of the current talk due to its structural design. It is likely that these tokens are pre-emptively deployed based on their producer’s recognition or anticipation of what the other speaker is saying.

In Section 5.2, I have discussed the token’s placement in reference to the TCU to which it responds. It has been shown that soo occurs at or around a possible completion to which it responds or a place where a possible completion is projectable. It has also been demonstrated that soo may be deployed pre-emptively during the construction of the current talk based on the producer’s inference or recognition of what the trajectory of the current talk is likely to be.

5.3 Claims of affiliation and epistemic independence

Now I will consider the role of the token soo and demonstrate that soo does not only display an affiliative stance but also indicates its producer’s ‘epistemic independence’ (Heritage 2002) about the matter discussed in prior talk.

As mentioned earlier, soo displays its producer’s affiliative stance toward what is said in the prior talk. Consider fragment (5) below, where soo is deployed at the beginning of a response turn to an assessment produced by the other speaker, i.e. a ‘second assessment’ (Pomerantz 1984a). This fragment is part of a telling delivered by Miho about a party she went to. The target soo, which is brief and breathy, is proffered in line 5.

(5) [3B: 563]

1 Miho: =>soo [soo soo sooh soo soo soo << oide: toka= come or
‘soo soo soo sooh soo soo soo come ((here)) or something’
2 Yumi: [hhn
3 Miho: =itte [ soo yuu hanashi o [shiteru n da tte. ]
say,and such story OBJ is.doing NM BE QT
‘((the doctor)) said “come here” and ((she)) was saying that kind of thing’
In line 4, Yumi, the recipient of the telling, produces an assessment, sugo omoshiroi ne ‘((she’s/that’s)) very funny’, in reference to a female doctor whom Miho talks about. In response to Yumi’s assessment, Miho produces soo and further demonstrates her affiliative stance by repeating the assessment, i.e. the ‘same evaluation’ (Pomerantz 1984a). The stress put on the intensifier sugo ‘very’ (line 5) may be hearable as upgrading the assessment, which is regarded as a ‘strong agreement’ (Pomerantz 1984a). This instance illustrates that the token soo displays some sort of affiliation with the prior talk to which it is oriented.

An important point I would like to note here is that Yumi’s assessment (line 4) to which the soo is oriented refers to what Miho, the producer of the soo, has recounted in the telling, i.e. Miho’s own experience. In this regard, it is reasonable to assume that Miho has ‘primary access’ to the referent and thus ‘knows better’ about the matter being assessed (Heritage 2002). However, since Yumi is the first speaker who actually articulates the assessment, she holds the status of the first assessor.

According to Heritage (2002), there is a rather significant difference between the roles of first assessor and second. Heritage (2002: 200) argues:

a first assessment establishes a context in which a second can be found to agree or disagree. In such a context, respondents may be vulnerable to the inference that their response is fabricated on the instant to achieve agreement or disagreement and is thus a dependent or even a coerced action within a field of constraint that is established by the first.

Thus, in this context, showing affiliation may be inferred as Miho’s agreeing with Yumi’s assessment, rather than the assessment, i.e. sugo omoshiroi ‘very funny’, being her own independent perspective on the referent. If Miho had already established
the same understanding, perspective, idea, etc. as the first assessment before it is issued and wishes to indicate this, Miho needs to mark it as such in her response. I suggest that the token *soo* is a resource to achieve this purpose. That is, the token *soo* functions to claim that the affiliative stance is independent of the interactional constraint established by the prior talk to which the *soo* is oriented. By using *soo*, its producer claims ‘epistemic independence’ (Heritage 2002), namely, that the producer has independent understanding, knowledge, perspective, idea, etc., which was formed at an earlier occasion in reference to the matter that has been dealt with in the prior talk.

This claim of epistemic independence is further supported by the fact that *soo* is regularly deployed by the party who is presumed to have independent access to, and/or knowledge about, the matter that is being discussed, or referred to, in the prior talk to which the *soo* is oriented. A frequently observed pattern in the data set is that *soo* is deployed in response to talk that deals with the matter that is originally discussed or talked about by the producer of *soo*, as in fragment (5) above. In such a case, the producer of *soo* as the original speaker is presumed to have independent access to, and/or knowledge about, the matter under discussion.

Further, it is also common that the producer of *soo* demonstrates that she has independent access to and/or knowledge about the matter being discussed, by proffering her own relevant knowledge, perspective, experience, etc., as in fragment (5) above and further illustrated by the fragment below. Fragment (6) presents a case where the producer of *soo* proffers her own experience that is similar to what the other speaker has said. The participants are nurses and talking about a doctor who they both know.

(6) [2A: 863]

1  Yumi:               [( ) yat te yat te hu- h uchoosan
     do do QT  head.nurse
     ‘do it, do it, the head nurse’
2  ga,  itsumo,(0.2) moq ne : ; m i ta  sensee ne : ; =
     SUB always          FP   ((name)) doctor FP
     ‘always said that, as for Dr. Mita,’
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3 tsuite >mawatte kore< kaitekudasai. = te chanto tanonde
follow.and this please.write QT properly request
"((you)) should follow and tell him "please write this"
4 kara [ne; kaerasenakya dfame toka itte(h)]( ) heh=
after FP return no.good or say.and
‘before letting him go home’
5 Yuka: [(nhh hhn) ] [ °(heh)° .hhh ]
6 Yuka: ➔=°<soo soo soo>°* goaltenn) kaku°kaku :
the.other.day also so was write write
7 tte yut*te:*; [*dasu wa dasu wa:* tte tte shohon ( )=
QT say.and submit FP submit FP QT say.and prescription
‘suo soo soo the other day was also like that , ((he)) said ((he)) would write
and turn in a prescription’
8 Yumi: [( nnn : °)
9 Yumi: =dasan katta ( ) .hh hok[atearu n da yo ng. = sono mama. =
did.not.submit being.left NM BE FP FP that as.it.is
‘and he didn’t do it. ((things)) are left ((undone)), you know, as ((they)) are,’
10 Yuka: [ hhh
11 Yumi: =*tch °mata sensee kaecchatta : ; toka°.
again doctor have.gone.home or
‘the doctor has gone home again or something like that’

At the beginning of the fragment, Yumi tells Yuka about something that the head nurse always says, which illustrates the doctor’s forgetfulness. Yuka produces the token soo soo soo at a possible completion of Yumi’s talk. Yuka goes on to tell her own relevant experience that affiliates with what is said in the prior talk, i.e. the forgetfulness of the doctor. The subsequent talk after the soo shows that the speaker has her own independent understanding regarding the matter under discussion.

In summary, I have argued that soo does not only display affiliation with the prior talk but also claims an epistemic independence of the producer in reference to the matter being discussed in the prior talk. What should be emphasized here, therefore, is that soo does not merely indicate that the producer holds the same view or stance as what is proffered in the prior talk, i.e. an affiliative stance. The use of soo also claims that such a stance is based on the producer’s understanding, knowledge, perspective, or idea, which was established earlier and independently, and thus is not formed as an immediate response to the prior talk and is independent of the interactional constraint that is set up by the prior talk to which the soo is oriented. To reiterate, a display of
affiliation with *soo* also proposes its producer’s epistemic independence regarding the matter at issue.

### 5.4 Trajectories of talk after *soo*: Following responsive talk

I will explore further the accomplishment of *soo* by examining trajectories of talk after the deployment of *soo*. The trajectories of talk will be examined, focusing particularly on the following two different sequential contexts where *soo* is frequently observed in the data set, namely, (i) as a third placed turn in a context where the other speaker produces responsive talk toward what the producer of the *soo* has said or is saying, and (ii) as a second placed turn following the other speaker’s non-responsive talk. The observation will reveal that, in both sequential contexts, *soo* tends to be followed by further talk on some matter under discussion. Based on this, I will suggest that *soo* implicates its producer’s orientation to progressing or developing the matter discussed in the prior talk.

In Section 5.4, I will discuss the case where *soo* is deployed as a third placed turn following the other speaker’s talk produced in response to what the producer of the *soo* has said. I will first examine the non-freestanding case, i.e. where the producer of *soo* continues to proffer further talk immediately after the *soo*, in 5.4.1. The freestanding case will be examined in 5.4.2.

#### 5.4.1 Non-freestanding *soo*

An environment where *soo* is frequently found is after responsive talk that is proffered in reference to a telling/informing, being deployed by the producer of the telling/informing. The producer of *soo*, i.e. the telling/informing party, often continues to proffer subsequent talk immediately after *soo*. In the current data set, when the subsequent talk is proffered immediately following *soo*, i.e. in the case of non-freestanding *soo*, the subsequent talk is found to always progress further the telling/informing to which the responsive talk is oriented.
Fragments (7) and (8) below illustrate the case where the responsive talk to which soo is oriented is proffered pre-emptively in the middle of some talk. In fragment (7), soo is proffered in response to an affiliative commentary (line 9) that is proffered in the middle of a lengthy TCU. Here, Miho is telling Yumi about a man who complained about the female friends whom Miho brought to the blind date. Miho and this man organised the blind date.

(7) [3B: 952]
1 Miho: \( \text{nn} : (0.2) \text{demo kitto so-} (\cdot) \text{kitto sooyuu huuni} \)
   \( \text{but surely surely such like} \)
2 shiteta to omounu da \( \text{kedo ; =.shh (0.2) muko-} = \)
   \( \text{was.doing QT think NM BE but that.side} \)
   'nn: (0.2) but ((I’m)) sure that ((the)) was doing like that but (0.2) they’
3 Yumi: [aah : ; ]
4 Miho: =nn demo nanka (\cdot) ‘nn : : o \text{demo atashi wa moo} \)
   \( \text{but uhm but I TOP already} \)
5 kichatteru ka[ra; =on*mae:* toka iwa]reteru (kara) =
   \( \text{have.heard CONJ you or is.told because} \)
   ‘nn but uhm mn : : but as for me, (because) I have already heard, I was told you or something’
6 Yumi: [nn : nn : nn : ];
7 Miho: \( \text{sonnan mo saishoni sonna koto iware tara sa ; =.hh} \)
   \( \text{such beginning such thing is.told if FP} \)
8 soko kar[a sa ; ];
   \( \text{there from FP} \)
   ‘if ((I)) was told such a thing at the beginning, from then, you know’
9 Yumi: [atode] itte yo [ ne.
   \( \text{later say FP FP} \)
   ‘((the)) should say ((that)) later, don’t you think?’
10 Miho: ‘soo recover, ((I)) will never be able to recover’
   \( \text{soo=ta[chinao $tachinao$ren=} \)
   \( \text{recover cannot.recover} \)
11 Yumi: \( \text{[ nhh hhhn ]} \)
12 Miho: =echuu no mitaina(h) sa(h)\$ \( \text{QT-say FP seem FP} \)
   ‘((it’s)) like that, you know’
13 Yumi: .ghhh
14 Miho: ↑.ghhh[ de sa : na]nka (0.2) sonnakanji \( \text{de : } \)
   \( \text{and FP uhm such impression BE} \)
   ‘and, you know, uhm (0.2) ((it was something)) like that, and’
15 Yumi: ↓[hee : : : ]_
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In line 9, Yumi proffers the affiliative commentary, _ato de itte yo ne_ ‘((he should)) say ((that)) later, right?’, at a place where Miho’s talk is not yet complete. It is notable that Miho’s talk to which the commentary is oriented does not progress very smoothly, especially in the first half, which contains cut-offs (line 1 and 2), pauses (lines 2 and 4), self-repairs (line 1 and 4), and a formulation (line 5). This suggests that Miho has trouble expressing what she wishes to convey. Another notable point regarding the environment where the responsive talk is proffered is the use of final particle _sa_ (lines 7 and 8). Deployment of the final particles in the middle of a TCU disrupts the progressivity of the on-going talk. This disruption provides the other speaker with an opportunity to enter the turn space (cf. Lerner 1996). Although the onset of Yumi’s commentary occurs slightly earlier than the second final particle _sa_, the successive insertion of the final particle _sa_, which furnishes turn-entry opportunities, may suggest the speaker’s pursuit of a response from the recipient. Considering the trouble Miho has had in constructing the turn, what is sought by Miki may be some response that demonstrates how the current talk is understood by the recipient.

In this context, Yumi’s affiliative commentary is proffered and Miho responds to this with _soo_. With the _soo_, Miho claims not only her affiliation but also that the affiliative stance is based on her own understanding, perspective, idea, etc., which had been formed independently. It should be pointed out that what Yumi is talking about in the turn to which the _soo_ is oriented (line 9) is Miho’s experience. This accordingly suggests Miho’s epistemic priority over the topic in discussion. Further, Yumi’s commentary is contrastive to what Miho has said in the immediately preceding talk, i.e. _saisho ni sonna koto iwaretara_ ‘If ((I)) was told such a thing at the beginning’ (line 7) and _ato de itte yo ne_ ‘((he)) should say that later’ (line 9). In other words, Yumi’s talk is in some way re-wording what Miho has said and can be traced back to Miho’s talk. Being deployed by the original speaker of the talk to which the commentary is oriented, I suggest that the _soo_ indicates that what Yumi has said is exactly what Miho has been trying to say. After the coparticipant has shown a strong understanding, i.e. the commentary (line 9), Miho’s talk may be regarded as being possibly complete.
Following the *soo*, however, Miho proffers on-topic talk with which she further progresses her talk to which the commentary is oriented (lines 10-14).

The orientation to progressing further the matter under discussion is also illustrated by the next fragment. Here, *soo* is deployed in response to the other speaker’s collaboratively completing the *soo* producer’s talk-in-progress. The fragment is a later part of Maki’s talk that proffers her thought about the process of greying hair.

The target *soo* occurs in line 5.

(8) [MY: 240]

1 Maki: *[jitsuwa nanka<sh]ikiso> o : sono .hh (0.3)*
   actually uhm pigment OBJ uhm
2 ha[ete kara mo: [koo mo- mookon kara : ;
   grow after also uhm hair.root from
   ‘actually, uhm, the pigment ((is)), also after ((hair)) has come out, uhm from
   the root of hair’
3 Yuri: [([oo<nn : oo) ]([oo<nn<oo))
   is.supplying
4 Yuri: kyookyuu[shiteru ( )
   ‘is being supplied’
5 Maki: \[soo so_= kyookyuu shitsuzu[kete :
   supply keep.doing.and
   ‘*soo* is kept being supplied and’
6 Yuri: [ano YOOMYAKU
   uhm leaf.veins
7 NO YOO [NI
   GEN like
   ‘uhm like veins of a leaf’
8 Maki: [SO SO SO SO SO SOO.
9 (0.3)
10 Maki: sooyuu huu na no kana : tte chotto<omotta$. such way BE NM FP QT slightly thought
   ((I)) wondered if ((things)) are like that, ((I)) thought ((like that)) a little bit.
11 (0.3)
12 Maki: dem[lo konna- anta tanjun sugi tte $[ka(h)nji ( ) hhn hhn]$ but like.this you simple too QT impression
   ‘but ((it’s)) like you are too simple’

In line 4, Yuri preemptively proffers her candidate understanding of the trajectory of the talk, collaboratively completing Maki’s talk with a final predicate, *kyookyuu*...
Chapter 5

shiteru ‘is supplying’. Overlapping with the candidate understanding, Maki produces soo so (line 5). Immediately following this, Maki continues the talk, recycling the verb that was used in the collaborative completion, i.e. kyookyuu suru ‘to supply’ (lines 4 and 5). By recycling what the other speaker said, the producer of soo demonstrates that what the other speaker has said is exactly what she was going to say (cf. Schegloff 1996b). In addition, Yuri’s candidate understanding is referring to Maki’s thought about the process of greying hair. That is, the soo is proffered in an environment where its producer is not only affiliative but also has already established independent understanding or perspective in reference to the matter under discussion.

What is notable in the subsequent talk following the soo is that the verb is transformed into a conjunctive form, kyookyuu shitsuzukete ‘is kept being supplied and’ (line 5). This projects at least one further component and indicates that there is more to come rather than being complete. The projected subsequent component, however, is not produced. Note that Yuri proffers further candidate understanding (lines 6-7) overlapping with Maki’s talk. Presumably, the lack of a subsequent component is accounted for as a result of abandoning the turn to resolve the overlapping talk. Although the subsequent talk may be cut short due to the overlap, the important point in this discussion here is that the subsequent talk following the soo is on-topic and is strongly oriented to progressing further the current talk rather than closing.

Above, I have examined instances where soo is oriented to responsive talk that is proffered pre-emptively during the construction of some talk. Soo is also commonly found to receive responsive talk that is produced at or around a possible completion of the talk to which it responds. As has been the case with the soo deployed to receive a pre-emptively proffered responsive talk, the immediately subsequent talk by the producer of soo usually progress further the matter discussed in the prior talk. This is illustrated by fragment (9) below. The fragment is part of a lengthy telling where Mina talks about when she gave birth to her daughter. Earlier in the conversation, Mina said
that the hospital was not busy at all as many people avoided having a baby around that
time, i.e. before the new millennium (data not shown).

(9) [9A: 445]
1 Mina: =↓<ichinchi tomarashitekudasai>, [tte ittara ↓;] ↑yokatta yo; =
one.day let.me.stay QT say-CONJ was.good FP
‘when ((I)) asked to let me stay one more day, ((ii)) was good’
2 Saki: [ nhhn hhn ]
3 Mina: =tomareta mon de,
could.stay NM BE
‘because I could stay’
4 Saki: nn[ : : .]
5 Mina: [ o nn : : o]
6 Saki: soo da yo ne_ =ippai dattara tomaren mo[n ne;]
BE FP FP full BE-if cannot.stay NM FP
‘that is so, isn’t it, if it was full, you won’t be able to stay, will you?’
7 Mina:⇒
8 deteke 9 te iwarechau mon ne_ . sonnaamaeta koto yuuna
get.out QT is.told NM FP such spoiled thing do.not.say
9 tte yu° tta hito mo otta kedo : ;=
QT said person also there.was CONJ
‘soo soo soo ((I)) would be told to get out immediately, you know, there was a
person who said that ((I)) shouldn’t say such a childish thing but’
10 Saki: =nn : : ;

Mina’s telling comes to a possible completion in line 5. This is marked with a quiet
and lengthened *mn* with a falling terminal intonation contour, which suggests that the
speaker has nothing more to say on the topic (cf. Chapter 3). Note that the telling has
been possibly complete in terms of grammar and as a conversational action before the
production of the *mn*. In line 6, Saki, the recipient of the telling, produces an affiliative
response and proffers her candidate understanding of what Mina has said. Here, what
Saki is talking about is Mina’s experience and thus Mina has epistemic priority over
what Saki is talking about. Mina responds to Saki’s talk with the token *soo*, indicating
an affiliative stance based on her own pre-established understanding or perspective,
and thereby confirming the proffered candidate understanding is in accord with what
she has been saying. Immediately following this, Mina proffers further on-topic talk,
extending the possibly complete telling (lines 7-9) to which the responsive talk is oriented.

The next fragment illustrates a strategic use of $soo$ where $soo$ is used to take over the other speaker’s turn. The fragment starts with a later part of Maki’s telling regarding sudden increase of her husband’s grey hair.

(10) [MY: 217]

1 Maki: ano : ; hi no hikari ni ikinari ate $tara$ shi(h)roku
   uhm GEN light to suddenly expose if white

2 na(h)[ta toka sooyuu .hh ] happa no sa ;=
   became or such leaf GEN FP
   ‘uhm, when ((it)) is exposed to the sun light, ((it)) became white or something
   like that, ((it’s like)) leaves’

3 Yuri: [ a hah hah hah hah ↑hah]

4 Maki =kan’yooshokubutsu mi(h)taina mon na no kashira toka .hhh$
   foliage.plant seem thing BE NM I.wonder or
   ‘((it)) is like a foliage plant or something like that, I wonder’

5 (0.4)

6 Yuri: demo yoku sa ;= sug@oi kuroo shita hito ga sa ; ; =
   but often FP very hardships had person SUB FP
   ‘but often, you know, a person who went through hardships, you know’

7 Maki: =nn ; ;

8 Yuri: hi- ichi hitoban de sa ; ; (. ) kaminoke
   one one.night within FP hair

9 ga [shi(raga) ni naru tokayuu] no wa [( ) are wa]
   SUB grey.hair to become or say NM TOP that TOP
   ‘within one, one night, you know, the hair becomes grey or something like
   that, that is’

10 Maki: $[sooso_o so.=> dakara hora<] [sugoi- ss ] soonan$
   therefore very disaster

11 shite toka sa [ : ;
   meet.and or FP
   ‘$soo$ $soo$ $so$ therefore, you know, having met a disaster or something, you
   know’

12 Yuri: [“nn : :”;

13 Maki: nanka ; ; sooyuu toki ni sugoi kyoohu o nanika
   uhm such time at terrible fear OBJ something

14 taikenshita [toki ni : ]; hontoni(.) hontoni ichinchi de=
   experienced time at really really one.day in
   ‘uhm at such a time, when someone experienced some terrible fear, really,
   really within one day’

15 Yuri: [ nn : : ];
In line 4, Maki’s telling comes to a possible completion. Following a silence of 0.4 seconds (line 5), Yuri takes the turn, proffering a more general story about increase of grey hair (lines 6-9). This action demonstrates Yuri’s understanding of the upshot or the point of the story as well as her understanding that the telling is over and is relevant at a storytelling completion (cf. Sacks 1973; Jefferson 1978; Schegloff 1992b).

In the middle of Yuri’s talk, Maki pre-emptively comes in with the token soo and goes on to proffer further on-topic talk (line 10). This results in a competitive overlap where both parties deploy overlap resolution revises, i.e. ‘hitches’ and ‘perturbations’ (cf. Schegloff 2000). After quite a substantial overlap, Yuri gives up the turn and stops talking, which leaves her talk unfinished (line 8). In line 12, Yuri aligns herself as the recipient by producing a quiet nn (cf. Chapter 2).

In this fragment, the soo is suggested to be utilised by Maki to claim her right to continue or talk about it as the original speaker. More precisely, the use of soo allows Maki to claim her pre-established independent understanding that aligns with what Yumi has said. As the producer of the original telling to which Yumi’s talk is oriented, Maki may treat what Yuri is saying as part of her telling and thereby claims her rights to take it over as an expansion of her own telling. This instance suggests that the claim of epistemic independence by soo may be utilised by the speaker of the original talk to claim the producer’s rights or priority to talk about the matter under discussion.
Fragment (11) is rather different from the instances discussed above and *soo* is used to receive an answer to an information seeking question. This instance also illustrates that the subsequent talk following *soo* progresses the matter that has been discussed in the talk so far. The *soo* is proffered by the producer of an information seeking question, who does not receive the right answer to it.

(11) [2A: 1040]

1 Yumi: ano ↑ nooge no kawarin- (.) katuoo sensee no ↓; (0.2) uhm brain.surgery of instead ((name)) doctor GEN

2 kootai de kita hito tte > nan te yuu[hiito datta] < ↓ relief as came person QT what QT say person was ‘uhm in the brain surgery ((department)), what’s the person who came as a relief for Dr. Kato called?’

3 Yuka: [ suzuki ] kooji. ((name)) ‘Kooji Suzuki’

4 (1.0)

5 Yumi: → soo sono- sono mae. that that before ‘soo that- before that’

6 (0.4) ((clearing throat))

7 Yuka: ‘ha : ° 6 ; (0.7) ° ↑ otta ka : ° ? there.was Q ‘huh (0.7) was there ((anyone))?’

8 (0.4)

9 Yumi: kita tte(0.7) so ↑ no sensee ↑↑ kotani sensee janakatta? came FP that doctor ((name)) doctor was.not ‘there was (0.7) wasn’t the doctor Dr. Kotani?’

In line 1, Yumi initiates a question, asking for the name of a relief doctor. Before the question reaches a possible completion, Yuka pre-emptively proffers the answer (line 3). After a second silence, Yumi responds to this answer with *soo* and then continues with subsequent talk, asking for a revised answer, *sono mae* ‘before that’ (line 5). The subsequent talk demonstrates that Yumi knows the doctor mentioned by Yuka, ‘Kooji Suzuki’, as *sono mae* ‘before that’ indicates that Yumi places him at a temporal position, i.e. later than the relief doctor. This therefore demonstrates epistemic independence of Yumi, i.e. the *soo* producer. The *soo* may be chosen here to claim that
she already had the name of the person in mind before the name was actually articulated by the other speaker before progressing with the further question to request a revised answer.

In Section 5.4.1, I have examined instances of non-freestanding *soo* that is proffered as a third place turn following responsive talk. It has been demonstrated that in the subsequent talk immediately after *soo*, its producer proffers on-topic talk and progresses further the matter that has been discussed so far. As argued earlier, *soo* claims its producer’s ‘epistemic independence’ (Heritage 2002), namely, that the producer has independently and previously obtained understanding, perspective, idea, etc. By receiving responsive talk with *soo*, the speaker of the original talk to which the responsive talk is oriented to, i.e. the *soo* producer, claims that what is said in the responsive talk is something that the producer already had in mind and thereby confirms it as what the original talk has said or projected before progressing further with the matter under discussion.

**5.4.2 Freestanding *soo***

The producer of *soo* may not proffer subsequent talk immediately after the *soo*, i.e. the freestanding usage. As will be demonstrated in this section, there still is a strong tendency that the subsequent turn following freestanding *soo* further progresses, or expands, the current talk, regardless of whether the subsequent talk is proffered by the other speaker or the producer of the freestanding *soo*.

When producers of the responsive talk proffer the subsequent talk, they tend to expand further the responsive talk, as in the fragment (12) below. The fragment is part of topic talk where Miho talks about a man who she met recently. The target *soo* occurs in line 10.

(12) [3B: 909]

1 Miho: =<tomodachi ni wa :>; 
   friend for TOP 
   ‘for a friend’
2  Yumi: \[ \text{nn} : = \]  
3  Miho: \[ \text{ano sensu toka wa sugoi : nanka yappari dezain toka uhm sense or TOP very uhm after all design or yatteru (.) \[ \text{ka(.)ra ka wa] = wakannai kedo : ; hh demo= is.doing because Q TOP not.know although but 'uhm for the sense or something like that ( ((it)) is very uhm, after all, maybe because ((he)) is doing design or something, ((I)) don't know but,} \]
4  Yumi: \[ [\text{nn} : \text{nn} : :] ; \]  
5  Miho: \[ \text{nanka sooyuu ; = nanka (1.1) nanka sooyuu (.) uhm such uhm uhm such} \]
6  Yumi: \[ [\text{ima made to sa:}] ; [\text{chigau shigeki ga} \text{ ga} \text{ no} \text{ from FP} \text{ different stimulation SUB 'from before, you know'} '((you)) can get different} \]
7  Miho: \[ \text{moraeru n ja[nai kitto]. can.get \text{ NM BE-NEG surely} stimulation, I suppose, for sure’} \]
8  Yumi: \[ \text{[ima made to sa:]; [chigau shigeki ga} \text{ ga} \text{ no} \text{ from FP} \text{ different stimulation SUB 'from before, you know'} '((you)) can get different} \]
9  Miho: \[ [\text{so so so . soo .}} \text{ soso .} \text{ soo. soo.} =] \]
10 Yumi: \[ a \text{ sorede nanka [ ; hika]reru n ja[nai. oh therefore uhm is.attracted NM BE-NEG 'oh that's why uhm ((you)) are attracted, I suppose’} \]
11 Miho: \[ [\text{soo } ] ; [\text{nn ;} = \text{tashikani ne, certainly FP} \text{ 'mn; =surely, you know’}] \]
12 Yumi: \[ \text{anshinkan tokawa tabun [ nai to omou. = sug]goi itsumo= sense.of.security or TOP probably no QT think very always} \]
13 Miho: \[ \text{'there won’t be any sense of security or something like that, I think. always…’} \]
14 Yumi: \[ \text{[nn : nn : : ]}_2 \]

In lines 6-7, the progress of Miho’s talk is disrupted by a pause, repetition, and a hesitation marker \text{nanka ‘well’, which provides Yumi with ‘unprojected opportunities’ to enter the turn space (cf. Lerner 1996). In this environment, Yumi proffers her candidate upshot of what Miho has been saying (lines 8 and 9). What Yumi’s talk is referring to is Miho’s experience and feelings that Miho has reported to Yumi. In other words, Miho has the epistemic priority over this topic. Miho produces \text{soo at a ‘pre-possible completion’ (Schegloff 1996a) of Yumi’s candidate understanding, indicating an affiliative stance based on her own independent understanding. She thereby confirms that the candidate understanding is what she has been trying to say. Latching}
to the so, Yumi goes on with another TCU, which further progresses her candidate upshot to which the token is oriented. A ‘change-of-state token’ (Heritage 1984a) prefacing the second TCU suggests that what follows is produced as a result of a change of state she went through due to the response she received after the first TCU, i.e. so so so so so, and that the expansion is initiated in response to the occurrence of so.

As discussed in Section 5.2, so may be proffered pre-emptively at a much earlier point than a possible completion of the current talk. When a freestanding so is proffered pre-emptively, the speaker of the talk to which the so is oriented often continues with the talk-in-progress toward a possible completion, as shown in fragment (13). In the fragment, two groups of so are deployed pre-emptively during the construction of a candidate understanding of some earlier talk. Prior to the portion below, Yuri said that life must be hard particularly for a family with domestic discord and explained what made her think like that. During Yuri’s talk, there was a problem of understanding (data not shown). At the beginning of the fragment, Yuri elaborates on the problematic part of her earlier talk (lines 1-5).

(13) [MY: 858]
1 Yuri: =dakara: so so dakara mo (sono nani) >utmaku ittenai tte therefore therefore uhm what well is.not.going QT
2 yuu no wa betsuni<(.).kenka o >surutokasoyuu n say NM TOP particularly quarrel OBJ do or such NM
3 janaku[ te : <; (0.3) hontoni aite- aite ni (.) shinsoko= is.not.and really partner to deep.rooted ‘therefore, so so, therefore uhm what ((should I put it)), ((what I meant by)) not going well is not like having quarrel or something like but (0.3) really toward the partner’
4 Maki: [nn : .
5 Yuri: =iyake o kanjiru [ toka $$(sa :)$;$ sick.feeling OBJ feel or FP ‘((you)) feel disgusted or something, you know’
6  Maki:...
7  koto o n nanka >[ai mo sameteru n da kedo wakare rarenai= NM OBJ uhm love also is.cool NM BE but cannot.break.up
   ‘oh oh ((you meant)) some thing like that, although ((you)) don’t love your partner, ((you)) cannot separate’
8  Yuri: ➔
9  Maki: =shi moo [(.) tte yuoo yoona nicchimosacchimo]ikanai yoona =
   also QT say such.as no.way.out such.as
   ‘and ((it’s)) like frustrating and there is no way out’
10 Yumi: ➔
11 Maki: =jootai no .hhh
   situation GEN
   ‘that kind of situation’
12 (0.7)
13 Yumi: n kaisha nanka wa sa kekkoo warikitteru kara
   company or TOP FP quite have.no.doubt.about because
14 ii kedo sa : ;
   alright but FP
   ‘in case of workplace, ((it’s)) okay because it’s just work, but, you know’
15 Maki: 

In line 6, Maki pre-emptively comes in, claiming her revised understanding of what Yuri has said, *aa aa soo yuu koto ne* ‘oh oh that’s what you meant’. The ‘change of state token’ *aa aa* ‘oh oh’ prefacing Maki’s talk indicates that Maki now understands what the other speaker has said (cf. Heritage 1984a). After this in lines 6-11, Maki further presents her candidate understanding of Yumi’s earlier talk. What Maki is referring to here is Yuri’s view or thought on some matter, i.e. a hardship for a family with domestic discord. Yuri, who is the speaker of the original talk and has epistemic priority over this topic, produces a reiterated *soo* twice during the candidate understanding (lines 8 and 10), claiming an affiliative stance based on her own epistemically independent understanding, and thereby confirming the candidate understanding. The talk by Maki to which the groups of *soo* are oriented is progressed toward a possible completion (lines 6-11).

In fragment (14), the producer of the talk to which *soo* is oriented stops the progress of the current talk once, after the onset of reiterated *soo*, but continues with the unfinished talk after the completion of the *soo*. The fragment starts with Yumi’s
commentary (lines 1-2) in reference to Yuka’s telling about their mutual friend who went on a date with a man who has a girlfriend, which was delivered prior to the portion below (data not shown). The target soo is deployed in line 8 in response to a candidate understanding proffered by Yumi.

(14) [2A: 59]
1  Yumi: *he_ e : o : o*, DEMO sa ; = soo yatte kaku tte koto wa nanka but FP like.that write QT NM TOP something
2   a- (.>) > aru n janai<,= jibun no (.). omoi ga [nahnhah. exist NM BE-not self GEN feeling SUB something ‘wow, but, you know, doesn’t the fact that ((she)) write like that ((mean)) there is something, her feelings or something’
3  Yuka: [soo soo soo soo.]
4 (0.9)
5  Yuka: itte mite: sore o shitta n janai kana: toka omotte. go.and see.and that OBJ knew NM BE-not FP or think.and ‘when ((she)) went, ((she)) found out about that, or something like that I think’
6 (0.5)
7  Yumi: ga : = sasowarete:. [itte , oh was.invited.and go.and ‘oh ((she)) was invited and went and
8  Yuka: [soo soo soo soo soo soo;]
9 (0.2)
10 Yumi: (e) kanojo 1ru n da *yo:* *tte [itte
girlfriend exist NM BE FP QT say.and ‘that ((he)) has a girlfriend’
11 Yuka: [^hn : : .]
12 (2.2)
13 Yuka: SORE tte donna shinri na notte kijite mita no.(1.0) kanojo that QT what mentality BE FP QT ask.and try FP girlfriend
14 ga iru noni: saso (0.3) deeto ni sasou tte [donna shinri ]↑hn ↓ SUB exist despite invite date to invite QT what mentality ‘((I)) asked what sort of mentality that is, what sort of mentality is that to ask to go on a date despite that ((he)) has a girlfriend nn’
15 Yumi: [a kare ni]↓
oh boyfriend to ‘oh to ((your)) boyfriend?’

In line 5, Yuka proffers what she thinks regarding the matter that is raised in the commentary. After a silence of 0.5 seconds, Yumi produces her candidate
understanding of what Yuka has said in the immediately preceding turn. This turn is prefaced with a ‘change-of-state token’ (Heritage 1984a), *aa* ‘oh’, which claims that the speaker now understands what the other speaker has said and displays the speaker’s “confidence or certainty” in the candidate understanding (Heritage 1984a: 321). The target token, *soo soo soo soo soo soo* (line 8), is pre-emptively deployed in the middle of the construction of the candidate understanding at a place that is marked with a conjunctive form of a verb, *sasowarete* ‘was invited and’ (line 7). Yumi stops talking after the brief subsequent component, *itte* ‘go and’, which is also marked with a conjunctive form. The rather lengthy reiteration of *soo* indicates that there will be no imminent subsequent talk by the same speaker and thus is designed as freestanding⁴. After the brief silence following the completion of the token, Yumi continues her candidate understanding to which the *soo* is oriented toward its completion.

So far, I have discussed the case where the subsequent talk following *soo* is produced by the other speaker, i.e. the speaker of the talk to which the *soo* is oriented. When no further talk has been forthcoming from the other speaker after the *soo*, the producer of *soo* may take the subsequent turn. Like in the case of non-freestanding *soo* (cf. Section 5.4.1), the producer of *soo* tends to proffer on-topic talk, which further progresses the current talk.

Observe fragment (15), where *soo* is proffered in response to a candidate understanding that is provided in the middle of the on-going talk by the *soo* producer. The portion below is part of a lengthy telling by Maki about her husband’s grey hair. Here, Maki is talking about her observation of the process of greying hair. The target token occurs in line 8. The *soo* in line 5 was discussed earlier in example (8).

---

⁴ As noted earlier, *soo* that is followed immediately by the same speaker talk, i.e. a non-freestanding *soo*, is usually kept brief so that the same speaker will be able to initiate the subsequent talk as early as possible.
(15) [MY: 240]

1 Maki: jitsuwa nanka <shlikiso> o sono : hh (0.3) actually uhm pigment OBJ uhm

2 ha[ete kara mo: [koo mo- moookon kara ; grow after also uhm hair.root from 'actually, uhm, the pigment ((is)), also after ((hair)) has come out, uhm from the root of hair'

3 Yuri: [(oon: oo) [(oonnoo)]

4 Yuri: kyookyuu[shiteru ( ) is.supplying 'is being supplied'

5 Maki: [soo so_ = kyookyuu shitsuzukete : supply keep.doing.and 'soo so is kept being supplied and'

6 Yuri: [ano YOOMYAKU uhm leaf.veins

7 NO YOO [NI GEN like 'uhm like veins of a leaf'

8 Maki:⇒ [SO SO SO SO SO SO SOO.

9 (0.3)

10 Maki: soovyu huuna no kana : tte chotto°omotta°. such like NM FP QT slightly thought ((I)) wondered if ((things)) are like that, ((I)) thought ((like that)) a little bit.

11 (0.3)

12 Maki: dem[lo konna- anta tanjun sugi tte $[ka(h)nj(o ) hhn hhn ]$ but like.this you simple too QT impression 'but ((it’s)) like you are too simple'

13 Yuri: [( ) [S hah hhn hhn hhn ] .hhh=

14 Maki: =$sugoi wakariyasui$ °toka (itte)° very easy.to.understand or say 'very easy to see, or something ((I)) said'

In line 4, Yuri proffers her candidate understanding of the trajectory of the current talk, which collaboratively completes the TCU in progress. In line 5, overlapping with Yuri’s collaborative completion, Maki produces soo so, confirming that the collaborative completion is exactly what Maki was going to say (cf. example 8). Immediately following the soo, Maki continues with her on-going talk, recycling what Yuri has said. In doing so, Maki changes the verb form from kyookyuu shiteru ‘is supplying’ (line 4) to kyookyuu shitsuzukete ‘is continuing to supply, and’ (line 5), which turns the current TCU into a preliminary component of a conjunctive TCU.
Consequently, Maki’s talk in line 5 projects a further component. However, Maki does not continue to produce the subsequent component. This is presumably due to the overlapping talk as a result of Yuri’s proffering a further candidate understanding in lines 6-7.

Maki responds to this candidate understanding (lines 6-7) with a reiterated *soo*. The length of this *soo* makes a great contrast with the prior non-freestanding *soo* produced in line 5, immediately after which its producer continues with the subsequent talk. The lengthy *soo* suggests that its producer is not competing for the turn to produce further talk, and thus the token in line 8 is designed as freestanding. By doing so, Maki makes the subsequent turn available for the other speaker. Maki may thereby encourage the other speaker to continue with further talk. Yuri, however, does not produce further talk. Note the silence (line 9) following the *soo* as well as the absence of talk by Yuri during the lengthy token. These suggest that Yuri is not proffering further talk. In this context where Yuri’s further talk has not been forthcoming, Maki self-selects and takes the turn (line 10). In the turn after the *soo*, although not in continuation of the prior TCU that was left unfinished, the subsequent talk following the *soo* is on-topic and progresses further the telling on her husband’s grey hair.

Fragment (16) illustrates another case where the producer of *soo* proffers further talk after some silence. In this fragment, *soo* is proffered in response to a commentary (lines 1 and 2) produced in reference to a telling about their mutual friend who went on a date with a man who has a girlfriend. The telling was delivered earlier by Yuka, the producer of the *soo*. The target *soo* is produced in line 3.

(16) [2A: 59]
1 Yumi: *he_e : o : o*, DEMO sa ; = soo yatte kaku tte koto wa nanka but FP like that write QT NM TOP something
2 a_ (.) > aru n janai< = jibun no (.) omoi ga [nahnkah. exist NM BE not self GEN feeling SUB something ‘wow, but, you know, doesn’t the fact that ((she)) writes like that ((mean)) there is something, her feelings or something’
3 Yuka: ➔ [soo soo soo soo.
4 (0.9)
Yumi’s commentary (lines 1 and 2) is oriented to the telling delivered by Yuka. Being the teller, it is plausible that Yuka has independent access to and knowledge about the matter that is dealt with in Yumi’s talk, i.e. epistemic independence. Terminally overlapping with Yumi’s talk, Yuka proffers a reiterated soo in line 3, claiming an affiliative stance based on her understanding or perspective that was already formed independently. Yuka does not proffer further talk immediately after the soo. The silence following the soo (line 4) clearly indicates that the other speaker is not taking the turn either. After the silence of 0.9 seconds, Yuka, the producer of soo, takes the turn. The subsequent talk after the soo (line 5) proffers further talk, which topically aligns with the commentary as well as the telling to which the commentary is oriented.

In Section 5.4.2, I have examined trajectories of talk after the freestanding soo and have shown that the freestanding soo tends to be followed by a continuation or further progress of the talk to which the responsive talk is oriented rather than a closure. More precisely, when a freestanding soo is pre-emptively deployed, the other speaker, i.e. the speaker of the talk to which the soo is oriented, tends to continue the talk-in-progress. When soo is proffered at or around possible completion and the other speaker takes the subsequent turn, it was shown that the other speaker tends to further expand the talk to which the soo is oriented. In addition, when further talk by the other speaker
has not been forthcoming, there is a strong tendency that the producer of *soo* proffers further talk on the matter under discussion.

### 5.5 Trajectories of talk after *soo*: Following non-responsive talk

Section 5.5 will examine the case where *soo* is deployed as a second positioned turn to receive other speaker's talk that is not designed as a response to earlier talk. I will first examine instances of the non-freestanding *soo* deployed in this sequential position in Section 5.5.1, and then move onto the case of freestanding *soo* in Section 5.5.2.

#### 5.5.1 Non-freestanding *soo*

In the current data set, the subsequent talk following the non-freestanding *soo* in this sequential context, i.e. as a second placed turn, appears to always align topically with the talk to which the *soo* is oriented. More concretely, the subsequent talk following non-freestanding *soo* as a second placed turn is found to proffer its producer's own relevant knowledge, understanding, perspective, experience, etc., about some matter or issue that is discussed or raised in the prior talk by the other speaker.

For instance, fragment (17) illustrates a case where the producer of *soo* proffers her own independently obtained equivalent experience to what has been said in the prior talk by a coparticipant. The fragment is part of topic talk where Yumi and Yuka talk about a forgetful doctor whom they both have an experience working with. Up to line 10, Yumi recounts an episode that illustrates the doctor's forgetfulness. The target *soo* is proffered in line 12. Note that this instance of *soo* was examined earlier as fragment (6).
(17) [2A: 856]

1 Yumi: でってさせつai いつすも＞ ATK terun て ていね フピ definitely always remain NM BE FP

2 みたせんせい [(no)<

((name)) doctor GEN

‘because, you know, Dr Mita’s stuff always remains unfinished’

3 ユカ:

[スオ Sweat. = スオ Sweat. = スオ Sweat.

4 ユミ: みつむせんせいきたとき＜ゆっくり
doctor came when said

5 *noni : [ : *>. CONJ

‘although ((I)) told ((him)) when he came.’

6 ユカ:

[あっはははははははははははははははは

7 ユミ: どこでゆっくりてつは- スーホウ san

8 が,いつすも, (0.2) もoo ne : ; みたせんせい ne : ; SUB always FP ((name)) doctor FP

‘always said that, as for Dr. Mita,’

9 =ついて＞まわッてこり＜かいべくササai＝て ちャントたんもでfollow around and this please write QT properly request

‘(you) should follow and tell him “please write this”’

10 カラ [ね : ; カレアセナキヤ [aime toka itte(h)] ( ) へה= after FP let return no good or say and

‘before letting him go home’

11 ユカ: [(ンッ ハン) [ あっ ハン]

12 ユカ: ➔

= あっ ハン, =

13 ユミ: =たっかた( ).ハホキ[あつたる] スオ
independence, namely, she had independently formed the same perspective about the doctor. Immediately after the soo, Yuka continues with further talk (lines 12-13). Yuka proffers an episode of her own relevant experience that also shows the doctor’s forgetfulness, which goes beyond the mere claim and demonstrates the producer’s affiliative stance and epistemic independence.

In fragment (18), the producer of soo proffers her own understanding or knowledge about the matter that was raised in the prior talk to which the soo is oriented. Yumi and Yuka are talking about their mutual friend, Rikako, whom they appear to have lost contact with.

(18) [2A: 495]
1 Yumi: ima rikako chan ga wakaran;= atashi . h
   now ((name)) SUB not.know I
   ‘I don’t know ((the contact detail)) of Rikako’
2 Yuka: ga > atashi mowakaran wa<.
   oh I also not.know FP
   ‘oh I don’t know either’
3 Yumi: dokoni(h) oru(h)te [.hhh [ renraku zenzen shitenai.=
   where exist NM BE QT contact not.at.all not.do
   ‘((I)) wonder where ((she)) is, ((I)) am not in touch with ((her)) at all.’
4 Yuka: ^o: o. o(>demo<)^o
5 Yumi: demo moo sorosoro kaettekuru n [ janai no;]
   but soon come.back NM BE-not FP
   ‘but isn’t ((she)) coming back soon’
6 Yuka: => demo moo
7 kaettekuru n yanai; hoshitara . hhh renraku : ‘(. ) ma [ yamachan
   come.back NM BE-not then contact well ((name))
   ‘soo so isn’t ((she)) coming back around February. then ((we)) contact, well,
   Yama-chan’
8 Yumi: [nn : .
9 Yuka: toko wa aru( .) daroo kara sa :=
   place TOP exist BE because FP
   ‘is probably in touch ((with her)), you know’
11 Yuka: nanaka (chotto zutto) itte renraku sureba mata * aeru
   uhm slightly throughout go contact do-CONJ again can see
   ‘well if ((I)) contact again, ((I)) can see ((her)) again’
In line 5, Yumi proffers her assumption on the circumstances of the friend, *demo moo sorosoro kaette kurun janai no* ‘but isn’t she almost coming back?’. Yuka responds to this with *soo*, claiming that she already formed the same perspective independently at an earlier occasion. Immediately after the *soo*, Yuka proffers her own relevant knowledge about the matter under discussion, elaborating on what Yumi has said, *nigatsu kurai ni kaette kurun yanai* ‘isn’t she coming back around February?’. This demonstrates its producer’s epistemic independence as well as affiliative stance. Following this, Yumi continues with further talk about this friend, Rikako, talking about a possible way to reach her again (lines 7-12).

Above, I have discussed the case of non-freestanding *soo* that is deployed as a second positioned turn following non-responsive talk. When producers of *soo* proffer subsequent talk immediately after the *soo*, they were found to proffer own independent understanding, knowledge, experience, etc., about the matter that was raised or discussed in the prior talk by the other speaker, which demonstrates the producer’s epistemic independence and affiliative stance.

### 5.5.2 Freestanding *soo*

I will now discuss the freestanding case where the producer of *soo* does not continue with further talk immediately after the *soo*. When the other speaker, i.e. the speaker of the talk to which the *soo* is oriented, takes the subsequent turn, she usually further extends the talk to which the *soo* is oriented, as shown in fragments (19) and (20) below.

In fragment (19), Yumi and Yuka, who are both nurses, are talking about a forgetful doctor, Dr. Mita, whom they both have an experience working with.
Preceding this fragment, they were talking about whether the head nurse would recognise Yumi, who no longer works with the head nurse. This fragment starts with Yumi’s claim that the doctor would not remember her. This is followed by Yuka’s assertion that he is forgetful (lines 3 and 4).

(19) [2A: 834]
1 Yumi: sensee toka demo sa: = zettai mitasensee tokaoboetenai doctor or even.though FP definitely ((name)) or not.remember
2 to omou. = QT think
‘as for doctors or someone, you know, ((I)) definitely think that Dr. Mita does not remember’
3 Yuka: = mita sensee ne : ↑ ho : nто wasureppoi mon. huh hh hh .hh
((name)) doctor FP really forgetful NM
‘Dr. Mita, you know, is really forgetful’
4 wara ↑ eru [ gurai wasureppoi mon.]
can.laugh as.much.as forgetful NM
‘((he)) is so forgetful that ((people)) could laugh’
((lines 5 to 24 omitted))

25 Yumi: = da:tte sa zettai itsumo > nokotteru n da tte because FP definitely always remain NM BE FP
26 mita sensei [(no)<
((name)) doctor GEN
‘because, you know, Dr Mita’s stuff always remains unfinished’
27 Yuka: → [ soo. = soo. = soo ] soo.
28 Yumi: * noni : [ : *].
CONJ
‘although ((I)) told ((him)) when he came.’
29 Yuka: [ ahh hah hah hh hh .hh[h

In line 25, Yumi begins to proffer an instance that illustrates the doctor’s forgetfulness, i.e. he forgets to do what he has been asked to do. Yuka, who has independent access to and knowledge about this doctor and his forgetfulness (cf. lines 3 and 4), responds to this with a reiterated soo, claiming an affiliative stance as well as epistemic independence. The soo is produced freestanding in the turn and not accompanied by
further talk. In the subsequent turn, Yumi extends what she has said in the turn to which the *soo* is oriented with further on-topic talk.

Fragment (20) below shows that the subsequent talk by the other speaker may not be proffered immediately after *soo*. This portion is taken from a later part of topic talk about the forgetful doctor discussed in fragment (19). As noted earlier in the discussion of fragment (19), both Yuka and Yumi have independent access to and knowledge about the doctor.

(20) [2A: 873]

1 Yuka: *mn: =*kotchi ga nanka m* mendoo*na* tema (.)
   here SUB uhmm troublesome trouble
2 kake(h)na ika(h)nu(h) naru(h)°. hh=
   have.to.take become
   ‘mn : ((it)) becomes like we have to take extra trouble’
3 Yumi: =soo° oo soo so°°
4 (1.3)
5 Yuka: oo sensei no sewa shitoru mita(h)i.=hah hah hah[(nanka)°°.hhh↓hah
   doctor GEN case is.doing.seem
   ‘((itʼs)) like ((we)) are looking after the doctor’
6 Yumi: [soo(h) soo(h) .hhh=
7 Yumi: =sewa ga yakeru tokaitte yoku itteta °(yappa) huchoosan°.
   care SUB take or say.and often was.saying after.all head.nurse
   ‘((she)) was often saying that ((the doctor)) needs extra assistance, after all,
   the head nurse ((was saying)).
8 (0.4)
9 Yuka: nhh hh (.) °*[ [ nakajima sensee wa chanto yatte]kureru
   (name) doctor TOP properly do
   ‘Dr Nakajima does things properly’

At the beginning of the fragment, Yuka proffers a summary assessment about the doctor. Yumi responds to this with *soo* with a lower volume, claiming affiliation based on her view or understanding that was formed independently at an earlier occasion. It is notable that, whereas Yuka’s talk, to which the token is oriented, is marked with ‘within-speech laugh particles’ (Jefferson 1979), the *soo* is not. The ‘within-speech laugh particles’ invite the recipient to laugh (cf. Jefferson 1979). Jefferson (1979)
argues that, when the recipient declines an invitation to laugh, the recipient pursues another aspect of the utterance, that is, its ‘topical import’. Therefore, the *soo soo soo* by Yumi, which is not particularly marked with laughter, may indicate her pursuit of the topic. The *soo*, however, is deployed freestanding in the turn and Yumi proffers no immediate further talk on the topic. A silence occurs as neither Yumi nor Yuka takes the subsequent talk after the *soo*. After the 1.3 second silence, Yuka takes the turn. In this turn after the *soo*, Yuka proffers on-topic talk, expanding her prior talk to which the *soo* is oriented.

The producer of a freestanding *soo* may take the subsequent turn when talk by other speaker has not been forthcoming. Similar to the case with non-freestanding *soo*, the speaker of the freestanding *soo* tends to proffer own understanding, knowledge, or perspective on the matter being discussed in the talk to which the *soo* is oriented, as shown in fragment (21) below.

Fragment (21) starts with the end of a telling where Yumi reports on a lively chat she was in, where one of the participants’ mutual friends, Seri, complains about another friend, Eri. It appears that Seri and Eri do not get on well with each other.

(21) [2A: 532]
1 Yumi: =$ sugoi omoshiro(a(h))tta seri chan$ .
very was.funny ((name))
‘((she)) was very funny, Seri ((was))’

2
hh [.hh aikawarazu datta yo]&
same was FP
‘((she)) hasn’t changed’

3 Yuka: [ de(mo) mata (chigau) byooin ni kawattorude na isshoni. hhhuh=
but again different hospital to change FP together
‘but again ((they)) are transferred to another hospital together’

4 Yumi: ➔=soo soo soo soo soo.

5 (0.7)

6 Yumi: jissho da mon ne, =zutto ne?
together BE NM FP all.the.time FP
‘((they)) are together, you know, all the time, you know’

7 (2.0)

8 Yuka: ‘nn : ; demo kekkonshiki mo itta yanai tabun’.
but wedding also went BE-not probably
‘nn : : but ((she)) also went to the wedding, probably’
Yumi’s telling comes to a possible completion in line 1. Overlapping with an additional component by Yumi in line 2, Yuka initiates talk about the circumstance of these two friends, i.e. Seri and Eri, saying that they transferred to the same hospital together (despite the fact that they do not get along well with each other). Yumi responds to this with *soo* (line 4). Neither of the participants takes the next turn and a silence occurs (line 5). When Yumi takes the turn following the silence, she proffers her own understanding or perspective about the friends under discussion, which affiliates with what Yuka has said in line 3 in the turn to which the *soo* responds.

Fragment (22) illustrates another case where the producer of *soo* takes a subsequent turn after some silence. In this fragment, the subsequent talk by the producer of *soo* proffers the producer’s own independent knowledge about the matter under discussion, but also demonstrates a slight shift in the topic. The portion below is part of a lengthy topic talk where Yumi and Yuka collaboratively figure out the chronology of their mutual friends’ weddings. Yumi’s talk at the beginning of the fragment is produced while Yuka expands her telling regarding the trouble caused by the two weddings held on the same day. In lines 1 and 3, Yumi introduces another troubled case of other friend, which Yumi describes as *gocha gocha gocha shiteta* ‘((things)) were confused’ (line 1).

(22) [2A: 644]

1 Yumi: [ANO HEN MO NA]NKA gocha gocha gocha shiteta =
around.there also uhm was.confused
‘((things)) were confused around there’

2 Yuka: [ tomodachi no : ]
friend GEN
‘((their)) friend’s’

3 Yumi: =n [da yo ne,=k]umi chan to (. )°(tana[ka kun]°
BE FP FP ((name)) and ((name))
‘right? Kumi and (Tanaka)’

4 Yuka: ➔ [ soo soo ].
[soo soo °soo soo°.]

5 (0.7)
In line 4, Yuka proffers the token *soo*, claiming that she has a relevant perspective that was formed independently at an earlier occasion. After a silence of 0.7 seconds (line 5), Yuka takes the turn and proffers her candidate understanding about the groom mentioned in the prior talk, *atopii no kare desho* ‘the one with atopic eczema, right?’, which suggests her independent access to the referent discussed in the talk to which the *soo* is oriented. Yuka’s talk following the *soo* is topically related to the prior talk but is rather ‘tangential’ (Jefferson 1978) to the on-going talk, which discusses the troubled wedding of their friend. What is notable here is that Yuka’s talk is marked with ‘within-speech laughter’, which is denoted by ‘(h)’ in the fragment, and with laugh tokens after a possible completion of the TCU, i.e. *hoh hoh* in line 6 (cf. Jefferson 1979). This suggests that Yuka’s talk is designed not to be taken up for its topical import but as an invitation to laugh together (cf. Jefferson 1979). Yuka’s talk is responded to by Yumi, who does not pursue the topic but proffers a disclaimer, *shirante sonna koto made* ‘I wouldn’t know such a thing’, which is also marked with laugh particles. This is followed by laughing together (lines 8-10). After this, the
participants collaboratively return to the talk to which the *soo* is oriented. Note that Yuka, the producer of *soo*, proffers talk that topically aligns with the talk to which the *soo* is oriented and demonstrates her affiliative stance (line 12). In this fragment, the subsequent talk demonstrates a slight shift in topic. The shift in topic, however, is not substantial and the talk with the shift has shown to be designed as not to be taken up for further development. The tangential talk in line 6 can be seen as initiating a ‘side sequence’ (Jefferson 1972). Upon its completion, the participants return to the talk to which the *soo* is oriented and continue with it.

In Section 5.5, I have examined trajectories of talk following *soo* deployed as a second positioned turn. It has been demonstrated that when producers of *soo* continue to the subsequent talk immediately after the *soo*, they proffer relevant understanding, knowledge, perspectives, ideas etc. regarding the matter that was raised or discussed in the prior talk. I have also examined instances where *soo* is deployed freestanding. It has been shown that when the other speaker proffers the subsequent talk, it tends to progress further the talk to which the *soo* is oriented. When no further talk is forthcoming by the other speaker, the producer of *soo* may take the subsequent turn to proffer talk on the matter that is discussed in the prior talk. The instances have shown that *soo* may not be immediately followed by subsequent talk but by a delay. It is quite striking that even when *soo* is followed by a delay, the subsequent talk tends to pick up the topic of the talk to which the *soo* is oriented, as delays often indicate that talk on the topic is exhausted.

### 5.6 Orientation to developing the current talk

In Sections 5.4 and 5.5 above, I have examined trajectories of talk after *soo* deployed in two different sequential contexts, i.e. (i) following responsive talk as a third placed turn and (ii) following non-responsive talk as a second placed turn. Although the sequential contexts where *soo* is deployed are different, there is a
common trait found in the trajectories of talk after *soo*. That is, the subsequent talk after the *soo* tends to deal with the matter with which the prior talk is concerned, regardless of whether it is proffered by the other speaker or by the producer of the *soo*. This tendency suggests that *soo* implicates an orientation to staying in and progressing further the matter under discussion. Recall that *soo* claims the producer’s epistemic independence as well as that it shows the producer’s affiliative stance toward the prior talk. What may be further achieved by showing such an affiliative stance, i.e. that the participants have aligned independent understanding, perspective, knowledge, or idea about the matter under discussion, is to mark the current context as the common ground on which further talk may be developed. I propose that *soo* indicates its producer’s understanding that the current talk is relevant for further development.

This feature of *soo* may be utilised to indicate the producer’s orientation toward staying in or progressing with the current talk, that is, to propose further talk on the topic, even in the case where the prior turn does not contain much to show affiliation with. For example, observe fragment (23), where *soo* is deployed following a receipt *nn*, which suggests that its producer has nothing to say and thus proposes a closure of the current talk (cf. Chapter 3). In the fragment, Mina is talking about a pain she experienced after giving birth to her daughter.

(23) 9A:326

1 Mina: nanka kon konna yoko de na(h)tte sa(h) : (netotta da yo).
   well like.this side at become FP was.lying BEFP

2 (itakute [hiji tsuite])
   painful.and on.elbow
   ‘well, this, like this, I was lying on my side, it was hurting ((so I was lying))
   on my elbow’

3 Saki:
   ["itasoo dana : :"]
   look.painful BE FP
   ‘((it)) sounds painful’

4 Mina: [i^takatta na:; ^tashikani]
   was.painful FP surely

5 itakatta kedo na : ?
   was.painful but FP
   ‘((it)) was painful, you know, ((it)) surely was painful, you know’
Chapter 5

At a possible completion of Mina’s talk, Saki proffers an assessment, *itasoo dana* ‘sounds painful’ (line 3). Mina expands her own prior talk, upgrading the assessment by using *tashikani* ‘surely’. In line 8, Saki produces a very quiet receipt *mn*, showing that she has nothing to say on the topic and proposes a possible closure of the topic-in-progress. In the next turn, Mina proffers the token *soo* and further on-topic talk, which expands her prior talk about the pain she experienced (lines 9-12). *Soo* may be deployed here in this environment where a closure of the current talk is implicated to indicate the teller’s orientation to staying in the current talk before proffering further on-topic talk.

Fragment (24) shows an instance where *soo* is deployed freestanding in a closing sequence. This *soo* seems to show the producer’s willingness to stay in the telling. At the beginning of the fragment, Yumi takes up the news that was delivered by Yuka earlier in conversation about their mutual friend, Mitchan. The target *soo* occurs in line 10.

(24) [2A: 140]

1. Yumi: e saikin: atta n da. = soo*yuu no gah°. Recently there was NM BE such NM SUB ‘((it)) happened recently, such a thing’
Yumi’s talk in line 1 takes up the talk about the news for further development. Yuka responds to this by providing more elaborated information. Following a silence of 0.7 seconds (line 3), Yumi produces a commentary in reference to the protagonist of the news, Mitchan. Yuka responds to this with a reiterated *soo*, claiming that she has had an independently formed similar understanding. After half a 0.5 second silence, Yuka proffers talk about Mitchan, which is hearable as thinking aloud. Yumi does not respond to this but explicitly claims an absence of her prior knowledge about the news instead (line 9). In the subsequent turn, a freestanding *soo* is produced by Yuka (line 10).
What is remarkable about the environment where the soo is produced is that the participants appear to have little to say on the news and a closure of the topic is implicated. Note that there is not much topical development after Yuka’s talk in line 2. In this environment, the freestanding soo may be used to indicate that the teller is willing to stay in the topic. Following this, however, the other speaker does not take the turn and a silence occurs (line 11). In line 12, Yumi, the telling recipient, proffers *huun*, with which she also shows an orientation to staying in the telling (cf. Chapter 4). Indeed, in line 15, Yuka, the teller, takes the turn and proffers further talk in reference to the news delivered earlier.

Above, I have shown that soo indicates its producer’s orientation to developing or progressing further the current talk and proposes further talk on the topic in a context where closure of the current talk is implicated. It should be noted, however, that the use of soo does not guarantee a further progress of the current talk. This progress is something that is ‘achieved’ by the participants. There is a small set of soo found in the data that fails to achieve further progress of the current talk and followed by a closure and a major shift in topic. In these cases, some sort of negotiation regularly occurs between the participants, delaying a major shift in topic, as shown in fragments (25) and (26) below.

In fragment (25), a major topic shift is proffered by the speaker of the token. The portion below is a later part of a long stretch of talk that follows Yuka’s telling regarding the recent romance of their mutual friend, Mitchan. Immediately prior to the excerpt, Yumi produces a summary-like commentary, claiming absence of her prior knowledge regarding what she has heard in the telling, *shirankatta sore wa ‘I didn't know that’* (data not shown).

(25) [2A: 322]

1 Yuka: °anma shaberu°kikai ga nai n janai ( )° ( [ ] )°
   not.much talk chance SUB no NM BE-not
   ‘there aren’t many opportunities to talk’
In line 1, Yuka proffers her speculation as to why Yumi did not know about the friend’s recent romance, i.e. a lack of opportunities to talk. This receives an affiliative response from the recipient (lines 2-3). Yuka minimally acknowledges the response with a receipt \( mn \) (line 4). Following a silence of 0.4 seconds, Yuka self-selects as the next speaker, proffering further talk that refers to the current circumstance of Mitchan (line 6). \( \mathrm{Soo} \) is pre-emptively deployed in response to this turn (line 7). In the subsequent turn, Yuka produces a very quiet \( mn \) (line 9), showing that she has nothing more to say and thereby proposing a possible closure of the current topic. There is a rather long silence of 2.7 seconds after this. This also suggests that the producer of \( \mathrm{soo} \) has nothing to say. Note that the producer of \( \mathrm{soo} \) often proffers further on-topic talk where no further talk has been forthcoming by the other speaker (cf. Section 5.5.2). After the silence, Yumi takes the turn and initiates talk about her having less contact with her friends. This demonstrates a major shift in topic, although it is somewhat related to the prior topic. The important point here is that the major topic shift is preceded by a closure proposal (line 9) and subsequent silence (line 10). In addition,
the talk with the major topic shift is prefaced by what may be called ‘pre-placed appositionals’ (Sacks et al. 1974; Schegloff 1987a), demo ‘but’ and yappa ‘after all’, which serve to further delay the delivery of the very component that demonstrates the topic shift.

Fragment (26) illustrates another case where soo is followed by a substantial shift in topic. In the previous example, the producer of the token proffers a topical shift. In fragment (26), however, talk with topic shift is produced by the other speaker. The target soo (line 15) is used in response to an affiliative commentary proffered towards talk that is delivered by the soo producer. Miho’s question in line 1 is initiated after Yumi’s telling about her sister’s infertility treatment.

(26) [3B: 218]

1 Miho: Yumi chan wa doo na no?  
((name)) TOP how BE FP  
‘how about you, Yumi’

2 Yumi: mada.  
not,yet  
‘not yet’

3

4 ?: *mada*=  
not,yet  
‘not yet’

5 Miho: =yotee wa mitee?  
plan TOP not.decided  
‘((you have)) no plans yet’

6

7 Yumi: nn : : ; iya- betsumi (,)are janai n da *kedo*,:=  
no particular that BE-not NM BE CONJ  
‘nn : : ((it’s)) not like that but’

8 Miho: =nn [ ;  

9 Yumi: [ mada dekite nai ne,  
not,yet done not FP  
‘((it’s)) not there yet’

10 Miho: oo(↑n; [: : ] ↑n)oo=  
(4.2)
The stretch of topic talk initiated by this question comes to a completion in line 11, which is followed by a long silence of 4.2 seconds (line 12). However, in line 13, Yumi extends her talk, *nantomo (0.6) (wakaran ne) sore wa* ‘quite, ((I)) wouldn’t know about that’, which wraps up what has said. Miho responds to this by claiming her affiliation, *da yo ne* ‘((it)) is, isn’t it’, which is further followed by an affiliative commentary, *kamisama shika (sorya) wakaran de ne* ‘only God knows, you know’. This commentary is an upgrade of Yumi’s talk in line 13, with the emphasising expression *kamisama shika* ‘God only’.

Yumi pre-emptively proffers *soo* (line 15) in the middle of Miho’s affiliative response immediately following *kamisama shika* ‘God only’. The affiliative response is marked with ‘within-speech laughter’ (line 14) and the subsequent laughter (line 16), inviting the other speaker to laugh together (Jefferson 1979). After Yumi accepts the invitation and laughs (line 17), Miho produces quiet talk, *honto ni* ‘really’ (line 20), which does not add much to what Miho has said, and thus, indicating she has nothing...
more to say. The subsequent lengthy silence of 3.0 seconds further indicates that neither of the participants has things to say (line 21). After the silence, Miho takes the turn, producing talk that demonstrates a major shift in topic. Note also that Miho’s talk is prefaced by *honto demo* ‘really but’, which delays the component that actually demonstrates the topic shift (line 22).

The fragments (25) and (26) above have shown the possibility of *soo* being followed by closure of the current talk and a shift in topic. As illustrated above, when this happens, *soo* is regularly followed by some negotiation between the participants where they indicate that they have nothing more to say. What is suggested by this observation is that *soo* may be deployed in a context where its producer has nothing to say but is willing to stay in the current talk if the other speaker has more to say. In such a case, however, there is a possible consequence of the *soo* failing to achieve to continue with the current talk if the other speaker has nothing to say, despite its orientation to progress further the current talk. That is, despite a proposal for further on-topic talk by *soo*, it is quite natural that sometimes there will be no further talk due to the nature of moment-by-moment, locally determined talk-in-interaction.

### 5.7 Summary

This chapter has investigated the use of the response token *soo*. First, the basic placement of the token has been outlined. It has been demonstrated that *soo* occurs at or around a possible completion of the talk to which it is oriented, or where the trajectory of the talk is projectable in the context. Then, I have proposed that *soo* does not only show an affiliative stance to the prior talk but also indicates that such a stance is based on the producer’s previously and independently formed understanding, knowledge, perspective, idea, etc., about the matter under discussion, rather than as an immediate response to the preceding talk.

I have also examined trajectories of talk after *soo*, focusing particularly on the following two different sequential contexts where *soo* is frequently found, namely, (i)
as a third placed turn following responsive talk and (ii) as a second placed turn following non-responsive talk. It has been demonstrated that, in both sequential contexts, there is a strong tendency of subsequent talk following *soo* being on-topic and continuing or further progressing the current talk. Based on this observation, I have suggested that *soo* implicates an orientation to staying in and/or developing further the current talk and that the current talk is relevant for further development. I have also discussed a small set of instances found in the data set where *soo* fails to achieve continuations of the current talk.

The findings of Chapter 5 are summarised as follows:

**Summary of the findings: *Soo***

**Basic functions:**
- Indicating affiliation and epistemic independence, and implicating that the current talk is relevant for further development

**Typical environment:**
- At or around a possible completion of the talk to which it is oriented, or where the trajectory of the talk is projectable in the context.

**Typical subsequent course of talk:**
- Continuation or further development of the current talk either by the producer of the token or the speaker of the talk to which the token is oriented.

**Actions that may be achieved:**
- Showing willingness to stay in the current talk.
- Confirming a candidate understanding of the talk that was originally proffered by the producer of *soo*.
- Claiming the producer’s rights or priority to talk about the matter under discussion
CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

6.1 Summary of main findings

This thesis has explored uses of three response tokens, \textit{nn}, \textit{huun}, and \textit{soo}, which are frequently used in casual Japanese conversation, employing the methodology of Conversation Analysis. Detailed examination of these response tokens as differentiated objects \textit{in situ} has revealed their accomplishment as interactional objects in Japanese conversation, which would not be captured otherwise. In this section, I will summarise main findings of this thesis.

The response token \textit{nn}, which was found to be the most versatile of all the three tokens, was explored in Chapters 2 and 3. In Chapter 2, I have examined \textit{nn} deployed at non-transition-relevance places (non-TRPs), focusing particularly on \textit{nn} occurring within a turn-constructional unit (TCU), i.e. the within-TCU case. It has been demonstrated that a within-TCU \textit{nn} frequently occurs at brief turn-entry opportunities created by halting the progress of the talk-in-progress. Such opportunities are often provided at turn-beginnings, especially at the initiation of a turn consisting of multiple TCUs or a sole but lengthy TCU, and where a turn-initiation is potentially problematic. In these environments, producers of a new turn tend to furnish turn-entry opportunities shortly after the turn-initiation for the prospective recipient with an opportunity to claim alignment as the recipient for the initiated talk. Securing the recipient, and
thereby establishing speakership for the projected talk, is a crucial task to be achieved 
at the initiation of talk. It has been shown that this important task is collaboratively 
achieved by the speaker of the new talk, who provides these opportunities, and also by 
the prospective recipient, who acknowledges the speakership incipiency and aligns as 
the recipient by minimally responding with *nn*. Furthermore, it has also been shown 
that the producer of on-going talk constantly furnishes brief turn-entry opportunities 
during the construction and *nn* tends to be deployed at these places. I have argued that 
*nn* deployed at these brief turn-entry opportunities displays that its producer is passing 
up the opportunity to take a turn at talk where more substantial talk may be proffered, 
and thereby indicates that the producer understands that the relevant TCU is still in 
progress and should be continued by its original speaker. These observations have 
suggested that *nn* deployed at these turn-entry opportunities at the beginning and 
during the construction of a turn serves as a continuer, which indicates that the current 
talk should be continued by the producer of the talk. It has been shown that *nn* is 
frequently used away from TRPs compared with English continuers, but nevertheless 
the analysis suggests that there is a strong orientation to partial grammatical 
completion and to intonation units, particularly ones with a non-final intonation 
contour. The examination of *nn* has demonstrated a crucial contribution of *nn* to the 
interactive and collaborative construction of TCUs in Japanese conversation.

In Chapter 3, I have examined *nn* occurring at a possible completion of the talk 
to which it responds, i.e. at a possible TRP. I have argued that *nn* at possible TRPs 
claims an adequate receipt of the talk to which it is oriented without projecting further 
talk in its own right. In the discussion of the trajectories of talk, it has been shown that 
a receipt *nn* can be followed by subsequent talk by the producer of *nn* as well as by the 
producer of the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. In reference to the former case, it has 
been shown that when receipt *nn* is deployed in a sequential environment where some 
activity is possibly complete, it tends to be followed by closure of the relevant 
sequence/activity. It has been argued that adequate receipt through the use of *nn* in 
such an environment shows the producer’s alignment with, or proposal of, a possible
closure of the current sequence/activity. In contrast to this, a receipt *nn* tends to be followed by expansion of the talk to which it is oriented when it is deployed in a context where more than a simple claim of receipt is sequentially relevant. I have argued that the expansion is occasioned as a result of the receipt *nn* being treated as problematic for the way the prior talk is responded to and a more preferred response being pursued instead of a simple claim of receipt. It was pointed out that turn-expansions following the receipt *nn* are fundamentally different from continuations of unfinished talk that typically occurs following the continuer *nn*.

As for the case where the producer of *nn* proffers subsequent talk, it was revealed that the subsequent talk typically demonstrates some sort of shift away from the talk to which the *nn* is oriented. For example, in the current data set, it was found that the producer of *nn* often initiates a new sequence or returns to some earlier talk after producing a receipt *nn*. In such cases, I have argued that the receipt *nn* works to close the relevant sequence before moving onto the next action and thus shifting away from the prior talk to which the *nn* responds. It was also shown that the producer of a receipt *nn* may proffer some responsive talk to the prior talk to which the *nn* is oriented. In this case, however, the subsequent talk was found to be relatively brief and to show orientation toward closure of the current talk. In the case where the producer of *nn* proffers disagreement, which further develops the current talk rather than closing it, subsequent talk was suggested to demonstrate a shift away from the prior talk in terms of preference. On the whole, the examination of the trajectories of talk has suggested that receipt through the token *nn* indicates its producer’s minimal involvement in developing the talk to which the *nn* is oriented, demonstrating orientation to its closure, or moving away, from the talk to which it is oriented.

Chapter 4 has been devoted to the investigation of the response token *huun*, which occurs in the context of an informing/telling. I have suggested that *huun* claims its producer’s epistemic stance of no independent access to, or prior knowledge about, the matter being discussed, as well as indicating the producer’s understanding of the current state of talk as being possibly complete, albeit with potential further expansion
of the topic. It has been argued that *huun* serves to pass up a more substantial response or action that may terminate the telling/informing, while demonstrating the producer’s awareness that such action may be relevant in the context. It was suggested that *huun* is used to invite the telling/informing party to produce further talk by furnishing a sequential context for expansion of the telling/informing and showing the producer’s orientation to staying in the telling/informing activity. I have also examined instances where *huun* is not followed by expansion of the telling/informing despite the invitation for further telling/informing. It was shown that, in such a case, the producer of *huun* tends to proffer recipient talk, which was passed up or withheld by the use of *huun*. Although it is not very common, it was shown that the producer of *huun* may immediately continue with further talk. I have argued that *huun* plus brief response talk works like *huun* deployed alone in the turn in the sense that it demonstrates orientation to expanding the telling/informing to which the *huun* is oriented. For the case where the producer proffers further substantial talk, it has been shown that the subsequent talk does not only stepwisely shift the topic but also seems to request more information on the topic, which suggests that the substantial subsequent talk shows some orientation to further development of the topic. I have also argued that the producer of *huun* passes up recipient talk in reference to the original telling by gradually shifting the direction of the telling.

Finally, Chapter 5 has explored another response token, *soo*, which is somewhat different from *nn* and *huun* in that it is lexically more substantial. It was demonstrated that *soo* occurs at or around a possible completion of the talk to which it is oriented, or where the trajectory of the talk is projectable in the context. It was argued that *soo* does not only display an affiliative stance toward what is said by the other speaker, but also claims the producer’s epistemic independence. That is, *soo* displays that the affiliative stance is based on the producer’s understanding, knowledge, perspective, idea, etc., which has been formed earlier and independently, and is not formed as an immediate response to the preceding talk. The discussion of trajectories of talk has focused mainly on *soo* deployed in the following two different sequential contexts: (i) as a third
positioned turn following responsive talk and (ii) as a second positioned turn following non-responsive talk. It was revealed that, regardless of whether soo is freestanding or non-freestanding, there is a strong tendency that the subsequent talk is on-topic and further progresses the current talk. I have suggested that soo implicates its producer’s orientation to staying in and/or further developing the current talk as well as understanding that the current talk is relevant for further development.

6.2 Japanese response tokens and talk-in-interaction

The findings of this thesis offer some implications for the study of Japanese response tokens and talk-in-interaction. This section considers these possible implications based on the findings of this thesis.

As discussed earlier in the thesis, Japanese response tokens are commonly understood as signalling the recipient role, such as listening to or having understood what the primary speaker is saying, as well as displaying a stance, such as agreement or interest (cf. Section 1.2.1). This does not sufficiently capture their importance as an interactional property of Japanese talk-in-interaction. The findings of this thesis have implications for understanding the interactional significance of response tokens in Japanese.

Firstly, the current study has demonstrated that response tokens serve to index the current state of the talk to which they are oriented. For instance, *nn* deployed during a TCU serves to indicate that the talk to which it responds is being constructed by other speaker and not yet complete (cf. Chapter 2). A receipt *nn* occurs in a wider range of sequential environments and claims the producer’s adequate receipt of the prior talk (cf. Chapter 3). *Huun* indicates the lack of its producer’s prior knowledge of, or independent access to, the matter that has been discussed in the prior talk and that the producer’s understanding that a telling/informing activity is possibly complete (cf. Chapter 4). *Soo*, on the other hand, indicates that the producer has independently obtained understandings, perspectives, ideas, etc. about the issue that was discussed in
the prior talk and that the current talk is relevant for further development (cf. Chapter 5).

Secondly, although Japanese response tokens appear to be recognised as having a certain influence on the progress of conversation (cf. Horiguchi 1988; Komiya 1986; Mizutani 1983; Maynard 1987, among others), little empirical explication has been provided on this aspect of Japanese response tokens in previous studies. This study, particularly the analysis of the trajectories of talk following response tokens, has empirically revealed the reflexive aspect of the Japanese response tokens and their implications on the unfolding of talk-in-interaction. For instance, as summarised in Section 6.1, the continuer *nn* projects the other speaker’s progressing the current talk to the next due matter (cf. Chapter 2). On the other hand, the receipt *nn* implicates the producer’s minimal involvement in the development of the current talk and projects different trajectories of talk depending on the sequential context in which they are used (cf. Chapter 3). *Huun* often projects further telling/informing by the telling/informing party (cf. Chapter 4). It was also demonstrated that the response token *soo* commonly implicates further progress or development of the current talk, which deals with the matter that is discussed in the prior talk to which the token is oriented (cf. Chapter 5). Needless to say, the course of the emerging turn is going to be adjusted and shaped by the interaction between the participants as it progresses. Response tokens have been shown to indicate their producer’s real time analysis of the talk to which they are oriented and the current state of that talk, which at the same time, furnishes a context for the next conversational action. These response tokens serve as a bridge to link the immediately prior action to the immediately next action in Japanese talk-in-interaction.

In relation to this response tokens’ reflexive aspect, I would like to note the response token’s possible contribution to the projectability of unfolding talk in Japanese talk-in-interaction. That is, response tokens may provide resources that compensate for a relatively delayed projectability of talk in Japanese. Studies on Japanese talk-in-interaction report on the relatively delayed projectability of Japanese turn-shape (cf. Hayashi 2003; Tanaka 1999), because the structures of the Japanese
language, such as the use of various post-positional particles, relatively flexible word order, and predicate-final orientation, allow TCUs to be projected incrementally in Japanese. This makes the projectability of emerging talk relatively delayed. In English, for example, turn-beginnings are often critical for the projection of the upcoming turn-shape (cf. Schegloff 1987a). Japanese turn-beginnings, in contrast, do not provide the coparticipant with many resources to, at least syntactically, project the unfolding turn (Fox et al. 1996). Studies have shown that there are some devices available for participants in Japanese conversation at the turn-beginning or mid-turn as a resource to locally project the unfolding of emerging or current talk. These devices include connective expressions (Mori 1996), the compound turn-constructional structures (Lerner and Takagi 1999), adverbs (Tanaka 2001), various configurations or formats of talk recognisable in the local sequential context (Hayashi 2003) and nonverbal behaviour (Hayashi 2003; Hayashi et al. 2002).

My analysis of the use of response tokens in turn-initial position, i.e. their non-freestanding usage, has demonstrated that response tokens provide some implications for the trajectory of the emerging talk. That is, response tokens at the turn-beginning become one of the resources available for the participants to gain some sense of roughly what course the emerging turn is going to take, and thereby partly contribute to the projectability of the emerging talk. Further, an deployed during a TCU is also suggested to compensate in part for the relatively low mid-turn projectability of talk by providing a resource for participants to monitor the progress of the on-going talk. As was shown in Chapter 2, the primary speaker constantly furnishes opportunities for the recipient to enter the turn during the construction of the on-going talk. These opportunities are utilised by the recipient to display understanding of the current state of the unfolding talk. Constant furnishing of a turn-entry space and proffering of acknowledgement of the progress allow the participants to parse and recognise the progress of unfolding talk. As such it becomes a resource for adjusting and projecting the course of the current talk.
6.3 Implications for future research

This study has examined three commonly used response tokens in Japanese, using the methodology of Conversational Analysis (CA). It was demonstrated that CA is an effective method for studying Japanese response tokens as has been the case for response tokens in other languages: for example, Gardner (1995, 2001); Heritage (1984b); Jefferson (1984a); and Schegloff (1982), for English and Sorjonen (1996), for Finnish. Due to the time limitations, this study has focused on instances of three more commonly used response tokens in Japanese. There are other response tokens, e.g. *ee*, *hee*, and *aa*, of which particular accomplishment is yet to be explicated. Investigating these response tokens as differentiated and interactional objects in close reference to their sequential contexts would empirically reveal much of their significance and their accomplishments in conversation. I believe this will contribute toward further understanding of Japanese talk-in-interaction.

In conclusion, this thesis has departed from the approaches adopted in earlier studies of Japanese response tokens in an attempt to explore uses of these three commonly used response tokens by investigating them as differentiated objects in close reference to their sequential contexts in naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. The use of Japanese response tokens has shown to be deeply linked to a crucial aspect of talk-in-interaction, namely, a turn-by-turn and moment-by-moment organisation of interaction where “a context of publicly displayed and continuously updated intersubjective understanding is systematically sustained” (Atkinson and Heritage 1984: 11). This thesis has shed some light on Japanese response tokens’ active contribution to locally achieved, temporally unfolding talk-in-interaction. Hopefully, this study will contribute to the current understanding of the Japanese response tokens and encourage further investigation of response tokens in Japanese and other languages as a part of interactionally accomplished practice of social interaction.
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