

Diluting Disagreement in Japanese Conversation

Yuri Hosoda

概要

この研究では日本語会話において会話参加者がいかにして話し相手の非同意を投射して非同意を希釈または回避するのかについて検証する。本研究で使用されたデータは約 10 時間の日常の日本語二人会話である。分析の結果、二人会話において非同意の希釈及び回避は話し手と聞き手双方の取り組みによって成し遂げられることがわかった。この論文は会話参加者が言語及び非言語の相互行為的資源と共に文法的資源をどのようにして駆使して相手方の非同意を投射するのかを解明するという点で「文法と相互行為」という応用言語学界で広がりつつある分野に貢献する。

Abstract

This study explores how speakers in Japanese conversation project disagreement with the other speakers in order to dilute or avoid disagreement. The data for the study come from approximately 10 hours of dyadic Japanese casual conversations. The analysis of the data revealed that the dilution and avoidance of disagreements were accomplished through mutual endeavors by both parties in dyadic interaction. This paper contributes to the expanding field of grammar and interaction in that it reveals how interactants make use of grammatical resources as well as vocal and non-vocal interactional resources to project the other interactants' disagreement in talk-in-interaction.

Introduction

One of the noticeable features of human interaction is avoidance of direct disagreement or conflict as much as possible. Although people do disagree with each other on many occasions, agreement is much more preferred sequentially as well as psychologically. This preference for agreement appears to be language universal. However, how it is actually implemented in social interaction can be influenced by syntactic and interactional features of specific languages: it is one of the areas where we can observe the connection between syntax and interactional action.

Using the framework of conversation analysis (CA), this study demonstrates how interactants dilute or avoid disagreement in Japanese conversation. Before presenting the analysis of the present study, this paper briefly introduces the key concepts of CA, projectability in Japanese conversation, preference organization in interaction, and some of the previous studies on preference for agreement.

Background

Conversation Analysis (CA)

Conversation Analysis (CA) was first developed in the late 60's through the collaboration of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson under the influence of Erving Goffman's approach to interaction (Goffman, 1963, 1964, 1967) and Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967). It emerged in reaction to mainstream American sociologists whose discipline at the time imposed a priori theorization of social phenomena. Thus, from its initial stage, CA methodology strongly cautioned against premature theorization and ad hoc analytical categorization of social interaction. Instead, through repeated examination of tape-recordings and transcripts of naturally

occurring conversation, the methodology focused on revealing participants' orientation to making sense of interactions, an orientation that is embodied in the detail of their talk and other conduct. Previous CA studies have provided accounts of basic organizations underlying everyday interaction, including turn-taking, sequence organization, repair, story-telling, word selection, reference, and description. Although CA originated in sociology, currently numerous researchers in adjacent fields, such as linguistics, anthropology, and education, apply CA to their studies. Among them, linguistics is probably the field in which CA is most frequently employed. A number of linguists studying English and Japanese have employed CA to demonstrate how language and its syntax has emerged as a resource for social action (e.g., Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 2002; Ford & Thompson, 1996; Fox, Hayashi, and Jasperson, 1996; Fox & Jasperson, 1995; Hayashi, 2001, 2003a, 2003b; Hayashi & Mori, 1998; Lerner & Takagi, 1999; Mori, 1999).

Japanese Grammar and Projectability

When people interact with each other, the interactants anticipate when the current speaker completes the turn and what action(s) the current speaker is performing through the talk. In CA, such anticipation is referred to as "projection," and "projectability" refers to the capacity to foreshadow roughly how the turn will be designed and what action(s) is being accomplished in the turn. Although CA was originally developed through examination of English conversation, a number of Japanese CA researchers have applied previous CA findings to Japanese conversation and found some relationships between Japanese grammar and projectability. As commonly known, canonical word order of Japanese sentences has a Subject (S)-Object (O)-Verb (V) construction, or more generally, predicate-final construction. As a predicate is one of the key resources for projecting the trajectory of the current speaker's turn, the occurrence of a predicate along with various post positional

particles that reveal the speaker's stance at the end of a turn may cause delayed projection in Japanese conversation (Hayashi, 2003b; Tanaka, 1999, 2000). However, previous CA studies have found that there are some resources interactants in Japanese conversations may use to compensate for such syntactic constraints. For example, the interactants can resort to (a) turn-initial connectives (Mori, 1999), (b) non-verbal behavior (Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b; Hayashi, Mori & Takagi, 2002), (c) compound turn-constructional structures (Lerner & Takagi, 1999), and (d) adverbials positioned before predicates (Tanaka, 2001) to facilitate projection. The current study also found that these resources are essential for projection in Japanese conversation, especially in projecting disagreement in Japanese conversation. Before proceeding to the present study, the basic concept of preference organization of everyday conversation is discussed in the next section.

Adjacency Pair and Preference Organization

The most basic unit for organizing courses of actions in talk-in-interaction is the "adjacency pair" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). According to Schegloff and Sacks, a very broad range of sequences in talk-in-interaction appears to be produced in pairs of actions. For example, "question" implicates some "answer" to be done in the next turn, "request" implicates actions such as "granting" or "declining" to be done in the next turn, and "complaint" implicates actions such as "apology," "account," "denial," "counter-complaint," or "remedy" to be accomplished in the next turn, and so forth. An adjacency pair in its minimal form without expansion can be characterized with the following five features: it is (a) composed of two turns that are (b) adjacently placed, that is, one after the other, and (c) produced by different speakers; (d) the two turns are ordered as a first pair part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP), and (e) the two turns are type-related, so that an FPP requires a particular SPP.

Most SPPs have alternative actions, and some SPPs are preferred while others are dispreferred. Following the introduction of adjacency pairs by Schegloff and Sacks (1973), many CA studies explored issues concerning alternative SPPs and preference organization (e. g., Davidson, 1984, 1990; Lerner, 1989, 1996a; Pomerantz, 1978, 1984a, 1984b; Raymond, 2005; Sacks, 1987; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1988, 2007; Schegloff & Lerner, 2009; Stivers & Robinson, 2006; Tanaka, 2005). These studies provided evidence showing that, generally speaking, SPPs that are positive (+) (agreement, acceptance, granting, etc.) are preferred and SPPs that are negative (-) (disagreement, rejection, declining, etc.) are dispreferred (Schegloff, 2007). The preference discussed in these studies is not a matter of personal psychological choice but is constituted by structural preferences built in sequences of talk-in-interaction, that is, the design of the utterances, type of sequences, frequency, and placement of the utterances. Speakers of FPPs tend to design their utterances so that they are likely to receive preferred SPPs. For instance, when someone assumes that it is unlikely that he can get a ride to go somewhere, he may ask, "It's not possible to drive me there, right?" As this question is negatively formulated, a sequentially preferred answer to this question is "no" or "right." The FPP speaker designs the question in such a way that the SPP speaker can provide a preferred answer. As for the sequence types, preferred SPPs tend to move the interaction forward and dispreferred SPPs tend to block or delay the sequence. Moreover, preferred SPPs occur much more frequently. One reason is that, as described above, FPP speakers tend to design the utterances so that they can get preferred SPPs, and SPP speakers also design their utterances so that their SPPs sound like they are preferred SPPs even when they may not be. For example, in response to a question, "Can you hear me?" the SPP speaker may answer "barely" instead of providing a direct denial, "no." (Schegloff, lecture, 2000). As for the placement of SPPs, preferred

SPPs occur much earlier in turns: immediately after FPPs in straight-forward ways, without any excuses or explanations. In contrast, dispreferred SPPs are usually delayed. Even if SPPs are initiated produced immediately after FPPs, the SPPs tend to start with some hesitations such as “uhm,” “well,” which may be accompanied by excuses or explanations. Therefore, hearing the initial parts of SPP utterances, FPP speakers occasionally project the occurrence of dispreferred SPPs and redesign their FPPs to induce preferred SPPs.

Preference for Agreement

When someone produces a FPP that calls for “agreement” or “disagreement” in a SPP slot, “agreement” is preferred over “disagreement.” Sacks (1987) noted that in response to question-type utterances, the answer that “agrees” with the question is preferred. Here are two examples Sacks provides.

(1) [Sacks, 1987, p. 57]

A: And it-*apparently* left her quite permanently damaged(I suppose)

B: *Apparently*. Uh he is still hopeful.

(2) [Sacks, 1987, p. 58]

A: Yuh comin down early?

B: Well, I got a lot of things to do before getting cleared up tomorrow. I don't know. I w-probably won't be too early.

In (1), B's answer “*apparently*” is designed to agree with A's question-type utterance and it occurs immediately after A's utterance. However, if we observe B's utterance in the latter part of the turn, we find that the answer actually disagrees with A's utterance (“he is still hopeful” means that she may not be

permanently damaged). Thus, even when SPP speakers need to produce dispreferred responses (i.e., disagreement), the speakers often manage to provide preferred responses (i.e., agreement). Even when disagreement is produced, as shown in (2), the disagreement component does not come early in the turn: the disagreement in (2) (“I w-probably won’t be too early.”) occurs only after some explanation or account is given. Moreover, the disagreement is made as weak as possible: it is not a straightforward “no.” As will be discussed in the subsequent sections in this paper, this preference for agreement appears to be language-universal, or at least common between English and Japanese.

The preference for agreement is not limited to question-answer sequences. Pomerantz (1984a) illustrated how the preference for agreement is manifested in assessment sequences as well. By proffering assessment, the speaker claims knowledge of the referent he or she is assessing, and the assessment makes a recipient’s agreement or disagreement with the assessment relevant in the next turn. Although there are some exceptions (e.g., self-deprecation sequences), generally speaking, agreement is a sequentially preferred next action while disagreement is a sequentially dispreferred next action, as in the case of question-answer sequences. Preference for agreement is demonstrated in the following features of assessment sequences: (a) disagreements are often prefaced; (b) disagreements are accomplished with a variety of forms including partial agreements and mitigated disagreements; (c) agreements are performed immediately with a minimization of a gap, while disagreements are often delayed within a turn or over a series of turns; and (d) the absence of SPPs is interpreted by FPP speakers as unstated disagreements.

This paper further addresses the issue of preference for agreement. Specifically, it explores how speakers in Japanese conversation project disagreement of the other speakers and redesign their utterances to dilute or sometimes avoid the

disagreement. The dilution and avoidance were accomplished mutually by FPP speakers and SPP speakers. This paper also contributes to the study of grammar and interaction in that it reveals how the interactants make use of grammatical resources as well as other interactional resources to project or anticipate the other interactants' actions in talk-in-interaction.

Data

The data for this study come from approximately 10 hours of dyadic Japanese casual conversations. The conversations were video- and audio-recorded in various settings, such as lunch break at work places, dinner at restaurants, and private home parties. The recordings were transcribed using transcription conventions commonly used in CA studies (Schegloff, 2007, see Appendix A). The transcription of a Japanese utterance in this paper consists of three lines. The first line is the original utterance, the second line is a word-by-word translation (see Appendix B for the abbreviations), and the third line is a rough, idiomatic English translation. In addition, nonverbal features are indicated in the transcripts when they are relevant.

Analysis and Discussion

The analysis of the Japanese conversational data demonstrated that as in English conversation, agreement occurred quickly in a straight-forward way, while disagreement was commonly delayed and mitigated. In disagreement sequences, both second pair part (SPP) speakers and first pair part (FPP) speakers were found to deploy practices for avoiding or diluting disagreement. Moreover, the analysis revealed that avoiding or diluting disagreement was accomplished by FPP speakers' and SPP speakers' mutual endeavors.

Quick, Straight-Forward Agreement

As discussed in the previous section, previous CA studies on English conversations have demonstrated that preferred SPPs tend to be delivered quickly (occasionally with overlaps) in a straight-forward way. Thus, agreement to the previous speakers is often found to be proffered immediately after the previous speaker's utterance if not in actual overlap with the end of the previous speaker's utterance. This feature of English conversation appears to be consistent with Japanese conversation. The extract below illustrates this point.

(3) [Tomi-Maki:11:235-240]

((Tomi and Maki run an English language school. They are discussing how they can cut down the number of classes to deal with lack of teachers and space.))

01 Tomi: *ato wa mou chu[gakusei no]*
 other TOP already junior.high.students GEN
 'The other((option))is,((classes))
 junior high school students'

02 Maki: *[chugakusei]*
 junior.high.students

03 *wa shoganai[kara ne]*
 TOP no.choice because FP
 'There is nothing we can do for junior
 high school students.'

04 Tomi: *[so:u na]no.*
 right COP FP
 'That's right'

05 *chusan wa mou ne, anomamade*
 9th graders TOP already IP as.it.is

06 *juken [site(yo)to wa omowa nai kedo]*
 entrance.exam take IP QT TOP think NEG but

'As for 9th graders, I don't think that they can take an entrance exam as the way it is now, but'

07 Maki: [>sou sou sou sou sou sou< u::n]
 yes yes yes yes yes yes hmmm
 'yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, hmmm'

In Extract (3), series of quick agreement can be observed. In line 1, as Tomi starts to produce “*chu*”, Maki projects that Tomi is about to say “*chugakusei* (junior high school students)” and co-constructs the turn. Anticipatory completion of a turn is one of the powerful ways used to demonstrate agreement with the prior speaker (Lerner, 1996b). In line 4, Tomi’s agreement with Maki’s turn occurs early: it overlaps with the end of Maki’s turn. In agreeing with Maki, Tomi produces “*so:u na no*. (That’s right)” with emphasis on the beginning of the utterance. Another agreement in this extract can be observed in lines 6 and 7. Following the agreement with Maki’s utterance, Tomi in line 5 states her opinion. Immediately after Tomi’s production of “*juken* (entrance examination),” even before Tomi produces predicate components, Maki starts to produce multiple tokens of agreement “>sou sou sou sou sou sou< (yes yes yes yes yes yes).”

As shown, as found in English conversation, interlocutors in Japanese conversation tend to start their turns immediately after, or even in overlap with, the prior speakers’ turns when they agree with the prior speakers. In contrast, as demonstrated below, disagreement tends to be delayed.

Delayed, Mitigated Disagreement

As in the case of English conversation, disagreements in Japanese conversation are often delayed through deployment of some elements such as pauses, accounts, explanations, non-lexical perturbations (e.g., *ano::*, *e::*, *u:::n*), and partial agreements; and the disagreement components are commonly mitigated. In

Extract (4) below, after an inter-turn silence, an account for disagreement is produced instead of actual disagreement.

(4) [Yui-Nao:17:400-402]

((Prior to this extract, Nao expressed her interests in perfume.))

01 Nao: *nanka tsuketeru hito? kousui.*
 something wearing person perfume
 'Do you wear perfume?'

02 → (0.6)

03 →Yui: *watashi ne(.)kimochi waruku nacchau no.*
 I IP feeling bad become FP
 'I become nauseous((if I wear perfume)).'

In line 1, Nao asks Yui if she wears some perfume. The design of the question as well as Nao's prior talk about her liking perfume calls for a preferred response in the next turn. However, instead, there is a silence after the question. In line 3, Yui starts to answer the question. Unlike with a preferred answer (i.e., "yes"), the answer is not straight-forward. Yui starts the answer with "*watashi ne* (I)" and pauses before proceeding with her turn. When she starts speaking again, it is not a direct disagreement but provision of a reason for not wearing perfume.

Similarly, in the following extract, disagreement is delayed and expressed in an indirect manner.

(5) [Yoko-Mako:4:7-11]

((Yoko and Mako are talking about some actors))

01 Yoko: *demo wa tkai hito:::(1.8)dat tara yappari*
 but young person COP if as.expected
 02 *dokushin no hou ga(.)°nanka°*
 single GEN way SUB somehow

'But in the case of a young person, being single sounds somehow(better).'

03 → (1.2)

04 Mako: *aa soo ka naa sonna mon ka naa.hhh*
oh right Q COP such thing Q COP
'Oh is that right. I wonder if it is right.'

Following lines 1 and 2 in which Yoko states her opinion that she prefers young actors to be single, there is a 1.2 second silence before Mako starts responding. Considering that normal turn taking timing is one beat of silence (i.e., 0.1 second), 1.2 seconds is noticeably long. After the long pause, she expresses her disagreement and the disagreement is delivered in a mitigated way.

In addition to inter-turn silence, disagreement can be delayed with some other elements. Consider Extract (6) below.

(6) [Nae-Iyo:15:332-338]

((Nae and Iyo are talking about Iyo's husband, who always makes a lot of efforts))

01 Iyo: *demo ne:::: doryoku[de wa]*
but IP effort by TOP
"But making an effort,"

02 Nae: *[sore]mo sainou no uchi*
that also talent GEN in

03 *da yo datte.*
COP FP because
"Because that is one of the talents."

04 Iyo: *demo baka mi tari suru koto mo aru*
but stupid see or do thing also exist

- 05 *desho::*
 COP:TAG
 "But there are times(making efforts))is worthless."
- 06 →Nae: *.hhh un ma::: sou dakedo ↑demo hora*
 yeah well right but but you.know
- 07 *sore ga betuni hora .hh honnin ni totte*
 that SUB particularly you.know oneself to for
- 08 *sore ga sa:=*
 that SUB FP
 "((in-breath))yeah, well, right, but, but particularly,
 you know, that is, for oneself,"
- 09 Iyo: =*un.*
 yeah
 "yeah."
- 10 Nae: *dou ka tte koto wa mata betu de-*
 whether Q QT matter TOP also another COP
 "whether that is((good for the person))is
 another matter."

Prior to this extract, Nae praised Iyo's husband for his constant efforts. In line 1, Iyo starts stating her position against extra effort. In hearing "*demo ne:::* (but)", Nae projects Iyo's negative position and starts her turn supporting hard work by saying that being able to make extra efforts is one kind of ability. Then in line 4, Iyo again states her position against making efforts in that it is sometimes worthless. In line 6, Nae's disagreement as a response to Iyo's statement is substantially delayed. Nae starts her turn with an in-breath and then produces a weak agreement "*un* (yeah)", a hesitation marker "*ma:::* (well)", and partial agreement "*sou dakedo* (right but)" before she begins to state her opinion with "*demo* (but)." In addition, her utterance is marked with hesitations such as a couple of "*hora* (you know)"

and an in-breath; and more importantly, what is produced at the end is not a straight-forward disagreement but an account for her disagreement (i.e., why she thinks making efforts is good).

As demonstrated, as in English conversation, when interactants in Japanese conversation disagree with the other parties' utterances, the occurrence of disagreement component is delayed through deployment of elements such as inter-turn silence, in-breath, accounts, explanations, non-lexical perturbations, and partial agreement. The following sections discuss how SPP speakers and FPP speakers utilize these elements to avoid or dilute disagreements in interaction.

Diluting Disagreement

Second Pair Part Speaker Maneuver

Temporal Agreement. As illustrated in Extract (1) from Sacks (1987) above, second pair part (SPP) speakers often design their turns to proffer preferred answers at the beginning of their turns so that their responses initially appear to be providing preferred SPPs. In the following extract, in response to Yone's request for confirmation, Yuki first provides a sequentially preferred answer at the beginning of her turn.

(7) [Yuki-Yone:1035-1038]

((Prior to this extract Yuki told Yone that computer prices are going down these days.))

01 Yo: *jaa ippai tsuke tara; ippai purintaa toka*
 then a lot put if a lot printer or
 02 *tsuke tara chotto ta[kame desu ne]*
 put if a little expensive COP FP
 'Then, if you put a lot of((stuff with it)), if
 you put a lot of((stuff like))a printer
 or((something)), it becomes expensive.'

- 03→ Yu: [ahh purintaa]tsukeru to
oh printer put if
- 04 sou desu ne.<demo purintaa mo ima yasuku
right COP FP but printer also now cheap
- 05 natteru kara:
has.become because
'Oh, that's right, with a printer. But since
printers have also become cheap,'

In lines 1 and 2, Yone asks Yuki for confirmation that even if computer prices are going down, if computer accessories such as printers are bought together with computers, the prices are still high. Here, as a request for confirmation in affirmative form, this first pair part (FPP) makes some kind of “yes” answer or agreement relevant as a preferred answer. Yuki’s answer in line 3 conforms to this preference. Yuki at first agrees with Yone “*purintaa tsukeru to sou desu ne* (that’s right with a printer).” Yuki then rushes to disagree with Yone by saying that printers have also become cheap.

Blocking First Pair Part. There was another kind of maneuver that SPP speakers did to avoid disagreement in the data: when SPP speakers projected that the FPP speakers’ upcoming questions or assessments would contain some information that the SPP speakers would disagree with, the SPP speakers blocked the FPPs halfway before the FPPs reached the actual disagreeable component. Here is one example.

(8) [Sada-Mako:20-25]

((Both Sada and Mako currently live in Osaka. Mako was born and raised up in Osaka.))

- 01 Sada: Tokyo no(.)Tokyo de ↑umare ta kedomo::
GEN in be.born PST but

102

- 02 *Osaka native ni natte simai masi ta ne.*
to become end. up POL PST FP
'I was born in Tokyo but ended up becoming a native
Osaka person.'
- 03 Mako: *ah sou desu ka.<demo nanka kankaku wa:*
oh right COP Q but somehow sense TOP
- 04 *anmari mada:*
(not)quite yet
- 05 → *[°(anmasi)Osaka tte ki ga shi nai°]*
(not)quite QT feel SUB do NEG
'Oh, is that so. But I think your sense has not fully become
Osaka-like yet.'
- 06 →Sada: *[KANKAKU WA NEE dakara ryoushin ga]*
sense TOP IP because parents SUB
- 07 *sou ya kara:*
so COP because
'As for a sense, since my parents are((from Osaka)),'
- 08 Mako: *ah sou na n de[su ka.]*
oh so COP N COP Q
'Oh, is that so.'
- 09 Sada: *[yappari] ie no naka no bunka*
as.expected home GEN in GEN culture
- 10 *ga:>sou ya kara<*
TOP so COP because
'After all, since the culture of my home
is((Osaka)),'
((Sada continues talking about how much his sense is
Osaka-like.))

In lines 1 and 2, Sada informs Mako that although he was born in Osaka, he ended up becoming a native Osaka person. Hearing

this statement, Mako in line 3 acknowledges the information with “*ah sou desu ka* (Oh is that so).” and then goes on to assess Sada’s “nativeness” saying, “*demo nanka kankaku wa: anmari mada: °anmasi Osaka tte ki ga shi nai*” (Oh, is that so. But I think your sense has not fully become Osaka-like yet).” However, at the point Mako finishes uttering “*anmari* (not quite) *mada:* (yet)”, Sada comes in with a louder voice, overlapping with rest of Mako’s utterance containing the actual assessment “*Osaka tte kiga shi nai* (I think your sense has not become Osaka yet)”. As shown in the following parts of this extract, this is the part of Mako’s assessment Sada disagrees with. Overlapping with Mako’s utterance in a louder voice, Sada tells Mako that his sense is indeed Osaka-like and it comes from his parents, who are originally from Osaka. Therefore, even before Mako actually produces the disagreeable part, Sada starts producing a statement that is contrary to what Mako says in overlapping part. As a result of the overlap, Mako produces the “disagreeable” with a quieter voice, and thus her assessment is weakened. Then, how did Sada project the upcoming disagreeable even before the actual disagreeable was produced? The answer lies in Japanese grammar. As mentioned above, in Japanese grammar, a predicate along with final particles and negation that display the speaker’s stance comes at the end of a sentence. Yet, adverbs and adjectives can precede predicates (for projectability from adjectives in Japanese conversation, see Tanaka, 2001). In the extract, two adverbs, “*anmari*” and “*mada*”, are uttered before a predicate component. In Japanese, both “*anmari*” and “*mada*” are used in negative sentences. Therefore, a hearer can project that the speaker’s utterance will end up as a negative sentence before negation “*nai*” is produced toward the end of the sentence. In addition, Mako begins the sentence with a connective “*demo* (but)”, which indicates that the upcoming utterance will contradict what has been produced before, and Mako then raises a topic “*kankaku wa* (as for a sense)”. All these resources bolster

yeah

'yeah'

((8 lines omitted))

14 Hiro: *jikkan aru?*
 actual.feeling exist
 'Hasn't it hit you?'

15 →Yume: *do:: °[ka na::]°*
 how Q COP
 'I wonder((if it))is((so)).'

16 →Hiro: [*demo jibun demo yatte kutteru kara sa:*]
 but oneself even do eating because IP
 'But since you also work and make a living
 for yourself,'

17 Yume: *u::n*
 yeah
 'yeah'

18 →Hiro: *sonnani nai to omou kedo.*
 so much NEG QT think but
 'I guess((you))don't((feel))it much.'

In lines 1 and 2, Hiro mentions the impossibility of changing jobs around his age and requests agreement with a tag question. As a tag question in an affirmative form, this tag questions makes “yes” or some kind of agreement a preferred next action. However, instead, there is an inter-turn silence in line 3. Then in line 4, Hiro revises his FPP saying, “*maa kika nai koto wa nai n dakedo* (although it is not impossible.)”, which is completely opposite from his own statement in lines 1 and 2. This utterance by Hiro in line 4 receives Yume’s acknowledgement or weak agreement even before Hiro finishes the turn. Eight lines later, in line 14, Hiro, who is still talking about the difficulty of changing jobs, asks Yume whether she senses that pretty soon she will be

reaching the age at which changing jobs would become difficult. In response, Yume produces, “*do::°ka na::°* (I wonder ((if it)) is ((so)))”. As soon as Hiro hears “*do::*”, he again reverses his question, line 14, and says that since Yume works and makes a living herself, she may not feel that way. As demonstrated in this extract, FPP speakers may project recipient disagreement quite early: before disagreement is produced or at the very beginning part of the disagreement turn so that FPP speakers can block the upcoming disagreement. In addition, FPP speakers may completely reverse their prior statements or questions in order to elicit preferred SPPs from their interlocutors. In Extract (9), the FPP speaker projected SPP speaker’s disagreement from an inter-turn silence and the beginning of a phrase. In the next extract, which was taken from the same conversation, the FPP speaker’s projection of upcoming disagreement is facilitated not only by the verbal features but also by the nonverbal behavior of the SPP speaker.

(10) [Hiro-Yume:11:253-266]

- 01 Yume: *demo kaisha ni iru to:*
 but company at being if
 ‘But if you are at a company,’
- 02 (.)((Hiro nods))
- 03 Yume: *onnazi kaisha ni=*
 same company at
 ‘at the same company’
- 04 Hiro: *=un=((nods))*
 mhm
 ‘Mhm’
- 05 Yume: *=zutto iru ka[ra:]*
 long.time being because
 ‘because you are((there))for a long time,’

- 06 Hiro: [un]((nods))
yeah
'yeah'
- 07 Yume: are *desho. ano sonnani t- tat ta*
that COP:TAG well such pass PST
- 08 *ki si nai desho.*
feel do NEG COP:TAG
'It is that, isn't it? Well, you don't feel
like
it's been a long time((since you started
working here)), do you?'
- 09 →Hiro: *.tsh dou ka na:: demo kokontoko=*
how Q COP but these.days
'((click))I wonder if((it))is((so)). But these
days,'
- 10 →Yume: =aa[*demo kodomo ga ne]*
oh but children SUB P
'Oh, but((your))children,'
- 11 →Hiro: [*kodomo miru to:]:=*
children see if
'If I see((my))children,'
- 12 →Yume: =*kodomo: san ga irassharu shi:=*
children HON SUB have and
'you have children and,'
- 13 Hiro: =un=
yeah
'yeah'
- 14 →Yume: =*dondon sodatteru °kara ne. u:n.°*
quickly grow.up because FP hmm
'Because they grow up quickly.'
- 15 Hiro: °*sou ne yappari juunen ijou yattekuru*

- right FP as.expected 10.years more having.
done
- 16 *to nagai naa tte omou shi saa°*
if long COP QT think and FP
'Right. You know, if you work((at a company))
for more than 10 years, it feels like a long
time, and'
- 17 Yume: *un.*
yeah
'yeah'

In lines 1, 3, and 5, Yume states that Hiro has been working in the same company for a long time. As “*kara* (because)” at the end of line 5 shows, this part of her utterance is a subordinate clause that gives the reason for her following talk. Notice that in the “response opportunity places” (Nishizaka, 2007) in lines 2, 4, and 6, Hiro gives some acknowledgment by producing a minimal token “*un* (yeah)” and nodding. Observing Hiro’s facial expression in the video of this extract shows that Hiro is smiling up from line 1 to line 6. In line 7, as Yume starts producing the main clause of her utterance, she uses “*are* (that)” to indicate that more talk that is temporarily referred to as “*are*” will be coming (Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b), and a tag question marker “*desho*” following “*are*” indicates that it will be a tag question which requires a confirmation in the next turn. In the main clause, Yume asks Hiro for confirmation that he does not feel like it has been long since he started working at his company. A preferred response to this request for confirmation is a simple agreement or, since the request for the confirmation is formulated as a tag question in a negative form, some kind of answer that indicates that he does not feel like he has been there long. However, Hiro starts his SPP with a click with an in-breath “*tsh*”, produces “*dou ka na::* (I wonder ((if it)) is ((so))”, and

continues with a connective “*demo* (but)”, which indicates that what will be said is contradictory to what had been said before. In addition, the change in his nonverbal behavior is relevant here. As noted above, from line 1 to line 6, Hiro was smiling and nodding at the response opportunity places. However, Yume’s turn in lines 7 and 8 do not receive Hiro’s nodding, and in line 9, Hiro is no longer smiling. These verbal and physical behaviors by Hiro facilitate Yume’s projection of upcoming disagreement. In line 10, latching with Hiro’s production of “*kokontoko* (these days)”, Yume utters a change-of-state token “*aa* (oh)” (Heritage, 1984), demonstrating that there was some kind of change by virtue of what happened just before, and then produces “*demo* (but).” On the other hand, Hiro continues his utterance from line 9 and says, “*kodomo miru to::* (if I see ((my)) children)”. It is not certain whether Yume’s incorporation of “*kodomo* (children)” is the result of hearing Hiro’s production of “*kodomo* (children)” in overlap. Yet, as Schegloff (2000) demonstrated, speakers in conversation can hear what the other speakers say in overlap. Therefore, it is possible that as soon as she hears Hiro produce “*kodomo*”, Yume incorporated the word in her utterance. As Yume raises “*kodomo*” as the subject of her following talk (as indicated by “*ga* (subject marker)” following “*kodomo*”), Yume revises her FPP utterance in lines 12 and 14. In these turns, Yume talks about why Hiro feels that it has been long since he started working for the company. In other words, Yume provides an account for recipient’s (i.e., Hiro’s) disagreement with her prior talk in lines 7 and 8. Then in line 15, Hiro displays his agreement by producing “*sou ne* (right)”.

As demonstrated in the extracts above, projecting recipient disagreement in the second pair part (SPP) slots, first pair part (FPP) speakers recurrently revised their FPPs. In the revisions, FPP speakers produced something completely contrary to the initial FPPs, as in Extract (9), or provided an account of disagreement for SPP speakers, as in Extract (10). In both cases,

FPP speakers succeeded in eliciting SPP speaker agreement in the end.

Dilution as a Mutual Achievement

So far, it has been illustrated that both first pair part (FPP) speakers and second pair part (SPP) speakers have practices for diluting disagreement. This section further demonstrates both parties' undertaking of the interactional labors for diluting disagreement and achieving agreement. Consider Extract (11) below.

(11) [Taka-Haru:41:04-42:02]

((Prior to this extract, Haru told Taka that he just visited England.))

- 01 Haru: *kekko u::n boku mo nee igirisu*
quite this hmmm I also IP England
- 02 *hajimete dat ta n desu yo.*
first COP PST N COP FP
'It's quite, hmm, it was my first time in England.'
- 03 Taka: *a sou desu ka:*
oh right COP Q
'Oh, is that right.'
- 04 Haru: *u::n.*
yeah
'Yeah.'
- 05 →Taka: *kekko ii desu yo. boku suki na n*
quite nice COP IP I like COP N
- 06 → *desu[yo.]*
COP FP
'It's quite nice. I like it there.'
- 07 →Haru: *[un]ano:: maa machi naka*
yeah uhmm well city inside
- 08 → *wa nee chotto [ko:]*
TOP IP a.little uhmm

- 'Yeah, uhmm, well, inside of the city is
a little, uhmm'
- 09 →Taka: [kita]nai=
 dirty
 'dirty'
- 10 Haru: =kitanai
 dirty
 'dirty'
- 11 Taka: London wa ne [tokuni]
 TOP IP especially
 'London is, especially.'
- 12→Haru: [a::::]:: demo nee kougai ni
 yeah but IP suburb to
- 13 → iku to:=
 go if
 'Yeah. But if you go to the suburb,'
- 14 →Taka: =sou ii desu yo ne::
 right good COP FP FP

In lines 1 and 2, Haru reports that it was his first time in England and Taka acknowledges the report in line 3. In line 5, Taka assesses England by saying that England is “*kekkou ii* (quite nice)” and that he likes it, “*suki* (like)”. As an assessment, this utterance by Taka makes agreement (preferred) or disagreement (dispreferred) relevant in the next turn. Overlapping with the end of Taka’s turn, Haru in line 7 produces an agreement token “*un* (yeah)” in a minimal form. However, Haru’s following talk in lines 7 and 8 foreshadows some problem. He utters “*ano*: (uhmm)”, and “*maa* (well)” at the beginning, introduces a topic “*machi naka wa* (inside the city is)”, and then produces an adverb “*chotto* (a little)”. As soon as Haru produces “*chotto*”, overlapped with Haru’s production of “*ko*:”, in line 9,

Taka co-completes Haru's turn by saying "*kitanai* (dirty)". Note that this word "*kitanai* (dirty)" has a negative connotation while Taka's assessment of the place in line 5, "*kekko ii* (quite nice)" and "*suki* (like)" have positive connotations, and thus Taka's talk in line 5 and his talk in line 9 contradict each other. In projecting Haru's upcoming disagreement, Taka closely monitors Haru's talk. Taka hears Haru's use of "*ano::* (uhmm)", and "*maa* (well)" as harbingers of a problem and "*machi naka wa* (inside the city is)" as a topic Haru is introducing. In addition, in Japanese grammar, there should be a predicate, most likely an adjective, after an adverb "*chotto* (a little)". All these interactional and grammatical resources help Taka to project that Haru will be producing an adjective with negative connotation which describes the inside of a city in England. This projection results in Taka's co-construction of Haru's utterance; Taka revises his assessment in the form of anticipated completion before Haru actually produces disagreement. As Haru agrees with Taka's co-construction in line 10 by repeating the word "*kitanai*", Taka starts to pursue his talk about negative aspects of England, singling out the dirtiness of London. In line 12, hearing Taka's pursuit of a negative aspect of England, this time Haru starts to revise his talk by giving an exception to his prior disagreement-implicated talk in lines 7 and 8. That is to say, Haru produces a partial agreement with Taka's initial assessment of England in line 5. In line 14, Taka provides agreement with Haru by producing "*sou* (right)" and co-completing Haru's turn.

As exemplified in the extract above, speakers in the present data repeatedly revised their opinions or assessment to dilute disagreement and the dilution was not a one-way process. In two-party interaction examined in this study, both of the speakers made mutual efforts to dilute disagreement and achieve agreement.

Conclusion

This paper first showed that as in English conversation, agreement as a preferred second pair part (SSP) occurs quickly in a straight-forward way while disagreement as a dispreferred SSP is delayed and produced in mitigated ways. This paper then discussed SPP speakers' and first pair part (FPP) speakers' practice for diluting or avoiding disagreement. As examples of SPP speakers' practice for diluting or avoiding disagreement, SPP speakers' practice for (a) providing temporal agreement, and (b) blocking FPP half-way before the occurrence of disagreeable was illustrated. It was noted that grammatical knowledge is a critical resource for projecting the occurrence of an upcoming disagreeable. As instances of FPP speakers' practice for diluting or avoiding disagreement, the ways FPP speakers project SPP speakers' upcoming disagreement and revise their FPP were described. In the revised versions of the FPPs, FPP speakers provided (a) a complete opposite statement from the initial FPP, or (b) an account for disagreement for the SPP speaker. In projecting forthcoming disagreement, FPP speakers resorted to both vocal and non-vocal resources of interaction. The final section of this paper described diluting disagreement as a mutual achievement between FPP speakers and SPP speakers. In the process of diluting disagreement, both FPP speaker and SPP speaker projected the other speaker's disagreement before the actual occurrence of the disagreement and revised their prior utterances, no matter whether their prior utterances had been provided as a FPP or SPP, to elicit agreement from the other parties. Here again, both grammatical knowledge and interactional knowledge were critical resources for projecting disagreement.

As demonstrated in this study, the practice for avoiding or diluting disagreement appears to be language-universal, or at

least common between English conversation and Japanese conversation. Accordingly, even in intercultural communication that includes second language speakers, the preference for agreement is most likely to have bearing. However, since projection of forthcoming disagreement necessitates grammatical and interactional competences of interactants, to what extent and in what timing second language speakers can project the other parties' disagreement remains to be explored. Thus, one area of research that is called for is the examination of the relationships among second language speakers' grammatical and interactional competence and projection of disagreement.

References

- Davidson, J. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 102-128). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davidson, J. (1990). Modifications of invitations, offers and rejections. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction competence* (pp. 149-180). Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (2002). *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ford C. E., & Thompson, R. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for management of turns. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 134-184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., and Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 185-237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, B., & Jasperson, R. (1995). A syntactic exploration of repair in English Conversation. In P. Davis (Ed.), *Alternative linguistics* (pp. 77-134). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places*. New York: Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (1964). *The neglected situation*. *American Anthropologist*, 66 (6), 133-136.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face to face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

- Hayashi, H. (2001). Postposition-initiated utterances in Japanese conversation: An interactional account of a grammatical practice. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 317–343). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hayashi, M. (2003a). *Joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hayashi, M. (2003b). Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36, 109–41
- Hayashi, M., & Mori, J. (1998). Co-construction in Japanese revisited: We do ‘finish each other’s sentences’. In N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics, Vol. 7* (pp. 77–93). Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Hayashi, M., Mori, J., & Takagi, T. (2002) Contingent achievement of co-tellership in a Japanese conversation. An analysis of talk, gaze and gesture. In C.E. Ford, B. A. Fox, and S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 81–122). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. (1989). Notes on overlap management in conversation: The case of delayed completion. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53, 167–177.
- Lerner, G. (1996a). Finding “face” in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59, 303–321.
- Lerner, G. (1996b). “Semi-permeable” character of grammatical units in conversation. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238–276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G., & Takagi, T. (1999). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 49–75.
- Mori, J. (1999). *Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Japanese: Connective expressions and turn construction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nishizaka, A. (2007). A stance dispersed within a turn-at-talk: Response opportunity places as an interactional focus. *The Japanese Journal of Language in Society*, 10 (2), 83–95.
- Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, H. (2000). Turn-projection in Japanese talk-in-interaction. *Research*

- on *Language and Social Interaction*, 33, 1–38.
- Tanaka, H. (2001). Adverbials for turn projection in Japanese: Toward a demystification of the “telepathic” mode of communication. *Language in Society*, 30, 559–587.
- Tanaka, H. (2005). Grammar and the “timing” of social action: Word order and preference organization in Japanese. *Language in Society*, 34, 389–430.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Complement responses: notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. N. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 79–112). New York: Academic Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984a). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984b). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 152–163). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939–967.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54–69). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York: Irvington.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1988). On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: A single case conjecture. *Social Problems*, 35, 442–457.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29, 1–63.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Lerner, G. (2009). Beginning to respond: Well-prefaced responses to wh-questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42 (2), 91–115.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8 (4), 289–327.
- Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in society*, 35, 367–392.

Appendix A

[]	overlapping talk
=	latched utterances
(0.0)	timed pause(in seconds)
(.)	a short pause
co:lon	extension of the sound or syllable
co::lon	a more prolonged stretch
.	fall in intonation(final)
,	continuing intonation(non-final)
?	rising intonation(final)
;	intonation between a period and a comma
CAPITAL	loud talk
underline	emphasis
↑	sharp rise
↓	sharp fall
° °	quiet talk
< >	slow talk
> <	fast talk
hh	audible aspirations
.hh	audible inhalations
(hh)	laughter within a word
(())	comment by the transcriber
()	problematic hearing that the transcriber is not certain about

Appendix B

IP	Interactional particle (e.g. <i>ne</i> , <i>sa</i> , <i>no</i> , <i>yo</i> , <i>na</i>)
P	Other particles
SUB	Subject marker (<i>ga</i>)
GEN	Genitive (<i>no</i>)
TOP	Topic marker (<i>wa</i>)
QT	Quotation marker (<i>to</i> , <i>tte</i>)
Q	Question marker (<i>ka</i> and its variants)
COP	Copulative verb
N	Nominalizer (e.g. <i>no</i> , <i>n</i>)
TAG	Tag-like expression
ONO	Onomatopoeic expressions
NEG	for marking negation
PST	past
HON	honorific