

UCLA

Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title

The Role of Questioning in Japanese Political Discourse

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/13r022km>

Journal

Issues in Applied Linguistics, 5(2)

ISSN

1050-4273

Author

Yokota, Mariko

Publication Date

1994-12-30

DOI

10.5070/L452005192

Peer reviewed

The Role of Questioning in Japanese Political Discourse

Mariko Yokota

University of California, Los Angeles

According to Nakajima (1989), Japanese political discussions are characterized by 'question-response' sequences which occupy considerable time, but display no clear resolution nor true dispute. The present study examines 'question-response' sequences in Japanese political discourse. In particular, the study addresses how questions (Qs) are used to control other interlocutors as well as the relationship between questions and conflict in Japanese political discourse. A panel discussion conducted among several panelists of Japanese politicians, economists, and professional moderators, was video-tape recorded from a Japanese television program and transcribed. Questions are identified and classified into several syntactic forms and the distribution of these question forms in the data is examined. The manner in which questions are posed and responded to is qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed in order to determine the degree of control exerted and their role as dispute markers. These analyses reveal that questions that possess greater ambiguity in terms of desired addressees' responses are preferred and strategically utilized along with suprasegmental features and non-linguistic devices in the Japanese political discussion under investigation. The study shows that the general tendency to avoid overt control and overt conflict is reflected in questioning strategies employed in the discourse, which may symbolize a characteristic type of Japanese-like argumentation.

INTRODUCTION

It has often been said that the Japanese tend to avoid argumentative discussion (Kindaichi, 1989a, 1989b; Itasaka, 1988; Sakurai, 1979). According to Nakajima (1989), Japanese political discussions are characterized by question-response sequences which occupy considerable time, but display no clear resolution nor true dispute.

On the other hand, a growing body of research about questioning in English demonstrates its important role in negotiation, especially in the management of verbal conflict (Connor-Linton, 1989). All questions appear to control discourse to some extent, but the degree of control and the role of the question as a dispute marker varies with the types or forms of questions (Harris, 1984; Philips, 1984; Benett, 1976).

Previous studies document that Yes/No Qs enable the questioner to assert more control over the ensuing discourse than WH-Qs (Harris, 1984; Philips, 1984). According to Connor-Linton (1989), because Yes/No Qs constrain the appropriate next turn to confirmation or denial, they narrowly define the ensuing discourse as either agreement or disagreement. Further, because of the preference for agreement which is strongly indicated by Yes/No Qs, they also heighten the likelihood and salience of dispute (Connor-Linton, 1989). In that sense, a Yes/No Q is claimed to be a good marker of potential and actual dispute (Levinson, 1979). In contrast, WH-Qs are more open-ended, inviting the addressee to participate in the co-construction of a view of the world. WH-Qs usually do not put the addressee into quite as tight a corner as Yes/No Qs do; rather they keep the conversation going (Garner, 1980).

It was thus expected that questions also function in different ways in Japanese political discourse. In examining the question-response sequences in one Japanese political discussion, it was observed that the question-response sequences are discourse locations in which political struggles for control take place.

The present study examines question-response sequences in Japanese political discourse. In particular, the study examines how questions are used to control addressees. The speaker attempts to control the addressee by imposing the topic and the speech act of the following turn. Japanese political experts are often aware of these considerations and may resist being so controlled. This study documents the linguistic strategies that speakers and addressees use in such interactions and describes the various degrees of control and cooperation that particular linguistic structures index.

Accordingly, the research questions are as follows:

1. What linguistic forms of Qs are used in Japanese political discourse?
2. How do participants in Japanese political discussion utilize Qs to exert control over one another?
3. What is the relation of the Q to conflict in Japanese political discourse?

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Data Base and Data Collection

The subjects for this study are two Japanese politicians, three economists (critics), and three professional moderators who are participating in a television panel discussion.¹ One of the politicians is from the Liberal Democratic Party (the ruling party) and the other from the Social Democratic Party (the biggest opposition party). Because of the nature of their professions, the subjects are regarded as belonging to a highly educated Japanese population who are accustomed to speaking in front of large audiences.

A panel discussion was video-tape recorded from a three hour Japanese television program entitled "NHK Special: A Revolution in Land Policy," aired on October 12, 1990. The topic of discussion was the government's land policy, which had been a serious national problem for many years. At the time of the discussion, a new land policy bill was being laid out and discussed in the Diet by several councils. The three economists were expected to speak on behalf of the national public, taking the position of criticizing or accusing the politicians, while the two politicians were expected to protect their own positions. The stance of the three moderators could be seen as closer to that of the economists, since the program appeals to the perspective of its viewers -- the national public.

While the social status of the two politicians and the three economists is not equal, they are all regarded as top leaders in their own fields, and are respectful toward each other. The politicians and the critics, in turn, show respect to the moderators even though their own social status is probably somewhat higher; which may be due to their awareness of being on television and the far-reaching effects of mass-media. Because of the purpose and the setting of the television program, the moderators, despite their lower social status, are more than welcome to challenge the politicians. Finally, the moderators are respectful of the critics and treat them as unbiased authorities who are interested in challenging the politicians.

It is also important to note here that the discourse is somewhat prepared or planned because of the television setting, and is thus not considered to be perfectly natural or spontaneous.

Working Definitions of Question Types

Qs are generally regarded as requests for information or attention, and include requests for confirmation, agreement, clarification, recognition, and acknowledgment. Although all of these social functions of Qs apply to the Qs in the present study, I have chosen to define a Q more broadly as *a request for the addressee's verbal or possibly non-verbal response*. Identifying Qs based on this definition actually involves examining the *degree of control* exerted by the speaker, which becomes the crux of the analysis in the present study.

The above definition, however, does not work as a sufficient framework by which Qs can be identified in the transcript. To determine whether an utterance is pragmatically a Q as defined above, a thorough analysis of the utterance in its context is needed (McHoul, 1987). Generally, in many languages, Qs and their functions are signalled by certain linguistic structures. While it is true that there is no isomorphism between linguistic structure and social function (Harris, 1984), it is nevertheless practical and worthwhile to classify Qs by using such linguistic structures, as they may signal something to the addressee and make an utterance distinctive from one without the structures.

Unfortunately, there is no clear agreement as to what actually constitutes a Q marker in the case of Japanese² which does not have as clear a grammatical

system of Qs as English, where question forms are explicitly marked by devices such as tags or subject verb inversion.

For the purpose of the present study, the categorization of Qs set forth by Nakada (1980) will be adopted as a basis for analysis. Nakada claims that Qs in Japanese are marked by such formal features as the sentence-final particle *ka* (Yes/No Q), rising intonation (prosodic Q), the use of interrogative words (WH-Q), and what he calls tag-like phenomenon markers *ne* and *deshoo*. Although there is no clear agreement on whether or not these criteria alone are sufficient to characterize a given sentence as a Q, this claim has been generally supported by several other Japanese linguists. Moreover, as Nakada's categorization of Qs bears a resemblance to some of the similar studies done on Qs in English (Harris, 1984; Woodbury, 1984), this categorization system suits the analytical purpose of the present study and even of possible future comparative studies on Qs in American political discourse. Based on Nakada's categorization, which was adjusted here to facilitate the drawing of clear and detailed conclusions, the surface linguistic structures which identify an utterance as a Q in the transcript are listed with examples as follows:

1. **Grammatical Yes/No Q:** a sentence marked by the final particle *ka*.

kare wa seijika desu ka?
 he T³ politician be Q
 'Is he a politician?'

2. **Prosodic Q:** a declarative sentence without the use of *ka* or the markers *ne* or *deshoo*, marked only by rising intonation.

kare ga soo iimashita?
 he S so say:past
 'He said so / that?'

3. **WH Q:** a sentence marked by interrogative words, possibly along with the use of the final particle *ka*⁴ and classified into the following two types.

- a) **Broad WH-Q:** a question asking *what*, *why*, and *how* which does not request specific information.

sore wa dooshite desu ka?
 it T why be Q
 'Why is that?'

- b) Narrow WH-Q: a question asking *who, where, which, or when*, which appears to require answers that are as specific as the addressee is able to make them.

sore o itsu kikimashita ka?
 it O when hear:past Q
 'When did you hear that?'

4. **Tag-like Phenomena:** a declarative sentence with the particle *ne* or the modal auxiliary *deshoo* at the end of a sentence.⁵

sore wa hontoo desu ne?
 it T true be FP
 'It is true, isn't it?'

sore wa hontoo deshoo?
 it T true auxiliary verb
 'It is true, isn't it?'

Based on the first pragmatic definition mentioned earlier, *the request for the addressee's verbal or possibly non-verbal response*, embedded Qs followed by clause markers such as *to, toka, toiu*, (similar in function to complementizer 'that' in English) are excluded from the present study. Rhetorical Qs which are regarded as those not requiring any response from the addressee have also been excluded, but only in obvious cases in which they contain formulaic expressions, such as *ittai*, or *nante*, (meaning 'what on earth' or an exclamatory form of 'how' in English), or in which they have been clearly analyzed as such from the context, from rhetorical intonation, or from other non-linguistic features. Most cases involving some degree of doubt have been included and are discussed in the analysis.

The categorization of tag-like phenomena is perhaps the most debatable issue when discussing categorizations,⁶ since Japanese does not have clear grammatical tag-Q forms as English does. This is why Nakada calls them "tag-like phenomena" instead of "tag questions." Although all linguistic features that index these phenomena have not been agreed upon,⁷ the structures *ne* and *deshoo* have been chosen to be considered as tag-like markers in this study because of their general acceptance as such, and their high frequency compared to other candidates (especially in these data).

As in many other languages, the particular surface structures stated above do not always guarantee that an utterance is a Q. In ambiguous cases, however, it is often the intonation that plays a crucial role in identifying questions also in Japanese. That is not only in the case of a prosodic Q, which is defined in the present study as a declarative without *ka, ne, or deshoo*, but also in the cases of Yes/No Qs, WH-Qs, and even more crucially, the tag-like phenomena.

It might be expected that, regardless of whether *ka*, WH-words, or tag-like markers appear, a sentence sounds like a Q when it ends with rising intonation, and a sentence does not sound like a Q when it ends with falling intonation. The analysis of each utterance in the transcript, however, indicates that it would be of no use to classify the variation in intonation, including whether a rising intonation is followed by a falling intonation, or whether there is stress on a falling intonation, into only two discrete patterns of rising and falling intonations. It is also better to take into consideration the intonation of a whole sentence rather than only that of its ending. Furthermore, as will be illustrated in the analysis, *ne* uttered without a clearly rising intonation sometimes gets a response, whereas *ne* uttered with a continuing rising intonation sometimes does not seem to require a response.⁸ Intonation is, of course, essential in deciding the function of an utterance. However, other suprasegmental features like stress and pitch, or even non-linguistic devices such as eye-gaze and gesture, are factors which must be considered in the above cases. It is for these reasons that no classification for Yes/No Qs, WH-Qs, and tag-like phenomena by intonation has been made in this study. Instead, intonation will be discussed, along with other suprasegmental features and non-linguistic devices in examining the *degree of control* exerted by the speaker in the analysis of the present study.

Data Analysis

The data were transcribed in Japanese, using romanization, followed by an English-Japanese word-by-word gloss and an equivalent English sentence. Transcription included both verbal and non-verbal communication (including eye-gaze and gesture) and followed the conventions of conversation analysis (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984).

Qs were first identified in the transcript according to the above working definition (*the request for the addressee's verbal or possibly non-verbal response*). In order to examine the differences across forms of Qs in Japanese, Qs in the data were then classified into the four syntactic forms (i.e., WH-Qs, Yes/No Qs, prosodic Qs, or tag Qs) and the distribution of those forms in the data was examined.

In order to analyze question-response sequences in terms of the degree of control exerted by the speaker and the role of the Q as a dispute marker, this study documented the distribution of Q types, the percentage of Qs actually followed by a speaker change, and the percentage of Qs followed by verbal and non-verbal responses (see Tables 1-3). The manner in which each type of Q was posed and responded to was qualitatively examined as well.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Distribution of Q Types

Table 1 displays the distribution of Q types which occur in these data.

Table 1: Distribution of Q types

WH-broad Q	14	(15%)
WH-narrow Q	0	(0%)
Yes/No Q	6*	(7%)
Prosodic Q	0	(0%)
Tag-like markers		
** <i>ne</i>	68	(75%)
<hr/> <i>deshoo</i>	3	(3%)
Total	91	(100%)

* 3 out of 6 Qs are asking for permission to ask Qs

** excluding phrase final tokens of *ne* and *deshoo*

*** Obvious rhetorical Qs are excluded

The first general findings to note are that WH-Qs are moderately used and Yes/No Qs are very rare, while tag-like phenomena are the most frequent Q type in these data. The WH-Qs in these data are all broad WH-Qs, and not narrow WH-Qs which seek to elicit specific information. If the three Yes/No Qs uttered by one of the critics, which were actually all requests to the moderators for permission to ask a Q, are excluded, there are only three Grammatical Yes/No Qs—less than one fifth of the number of WH-Qs. No Prosodic Qs were identified in these data. This might seem surprising, however, as noted by Mikami (1976), the Prosodic Q is inappropriate in polite contexts. More than 95% of the tag-like markers include the final particle *ne*, and these account for 75% of all the Q types in the data.

The Degree of Control Exerted by Qs

According to Schegloff (1972), Qs control the ensuing discourse because they are a first pair part of an adjacency pair. It is further claimed that Qs involve an initiating act (Harris, 1984), which is accomplished through turning the floor over to someone else (*turn control*), and initiating a topic (*topical control*).

Turn control

Turn control is defined here as putting the addressee in a position where s/he has to say something. That is, speakers control a turn when they elicit the addressee's verbal or non-verbal response. Not all Qs in English turn the floor over to the addressee, and the degree of turn control varies according to different types of Qs (i.e., WH-Qs, Yes/No Qs, Prosodic Qs, or Tag-Qs). Table 2 displays the extent to which each Q type in this corpus gets a verbal response from the addressee.

Table 2: Percentage of Each Q type followed by Speaker Change

WH-broad Qs	100%	
WH-narrow Qs	-	
Yes/No Qs	100%	
Prosodic Qs	-	
Tag-like markers		
<i>ne</i>	17%	}41%
<i>deshoo</i>	66%	

According to Table 2, WH-Qs and Yes/No Qs are always verbally responded to by their addressees, while tag-like phenomena elicit the addressees' verbal responses only 41% of the time.

These figures suggest that the probability of eliciting an addressee's verbal response to broad WH-Qs or Yes/No Qs is very high, while that by tag-like phenomena is lower.⁹ Table 2 shows a very low figure of 17% for *ne*, and a much higher figure of 66% for *deshoo*. Table 2, however, shows only verbal responses by the addressee. In Table 3, which includes non-verbal responses like nodding, the frequency of response increases to 21% for *ne*, and 100% for *deshoo*.

Table 3: Percentage of Each Q type followed by Verbal and Non-Verbal (Nodding) Response

WH-broad Qs	100%	
WH-narrow Qs	-	
Yes/No Qs	100%	
Prosodic Qs	-	
Tag-like markers		
<i>ne</i>	21%	}60%
<i>deshoo</i>	100%	

Taking nodding into account, *deshoo* appears stronger in exerting turn control (eliciting verbal and non-verbal response),¹⁰ while *ne* still remains weak.

It is worth noting, however, that *ne* itself may exert different degrees of turn control in different contexts. In other words, the low figure of 21% for *ne* does not mean that the potential of *ne* to elicit the addressee's response is consistently very low. Examining *ne* qualitatively in the discourse reveals that *ne* sometimes requires the addressee's verbal response to a great extent, in which case a pause (non-response) followed by *ne* seems very conspicuous, but in other discourse contexts, a response or non-response from the addressee is not so noticeable. In other words, the implication of the figure 21% is better taken as 'uncertainty' or 'ambiguity' of its function, rather than as a weaker degree of turn control. To achieve a response, suprasegmental features such as intonation, stress, pitch and so forth, as well as non-linguistic devices, such as eye gaze, or gestures, are often employed along with *ne* as exemplified in example 1, below:

(1)

P1: *Sore ike: toiundewa () ikenai!*

well go like modal: neg

'"well then let's go" is no good.'

[

C1:

Katoo-san sore wa ((laugh))

Mr. Kato that T

'Mr. Kato, that is,'

M3: *Sore katoo-san ne: tochi mondai wa ne:*

that Mr. Kato P land problem T P

'That is, Mr. Kato, the land problem is, '

[

P1:

(*un*)

'yeah'

M3: *yappari !SEIkatsu! no mondai da to omoundesu !ne!*

after all living LK problem be QT think FP

'after all, a problem of "(every day) life," I think,'

((Short pause))

P1: *un.*

'yeah.'

M3: *dakara SEIkatsu! no mondai o*

therefore life LK problem O

'So, the problem of "life"...' ---

In example (1), *ne* succeeds in achieving a verbal response¹¹ after a short pause. Politician 1 (P1) purposely ignores the critic's points in the previous questions in his long talk, so critic 1 (C1) and moderator 3 (M3) try to cut his turn short and point out the matter ignored by P1. This *ne* does not have a clear rising intonation, but as the transcript shows, there is some type of emphasis on this token of *ne*. Furthermore, M3's tone of voice, eye gaze, short pause after *ne*, and M3's next utterance beginning with *dakara* 'OK, so,' followed by P1's response, all seem to indicate that this token of *ne* requires a verbal response to a great extent. However, *ne* does not always necessitate such a response, as shown in example (2) below:

- (2)
 C3:() SHIKASHI *desu ne*:, MOO *koremade ano: nikai sankai*
 but be P already so far well 2- 3- times
 'But, we have already experienced hikes in land prices two or three

 tochi kootoo wa attandesu ne:.
 land rise T occur:past FP
 times, (right?),

 DE: *sono: keii o mitemasu to*,
 and its process O looking as
 and as I examine the process.'

Here, *ne* does not receive any response, but this lack of response is not conspicuous. This *ne* has a slightly rising continuing intonation, yet no pause follows *ne*, and the speaker simply goes speaking. In this example, *ne* does not seem to require a response as strongly as the token of *ne* in example (1). In contrast, when *ne* is used in a way which suggests that a response is necessary, the absence of such an expected response becomes obvious, as shown in example (3):

- (3)
 P1: *TOkoroga, tochi no baai wa !tochi! o mottoru hito de jakusha*
 But land LK case T land O own people LC the weak

 to kyoosha ga aru wake desu ne.
 and the strong S exist be FP

 'But, in the case of land, people who own land are grouped into the
 weak and the strong, (right?),'

 ((long pause))

mottoru hito de desu yo, !jakusha! to !kyoosha! ga aru.
 own people LC be FP the weak and the strong S exist
 'people who own land are classified into the weak and the strong.'

M1:(*un un*)
 yeah yeah

P1:*sorekara:*
 and,

Ne, as used in example (3), is spoken with stress and a slightly rising intonation. This token of *ne* does not get a response, but unlike the *ne* in example (2), it is followed by a conspicuously long pause. Furthermore, the speaker, failing to get a response, tries to repeat his previous statement with more stress on some words, working harder to get a response this time.

As examples (1) - (3) illustrate, the linguistic structure *ne* itself is very ambiguous. By using *ne*, the speaker may be asking for agreement or confirmation as in examples (1) and (3), or simply looking for attention as in example (2). It is very difficult to distinguish *ne* requiring the addressee to take a next turn from *ne* simply asking for attention while still wanting to keep the turn. As shown in the previous examples, suprasegmental features like intonation, stress, and tone of voice, plus non-linguistic devices such as eye gaze, are often playing a role in signalling the degree of turn control and these cues compensate for the ambiguity of this interactive particle *ne*. Examples (4) and (5) below display further functional subtleties of *ne* :

(4)
 M1:*maa sono: shingikai no koto o ima: chuushinni hanashiteru*
 well that council LK about O now mainly talking

to omoundesu kedo ne
 QT think SF FP
 'Well, I guess we are mainly talking about that council,'

MA: *are wa tashikani:*
 well that T certainly
 'well, that is certainly,'

[

P1: *Iya! () sono baai nara*
 NO that case if
 'No. If that's the case,'

In example (4), the particle *ne*, which is accompanied by neither rising intonation nor stress, but which involves eye gaze, prompts the addressee P1 to respond in a manner unexpected by the speaker, as evidenced by the fact that M1 goes on to the next sentence without waiting for any response. P1 ignores the speaker's utterance followed by *ne*, and jumps into the middle of the speaker's turn, responding immediately to *ne* and displaying his disagreement. Example (4) thus implies that *ne* sometimes elicits a change in turn even when the speaker does not expect it to.

However, as shown in example (5), an addressee may also take advantage of the possibility that *ne* does not require a response:

- (5)
 M1:*sorekara::: MAA zaikai OB ga takusan iru membaa*
 and still well business world OB S many exist member
 'There is a criticism that there are too many former executives
- toshite oosugiru n dewanai ka toiu hihan ga aru ndesu ne:::.*
 as too many be:neg Q QT criticism S exist FP
 from the business world as members (of the council), (isn't there?)'

P1: ((*not looking at the speaker M1, seems to be thinking or searching for words, not trying to respond as before*))

In example (5), *ne* which is uttered with continuing intonation, elicits no response, either verbal or non-verbal. Even though the camera is on M1 and P1, implying that P1 is to be the next speaker, he does not look at the current speaker, possibly in order to avoid taking up the question. Thus, in contrast with the grammatical Yes/No Qs or WH-Qs, *ne* is not a guaranteed Q-marker in the grammatical sense, as it does not always require a response. The addressee is making the most of this feature in this case.

As illustrated, *ne* possesses ambiguity regarding the degree of turn control. According to Table 1, the ambiguous tag-like markers (especially *ne*) are the most frequently used Q-type in this discourse. It is possible to infer that depending on the context, speakers strategically use the ambiguous tag-like markers, adjusting the degree of turn control in each case by using suprasegmental features and non-linguistic devices, and that the addressees are taking advantage of the ambiguity of *ne* as well.

Topical control

It has been noted that the asking of a Q fairly strictly constrains what can be said in the next turn (Connor-Linton, 1988), however, several studies also argue that all Qs do not constrain the next utterance in a similar way (Philips, 1984; Woodbury, 1982; Harris, 1984). Some types of Qs constrain the next turn either as confirmation or denial, while others are more open-ended, allowing

many options for the appropriate responses. To examine topical control (i.e., the control of what can be said in the next utterance) Qs in the discourse were qualitatively analyzed according to the question types isolated in Table 1.

Broad WH-questions. As Table 1 shows, WH-Qs used in these data are all broad WH-Qs. The broad WH-Qs in these data are always followed by extremely lengthy turns, in which the topic of the Q is expanded or developed according to the addressee's will, as in example (6):

(6)

M1: *KA*too-san wa sonohen wa () shingikai no arikata wa
Mr. Kato T about it T council LK supposed way T

do :omowaremasu ka?
how think FP

'Mr. Kato, what do you think about it, - about how a council is supposed to be?'

P1:(*hh*) *ano*:: shingikai toiu ippanron to desu ne:,
well council general discussion and be P
'Well, we are having a general discussion about 'a council' and,'

M1:(*e*:)
yeah,

P1:*ano*:: *rinchoo* de mooketa tochi taisaku kentoo iinkai
well ad hoc committee LC made land- countermeasure council
'Well the land countermeasure council set within the ad hoc
committee, and/or,'

to, *aru*iwa ,
'and, or'

soreto: *iroiro iinkai ga ippai arimasu ne.*
and various council S many exist FP
'and we have various kinds of councils, (don't we?)'

M1:*hai*.
yes.

P1: () !*HOORITSU!* ni motozui !*te!* () *kokkai de shooninsuru hito*
law according to Diet LC elect people
'The member we select in the Diet according to the law, '

watakushi wa shingikai ni wa josei o takusan irero to toiukoto o
 I T council LC T females O many put QT such idea O

ITSUMO oh: mooshiage shuchooshiteoru ichiin nandesu ga,
 always uh saying claiming one but

'I am one of the members who always claims that we should have
 more female members in our council,
 ((grins))

M1:

[
Ano:
 Well,

gyoousei soshiki hoo no desu ne, DAI HACHIjoo ni
 administrative orgz'l law LK be P the eighth LC

arimasu ne: shingikai
 exist FP council

'We have a reference to article 8 in the administrative
 organizational law

P1: [*HACHIjoo iinkai!*
 the eighth council

M1: *E: hachijoo ----*
 yeah, the eighth ---

Example (6) demonstrates how the broad WH-Q controls the topic of the next turn. In his first turn, M1 self-repairs his broad WH-Q, by rephrasing *sonohenwa* 'regarding that' with *shingikai no arikatawa* 'about how a council is supposed to be,' aiming at heightening the degree of topical control. The subsequent response by P1, however, indicates that the WH-Q fails to tightly control the topic of the response, and only succeeds in maintaining the global topic of something about the "council." P1's response illustrates that, as the addressee, he feels free to expand his opinion without being tightly controlled by the broad WH-Q. In his talk, P1 frequently uses *ne* to elicit agreements to his developing opinion. When M1 finds that P1's long response is drifting away from M1's original intention, M1 interrupts P1 in order to topically control the

response again; he succeeds this time by using *ne* instead of a WH-Q. Furthermore, as the transcript indicates, M1 finally gained control of the floor by jumping into the middle of P1's talk. The weakness in topical control of the WH-Q as displayed in example (6) is evident in many other places in these data.

Yes/No questions. In contrast to WH-Qs, Yes/No Qs do not allow an addressee to have as many options. Since a Yes/No Q is itself a complete, ready-made statement, it constrains the appropriate response to either agreement or denial. The absence of an explicit response is often taken as an indirect denial.

(7)

M3:*sono baai wa ano: !DAIzentei! wa desu ne;*
 that case T well major premise T be P
 'In that case, well is the major premise that,

P1:(*un*)
 'yeah'

M3:*tochi o !Sageru! to ima no kakaku o sageru toiu koto*
 land O lower QT present LK price O lower QT

de wa iindesu ka?
 T OK FP

'land, the price of the land should be lowered:?'

P1:*!ii! desu.*
 OK be
 'Yes, it is.'

() *ano:: iroirona dantai ga iutekuru baai ni i: !honno! to tatemae,*
 well various parties S claim case in uh 'honno' and 'tatemae'

ga arimasu yo ne, watakushitachi wa korekara: moo
 S exist FP FP we T from now on EMPH

!HONNE de! subete yatteiki tai.
 'honno' INST all do want

'Well, when various parties claim (to us), there are 'honno' (real intention) and 'tatemae' (superficial meaning), we, from now on, we would like to do everything based on 'honno'.'

sonotameniwa takane antei dewa !ikenai! to.
 for that high-price stability modal:neg QT
 'In order to do that, the stabilized high price is no good,

() *sageru tameni dooiu hoohoo o koozuru ka to.*
 lower for what way O think QU QT
 'To lower (the price), what we do is, ...'

In example (7), the Yes/No Q elicits the clear answer of *!ii! desu* (yes, it is), and the strong degree of topical control is substantiated in P1's response. P1 first exhibits his clear agreement and after explaining the reason, he again comes back to the point raised by the questioner, confirming his agreement. As Table 1 shows, however, excluding the three cases of Yes/No Qs asking permission to ask Qs, only three cases of Yes/No Qs exert a strong degree of topical control in this discourse.

Tag-like phenomena. Tag-like phenomena also seem to constrain the content of the next turn, since they state a proposition and ask the addressee to agree with it. In example (1), the Tag-like marker *ne* elicits the addressee's agreement with the speaker's statement although the addressee's turn is not long enough to develop his own opinion, which is not expected by the speaker. In example (4), *ne* is responded to by *'Iya! 'No!'* followed by the explanation of why the addressee does not agree with the speaker's statement. In the two cases *ne* sets up the next turn as being either an agreement or a denial, obviously preferring agreement or confirmation of the speaker's opinion.

In example (3), *ne* is followed by a pause. As noted in the previous section, this pause sounds conspicuous because it signals a clear absence of a response. Failing to get the desired response, that is, an agreement to his statement, the speaker tries to self-repair his Q to achieve the expected response.

These examples suggest that the tag-like markers control the topic of the next turn as a Yes/No Q does, in the sense of favoring an agreement. A careful examination of tag-like markers, however, indicates that the degree of topical control of tag-like markers may not be that obvious. Cook (1990) claims that *ne* appeals to the general feelings or attitude of the addressee, and the analysis of the following extracts supports this claim.

(8)
 P1: *HOrekara, sorede: e: e: tochi rinchoo o yatteitadaitte*
 and then uh uh land ad hoc-committee O serving

tooshin o itadaku iin no senseigata wa
 report O submit members LK politicians T

kokkai shoonin jinji dewa NAkatta wake desu ne.
 Diet elected member be:neg:past be FP

'And then uh the members who serve on the land ad hoc-committees and submit reports are not the ones (officially) elected by the Diet, (right?)'

M1:*DEmo maa: sono rigai kankeisha ga desu ne: Takusan ()*
 but uh its interest party S be P many

tokuni kanchoo OB toka desu ne: --
 especially public office OB etc. be P

'But, well (there is a claim that there are) too many parties involved, especially people who originally were serving in government offices.'

In example (8), although P1 presents a complete statement with *ne*, the addressee, M1, initiates a new subtopic, without explicitly showing his agreement with or denial of P1's statement, as in the case of responding to a Yes/No Q. Instead, M1 answers, "*DEmo ma::*", which sounds like "I understand what you want to say although I don't know/care if it's right or wrong, but what I believe is..." The addressee M1 is not tightly controlled to show agreement with or denial of the speaker's statement, while he is responding to P1's intention or feelings by saying, "*DEmo ma::*." Cook (1988) claims that *ne* controls the addressee's feelings instead of the specific propositional content of the response, by appealing to the emotions of the addressee. The interactions of P1 and M1 in example (8) are explained by this perspective, which possibly better elucidates the use of *ne* in examples (1) and (6). In all cases, the speaker tries to control the addressee by employing *ne*, through appealing to the addressee's feelings, rather than by using a Yes/No Q, which asks the addressee to show his agreement with or denial of the speaker's statement.

Summary and discussion of this section

Examining turn and topical control exerted by different types of Qs displayed the following results:

Yes/No Qs which have a strong degree of both turn and topical control are rarely used in this discourse. WH-Qs which have a strong degree of turn control, but a weaker degree of topical control are moderately used. On the other hand, tag-like markers, which are ambiguous in terms of exerting turn and topical control, are the most frequently displayed in the discourse.

These findings lead me to propose that the way Qs exert control towards the addressees in the discourse is indirect. It is not done by employing Qs with overt control; rather, Qs which possess greater ambiguity in terms of desired addressee response are strategically utilized, the degree of control being adjusted

in each case, depending on the context, by suprasegmental features and non-linguistic devices. Even when a questioner tries to exert control over the addressee, the device used in the discourse is *ne*, instead of the more guaranteed form of Yes/No Qs. Through the use of *ne*, the questioner tries to control the addressee by appealing to feelings, rather than by specifically asking for agreement on the propositional content of the Q.

This use of tag-like phenomena is subtle, but nonetheless can be strongly appealing on an emotional level. At the same time, the pragmatic ambiguity of such Qs allows the addressee to interpret and respond to his own advantage, rather than to the speaker's advantage. Here, the pragmatic status of the Q is actually much more in the hands of the addressee (McHoul, 1987). This elusive way of controlling leaves a certain grey area of negotiation between questioner and respondent, where they both struggle to control each other strategically.

This general tendency toward a lack of overt control exerted through questioning in this discourse is, in fact, one of the significant characteristics of the discourse as an argument. Without being overtly controlled by the previous utterances, participants are relatively free to claim their own opinions as illustrated in example (6). As a result, their opinions do not necessarily relate to the previous turn topic, as long as they are appealing and responding to each other's feelings, which is also demonstrated in example (8). One opinion is not necessarily built on the previous one. Consequently, the discussion takes time, but does not become an argument logically built upon explicitly stated opposing opinions.

Questions as Dispute Markers

As explained in the methods section, a strong potential for conflict exists in this discussion because of its political nature. The different types of questions used, however, may act to mediate this conflict, as discussed below.

Broad WH-questions

As previously noted, WH-Qs are weak in topically controlling the next turn. Since the addressee has many options for responses and does not have to refer to the specific claim made by the questioner, the potential for conflict is relatively small as shown in example (9):

- (9)
 C2: KORE wa ne !HONtooNI! (hh) E::() SUkyandalikkuna
 this T FP really uh scandalous
 koto desu ne::,
 matter be FP

'This is really a scandalous matter (that ---), (isn't it)'

Sore o mata: yurushiteiru desu ne: YATOO
 that O EMPH allowing be P the Opposition Party]
 () *KORE wa ittai NAN nanda toiu fuuni omou ndesu ga*
 this T on earth what QT in such way wonder SF

'but I wonder what on earth the Opposition Party which allows the government to do so is (doing)!

((laughter))

ikaga deshoo ka. ((laughter))
 how be FP

'So, what do you say (think)?'

P2: *watakushi mo hontooni saikin soo omotteorimasu.*

I too really recently so thinking

'I really think so, recently.'

(hh) *Ano juurai yayamo shimasuto ne, hooritsu ga tooru.*
 uh well so far a tendency that P law S pass

'Well, so far, we have a tendency that a new law passes,

shingikai ga dekiru. SOOshimasuto desu ne: YATOO no
 council S made then be P Opposition Party LK
 '(And) then a council is established, then (it was often requested)

In example (9), C2 places a broad WH-Q at the end of a lengthy turn. Within his turn, C2 projects his opinion, trying to get a confirmation to his claim and leading up to a strong accusation towards the end of his turn. But it is immediately followed by the broad WH-Q, *ikaga deshoo ka?* 'What do you say/think?,' and accompanied by laughter. This broad WH-Q, which is often used in Japanese discourse, is in fact very ambiguous. Depending on the context, it means "What do you say/think (about this)?," "Do you agree with this/me?," or something similar. The ambiguity of this type of broad WH-Q allows the addressee to have many options for response and does not put the addressee into a tight corner. Thus, in example 9, the WH-Q functions in mitigating the potential conflict, which might have been provoked by the previous strong accusation made by the speaker. P2, recognizing C2's intention to mitigate the potential conflict, responds with *watakushimo honto:ni -- soo omotte orimasu* 'Me too, I really think so.' This utterance maintains the ambiguity as to what P2 really thinks is "soo." By using this vague expression, P2 is allowed to avoid clarifying the accusation, aggressively alleged by C2 immediately before the broad WH-Q, and freely goes on to initiate his new topic.

Yes/No questions

In contrast to the conflict mediating nature of WH-Qs, a Yes/No Q heightens the likelihood and salience of dispute (Connor-Linton, 1989). It constrains the response to either agreement or denial. Benett (1982) argues that the use of a Yes/No Q has certain advantages in creating dispute.

Example (7) is a good illustration of this claim. The Yes/No Q in this example sounds aggressive in the discourse. Irritated by the obscurity of the argument so far, speaker M3 gets into the conversation and attempts to clarify an uncertain point by using the Yes/No Q. This particular Yes/No Q fortunately gains agreement. However, if the response in this kind of situation is denial, the Yes/No Q could provoke conflict and would be very useful in making clear the opposing positions of the speakers. As already displayed in Table 1, however, such Yes/No Qs are rarely used in this discourse.

Tag-like phenomena

The tag-like phenomena function more frequently as potential dispute markers in this discourse than the Yes/No Qs. Nevertheless, as documented in the previous sections, they also exert varying degrees of turn and topical control when used in different contexts and in conjunction with different suprasegmental strategies. Example 10, below, further displays one of the various functions of *ne*:

(10)

M3: *SORE kato-san ne: tochi mondai wa ne:*
 that Mr.Kato FP land problem T P
 =That is, Mr. Kato, the land problem is,

P1: [(un)

M3: *yappari !SEIkatsu! no mondai da to omou ndesu !ne!*
 after all life LK problem be QT think FP
 =after all, a problem of (every day) 'life', I think, (right?)

((short pause))

P1: UN
 =Yeah.

M3: *dakara ! SEIkatsu! no mondai o desu ne, yappari !sakiokurisuru!*
 therefore life LK problem O be P after all postpone

teiu no wa mondai da to omoundesu yo ne,
 QT NM T problem be QT think FP FP

'So, to put off dealing with the problem of 'life' is a problem,
after all, I think (right?)'

((pause))

P1:(hh) ano:: !saki! okuri wa::::: maa:::::

uh well postpone T uh

'Well, putting it off is -----

In example (10) (part of which is introduced in example (1)), the emphasis on *ne*, the following pause, as well as M3's tone of voice and eye gaze, all indicate that M3 is trying to exert strong control. This impression, however, is achieved not by explicit appeal to the addressee through a Yes/No Q, but by using suprasegmental cues to appeal to the addressee's feelings or general attitude. Two tokens of *ne* in M3's turn are used with *omoundesu* 'I think,' as in "*omoundesu(yo)ne*," which sounds like 'I think that ..., do you agree?' but which is never overtly verbalized as in the case of Yes/No Qs. This tag-like question is more elusive in that *ne* encourages the addressee's involvement or cooperation with the questioner by pulling the addressee's feelings closer towards the questioner's.

Cook (1990) argues that *ne* indexes affective common ground. With this observation in mind, it is intriguing to find *ne* being used by these speakers to exert some control towards addressees in arenas of potential conflict. It is possible that because *ne* implicitly exerts control while simultaneously indexing common ground, speakers use this marker more frequently than Yes/No Qs or prosodic Qs, which exert overt control and may lead to overt conflict. In the discourse examined here, speakers try to execute control in subtle ways by appealing to the affective common ground with the help of *ne*.

However, since tag-like phenomena appeal to feelings and work on an emotional level rather than on a straightforward propositional level, once such tag-like markers are rejected by the addressee, the conflict may become intense and has the possibility of ending up in an emotional rather than a logical argument. Example (11) clearly illustrates this claim:

(11)

M3:*Konsensasu ni jikan ga kakatteiru aidani dondon chika*

consensus for time S taking while more and more land price

'While it is taking (a lot of) time to reach a consensus, the price of
land is rising further, (right?)'

ga agacchau wake desu ne.

S rise be FP

((pause))

P1: *!iya!* DAKARA::: *iroiro utsute ga arimashite*
 No therefore many plans S have
 'No, therefore, we have many plans,

In example (11), in responding to M3's remark which ends with *ne*, P1 puts more stress on *!iya!* 'no!', and raises his tone of voice for DAKARA:::, 'therefore,' which illustrates his strong disagreement.

Example (12), illustrates another situation in which a tag-like phenomena marker nearly provokes explicit conflict:

(12)
 M1: *sorekara:: MAA zaikai OB ga takusan iru*
 and still well business world OB S many exist

menbaa toshite oosugiru n dewanai ka toiu hihan ga
 member as too many be:neg QU QT criticism S

aru ndesu ne::.
 exist FP

'There is a criticism that there are too many former executives from the business world as members (of the council), (isn't there?)'

P1: ((*not looking at the speaker M1, seems to be thinking or searching for words, not trying to respond as before*))

M2: *DE sonoatari desu ne:, ano: nakatani-san - osoreirimasu,*
 well about that be P well Mr. Nakatani excuse me
 'Well, regarding that point, Mr. Nakatani, oh excuse me,

ima: ano: kato-san utsurimashita keredomo:
 now well Mr. Kato taken (by camera) SF
 just now the camera was on Mr. Kato.

C3: *E:,*
 Yeah,

M2: *SAkki ne:, rigai choosei MOO taihenna rigai choosei o*
 before P interest adjustment EMPH intensive interest adjustment

'You were saying before that (they) are doing an intensive adjustment of interests (there), (weren't you?)'

yatteru n janai ka to osshatemashita yo ne,
 doing be:neg QU QT saying:past FP FP
 C3: [Un.: ano:
 =yeah, well,

M2:Ikaga desu ka,
 how be FP
 'What do you say/think?'

C3: sakihodo ano seichookaichoo ga desu ne:
 earlier well Chairperson S be P
 'Well, earlier, the Chairperson (Mr.Kato) said that ---

In example (12) (part of which is discussed in example (5)), the conspicuous absence of P1's response to M1's utterance of the tag-like marker *ne* foreshadows potential conflict. This potential conflict is, however, suddenly diffused by another moderator's (M2's) interruption, which ends with a broad WH-Q. M2 admits that the supposed next speaker is P1, referring to the camera work, but she takes the turn from P1 and allocates a different speaker, C3, to take the next turn. The flow of possible argumentation is cut off in the middle of its highlight and digresses to a more open-ended discussion initiated by the WH-Q (cf. example 9). These examples show that conflict, especially that involving intense emotions, is not preferred by participants. The important implication of this analysis is that a tendency to avoid overt verbal conflict because of the participants' awareness of the possibility of an ensuing emotional argument is reflected in the choice and use of Q types in the discourse. Qs are generally used to exert control up to a certain limit, and when that limit is approached, speakers try to adjust their control by using particular linguistic structures such as WH-Qs.

Discussion of Some Cultural Aspects

Both linguists and anthropologists have argued that the structure of language both reflects and reinforces fundamental cultural beliefs about the way people are and the nature of interpersonal communication (Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1982; Sapir, 1921). In the course of the present study, several unique features of the use of Japanese language, which have not been discussed in the previous sections, seemed to suggest that indeed, the Japanese language fosters certain cultural values or concepts. This section presents some of those findings, and is followed by a short discussion of cultural concepts underlying the discourse argument.

As many Japanese linguists have pointed out, the way of saying "yes" or "no" in answering Yes/No Qs in Japanese is different from the way this is done in English. Japanese learners of English often experience difficulty with this difference, and frequently make mistakes in answering Yes/No Qs in English. In answering a Yes/No Q asking, "Aren't you going?", English speaking people who are not going, answer, "No, I'm not." In Japanese, however, the response is the opposite as in "Yes, I am," which sounds contradictory in English, but is expected in Japanese. In the Japanese language, 'yes' means "what you've just said is correct," and 'no' means, "what you've just said is not correct". Japanese has to show agreement with or denial of what the speaker said, rather than agreement with the propositional content of the Q. In other words, saying 'no' to a Yes/No Q in Japanese is almost the same as denying the person as a whole, which is regarded as impolite in Japanese society, where people tend to put importance on the harmony of an interaction. It would be considered running the risk of being 'impolite' to ask a Yes/No Q, which might end up threatening the face of an addressee by forcing him to show his agreement or disagreement with the questioner. In such a case, the addressee is afraid of threatening the face of the questioner. Because of this reluctance to threaten the face of others, Japanese speakers tend to avoid asking Yes/No Qs directly. The findings reported in this study, which show that Yes/No Qs are rarely identified and that more 'ambiguous' tag-like phenomena are preferred in this discourse, are properly explained by this feature of the Japanese language along with this Japanese cultural value. The assertion that in Japanese, responding to Qs may signify a personal response to the questioner him- or herself, can probably help to elucidate the analysis of Japanese political discourse.

As already demonstrated in the previous sections, in the structure of the Japanese language, Qs are mostly lexicalized by final particles such as *ka* (Q marker), and *ne* (tag-like marker). These final particles have recently come to the attention not only of linguists but also of conversation analysts who recognize their uniqueness as language structures. These final particles may index feeling or attitude (Cook, 1988).

The fact that placement of Q markers, that is, final particles, is literally delayed until the end of a sentence enables speakers to decide at the last moment which final particle to use. In other words, depending upon the addressee's facial expression, the speaker may change his original intention from asking a Q to asserting an opinion, or from Yes/No Qs to tag-like phenomena. In any case, the final particle chosen to be employed indexes the speaker's respective affective disposition. It is thus expected that explicit and implicit interactions between speaker and addressee are taking place at the locations of question and response sequences.

In Japanese conversation, as in all conversation though to differing degrees, the relationship between participants is of great importance. Any overt conflict between speaker and addressee could jeopardize the harmony of an interaction if expressed directly. In Japan, conversation is a way of creating and reinforcing

the emotional ties that bind people together (Clancy, 1986). Therefore, overt expression of a conflicting opinion is regarded as taboo. Throughout Japanese discourse, avoidance of overt control and overt conflict is exemplified in the choice and use of Qs. The present analysis of Japanese political discourse supports this cultural concept by indicating how Q types are carefully chosen in order to mitigate potential conflict in a political discussion.

Japanese views of verbal communication may also impact the use of Qs by participants in political encounters. Reddy (1979) suggested that while Americans believe the main responsibility for successful communication rests with speakers, Japanese feel it rests with the listener. In his comparison of English and Japanese writing, Hinds (1987) claims that in English writing, all responsibility lies with the writer who has to make himself clear, while in Japanese writing, the reader takes the ultimate responsibility, since much is being left to the reader to interpret from the literal meaning of the writing. According to Nakamura (1984), expressions which are too transparent to allow an addressee to make his own interpretation sound aggressive. In the present study of political discourse, the preference for the ambiguity of WH-Qs and tag-like markers, which facilitates a middle-ground of negotiation between the speaker and the addressee, reflects this Japanese view of verbal communication.

CONCLUSION

This investigation into the distribution of Q types and the qualitative analysis of Qs in terms of turn and topical control yields the following results: Yes/No Qs, which have a strong degree of both turn and topical control, are rarely used in the discourse. WH-Qs, which have a strong degree of turn control, but a weaker degree of topical control are moderately used. On the other hand, tag-like phenomena, which are ambiguous in terms of exerting turn and topical control, are the Q types most frequently displayed in the discourse. Based on these findings, I propose that Qs without overt control but with greater ambiguity in terms of desired addressee response are strategically utilized in the discourse: Depending on the discourse context, the degree of control is adjusted from the very weakest to the strongest levels by suprasegmental features and non-linguistic devices.

This study suggests that the general tendency to avoid overt control is a significant characteristic of Japanese argumentative discourse. The analysis of Qs in the discourse demonstrates that interlocutors try not to constrain one another to respond directly to the current topic or to explicitly state an opinion concerning that topic. Consequently, Japanese political discourse does not take the form of an argument which is logically built up turn-by-turn with explicitly stated opposing opinions.

The analysis of Qs as dispute markers shows that avoiding overt control and overt conflict is reflected in questioning strategies employed in the discourse. By avoiding overt control and overt verbal confrontation, which jeopardize the favorable relationship between speaker and addressee, participants try to appeal to each other's feelings and seek the 'cooperation' of the addressee. This work is done through employing Qs which possess pragmatic ambiguity, and which are ultimately aimed at skillfully convincing the addressee without overt confrontation, but with the possible threat of an emotional argument, all of which may represent a prototypical form of Japanese-like argumentation. In general, cross-linguistic study shows that final particles frequently index affect (Ochs, 1990). The claim that Japanese Qs in political discourse are mostly marked by final particles that similarly index affective disposition contribute to our more general understanding of Qs in Japanese discourse. Affect is a highly valued dimension in Japanese communication, where relationships among participants are most crucial.

Since the present study is based on the analysis of the transcription of only one television panel discussion, the findings reported here should be viewed as tentative. Certainly, expanding this study by looking at similar data will increase the validity and generality of the results. As pointed out, the data presented here are limited in not being totally spontaneous because of the television setting. There is no doubt that other data must be collected to further validate the analysis; however, it would also be interesting to examine an ordinary, unstaged Japanese political conversation to compare the two types of discourse.

Although the eight participants in this discussion are divided into three speaker groups of moderators, critics, and politicians, the present work did not examine any specific features found within each speaker group. Breaking down the analysis of Qs into speaker groups may further elucidate the findings of the present study and should therefore be done in future studies.

The present study began as an attempt to investigate Qs in Japanese political discourse; however, in the course of the study, it was found that dealing with final particles is indispensable in examining Qs in Japanese discourse. As mentioned in the methods section, it was difficult to define Qs in Japanese, which may be itself an indication of the inherent ambiguity in Qs in Japanese. Some linguists argue that in Japanese, there is not a clear distinction, but rather a non-discrete speech act continuum between what has been traditionally labeled as 'declarative' and 'interrogative', lexicalized by final particles (cf. Tsuchihashi 1983). The analysis in this report indicates that, when considering issues of control and conflict, final particles are crucial to the discussion of Qs in Japanese political discourse. This study was at least able to show the necessity for a more thorough examination of final particles in the analysis of Qs in Japanese.

Finally, it is expected that the present work will be further validated if it is someday accompanied by a comparative study done on questioning in American political argumentative discourse.

NOTES

- 1 Although the data base was collected from only one source, because of the random nature of the selection process, the findings of the present study demonstrated several essential points that could be applicable to other sets of data using similar political discourse.
- 2 Mikami (1972) admitted the difficulty of defining Qs and claimed that there is a gradual change from Qs to declarative sentences in Japanese. A very recent study even points out that there is no such thing as a questioning sentence in Japanese (Tsuchiya, 1990)
- 3 Abbreviations of morphological glosses, used for ease of reading, are listed in the Appendix.
- 4 A WH-Q can have *ne* or *deshoo* at the end, although examples have not been found in the data used for this study. It is inferred that there might be some differences among WH-Q without a final particle, WH-Qs with *ka*, and WH-Qs with *ne* or *deshoo*, which would illuminate more of the findings of the present study. This will be further examined in a future study..
- 5 It must be noted that *ne* and *deshoo* can occur not only at the end of a sentence, but also at the end of a phrase. Phrase-final uses of *ne* and *deshoo* have been excluded from this study since they are generally not regarded as tag-like phenomena markers by linguists.
- 6 In the present study, however, it is essential to have an independent classification of Tag-like Phenomena, because they have distinctive characteristics which set them apart from both Yes/No Qs and Prosodic Qs. While Yes/No Qs grammatically ask a yes or no response from the addressee, Tag-like Phenomena contain a statement and generally seek confirmation or agreement, in which case the desire of these responses is usually considered to be stronger than in the case of Yes/No Qs. Prosodic Qs in the categorization used in this study do not have *ka* or the markers *ne* or *deshoo*, and usually elicit a yes or no response as Yes/No Qs do.
- 7 Maynard (1987) regards forms like *deshoo*, *daroo*, and others like *janai*, *janaika*, and *jan* as Tag-Q-like auxiliary verbs and treats the final particle *ne* as a 'particle of rapport' instead of as a Tag-like marker. But it is also claimed that *ne* has functions of inquiry, confirmation, or request for agreement, which fall under the category of Tag-like Phenomena in the present study. Forms like *daroo*, *janai*, *janaika*, and *jan*, have not been found in these data, because of their inappropriateness in this particular formal setting.
- 8 Although it was not identified in these data, it is also possible to imagine a situation such as the interrogation of a suspect by the police, in which *ka* with a falling intonation does receive a response.
- 9 It is worth noting that all Yes/No Qs in these data happen to have rising intonation, which could be related to the fact that they all received responses, whereas *ne* was executed with various intonations, and received fewer responses.
- 10 Because of the limited amount of data especially involving *deshoo*, the claims made should be viewed as tentative, but probable, based on the fact that these figures are based on a random sampling of data, and are therefore at the very least, indicative of a certain trend.
- 11 This "un" in example 1 is distinguished from a backchanneling cue, although it is also regarded as another form of response in the present study. P1's utterance here is regarded as turn because P1's utterance is very clear and is preceded by a pause and followed by M3's next utterance beginning with "DAKARA:::", all of which imply that M3 actually waited for P1 to take a turn to acknowledge M3's claim.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, J.M. & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Benett, A. (1976). Strategies and counterstrategies in the use of yes-no questions in discourse. *Berkeley, CA: Linguistic Society Proceedings*.
- Clancy, P.M. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs, (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213-250). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor-Linton, J.T. (1989). *Crosstalk: A multi-feature analysis of Soviet-American spacebridges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Cook, H. M. (1988). *Sentential particles in Japanese conversation: A study of indexicality*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Cook, H. M. (1990). *Meanings of non-referential indexes: A case study of the Japanese sentence-final particle NE*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Gamer, A. (1980). *Con conversationally speaking: Tested new ways to increase your personal and social effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, S. (1984). Questions as a mode of control in magistrates' courts. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 49.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Conroe & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across language: Analysis of L2 texts*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-85). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Itasaka, G. (1986). *Nihongo no hyogen*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Kindaichi, H. (1989a). *Nihongo*. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Kindaichi, H. (1989b). *Nihonjin no gengo hyogen*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Levinson, S.C. (1979). Activity types and language. *Linguistics*, 17.
- Maynard, S. K. (1987). *Japanese conversation: Self-contextualization through Structure and interactional management*. In Roy O. Freedle, (Ed.), *The series of advances in discourse processes* (vol. 35). New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- McHoul, A.W. (1987). Why there are no guarantees for interrogators. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11.
- Mikami, A. (1981). *Gendai goho sinsetsu*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Nakada, S. (1980). *Aspects of interrogative structure: A case study of English and Japanese*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Nakajima, F. (1989). *Nihongo no kozo*. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Nakamura, A. (1984). Nihonjin no hyogen. In N. Masaki (Ed.), *Nihongo no hataraki: Kozo nihongo no hyogen* (pp. 300-310). Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo.
- Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. Stigler, G. Heredt & R. Shweder (Eds.) *Cultural psychology: The Chicago symposium* (pp. 287-307). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Philips, S. (1984). The social organization of questions and answers in courtroom discourse: A study of changes of plea in an Arizona court. *Text*, 4.
- Reddy, M. (1979). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.) *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 284-320). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sakurai, K. (1979). *Kangaekata no fudo*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Sequencing in conversational openings, in J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.) *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Tsuchihashi, M. (1983). The speech act continuum: An investigation of Japanese sentence final particles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 7, 361-387.
- Tsuchiya, S., Shirai, K., Suzuki, H., & Kawamori, M. (1990). Nihongo no imiron o motomete 4. *Gekkan Gengo*, 19, 90-95.
- Uyeno, T. (1971). A study of Japanese modality: A performative analysis of sentence particles. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Woodbury, H. (1984). The strategic use of questions in court. *Semiotica*, 48, 197-228.

Mariko Yokota has an M.A. in TESL from UCLA. Her interests include second language acquisition, language pedagogy, and discourse analysis.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

For the help of readers, the transcription ? : rising intonation. not necessarily a Q.

! : an animated tone. not necessarily an exclamation.

!! : emphasis of the words between ! !.

Capital letters are used to indicate an utterance or part thereof, that is spoken much louder than the surrounding talk.

** Speakers of each utterance is indicated as

P1 & P2: Politician 1 and Politician 2

C1 & C2 & C3: Economist 1, Economist 2, Economist 3

M1 & M2 & M3: Moderator 1, Moderator 2, and Moderator 3

Transcription conventions which appeared in this study are listed as follows.

[: overlapping utterance

: : extension of the sound or syllable it follows

. : a stopping fall in tone. not necessarily the end of a sentence.

, : continuing intonation. not necessarily between clauses of a sentence.

() short, untimed pause

Abbreviations of Morphological Glosses

be : copula

EMPH: emphatic marker

FP : final particle

INST: instrumental particle

LC: locative particle

LK : linker (linking nominal and nominal adjectives)

neg: negative

NM: nominalizer

O : object marker

.P > non-final particle

past: past tense marker

QT: quotative marker
Q: question particle
S : subject marker
SF: softener
T: topic marker



Linguistic Research



MARGARET THOMAS (Boston College):
Knowledge of Reflexives in a Second Language
x, 234 pp. 1 55619 241 X \$65.00 Hb

ROBERT SCHREUDER & BERT WELTENS (eds.) (University of Nijmegen):
The Bilingual Lexicon
viii, 307 pp. 1 55619 536 2 \$70.00 Hb Also available in Paperback: \$29.95

SUSAN GASS & LARRY SELINKER (eds.):
Language Transfer in Language Learning (rev. ed.)
vi, 108 pp. 1 55619 390 4 \$56.00 Hb Also available in Paperback: \$24.95

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING

Box 27519 • Philadelphia PA 19118-0519

(215) 836-1200 • (215) 836-1204

Toll-free Ordering (US & Canada): 800-562-5666