

**Speaker change after the *Shi*- form:
Implication for the status of the *shi*- form in Japanese syntax for
conversation**

Manabu Kawakatsu
Research Centre for Languages and Cultures
University of South Australia

Abstract

According to the conversation analytic model of turn taking, the essential element for turn organisation is the recognition of a turn at talk as being possibly complete – at possible completions speaker change becomes a relevant next action. In the case of the *shi*-form, it seems to indicate that the turn so far has not reached a possible completion because the function of *-shi* is to indicate that there is more to come. However, speaker change commonly occurs after *shi*-forms with minimal gap or overlap, and speaker change in this position is routinely not treated as problematic (e.g. the speaker change is not repaired as mistimed or wrongly positioned). At the same time, turns at talk which continue beyond a *shi*-form to produce an additional clause are also treated as unproblematic in terms of speaker change. This raises the question, does a sentence ending in the *shi*-form constitute a turn-constructional unit (TCU) – that is, is it a unit of talk which is possibly complete in context? This paper will examine a corpus of naturally occurring Japanese language conversations collected in Tokyo in order to analyse the ways in which *shi*-forms are deployed interactionally. It will argue that the *shi*-form is an incomplete TCU, but that it is designed to be incomplete and that there are action motivations for such a design. The incompleteness of *shi*-forms is therefore not a problem of turn construction but an interactionally relevant example of what Schegloff (1996) calls TCU's without endings.

Keywords: Syntax-for-conversation, conversation analysis, *shi*-form, turn-ending, speaker change

1. Introduction

According to the conversation analytic model of turn taking (Sacks et. al, 1974), the essential element for turn organization is the recognition of a turn at talk as being possibly complete – at possible completions speaker change becomes a relevant next action. In Japanese, this proposal that speaker-change occurs at possibly complete points raises a problem for understanding how turn taking operates, because the status of clauses as turn constructional units is problematic (Tanaka, 1999). Researchers such as Tanaka (1999) argue that some clauses in Japanese are not syntactically complete as they project further talk beyond the end of the clause and so treating some clauses in Japanese interaction as turn-constructional units (henceforth TCUs) is problematic. Even though there have been some studies of construction of conjunctive particles such as *-kedo*, *-kara* and *-ba* (e.g. Tanaka, 1999), there has been little discussion of *-shi*. In the case of the *shi*-form, it seems to indicate that the turn so far has not reached a possible completion because the function of *-shi* is to indicate that there is more to come. However, speaker change commonly occurs after *shi*-forms with minimal gap or overlap, and speaker change in this position is routinely not treated as problematic (e.g. the speaker change is not repaired as mistimed or wrongly positioned). At the same time, turns at talk which continue beyond a *shi*-form to produce an additional clause are also treated as unproblematic in terms of speaker change. This raises the question, does a sentence ending in the *shi*-form constitute a turn-constructional unit (TCU) – that is, is it a unit of talk which is possibly complete in context? The problem arises because of the post-positional nature of Japanese grammar in which some conjunctions occur at the end of a subordinate clause and project an independent clause to complete a full grammatical sentence.

Grammatically, *-shi* is a conjunction which connects two clauses, and is often translated as ‘and’ in English. It is attached to the end of Clause 1 and projects Clause 2 as in the following:

- (1) *Nihon jin ga kirai da shi Nihon mo kirai da.*
Japan people NOM hate COP *SHI* Japan also hate COP
(I) hate the Japanese, and (I) also hate Japan.

In Extract 1, *-shi* is located at the end of Clause 1 *Nihon jin ga kirai da* ((I) hate the Japanese) and connects Clause 2 *Nihon mo kirai da* ((I) also hate like Japan), and *-shi* at the end of Clause 1 projects Clause 2. The conjunction *-shi* can connect more than two items or clauses as the following example.

- (2) 1 kare wa komunike:shon heta da shi, kao warui shi,
 he TOP communication bad COP SHI face bad SHI
 Because he does not have a good communication skill, his face is
- 2 kawatteru shi, atama mo warui kara daremo yatowanai.
 strange SHI brain also bad KARA nobody hire-NEG
 ugly, his behaviour is strange, and he is not clever, nobody will hire [him]

In Extract 2, *komunike:shon heta da* (bad communication) connects to and projects the next clause *kao warui* (bad face) through the conjunction *-shi* located at the end of the clause, while *-shi* at the end of *kao warui* connects with and projects next item *kawatteru* (strange), and *kawatteru* and connects with and projects *atama mo warui* through the *-shi* at the end of *kawatteru*. Extract 2 indicates that *-shi* functions to mark a current item as being part of a series with further items to come. This indicates that a clause ending in *-shi* is not a complete syntactic unit, but rather that the presence of *-shi* projects some next unit for completion to be achieved.

Even though the main syntactic function of *-shi* is to connect two or more clauses and to project further items to come, *-shi* sometimes appears at the end of a sentence, especially in spoken interaction, as in the following (in bold):

- (3) 1 A: *do: shite kare e yatowanai no?*
 why he ACC hire-NEG QP
 Why does ((nobody)) hire ((him))?
- 2 B: *kare wa komunike:shon heta da **shi**,*
 he TOP communication bad COP **SHI**
 Because he does not have good communication skills, AND...

Some linguists such as Makino and Tsutsui (1986) argue that the sentence final *-shi* occurs when a speaker just lists one of a number of reasons or possibilities in order to weaken the force of the utterance or to make a stated reason more obscure as is the case with B's contribution in example (3). However, this argument about the effect of *-shi* is problematic in interactional terms since it focuses only on the nature of the turn in which *-shi* is used. It does not consider the position of *-shi* in the sequence of talk being produced. Such an analysis is

based on an idea that turns which end in *-shi* are unambiguously designed to end in *-shi* and that the analysis needs only to account for the effect of such turns. This means that studies to date have not identified how recipients know that a turn is designed to end at *-shi*, – that is, how they distinguish whether *-shi* is in the middle or at the end of an utterance, and so, how speaker change is organized by participants in such turns. Sentence final *-shi* therefore constitutes a problem that needs to be addressed in a syntax for conversation. The following study is based on a corpus of naturally occurring Japanese language conversations collected from 20 audio recordings of casual conversations between 50 native speakers of Japanese made in Tokyo in 2007.

2. ‘Syntax–for–Conversation’

The term “syntax–for–conversation” was proposed by Schegloff (1979) as a field of investigation which analysed how syntactic structures were used interactionally to construct and understand turns at talk. It involves looking not just at the grammatical properties of the turn itself, but how these grammatical properties interact with the sequential context in which the turn occurs. Many syntactic theories have considered the structure of grammar beyond the level of the sentence, for a discussion see, for example, Newmeyer (1998). Syntax–for–conversation attempts to integrate the notion of conversation as social interaction with grammar (Schegloff, 1979) and such work is relatively new in linguistic analysis, although it has been adopted in some functional approaches to linguistics such as Ford and Thompson (1996) and Selting (1998). The idea of syntax-for-conversation emphasises the social as well as the linguistic role of turns at talk and seeks to examine how grammar forms a part of social action. It focuses on the grammar of spoken language as it is used by speakers to achieve social interaction. This means that turns at talk need to be considered not just as linguistic form but also as a form of social action and the analysis of the social action being performed by participants is important to understanding how syntactic constructions are being used in interaction. Syntax–for–conversation claims as a theoretical position that (Schegloff 1979):

1. sentence grammar is placed within turns at talk, which are in turn situated inside sequences of turns.
2. sentence grammar is dependent on social interaction and communication.
3. sentence grammar is a source for conducting social interaction.
4. actions, which are grammatically based, have social importance.

TCUs are a key structure for analysis in ‘syntax–for–conversation’. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974, p. 702) identify a TCU as the basic unit for constructing turns at talk. TCUs are contextually sensitive units of analysis – that is they are defined in terms of conversational action rather than in terms of the structural components of the turn itself. TCUs are therefore considered to be units of talk which are possibly complete in their sequential context. This means that a TCU may consist of a number of different unit types from a syntactic perspective – sentences, clauses, phrases or words – and what is salient for analysis is not the linguistic structure itself, but whether this structure can be understood in context as being a recognisably complete conversational contribution.

TCUs are however both structural and interactional and it is possible to analyse TCUs in terms of their internal structure and to identify structural locations within TCUs, such as the beginning or ending of the unit. Each of the locations is not just a structural point in the TCU but also a site at which sentence grammar and social action can be interrelated. Schegloff (1996) has pointed out a number of structural locations in the TCU, which are interactionally relevant positions for deploying sentence grammar to accomplish socially relevant achievement. These are (Schegloff, 1996):

1. The boundaries of the TCU
 - a. turn beginnings
 - b. turn endings
2. Internal positions within the TCU related to TCU boundaries
 - a. post–beginning
 - b. pre–completion
3. External positions relevant to the TCU related to TCU boundaries
 - a. pre–beginnings
 - b. post–completion

The external positions are structurally different from TCU boundaries and TCU–internal positions in that they can be regarded as turn elements rather than the TCU itself; however, they are oriented to reference to the TCU which they follow or precede (Schegloff, 1996).

In this study, the focus of the analysis is placed on the boundaries of TCUs and examines the use of *–shi* as the possible end of a TCU. From a syntax–for–conversation perspective, this means not only examining the ways in which the turn at talk ends, but also how the next turn at talk begins as the end of a turn at talk is interactionally accomplished and achieved through speaker change (Liddicoat, 2007). In this paper, I will utilize Schegloff’s notion of ‘syntax–for–

conversation' to analyze *shi*-forms occurring at the end of an utterance with consideration of context-dependent nature of spoken language. Using this context-dependent approach, I will focus on how previous and following utterances are influenced by or influence the utterance with the *shi*-form. Moreover, I will focus on conversation utilizing naturally occurring data to fully investigate how participants actually utilize the *shi*-form at the end of utterance in natural spoken Japanese.

3. *-Shi* as a Connector in Conversation

In Japanese conversation, *-shi* often functions as a conjunction connecting two clauses and occurring within a single turn construction unit with only one possible completion as in the following (in bold):

(4) [Teachers]

1 B: = *raku desu ne., Genki wa.*
 easy COP P *Genki* TOP
Genki ((Japanese textbook)) is easy ((to use))

2 A: *a: so [: nano,] do:shite?*
 oh is it so? why
 Oh, is it so? Why?

3 C: [*do:shite?*]
 Why?

→ 4 B: *nanka, nanka, e ga o:i shi:, goi ga*
 well well pictures NOM many-**SHI** vocabulary NOM
 Well, for example, ((there are)) many pictures AND

5 *sukunai.*
 little
 a little vocabulary

6 (0.2)

- 7 B: *esu efu je:tte*, [*suggoi o:i janaidesuka.*]
 SFJ-TE very lots has
 SFJ ((Japanese textbook)) has lots of ((contents))
- 8 A: [*a, ufu, u.n, tsume tsume.*]
 well laughter yes stuffed
 Well, yeah, ((the contents are)) stuffed
- 9 A: *tsume sugi desu yo ne, naiyo* [*:ga.*]
 stuffed over COP P P contents NOM
 The contents are over-stuffed
- 10 B: [*so:*] *tsume*,
 Yes stuffed
 Yes stuffed
- 11 *tsume.*
 stuffed

Here B connects the first clause *e ga o:i* (((there are)) many pictures) and second clause *goi ga sukunai* (a little vocabulary) with the connector *-shi*, seen in Line 4 projecting a single TCU. In interaction, from a purely sentence grammar perspective, *-shi* functions as a conjugation and indicates that further talk is coming and that the talk is in some way related to the previous clause and that speaker change will be relevant after the second clause. In Extract 4, B completes his talk without a break and proceeds through to the end of a sentential TCU before speaker change occurs. The TCU underway is therefore oriented to as incomplete by both participants, and there is no evidence that speaker change is relevant after *-shi* in such cases. Moreover, the continuing intonation after the *-shi* helps the current speaker to continue the TCU until the end. This reflects Tanaka's (1999) argument that intonation is important in Japanese for understanding whether or not a clause is designed to be a TCU.

Another example of *-shi* as a connector in conversation is as in the following (in bold):

- (5) [27 November I]
- 1 R: *un, sugoku hosoi.*
yes very slim
- 2 (0.2)
- 3 Q: [*ne..*]
I agree
- 4 R: [*zuru*]*i* [*futsu:ja*]*nai, uhahahahaha.*
Unfair normal-NEG laughter
It is unfair and abnormal, laughter
- 5 P: [*nan de:?*]
why
- 6 Q: *da yo ne, moh,*
COP p P well
That's right, well...
- 7 R: *se mo takai shi ii yo [ne.]*
height also high-SHI good P P
You are also tall, AND ((it is)) good ((for you))
- 8 Q: [*da*] *yo ne..*
COP P P
That's right
- 9 P: *futsu..*
average
((my height is)) average
- 10 R: *nan senchi?*
what cm?

11 (1.2)

12 Q: *futsu*. [*ufufu*.]
average laughter

In this Extract, R connects the first clause *se mo takai* (The height is also high) and *ii yo [ne]* (((it is)) good ((for you))) with the connector *-shi* as seen in Line 7. This allows R to continue the second clause after *-shi* and continue to produce comments about P's height. Extract 5 provides further evidence to indicate that *-shi* projects further talk and that conversation participants orient to the projected further talk as a relevant next action.

These examples show that Japanese speakers sometimes treat *-shi* as a point in talk which is not yet possibly complete and at which speaker change does not occur. That is, *-shi* is treated as a conjunction projecting further talk and speaker change occurs after the projected conjoined element has been produced – that is at a first possible completion following *-shi*. Such cases indicate that *-shi* is not a transition relevance place as the turn-so-far is oriented to as incomplete.

4. Turn final *-shi* with speaker change

Although *-shi* is used to project further talk, cases of speaker change immediately following *-shi* with no gap or overlap are common in Japanese conversation. An example of a turn final *-shi* with speaker change is presented in Extract 6 (in bold):

(6) [Classroom]

1 G: *demo ko:haku toka, kya:* [*tte, mo:*] *terebi no mae*
but music program scream¹ TV GEN front
But, [I] scream 'kya:' and watch the music program in front

2 H: [*ahahaha.*]
laughter

3 G: *de miru kara,*
Of watch-KARA
of the TV

¹ Onomatopoeia for women screaming in front of favourite celebrity

- 4 G: *fufufu, rokuga, rokuga toka,*
 Laughter recording recording
 Laughter recording, recording ((the music program))
- 5 H: *a: waku waku.*
 yeah I see I see
- 6 G: *dakara, oya ga yarisgijanaino tte.*
 Because parents NOM went too much-TTE
 Because ((of my behaviour, my)) parents say ‘((I)) went too far’
- 7 G: *u:n demo, okkake toka shinakatta shi.,*
 yeah but a groupie act-PT-NEG-SHI
 Yeah, but, ((I)) did not act like a groupie, AND...
- 8 I: *ma:, [demo,] sokomade it tara ijo: da*
 well but that far went if abnormal COP
 Well, but, if ((you)) went that far, ((it would be)) abnormal
- 9 *yo, [yappari.]*
 P you see
- 10 H: *[a:..]*
 I agree
- 11 G: *[u:n] demo, ita yo ne?*
 Yeah but is-PT P right?
 Yeah, ((there)) was ((one)), right?
- 12 H: *u:n.*
 yeah

Line 7 contrasts with Line 6, which sets up a frame for understanding the function of Line 7 and the projected next element as a further contrast with ‘going too far’. G’s utterance in Line 7 is constructed with *-shi* with the speaker change occurring immediately after the *-shi*. In this

case, the speaker change occurs at a point at which some further talk is signaled as relevant, and so at a point which is not syntactically possible complete. However, there is no gap or overlap in speaker change that is, speaker change is precisioned–timed at *–shi*, and the speaker change at this point is treated as unproblematic even though *–shi* is spoken with continuing intonation (marked by the comma in the transcript) to indicate a further item to come intonationally. It is neither syntactically or intonationally complete. I responds to the element prior to *–shi* as interactionally complete enough to initiate speaker change and produces an evaluation of this talk. I’s talk at Line 8 is treated by both the speaker and the recipient as sequentially relevant and adequate. Moreover, it would appear that speaker change at this point allows the recipient to display quick up–take of the speaker’s meaning (Schegloff, 2002; Liddicoat, 2004).

Another example of a turn final *–shi* with speaker change occurs in the following (in bold):

(7) [29 November]

1 D: *dakara watashi, zettai, nanka, garagara demo*
because I definitely like empty even
Because ((of that)), I definitely do not sit ((on the))

2 *yu.sen seki suwaranai.*
Priority seats sit–NEG
priority seats ((for elderly))

3 C: *u.n.*
yeah

4 B: *watashi mo suwa [n nai.]*
I also sit– NEG
I also do not sit ((on the priority seats))

5 C: [*u.n*] *kondokara, suwan no*
Yeah from now–KARA sit VN
Yeah, from now on, I ((will)) stop sitting

6 *yame yo.*
stop P
((on the priority seats))

- 7 D: *nanka, mendo:kusaishi*,
like troublesome-*SHI*
((Sitting on the priority seats is)) like troublesome
- 8 B: *mendo:kusai*.
troublesome
- 9 C: *un*.
yeah
- 10 B: *datte, shikamo, ne:*,
because and right?
- 11 D: *shikamo, ke:tai tsukat tara ikenai(0.2) [jan.]*
and mobile phone use if prohibit
And, the use of mobile phone is prohibited ((on the seats))
- 12 C: [*u.n.*]
Yeah

This is a sequence in which participants make comments about priority seats for the elderly and disabled people after hearing a story that D was stared at by an elderly person when she was sitting there. D produces a further comment at Line 7 which is constructed with *-shi*. B in Line 8 responds to D's comment even though D's utterance ends with continuing intonation which indicates further item to come intonationally. Here again, D's utterance in Line 7 would indicate further talk to come due to the construction with *-shi* at the end. Despite *-shi*, B produces talk which agrees with and accepts D's comment. B in Line 8 indicates she understands D's utterance in Line 7 to be completed despite *-shi* indicating further talk syntactically. B's talk in Line 8 treats D's previous talk as a complete enough action, 'having done what needs to have been done at this point in the conversation' (Liddicoat, 2007: 58) to allow to be assumed to be understood and for the relevant next turn to be produced. Moreover the *-shi* in Line 7 is not lengthened like in Extract 6. Therefore, the phonetic lengthening after *-shi* is not a clear indicator to distinguish whether *-shi* is turn final or turn internal. This is another example in which a complete action allows for speaker change and allows the speaker to confirm the end of a sequence, rather than syntactic completion being the trigger for speaker. Because B in Line 8

responds to the content of the turn prior to *-shi*, it is interactionally complete enough to initiate speaker change. Especially like in Line 8, the repetition of previous utterance, a participant responds to what has just been said previously.

Another example of a turn final *-shi* with speaker change is found in Extract 8 (in bold):

(8) [English]

- 1 Y: *firipi.no kananka cho* [*tto, chotto ne.*]
 Filipino something like like P
 Filipino, ((You look)) like, something like
- 2 Z: [*a:, mieru*] *firipin*
 yes look like Philippine
 Yes, ((you)) look like a person
- 3 *jin.*
 person
 from the Philippines
- 4 A: *demo, hana kuroi shi.*,
 but nose dark-**SHI**
 But, ((my)) nose ((is)) dark, AND ((I do not look like Filipino))
- 5 Y: *hana ga kuroi kara* [*ne.*]
 nose NOM dark-KARA P
 Because ((your)) nose ((is)) dark, ((you do not look like Filipino))
- 6 A: [*so*] *reni, nanka, kontakuto*
 And like contact lens
 [I] also wear contact lens, AND...
- 7 *mo ireteru shi.*
 also wear-**SHI**
- 8 Y: *e., karakon?*
 oh colour contact lens?

- 9 (2.0)
- 10 Y: *en kin dakara, karakon.*
 far near because colour contact lens
 Because ((my contact lens are for)) far ((or)) near ((sight
- 11 [*ni shi yo: kana:?*]
 use P might
 correction, I)) might use colour contact lens
- 12 A: [*e:, demo, are]yokunaitte iwareteiru yo.*
 well but that good-NEG-TTE said P
 Well, but, that ((colour contact lens)) is said not to be good
- 13 Z: *are, shiryoku ochirun desho [:.]*
 that eye sight drop right
 ((Your)) eye sight ((will)) get worse ((using)) the((colour contact lens)),
 right?

After Y produces an utterance attempting to confirm that A's exotic face looks Filipino in Line 1, Z accepts Y's confirmation in Lines 2 and 3. After the confirmation by Z, A produces a comment rejecting the confirmation by Y and Z. She constructs this with *-shi* at the end of utterance in Line 4. After the *-shi* in Line 4, Y who had said A's face looks Filipino, repeats the words, *hana kuroi* (dark nose), and Y now agrees with A's grounds for rejection in Line 4. The responses indicate that A's previous utterance in Line 4 is being treated as a sufficient response to be understood even though turn talk is constructed with a continuing intonation to indicate a further item to come. Moreover, after Y produces an utterance attempting to agree with A that A's exotic face does not look Filipino in Line 5, A produces another utterance about contact lens as to emphasize that she does not look Asian. She also constructs this with *-shi* at the end of utterance in Line 7. Here, A's utterances in Line 4 and Line 7 are constructed with *-shi*; however, both Y and Z treat A's utterances with *-shi* to be relevant enough to be evaluated as an utterance and produces an assessment to achieve this.

An interesting point in Line 7 compared with Line 4 in terms of *-shi* is that there is falling intonation on *-shi* in Line 7 and a continuing intonation in Line 4. Since falling intonation does not occur with the *-shi* when it is found in the middle of a turn, the falling intonation could be

an indicator for a recipient to recognize the *-shi* is at the end of the turn. However, intonation does not seem to be a significant factor in establishing a turn as possibly complete as the speaker change at Line 4 and in the earlier examples show and as Tanaka (1999) has argued. Speaker change therefore occurs even where the turn so far is not marked as intonationally complete and turn-taking needs to be explained independently of intonation. Therefore like the previous two extracts, Extract 8 deals less with projection, and more with what has just been said.

Another example of a turn final *-shi* with speaker change is found in Extract 9 (in bold):

(9) [Linguistics]

- 1 V: [e:] *son na koto, konomae, taihen ne.*
 well that thing before problem P
- 2 U: [a:]
 yeah
- 3 V: *ma:, nanigeni min na [ki:teruyo ne.]*
 well without notice everything listen P P
 Well, ((he)) listens to everything without ((our)) noticing
- 4 U: [*uchira, uchira.*]
 our our
 ((He)) listens to us,
- 5 *no hanashi, ki:teru **shi**,*
 GEN talk listen-**SHI**
 us talking, AND...
- 6 V: *so:, ki:teru, [ki:teru.]*
 yes listen listen
 Yes, ((he)) listens, listens ((to us talking))
- 7 U: [*ki:teru,*] *ki:teru.*
 Listen listen
 ((He)) listens, listens

- 8 U: *meccha ki:teru desho?: [kikoe teru nokatte]*
indeed listen doesn't he hear can whether-TTE
Indeed, ((he)) listens. ((He even)) asks us
- 9 V: [*ahahahahahahaha.*]
laughter
- 10 U: *ki:teru shi.*
ask-SHI
whether we can hear ((him)), AND...
- 11 V: *sore wa arimasu yo ne. sore wa arimasu yo ne.*
it TOP does P P it TOP does P P
((He)) does it, ((he)) does it
- 12 U: *so: sorenanoni, T**, T***** no hanashi sa.,*
yes but Ms T GEN story P
Yes, but ((the)) story ((about)) Ms T, ((he)) sounds like
- 13 *hatsumimida kedo mitaina kanji datta yo ne.*
first time-COP-KEDO like sound COP- PT P P
((this is the)) first time ((he heard it))
- 14 V: *ichio:, so:iu fu:ni shitan janai.*
tentatively that way do-PT probably
((He)) probably did it that way tentatively
- 15 U: *a:, so: desu ka ne?*
well that COP QP P
Well, is that so?

This is a sequence in which V and U are talking about their teacher, who communicates very well with his students. After V produces her utterance saying that the teacher listens to everything without the students' noticing in Line 3, U produces an utterance ending with *-shi* to agree with V's previous comment by saying something similar to V's previous utterance in

Lines 4 and 5. Interestingly, there is a continuing intonation after *-shi* to indicate further talk to come. The *-shi* is preceded by the phrase *ki:teru* which is used repeatedly in Line 6 by V to agree with U's utterance ending with *-shi* and responds to the content of the turn prior to *-shi* not to a next element. It means that the assessment constructed the prior talk is assessable, and even partial but entire conversation actions are available for assessment (Liddicoat, 2007). Therefore in Line 6, V is formulating a summary of the prior talk and therefore displays an orientation to the topic as potentially concluded (Liddicoat, 2007; Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970). After V repeats the evaluation uttered in Line 6, U accepts the evaluation by repeating the same word *ki:teru* (listen) in Line 7. After the comments with *-shi* in Lines 5, neither V or U adds additional information and do not return to any projected matter remaining from their prior talk.

They also accept the evaluation by V in Lines 6 as ratifying the understanding of the comments produce in the turn ending with *-shi*. Moreover in Lines 8 and 10, after U produces an utterance ending with *-shi* saying that the teacher even asks them whether they can hear him, U produces an utterance which agrees with U's previous comment repeating the phrases *sore wa arimasuyone* ([he] does it) in Line 11. Therefore, as V's evaluation in Line 6, Line 11 could be considered as formulating a summary of her prior talk. After the comments in the turn with *-shi* in Line 10, neither V or U adds additional information, as was also the case in Line 5. However, They also accept evaluation by V in Line 11 and ratify the understanding of the comments in the turn with *-shi* as in Line 6. It could be the case that the falling intonation after *-shi* in Line 10 gives a signal to the other participant that the *-shi* is a turn final *-shi*, not a turn internal one. Extract 9 demonstrates two instances of speaker change immediately following *-shi* which would appear to be instances of early speaker change before a possible completion, however the examples are not treated as instances of problematic speaker change. That is, they are not repaired as cases of mistimed or misplaced speaker change would be but rather are treated as appropriately placed and sequentially relevant talk (Schegloff, 2000).

In each case, speaker change occurs after the turn-so-far has become a recognizable conversational action and the next speaker's talk orients to the preceding talk as being complete in those terms. Because B in Lines 6 and 11 responds to the content of the turn prior to *-shi*, this turn is being treated interactionally complete enough to initiate speaker change with any projected next element being disregarded. As in Line 6, the repetition of a previous utterance, a participant responds to what has just been said previously and displays uptake of prior talk. Therefore like previous three extracts, Extract 9 is more about early entry and less about projection than other extracts previously mentioned.

A further example which reveals this local management of speaker change after *-shi* can be seen in Extract 10.

(10) [Cafeteria I]

- 1 T: [sakka:,] *un, hetada kedo, miruno mo yarunomo*
Soccer yeah unskillful–*KEDO* watch and play
Even though ((I am)) not good at soccer, ((I)) like watching
- 2 S: [u:n.]
yeah
- 3 *sukinano.*
like
and playing ((it))
- 4 S: *fu:n.*
I see
- 5 T: *un, soreni hetanano kankeinai shi.,*
yeah and unskillful nothing to do–*SHI*
Yeah, and being unskillful ((has)) nothing to do ((with
it)), AND...
- 6 S: *a:, kekko:, e,*
oh seriously well
- 7 U: *u:[n.]*
I see
- 8 T: [u]n, *hetada [kedo,]*
Yes unskillful–*KEDO*
- 9 S: [fi] *gyua*
figure skating
Figure skating, I...
- 10 [suke.to watashi.]
I

- 11 T: [hetada kedo, tennis] mo sukida *shi*.
 unskilful–*KEDO* tennis also like–*SHI*
 Unskilful, but I also like tennis, AND...
- 12 S: *suki? ano, miruno?*
 like well watching?
 ((Do you)) like watching ((it))?
- 13 U: *ja:, kondo mini kichai na yo.*
 then next time watch come P P
 Then, next time, ((we)) come and watch him
- 14 S: *iya, mini ikane:, ne:?*
 well watch watch–NEG P
 Well, ((but, I do)) not go and watch ((him))
- 15 U: *mini iki tai to omou. Terebi mi tai yo ne?*
 watch go want VN think TV watch want P P
 ((I)) think ((I)) want to go and watch ((him)).
 ((I)) want to watch TV
- 16 S: *un.*
 Yes

Prior to this sequence, S and U have made fun of T because he likes sport even though he is not good at it. At Lines 1 and 3, T produces an utterance telling S and U that he likes to watch and play soccer even though he is not good at it. After the T's utterance, S produces a minimal assessment in Line 4. Then, T produces an utterance in Line 5 rejecting S and U's comments by saying there is no relation between liking sport and being skilful at it, ending the clause with –*shi* with continuing intonation. S initiates speaker change immediately after –*shi* in Line 6. S and U seem to accept T's talk at Lines 6 and 7. T then continues his telling, moving from soccer to tennis. S responds immediately to the content of the talk prior to –*shi*. After this, S and U start responding to T's utterance from Lines 12 to 14. There is falling intonation after –*shi* in Line 11 compared with continuing intonation in Line 5. So Line 11 is intonationally complete. T's talk at Line 5 and 11 is treated by both the speaker and the recipients as

sequentially implicative and adequate. Moreover, it would appear that speaker change at this point allows the recipient to display quick up-take of the speaker's meaning (Schegloff, 2002; Liddicoat, 2004). Therefore like previous four extracts, Extract 10 less deals with projection, but more about early entry. Like the S and U's responses, a participant uptakes or responds just said previously, not necessary next projected bit.

Extracts from 6 to 10 illustrate that the element prior to *-shi* as interactionally complete enough to initiate speaker change. In each case, a participant responds to what has just been said previously. Without considering a projected next bit and there is no evidence that the next speaker is showing understanding of what is projected. A participant responds to something which has just been said and not to some projected next element of talk in Extract 6 to 10. Speaker change after *-shi* is achieved collaboratively by participants. Moreover, since both continuing and falling intonation did occur with the *-shi* at the end of the turn, the falling intonation could not be an indicator for a recipient to recognize the *-shi* is at the end of the turn and does not seem to be a significant factor in establishing a turn as possibly complete.

5. Overlapping Talk Following *-shi*

The examples discussed so far show that syntactically and intonationally the status of *-shi* as a turn final element is ambiguous and that speakers rely on recognition of completed action to organize speaker change. It is not therefore surprising to find examples where *-shi* is used to connect two clauses by a current speaker, but speaker change occurs after the *-shi* itself as in the following:

(11) [Cafeteria II]

1 S: *e, demo, docchinishiro watashi Dokomo shoppu*
 well but anyway I Docomo shop
 Well, but, anyway, I might go to

2 *i, iko: kana? =*
 go might
 ((a)) *Docomo* ((Mobile phone company)) shop

3 T: *= are, okashi: na, kore na.*
 well wrong P this P
 Well, ((there is something)) wrong ((with)) this

- 4 (0.4)
- 5 S: *ginko: mo ikanakya ikenaishi*
 bank also go have to-*SHI*
 ((I)) also have to go to bank AND
- 6 S: [*yu: binkyoku ni mo ika nakya.*]
 post office LOC also go have to
 ((I)) also have to go to post office
- 7 U: [*watashi mo, ginko: furiko*] *mi shinakya ne., =*
 I also bank transfer have to P
 I also have to ((make a)) bank ((money)) transfer
- 8 S: = *a.* =
 I see
- 9 U: = *furi- furikomi no shikata toka wakarū?*
 transfer GEN how to know
 Do ((you)) know how to transfer ((money))?
- 10 S: *furikomi, e., tada [bango: o o] sudake:?*
 Transfer well only number ACC press
 [Money] transfer? Well, only press numbers

After S's first clause in Line 5, *ginko: mo ikanakya ikenaishi*, (((I)) also have to go to bank AND), U initiates his own utterance starting an utterance in Line 7 overlapping with S's Clause 2, *yu: binkyoku nimo ikanakya* (((I)) also have to go to post office) in Line 6. Here again, U responds to context of the turn prior to *-shi*. Speaker change is initiated immediately after *-shi*. There is a problem for organising speaker change as U treats S's talk as complete, even though *-shi* projects further talk, which does in fact get produced. Moreover as illustrated in Extract 5, since a turn internal *-shi* occurs even with non-continuing intonation, it is difficult for the participants to distinguish whether the *-shi* is turn final or internal *-shi* intonationally. In Line 5, *ginko: mo ikanakya ikenaishi*, (((I)) also have to go to bank AND) constitutes as an action because '[I] also have to go to bank AND' is enough information for U to initiate her turn

((*watashi mo, ginko: furikomi*)) *mi shinakya ne:*, = (I also have to ((make a)) bank ((money)) transfer) which is a continuation of response for S's prior utterance and relevant in this context.

A similar example can be seen in Extract 12:

(12) [November 27 II]

- 1 X: *nanka, chotto, atama, yokutte, nanka nandemo dekiru ko*
 like bit clever-TE like everything able women
 Like, ((men like women who look)) innocent rather than
- 2 *yorimo, nanka, toboketeru ko noho:ga,*
 rather like innocent womenthan
 women ((who)) can do everything and...
- 3 W: *nanka, ore ga hippatte ikanakya mitaina ne.*
 like I NOM lead-TE have to like P
 Like, 'I have to lead her' like
- 4 X: *so:.*
 Yeah
- 5 (1.0)
- 6 W: *are, do:nano, ma:, i:n dakedo.*
 that what happen well never mind-KEDO
 What happened to that? Well, never mind, but...
- 7 W: *watashi wa hippatte ikare nakutemo i:shi.*
 I TOP have to be led-NEG-SHI
 I do not have to be led [by a man], AND
- 8 X: [*so: so: so: so: so:.*]
 Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah
- 9 W: [*a:, demo, daredemo*] *kandemo, hippatte itte*
 Well but everyone to be led

well, but, everyone wants to be led ((by someone))

- 10 *hoshi.monjan.*
 want
- 11 X: *so:da yo ne.*
 I agree P P
- 12 W: *tsuyoki demo.*
 strong heart even
 even ((with)) a strong heart
- 13 X: *demo, so:iunotte, ienaikara ne.*
 but that thing-TE say-NEG-KARA P
 But, ((we)) cannot say that

Immediately after W's utterance in Line 7, *watashi wa hippatte ikare nakutemo i:shi* (I do not have to be led [by a man], AND), X initiates his own utterance in Line 8 overlapping with W's ((*a:, demo, daredemo*)) *kandemo, hippatte itte hoshi:monjan* (well, but, everyone wants to be led ((by someone))) in Lines 9 and 10. For X, *watashi wa hippatte ikare nakutemo i:shi* (I do not have to be led ((by a man)), AND) in Line 7 constitutes as an action and is enough information for X to initiate her turn [*so: so: so: so: so:*] (Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah). Since the word *so:* is repeated so many times, it cannot be considered as just backchanneling, but needs to be seen as a full turn in its own right. The response is to the element prior to *-shi*. The issue here is more complex. It shows that turn constructional elements ending with *-shi* may occasion responses to the element prior to *-shi* even though the current speaker's subsequent talk indicates that the turn was designed to project beyond *-shi*. Moreover, non-continuing intonation after *-shi* makes the recipient hard to distinguish whether the *-shi* is turn final or internal. This shows that the interactional value of the conjunction *-shi* after some bit of talk is problematic for the organisation of speaker change in Japanese.

6. Conclusion

-Shi signals that further talk is projected, but the projected talk is not always produced. Speaker change may occur after *-shi* with no gap or overlap, but it does not seem that this is simply the

result of *-shi* as a turn designed not to be complete or to be complete after *-shi* as shown in the earlier analyses. Moreover, *-shi* can be both grammatically and intonationally incomplete but speaker change may still occur unproblematically. Neither grammar nor intonation provides clear resources for speaker change. In fact, examples of mistimed speaker change after *-shi* show that turns ending in *-shi* are not unambiguously designed as turn final. Instead speaker change after *-shi* is achieved collaboratively by participants and often involves an affiliative agreement with it. *-Shi* provides a site at which speaker change may be locally managed and the incompleteness is interactionally accomplished by participants not a design feature of turns. The issue here seems to be responding to talk prior to *-shi*, not orienting to a projected next element. The analysis here shows that the *shi*-form has potential to be treated as complete where a recognizable action has been performed which is considered to be a pragmatic possible completion. The *shi*-form inherently projects further talk, and whether or not unproblematic speaker change occurs after *-shi* is not a property of the syntax of the utterance, but of syntax in its conversational context. In this sense, whether or not speaker change can or does happen after the *shi*-form is locally managed by participants in a particular conversation at a particular moment in that conversation. It is therefore a phenomenon which needs to be considered through a syntax-for-conversation approach as its role in language cannot be seen in a decontextualised approach to syntax.

REFERENCES

- Ford, C.E. and Thompson, S.A. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, and S.A. Thompson (eds.). *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 134-184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garfinkel, H. and Sacks, H. 1970. On formal Structures of practical actions. In J.C. McKinney and E.A. Tiryakian (eds.). *Theoretical Sociology* (pp.10-39). New York: Appleton.
- Liddicoat, A. 2004. The projectability of turn constructional units and the role of prediction in listening. *Discourse Studies* 6(4), 449-471.
- Liddicoat, A. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. Continuum, New York.
- Makino, S. and Tsutsui, M. 1986. *A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar*. Japan Times, Tokyo.

- Newmeyer, F. J. 1998. *Language Form and Language Function*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Psathas, G. 1995. *Conversation Analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. A. and Jefferson, G. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1979. The relevance of repair to syntax for conversation. In T. Givón (ed.). *Discourse and Syntax* (pp. 261-286). New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1996. Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson (eds.). *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. 2000. Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society* 29(1), 1–63.
- Schegloff, E. A. 2002. Opening sequencing. In J. E. Katz and M. Aakhus (eds.). *Perpetual Contact: Mobile Communication, Private Talk, Public Performance* (pp. 325-385). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selting, M. 1998. TCUs and TRPs: The construction of units in conversational talk. *Interaction and Linguistic Structures* 4, 1-48.
- Tanaka, H. 1999. *Turn-Taking in Japanese Conversation: A Study in Grammar and Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Appendix I

Abbreviations in transcripts

(Tanaka 1999)

ACC	accusative particle	NEG	negative
ADVP	adverbial particle	NOM	nominative particle
AP	appositional	NP	noun phrase
CAUS	causative	P	particle
CONJ	conjunctive particle	PT	past tense
CONT	continuation	PASS	passive
COP	copula	POT	potential
DAT	dative particle	PRE	present tense
DESI	desiderative	QP	question particle
DF	disfluency	QUOT	quotative particle
EXC	exclamation	SFP	sentence final particle
GEN	genitive	SFX	final suffix
INT	intensifier	TOP	topic particle
LOC	locative particle	VN	verb nominalizer
N	nominalizer		

Appendix II

Transcription conventions

(Tanaka 1999)

CAPITAL	passages delivered a louder voice than surrounding talk
<u>underline</u>	highlights parts produced in a louder or more emphatic tone than surrounding talk
[]	overlapped speech in contiguous lines
[]	two or more speakers begin simultaneously or a speaker overlays the talk of another speaker overlapped speech ends
[.....]	overlap speech begins and ends
[]	one speaker stops and another starts up contiguously
(2.0)	the number indicates the length of a pause or silence measured in seconds
(.)	unmeasured micro-pause
()	transcriptionist doubt of what was said
(())	commentary by transcriptionist
↑	rising intonation
↓	falling intonation
→	points out a phenomenon under scrutiny
<	a hurried start in speaking
< >	talk delivered at a slower pace in relation to surrounding talk
> <	talk delivered at a quicker pace in relation to surrounding talk
° °	delivered in a quieter voice than surrounding talk
°° °°	delivered in a much quieter voice than surrounding talk
h or (h)	aspiration, breathiness, or laughter tokens
hh	inbreath or inhalation
=	“latching or contiguous talk
:::	sound stretch
cut-off	
,	continuing intonation
.	falling intonation
?	rising intonation
ɹ	a hardened or dentalized quality of sound