# A sentence dispersed within a turn-at-talk: Response-opportunity places as loci for interactional work[1]

*Aug Nishizaka*

## Abstract

*The aim of this study is to show that there is orderliness in a piece of talk that is extremely complex and, in so doing, to explore the grammatical construction of naturally occurring, and contingently produced, utterances in Japanese interaction. First, I distinguish between unit-completeness and turn-completeness. Second, I introduce the notion of response-opportunity places to indicate those places in which although the ongoing talk is still both unit- and turn-incomplete, responses may be produced. These places are systematically used as loci for initiating solutions to various possible interactional problems, such as problems of hearing and understanding. Third, I examine different practices through which the speaker returns to the incomplete turn-constructional unit. The orderliness of the target talk is the result of the speaker's systematic use of these places and practices.*

**Affiliation**
Chiba University, Japan
email: augnish@chiba-u.jp

The aim of this study is to show that there is orderliness in a piece of talk that is extremely complex in that clausal parts, normatively ('grammatically') expected to be contiguously placed, are instead dispersed throughout a turn-at-talk. In so doing, this study explores the grammatical construction of naturally occurring, and contingently produced, utterances in Japanese interaction. The following excerpt from a conversation is the talk that contains the target of this study (lines 03–11). In it, three young women are discussing the third instalment of the *Harry Potter* movie series. Nao has a negative opinion about the movie, while Ori views it positively.

(1) [FFG: 28:25–34][2]

```
01   Nao:    °$muzukashi katta (yo)$°.
             difficult    PAST   PART
             It was difficult to understand.
02           (1.6)
03   Ori:    soo   ne: (0.4) ↑demo ↓kirai ja nai
             right PART          but   hate  JD NEG
             Right, but ((I)) didn't think it was too bad,
04           ↓kedo=demo are sa:  ai chan kara
             though but that PART PN HOR  from
05           kiita n'da kedo_=
             heard JD   though
             but uh:m ((I)) heard from Ai,
06           =baito no   ko nan'da kedo: .hh
              work PART girl JD     though
             ((she)) is a girl from my part-time job,
07     →     ga: (.) >'n'ka< harii pottaa mita:?
             PART      well  Harry Potter saw
08           ttsu >tara<
             QUO    when
             did, when ((I)) was like, 'Did ((you)) see Harry Potter?',
09           a ↑mi  mashita  yo:: ↓toka
             oh see POL.PAST PART  QUO
10           yutte: .hhh
             said.and
             say 'Oh, ((I)) saw it,'
11           >m demo< kyasuto ga (.) kawaru  toka.
              but     cast    PART  replace like
             but, like, the cast will be replaced.
12           (0.8)
```

```
13    Ori:    >nan⌐ka<   omotta   yori  mo:⌐
              well       thought  than  also
              Well, than ((I)) had thought
14    Mai:         └n   pottaa  seechooshi┘  sugi
                   yeah PN      grown        too
15            ja:n.
              JD.NEG
              Yeah, Potter has grown too much, right?
```

The grammatical construction of the target turn is very complex, but it is perfectly comprehensible. In fact, Mai's response in lines 14–15 demonstrates the intelligibility of Ori's preceding talk. Mai offers an agreement to Ori's potential complaint that the actor who plays Harry Potter has 'grown too much'; the information that Ori provides regarding the possibility of recasting may potentially imply such a complaint. Furthermore, when Ori introduces this information in line 04 using the contrastive marker *demo* ('but'), she marks it as contradictory to the positive assessment of the movie immediately preceding it (line 03). Thus, Mai formulates an understanding of what was implicated in Ori's preceding turn.

This study explores the procedures that the participants employ to generate the orderliness of utterances in which clausal parts are dispersed. Such utterances are not 'grammatically well-formed' in the linguistic sense. However, if 'grammar' means the procedure of connecting lexical items or morphemes, then the orderliness of such utterances can be a part of grammar, neglected by classical studies of grammar. In this sense, this study is a continuation of other conversation analytic (CA) studies of grammar in interaction (Goodwin, 1981; Hayashi, 2003, 2004; Mori, 1999; Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996; Schegloff, 1979; Tanaka, 1999).

In Excerpt 1, the use of the postpositional item *ga* in line 07 is prominent in that this item normatively has a strong connection to the phrase immediately preceding it; that is, it is normatively expected to be used immediately following a noun phrase. However, there is no immediately preceding noun phrase in line 06 that *ga* marks postpositionally. (The particle *ga* is a case-marking particle, not a verb, but I gloss it as 'did' to convey the sense of the incompleteness of the ongoing clausal part and its strong connectedness to prior and subsequent portions of the entire ongoing turn-at-talk.) In spite of this irregular use of *ga*, the recipients of the talk can extract the nested potential clauses, such as (1) *ai chan* ('Ai' [line 04]) *ga* ('did' [line 07]) *a mi mashita yo toka yutte* ('say, "Oh I saw it"' [lines 09–10]) and (2) *ai chan kara kii ta n̄da kedo* ('I heard from Ai' [lines 04–05]) *kyasuto ga kawaru toka* ('the cast will be changed' [line 11]).

This orderliness is partially generated by the connections that such postpositional terms have both retrospectively and prospectively (see Tanaka, 1999,

Chapter 5). On the one hand, because of its normative connection to a noun, the hearer of the particle *ga* in line 07 can be expected to retrospectively search for a noun phrase that it potentially marks; indeed, *Ai-chan* is the only possibility in Ori's utterance (see also Hayashi, 2001). On the other hand, *ga* cannot be the final item of a clause normally. It projects a predicate to complete the ongoing clause, which the hearer can detect in lines 09–10 with *yutte:* ('say'). However, these normative connections that the postpositional term has does not explain all the orderliness of the talk in lines 04–11; for example, it does not explain how that *ga* is placed at that position, nor how this predicate is placed at this position.

To address these issues, I first distinguish between unit-completeness and turn-completeness. I demonstrate that the parties orient to the distinction between these two types of completeness. Second, I introduce the notion of *response-opportunity places*, which are the places where although the ongoing talk is still both unit- and turn-incomplete, responses may be produced. They turn out to be interactionally significant; they are systematically used as loci for initiating solutions to various possible interactional problems, such as problems of hearing and understanding. The item *ga* in line 07 of Excerpt 1, for instance, is produced at one such place, and the term also creates another such place at its end. Third, I examine different practices through which the speaker returns to the incomplete "turn-construction unit" (Sacks et al., 1974). The contrastive token *demo* in line 11 serves one of these practices and reconfigures the entire talk in progress (see Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001; Nishizaka, 2016); the utterance thus-marked (line 11) is not contradictory to any portion of earlier talk.

## Unit-incomplete and turn-complete

When elucidating the procedure for generating the orderliness of 'one speaker at a time' in conversation, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) propose the notion of turn-constructional units (TCUs) – units that can each constitute a complete turn. At the end of each TCU a 'transition relevance place' (TRP; a place at which the turn-transition becomes relevant) is provided. They also observe that not only full sentences, but also lexical items, phrases, and clauses can form complete units (i.e., TCUs; throughout this article, a 'unit' refers to a TCU). In Excerpt 2, taken from a telephone conversation, A and B are arranging to meet in a town called Akiba. As the excerpt begins, B requests that A propose the time they will meet.

(2) [TB: 04:13–18]

```
01   B:    jaa   kondo     na̲n'↓ji:.
           then this.time what.time
           Then, this time, what time?
```

```
02          (0.8)
03    A: →  'n jaa ↓juu ni  ji.=
               then    twelve   hour
            Then, twelve.
04    B:→   =juu ni  ji    ↓de.
               twelve hour AUX.CONJ
            At twelve, and.
05    A:→   an.=
            Yeah.
06    B:    =juu ni ji   de  kiba no  <doko> ↓da:.
               twelve hour PART PN PART   where   JD
            At twelve, where in Akiba?
```

Both A's response (i.e., requested proposal) in line 03 and B's acceptance of it in line 04 consist of one phrasal unit, respectively. The fact that the turns immediately following them are produced without gaps gives evidence that both turns are heard as projectably turn-complete. Note that this projectability is grounded in the fact that they are also hearably unit-complete; this hearing, in turn, is grounded in the intonation contour, namely, in the clear downward intonation at the end of each turn. Thus, 'unit-completeness' here does not mean sentential completeness, but rather indicates the lexical, phrasal, clausal, and sentential unity with an intonation contour that adequately marks the possible completion of the ongoing turn. However, turn-complete turns may be designedly unit-incomplete, as the following excerpts (3 and 4) exemplify (the φ sign in the English translation is a placeholder for a grammatically missing item).

(3) [MT-3: 10:16–20]

```
01    Taki:   >dakara< nori ga   mada  chichai
                 so      PN  PART still very.young
02            toki ⌐ni:
              when PART
            So when Nori was still very young,
03    Hide:        └ni  sai  gura:i?
                      two year about
            About two years?
04    Taki:   ni  sai  san   sai  gura:i
              two year three year about
            About two or three years.
05            (0.8)
```

```
06    Hide:→   NO   toki ni   kochi ni   kita n'da.
               PART time PART here   PART came JD
               at the time of φ, ((you)) moved here.
```

(4) [FFG: 06: 02–05]

```
01    Ori:     e   de  gakusai     wa   itsu nano?
               ITJ and school.fest PART when JD
02             (.) yatsuda:i.
                   PN ((college name))
               And when will the school festival be, (.) at Yatsudai?
03             (0.4)
04    Nao:→    wa:↓: (.) juu gatsu sanjuu ichi
               PART       October  thirty one
05             >juu ichi gatsu tsuitachi:<
                 November      first
               φ will be on the 10th of October and the first of November.
```

In line 01 of Excerpt 3, Taki tries to answer Hide's inquiry as to when her family had moved to the community by figuring out the time frame of the move via reference to the age of her child, Nori, at the time the move took place. Hide's turn in line 06, responding to Taki's answer, begins with a postpositional item *no* ('of'). This use of *no* is irregular, as in this turn construction there does not appear any noun phrase that the *no* marks postpositionally, but the postpositional *no* is understandable as connected to the phrase that occupies Taki's entire turn in line 04 ('At the time of [((Nori's)) two or three years], ((you)) moved here'). In Excerpt 4, Nao's answer (lines 04–05) to Ori's inquiry has a similar construction, beginning with another postpositional item, *wa* (adverbial particle, to be glossed as 'will be'). It is, however, hearable as connected to *gakusai* ('school festival') in Ori's preceding turn (lines 01–02). These turns are designedly unit-incomplete, that is, they are designedly 'parasitic' to the construction of the preceding turn;[3] nevertheless, they can still be turn-complete (see Hayashi, 2001, for interactional work that such postposition-initiated turns achieve).

The next example, Excerpt 5, illustrates a case in which, both retrospectively and prospectively, a turn is designedly unit-incomplete. Two friends have been discussing the best place for them to meet on the way to Akiba. Prior to the excerpt, A indicated that the Hibiya line (a subway line) would be the most convenient one for him. However, in lines 01–03 B has trouble figuring out where they can meet if A uses the Hibiya line.

(5) [TB: 05:11–17]

```
01   B:    hibiya sen  de   iku no   wa: (.) e?
           PN     line PART go  PART PART     ITJ
           Via the Hibiya line (.) what?
02         a  hai hai doko  da 'kke = eeto eeto
           oh yes yes where JD  PART  uh   uh
           Oh, yes, where was that? = uh
03         etto: nan' da 'kke:.
           uh    what JD  PART
           uh what was that?
04   A:    nakameguro:↑ ((singing))
           Nakamegro ((railway station))
05   B:→   <de: norikae te:
            at  change  and
           At φ ((you)) change to
06         (0.4)
07   B:    ⌈'ka⌉.
            INTR
           OK
08   A:    ⌊ta ⌋da:, betsuni:    are de  ii
             only    particularly that PART okay
09         yo. tameikesannoo de   ii   yo:.
           PART PN            PART okay PART
           But that will be fine. Tameike−sanno Station will be fine.
```

B's turn in line 05 begins with another postpositional item *de* ('at') and ends with a conjunctive particle *te* (glossed as 'and') with a clear intonation contour of continuation (i.e., with the last sound first stressed and then prolonged). Certainly, phrases with conjunctive particles, which are normatively expected to be followed by another item, can be unit-complete when pronounced with a clearly downward intonation contour (see line 04 of Excerpt 2 for a similar example). However, the turn in question (line 05 of Excerpt 5) is prospectively, as well as retrospectively, unit-incomplete due to the continuation-indicating intonation contour. It is designed as parasitic not only retrospectively to the preceding turn construction, but also prospectively to the turn construction that is to ensue after the turn in question (see Lerner, 2004 for similar practice). Nevertheless, it can still be hearably turn-complete, designed to elicit a continuation from A. This hearing is grounded in the fact that this unit-incomplete turn in this context con-

stitutes a complete action that makes a responding action relevant immediately following it; namely, it constitutes a request for further information that should have been provided without such a request. B's turn hearably implies a complaint about the inadequacy of A's only mentioning one railway station. Responding to this implied complaint, A, instead of offering the requested information, mentions another railway station that is understandably favourable to B (lines 08–09).

Turn-complete turns need not be unit-complete, while the reverse also hold true (as CA studies have noted on turns projected to be specifically 'multi-unit'; see Sacks, 1978; Schegloff, 1982), although unit-complete turns must be *possibly* turn-complete. Furthermore, all actual turns are not always turn-complete (i.e., turn-completeness is a normative, not a factual notion). For example, when a speaker searches for a word during his or her turn, the next speaker may take a turn to provide a candidate solution before the ongoing turn becomes complete, or when a speaker may invasively interrupt the preceding turn and take a turn before the preceding turn has become complete. In the remainder of this article, I focus on particular places at which turns in progress are yet turn-incomplete as well as unit-incomplete, but which appear to systematically provide opportunities for recipients to produce small responses. I call such places 'response opportunity places' (further referred to as ROPs).[4]

## Response opportunity places

### General observations

A typical example of ROPs is observed in the next excerpt (Excerpt 6), which is a continuation of Excerpt 2. In line 01 of Excerpt 6, B requests that A propose the place at which they will meet in Akiba.

```
(6) [TB: 04:18–23]

01   B:      juuni  ji   de akiba no <doko> da:.
             twelve hour at  PN   of where  JD
             Where in Akiba at twelve?

02           (2.0)

03   A:→     te yuu ka sa::
             Put differently,

04   B:→     nn
             Mm hm

05   A:      betsuni    tochuu de  machiawase
             particular on.the.way meet

06           shi te  mo   ii    n'ja ⌈nai ⌉
             do  and even good  JD    NEG
             it may be better to meet on the way.
```

```
07   B:                                   └a  m┘aa
                                           oh well
08              mochiron:.
                of.course
                Oh well of course.
```

After a long silence in line 02, in line 03 A initiates his response with the phrase
*te yuu ka sa̲:* ('put differently'), indicating that his ensuing response will not be a
straightforward answer to the question, and providing an account for the silence
in line 02 by hinting at having a difficulty in giving a straightforward answer.[5] In
fact, in lines 05–06, A proceeds to provide a proposal that contradicts the presup-
position of B's original question (i.e., meeting in Akiba). The phrase in line 03 is
not only unit-incomplete, but it is also turn-incomplete because it only projects
the abstract nature of the ensuing answer, and it does not yet provide any substan-
tive answer to the question posed in line 01; no TRP is provided around its end.
Nevertheless, the recipient produces a response to it (line 04). The conventional
phrase *te yuu ka*, marking a shift of sequence trajectories,[6] may provide a system-
atic place for a response opportunity from the recipients at its end, although it is
not turn-complete by itself. Excerpt 7 contains another similar example. B asks
about a class assignment in lines 01–02.

(7) [MS 8: 01]

```
01    B:    toransup- kuriputo 'tte >honto<
            trans-    cript      QUO  really
02          san juu  byoo   de    ii no:?
            thirty   second PART  is.it.true
            Is it true that ((we)) are supposed to transcribe only thirty seconds?
03          (0.6)
04    A:    e? chigau ┌no:?
            Oh! Is it not?
05    B:→              └.hh te y̲uu ka::_
            Put differently,
06    A:→   n:┌n.
            Mm hm
07    B:      └yatta:?
               did
            did ((you)) do that?
08          (.)
09    A:    yata yatta::.
            did  did
            Yes, ((I)) did.
```

After A displays surprise at an implied possibility in line 04 instead of answering B's question, B marks that her ongoing turn is shifting the sequence trajectory that her original question potentially initiated (line 05). This marking by *te yuu ka* receives a response from A, even though the phrase in line 05 cannot be turn-complete by itself.

Another systematic locus for a response opportunity is created after the launch into the reason for the call is marked with a distal demonstrative (*are* or *ano*; glossed as 'uhm'), frequently accompanied by a particle *sa* or *ne*, following the opening section of a telephone conversation (see Schegloff, 2010, for a similar marking in English conversation). Excerpt 8, which immediately precedes the previous excerpt, shows this opening section of their conversation.

(8) [MS 8: 01]

```
01    A:     moshi moshi:⌐:?
             Hello.
02    B:                  └moshi moshi:⌐: mikiko
                           hello            PN
03           desu kedo::
             JD    but
             Hello. This is Mikiko.
04    A:                                  └n::n.
             Mm hm.
05    A:     hai ha:⌐i.
             Yes.
06    B:→          └.hh ano  sa:::⌐::
                        that PART
             Uh:::::m
07    A:→                              └hai.
             Yes.
08    B:     toransup- kuriputo 'tte >honto<
             trans-    cript      QUO  really
09           san juu byoo de ii no:?
             thirty    second PART  is.it.true
             Is it true that ((we)) are supposed to transcribe only thirty seconds?
```

In line 06, the caller (B) launches the reason for the call with the item *ano sa:::::* ('uh:::::m'). Excerpt 9 provides another example, and it also shows the very beginning of the conversation.

(9) [FF V: 01]

```
01    A:     hai kataoka des':::.
             Yes, Kataoka is speaking.
```

```
02   B:    a< moshi moshi kikuta desu kedomo:.
           oh hello       PN    JD    though
           Oh hello this is Kikuta
03   A:    n::n
           Mm hm
04         (.)
05   B:    okit' ta:?
           awake PAST
           Were ((you)) awake?
06   A:    okit' ta   okit' ta:.
           awake PAST awake PAST
           Yes, ((I)) was.
07         (.)
08   B:→   are  sa:
           that PART
           Uh:m
09   A:→   n::n
           Mm hm
10   B:    me:shi kuwa nee kana to  omotte ta
           lunch  eat  NEG INTR QUO wonder PAST
11         n'da kedo:.
           JD   though
           I wonder if you want to go for lunch together.
```

In line 08, the caller (B) launches the reason for the call following a brief exchange regarding A's condition (asleep or awake), occasioned by A's noticeable tone of voice. In both excerpts, the item that marks the launch into the reason for the call (a distal demonstrative accompanied by a particle *sa*) is unit- and turn-incomplete, but it receives a response.

Certainly, the initiation of both sequence-trajectory shifts and reason-for-call launches may motivate the recipients to provide the speaker with a display of adequate recipiency.[7] Therefore, the markings of such things may elicit such a display at their ends. However, such markings do not make it relevant, or generally expectable, for the recipient to produce a response around their ends. Excerpts 10 and 11 are examples of the unproblematic absence of any response following such markings.

(10) [FF X: 02–03]

```
01   B:    <kongetsu   matsu> gurai:- hima?
             this.month end    about   free
           Are ((you)) free at the end of this month?
```

```
02    A:     .hh ┌h
03    B:          └maa-  san juu ichi ka ichi gurai.
                  (well) thirty one  or one  about
```
Well- the thirty-first or the first.
```
04    (.)
              ((11 lines omitted))

05    A:     a <san juu ichi> ka i- tsuitachi
             oh thirty  one   or   the.first
06           dattara: zenzen hima.
             if       at.all free
```
Oh on the thirty-first or the first ((I)) will be totally free.
```
07    B:     n hima:.
```
Mm free.
```
08    A:     nn:
```
Yeah.
```
09    B:→    iya tte yuu ↓ka::-: (0.4) yoshio kara
             no  put.differently      PN     from
10           ne:
             PART
```
No, put differently (0.4) Yoshio
```
11    A:     n: ┌n
```
Mm hm
```
12    B:        └tsui saikin   denwa ga   atte:
                 very recently call  PART there.was
```
called ((me)) a couple of days ago, and
```
13    A:     e:n
```
Yeah.
```
14    B:     kondo: kataoka n'  chi  de nomoo
             next   PN      PART home at will.drink
15           'tte koto n'natta kara. (hehh hehh
             QUO that decided because
16           hehh) hehh .hh
```
((we)) have decided to drink at your place. (hehh hehh hehh) hehh .hh

B's inquiry in lines 01 and 03 is an instance of 'type-specific pre-sequence' (Schegloff, 1980, 2007). Namely, it is a question that projects a particular type of action (typically, an invitation or request) to ensue, depending on the response to it. When, however, a 'go-ahead' type of response to the question has been provided by A, and a certain type of invitation is in order, then the original inquirer, B, first

produces *iya* ('no') and *tte yuu*  ↓*ka::-:* ('put differently'), both of which indicate the incipient trajectory-shift (see Hayashi & Kushida, 2013, for a similar working of *iya* in turn-initial position) and then proceeds to produce a report of a decision already made, constituting a type of action that contradicts the projected type of action. However, no response follows *tte y̲u̲u̲* ↓*ka::-:*, even though a slight pause is provided after it that can be used to make a response, and B proceeds to produce the next item without pursuing a response from A.

   Excerpt 11 begins when the caller, B, launches the reason for the call after A's noticeable difficulty in speaking is accounted for.

   (11) [TJG: 01]

```
01    B:    so'kka:: senbee    kutteta'n ka(hh).
            I.see   rice.cracker eat.PAST INTR
            I see, ((you)) were eating a rice cracker(hh)


            ((Three lines omitted))


02          (0.8) sooka soo↓ka::
                  I.see I.see
            (0.8) I see, I see.
03    B:→   .hh are  sa:: ano takahashi san to
                that PART uh  PN        HNR with


04          kon'aida atte sa:ɾ: 'noꞁ minnade=
            the.other.day PART   uh  together
05    A:                    L nn  ᒥ
            Mm
06    B:    =hora ...
             look
            .hh uh:::m ((I)) got together with Takahai, and do you remember, we
            together, [Lines 03–04 and 06]
```

In line 03, the item that marks the launch into the reason for the call, *are sa::* ('uh:::m'), is clearly punctuated with a continuation-indicating intonation contour, but it does not receive any response from the recipient. The speaker (B) proceeds to produce the next item without pursuing a response.

   Thus, places for response opportunity are systematically provided when the turn in progress is yet turn-incomplete as well as unit-incomplete. At such places, a response does not become relevant, but only an *opportunity* for response is provided, which the recipient may or may not utilise to display a certain recipiency. The following characteristics of ROPs can be gathered: the final sound is

stressed, prolonged, or both, to be markedly continuous and thereby be punctu-
ated to a certain degree; at the time of its production, the turn in progress is yet
both unit- and turn-incomplete. Many instances of ROPs are accompanied by
'final' particles such as *sa* and *ne* (see Morita, 2005, for the intra-TCU use of *sa*
as an 'interactional particle'). Such places are often accompanied by a prolonged
sound followed by a hedging article ('uh'), an inbreath and/or a brief pause, but
these articles, inbreaths, and pauses do not constitute any observable absence of
response (see Jefferson, 2004a). ROPs only serve as potential response opportu-
nities. However, ROPs are useable as systematic loci for interactional work. I will
explore this point in the remainder of this section.

### Locus for testing recipiency

In spite of the above observations, in special environments in which a potential
problem regarding the recipient's participation becomes visible in a certain man-
ner, the absence of an adequate response at an ROP may be treated as problem-
atic. Excerpt 12 exemplifies this. In line 11 the caller, B, launches the reason for
the call. At the end of *ano sa::::(h)* ('uh:::(h)m'), an ROP is provided. Although A
offers a response in a quiet voice (line 13) following a 0.6-second silence (line 12),
B summons A with the conventional expression for summoning, which is also
used to answer a phone call, in order to check whether A is ready to appropriately
participate in the conversation (line 14) (see Schegloff, 1968, who observes that
a summons addresses the problem of the recipient's availability). Thus, A's inad-
equate response is treated as problematic here. However, the potential difficulty
in A's participating in the conversation became visible before B's launch into the
reason for the call.

(12) [TJG: 01]

```
01          k kr ((sounds like biting something hard))
02    A:    m'hi m'hi:
            Hello ((sounds like she has something in her mouth))
03    B:    moshi moshi. na- moshika shite gohan
            hello             possibly      meal
04          tabete ta::?
            eating PAST
            Hello. wha- By any chance, were ((you)) having your meal?
05          (.)
06    A:    °n n:°.
            °Nope°.
07          (0.2)
08    B:    so(h)o(hh)ja nai no?
            so       JD NEG INTR
            We(h)re(hh)((you)) not?
```

```
09    B:      hh .h h |
                      |   (2.9)
10            (1.2)   |
11    B:→     ano  sa:::(h)
              that PART
              Uh:::(h)m
12            (0.6)
13    A:      °n°
              °Mm°
14    B:      m(h)- $moshi moshi:?$
              h(h)- $Hello?$
```

Immediately before A, the one called, picks up the phone, a sound of biting something is audible (line 01) and, when answering the phone (line 02), A sounds as if something is in her mouth (the conventional expression *moshi moshi* sounds like *m'hi m'hi*). B's inquiry in lines 03–04 is occasioned by these auditory circumstances. In this inquiry, B proposes a most normal (harmless and inoffensive) account for these circumstances. It serves here as what Sacks (1992) called a "correction-invitation device"; the proposed account invites its recipient to correct it if it is rejectable. However, A only minimally rejects the account in a quiet voice (line 06), and then B further pursues the account for the unusual circumstances (line 08), but A does not offer any response for 2.9 seconds. B launches the reason for the call in this very unstable environment, and therefore any response showing adequate recipiency is highly expected at the ROP provided at the end of line 11.

In the next excerpt, Excerpt 13, the absence of a response is treated as problematic retrospectively. The example is excerpted from a radio counselling session, in which a mother (MOT) complains to a program host (HST) about her son. She says that on a holiday, all of the students were supposed to go to school ('schooling') except for the baseball team members who were exempt from this obligation, because they had an official game that same day. Her son (a baseball team member) went to neither the game, nor to school. She is starting to worry about his behaviour.

(13) [RC 94B1: 02:03–17]

```
01    MOT:    sono sukuuringu  no hoo ni  ika naku
              that schooling       to      go  NEG
02            te: .hh ya- ano::::::  yakyuubu
              and          uhm     baseball.team
03            no hoo ni itta n'desu ne.= shiai
                  to    went JD      PART game
```

04           *no hoo ni.*
                 to
             ((He)) did not go to school, .hh but to the base- uh::::: the baseball, to
             the game.

05    HST:   *ee*
             Yes.

06    MOT:   *de, machiawase shita tokoro ga: .hh*
             and meeting     did   place   PART
             And the meeting place is,  .hh

07           *ano:: chiiki kara, maa:=deta koto*
             uhm   area   from  well have.got.out

08           *ga   nai ko   da mon'desu kara:*
             PART NEG child   JD.POL    because
             uh:: as he had not been out of his community, so:

09    HST:   *hai*
             Yes.

10    MOT:→  *.hh ano:: (.) gooryuu deki naku t*e*:*
                   uh      join   can NEG  and
             .hh ((he)) couldn't join ((his)) teammates and uh

11     →     *(1.2)*

12    MOT:   *ano:: machiawase shita tokoro*
             uh    meeting     did   place

13           *de ⌈desu ne:? ⌈.hh*
             at  JD   PART
             Uh::: at the meeting place?

14    HST:→      ⌊*ee, ee, ⌊ee °ee°*
             Yes, Yes, Yes, °Yes°

15    MOT:   *gooryuu deki naku t*e*:*
             join    can  NG    and
             ((He)) couldn't meet with ((his)) teammates, and

16           *'n'de: ano: hitoride  nanka  maa*
              and   uh  by.himself anyway well

17           *shihoo happoo     sagashita  rashii*
             in.all.directions looked.for seems

18           *n'desu:.*
             JD
             And uh: ((he)) was looking for ((them)) in all directions by himself,
             I guess.

```
19    HST:    hai.
              Yes.
20    MOT:    n'de: shichi ji:: sugi kurai ni:
              and   seven  hour past about at
21            maa: a- ageku no hate kaet'te kita
              well        finally    came.home
22            'tte yuu yoona jootai   de:
              QUO     like situation and
              And finally ((he)) came home around seven in the evening,
```

For MOT's complaint to be intelligible as a complaint it is crucial for the son's
failure to join his teammates in the end to be grasped adequately. In fact, gener-
ally, if a high school boy comes home around seven in the evening there should
be no predictable problem. In this context, MOT's report in line 10 ('((he)) could
not join his teammates') is expected to be adequately acknowledged. What actu-
ally happens is that after an ROP is provided at the end of line 10 (unit- and
turn-incomplete with a continuation-indicating intonation contour and the
ongoing status of the current turn as the speaker's complaint about her son), a
substantial (1.2-second) silence ensues (line 10). When, in line 12, MOT repeats
the phrase that she used in line 06 (*machiawase shita tokoro* 'the meeting place'),
it is now revealed that a response was expected at the end of line 10, and that
MOT is now pursuing it by repeating an earlier portion of her talk. In fact, HST
produces multiple acknowledgment tokens precisely at the point where the rep-
etition becomes recognisable as a repetition (see Jefferson, 1973, for such precise
timing of response). This emphatic manner of acknowledgment indicates that at
the time of line 11, HST was not resistant to acknowledgment, but merely failed
to realise that any acknowledgment was in order. Once an adequate acknowledg-
ment is obtained, MOT proceeds to the final item ('And finally he came home
around seven in the evening') after she brings the ongoing repetition to comple-
tion. In this fashion, in such an environment, the fact that a response was actually
expected at a certain ROP may be retrospectively revealed.

Thus, although at ROPs no response is generally expectable, such places can
provide an interactional locus for testing adequate participation. In the next sub-
section, I will examine cases in which problems of understanding (see Schegloff,
Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) are addressed at ROPs.

### Locus for addressing problems of understanding

I have so far demonstrated that ROPs are places available to recipients to display
how they are getting along with the ongoing talk. This means that such places

also allow the recipients to raise any issues related to understanding. Excerpt 14 exemplifies this. As it begins, B is telling a story involving a production company. At the end of line 01, when the ongoing talk is unit- and turn-incomplete in terms of the intonation contour and action in progress, an ROP is provided, and A produces an acknowledgment token in line 02.

(14) [KB-3: 01:30–02:06]

```
01    B:→    asko ni kachikomi ga:: atta toki ni:
               there raid      PART was  time PART
             There a raid happened, and then uh
02    A:     nn
             Mm hm.
03    B:     ⌈moo-
             gosh-
04    C:→    ⌊zeemusho?
             Taxation office?
05    B:     a ano  zeemusho     ja naku te,
             oh uh taxation.office  not  and
             Oh, not the taxation office, but
06           moo o- kowai onii san ga-
             gosh  scary youngster PART
             gosh y – scary youngster, with a pistol, did::: [including line 08]
07    C:     AA AA ⌈AA AA AA:. HONMA MON' kai.
             oh              real  thing INTR
             Ohhhh the real one.
08    B:          ⌊pisutoru de:::
                   pistol  with
09    B:     n mhahahahahahahahaha, sono,
             n mhahahahahahahahaha, That,
11           .hhh ⌈aa:
             .hhh well:
12    A:          ⌊uchikomare  ta 'tte koto?
                   be.fired.at PAST QUO that
             You mean being fired at?
13    B:     aa aa soo soo. ano: garasu ni
             Yeah right   uh  glass  PART
             Yeah, right. Uh: into the glass,
14           ni hatsu gurai warare te'ru n'desu
             two shots about broken PAST  JD
```

```
15              ⌐ne::
                PART
                two or so shots were fired.
16      A:      ∟n::n
                Mm hm
17      B:      juu- juu- ni- ano ni  hatsu gurai.
                gun         two uh  two shots about
                gun- gun- two uh two or so shots.
18      →       =n'de sono toki moo (.) choodo-
                and   that time also    just
                =And then, too, just-
```

Following A's production of an acknowledgment token, B continues telling the story (*moo-* 'gosh-') in line 03. Simultaneously, C initiates repair, requesting a clarification of *kachikomi* ('raid') by offering a candidate understanding (i.e., 'taxation office'). Thus, an ROP can be used to initiate repair by a recipient. As Schegloff et al. (1977) observed, a recipient's initiation of repair frequently initiates a sequence of turns. The initiated sequence appears to be brought to a close in line 09, where B attempts to return to the story with the demonstrative term *sono* ('that'). However, A initiates another repair sequence by offering an additional candidate understanding (line 12). After B confirms A's understanding and further elaborates on it (lines 13–14, and 16), B then re-attempts to return to the story by referring back exactly to the point at which he left it earlier using the demonstrative term *sono* ('that'), as well as the repetition of the term *toki* ('time'), which he used immediately before he left the story in the first place. This attempt is again unsuccessful, and other sequences intervene before B is finally able to resume the interrupted story (data not shown). Important here is the fact that, when a new sequence is initiated at an ROP, the relevance of the completion of the turn that is designedly both unit- and turn-incomplete at that point appears to be sustained until the completion of the newly initiated sequence.

Interestingly, ROPs can also be systematic places used to initiate a new sequence by the speaker to address a potential difficulty in understanding the ongoing turn. Excerpts 15–17 exemplify this.[8] Excerpt 15 immediately precedes Excerpt 14. In line 01, B refers to a production company via a minimal 'recognitional' term (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), that is, by its name. Note that at the end of the phrase *booingu no:* ('of Boing') an ROP is provided, followed by an inbreath. This ROP is not used by the recipients, and B proceeds to produce the next item *jimusho ni:* ('at the office'), at the end of which another ROP is provided. Following a breath (an absence of a response at this moment), B, the current speaker, initiates a sequence to check the recipients' recognition of the production company.

(15) [KB-3: 01:25–30]

```
01   B:     ano booingu no: .h  jimusho      ni:
            uh  PN       of     office/company at
            Uh at Boing uh .h at the office of the production company uh
02   A:     h ⌐n:
            Mm
03   B:→     ⌊booingu 'tte aru  ⌐ja nai=
             PN         QUO exist JD NG
            You know Boing, right? [including line 05]
04   A:                          ⌊hh ((clear throat))
05   B:     =desu ⌐ka::
             JD    INTR
06   A:→        ⌊°n n°
            Mm hm
07   B:     asoko ni kachikomi ga:: atta toki ni:
            there    raid      PART was  time PART
            There a raid happened, and then uh
```

Note that production companies are called *genoo jimusho* in Japanese. The term *jimusho* (literally meaning an 'office') in line 01 can not only be understood to mean an office of the company, but it also indicates that *booingu* is a production company, thereby offering the recipients further assistance with its recognition. Thus, in the construction of the utterance in line 01, the potential recognition issue surfaces to some extent. In this context, the potential absence of any recognition claim after the second ROP occasions the speaker's (B's) recognition check (line 03). After the sequence initiated in the above-mentioned manner is completed with A's acknowledgment (line 06), B returns to the self-interrupted story by referring back to the production company in line 01 with the demonstrative term *asoko* ('there') in line 07.

A similar pattern is observable in Excerpt 16. As the excerpt begins, B and C in collaboration are telling A that one must wait for a long time before having a seat at a particular ramen noodle shop. Note that C's gaze is directed at A, the recipient of the ongoing telling, for the duration of his utterance in lines 01 and 02, while in line 03 C turns to B, his co-teller, in order to request the confirmation of the shop's regular day off.

(16) [KB-3: 13:19-24]

```
01   C:     de:: sore de: sore ga:: (1.0) ni-
            and    then    that PART
            And then, that is (1.0) Sun-
```

```
02              do- doyoo    donichi  ja naku te:
                    Saturday weekends JD NG
                Not Sat- Saturdays Weekends uh
03      C:→     suiyoo    yasumi da yone: °are
                Wednesday closed JD PART    that
                ((It's)) closed on Wednesdays right?
04              tashika°.
                °As far as I remember°
05      B:→     nhhh moo(h) ($soo ⌈desu ne$)
                     ah       right JD   PART
                nhhh Ah(h) ($that's right$.)
06      C:                      ⌊donichi: ga   soo
                                 weekends PART so
07              'tte yuu no   wa   atarimae nan'da
                 QUO say PART PART obvious   JD
08              kedo, heejitsu mo soo na no.
                though weekdays also so JD PART
                Not only on weekends, but also on weekdays it is so ((you have to wait
                for a long time)).
```

The confirmation sequence (lines 03 and 04) is initiated at the ROP that is pro-
vided at the end of line 02, when the ongoing talk is still both unit- and turn-in-
complete. As the intervening sequence is completed (i.e., immediately after a pos-
itive answer becomes incipient), C recognisably returns to the self-interrupted
telling, by repeating the phrase *donichi* ('weekends') that was used shortly before
he left the telling (line 02).

Excerpt 17 illustrates a variation. Kana and Taki meet for the first time on
this occasion. In lines 01–03, Kana mentions her daughter's friend's test score,
which is followed by Hide's receipt of this information (line 04). In line 05, Kana
mentions her daughter by name, and an ROP is provided at the end of the line,
where the ongoing talk is still both unit- and turn-incomplete. Subsequently, the
speaker, Kana, explains to Taki who the name refers to (lines 07–08).

(17) [MT-3: 07:08–14]

```
01    Kana:    n:::n demo michiko chan kono mae
               yeah  but  PN      HNR  last.time
02             sugoi yoka 'tta n'da yo
               very  good  PAST  JD PART
03             ⌈tesuto no tensuu.
                test  PART score
               Yeah, but Michiko's was very good, her test score.
```

```
04    Hide:     └hh soonano?
                hh Really?
05    Kana:     mo'  miki ga   sa┌::
                gosh PN   PART PART
                Gosh, Miki did::
06    Hide:                         └HH ┌hh
                                      ((coughs))
07    Kana:→                            └miki 'tte
                                         PN    QUO
08      →       uchi no  ko  nan'desu kedo ┌::
                  my   child  JD     though
                Miki is my daughter though::
09    Taki:→                                  └°hai°
                Yes
10    Kana:     ↑ma-  mi-michiko sugoi  n'da yo:
                 mo(ther) PN    amazing JD  PART
11              toka 'tte yutte ┌sa:  hito   no=
                or   QUO say     PART others PART
12    Hide:                    └(°honto°)
                Really
13              =tensuu jiman shite 'n┌da(h)yo(hh)
                 score  boast  do    JD    PART
                say 'Mo- mi-Michiko is amazing' and boasted of another person's
                score. [including lines 10-11]
14    Hide:                          |ehehh hh
15    Taki:                          └hhhhhhhhh
```

After obtaining an acknowledgment from Taki (line 09), Kana simply continues with the self-interrupted unit (line 10), without any additional devices indicating the point being returned to (e.g., repeating and/or referring back to an earlier portion).[9] We now have a sententially complete unit when we combine lines 05 and 10–13: *miki ga sa:: ↑ma- mi-michiko sugoi n'da yo: toka 'tte yutte sa: hito no tensuu jiman shite 'nda(h)yo(hh)* ('Miki did say "Mo- mi-Michiko is amazing" and boasted of another person's score'). In addition, Kana's inserted explanation (lines 07–08) is not unit-complete or turn-complete so that at its end it provides an ROP, using a continuation-indicating intonation contour. This means that a response from the recipient is not relevant at this point, although Taki does actually produce an acknowledgment. This (unit- and turn-incomplete) construction of Kana's explanation may be due to the fact that Kana, the speaker, provides the information that she has, rather than checking the recipient's knowledge (Excerpt

15) or requesting information (Excerpt 16). This fact may also relate to the fact that the speaker simply continues with the interrupted talk.

In this section, I have shown that ROPs are systematic places that both the speaker and the recipient can use to address potential problems related to understanding. Furthermore, I have suggested that when the speaker uses an ROP to offer the information that she has, she may only provide another ROP at the end of the offer, rather than making a response relevant, and that after the information is offered she may simply continue with the interrupted unit. Now, the orderliness of the target case in Excerpt 1 can be explained by the practices identified above, and in turn provides evidence for the suggested claims.

## Revisiting the target case

Excerpt 1a reproduces Ori's talk in Excerpt 1, and provides annotations of Ori's gaze directions, as well as the recipients' nods.[10]

(1a) Detail

```
04   Ori:    ↓kedo=demo are  sa: |ai chan kara
             though but that PART NP HOR  from
     o.g.:   NNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNn
     nao:                        |slightly nods
     mai:                        |slightly nods
05           kiita n'da kedo_=
             heard JD    though
     o.g.:   mMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM
             but uh:m ((I)) heard from Ai,
06           =|baito no  ko    nan'da ke|do: .hh
               work  PART girl JD        though
     o.g.:   MMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMm
     mai:    |slightly nods             |clearly nods
             ((she)) is a girl from my part-time job,
07    →      ga: (.) >'n'ka< harii pottaa mita:?
             PART      well  Harry Potter saw
     o.g.:      nNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN
08           |ttsu >tara<
              QUO   when
     o.g.:   NNNnnn
     nao:    |slightly nods
     mai:    |slightly nods
             did, when ((I)) was like, 'Did ((you)) see Harry Potter?',
```

```
09              a ↑mi  m̲ashita  yo::  ↓toka
                oh see POL.PAST PART   QUO
        o.g.:                        mMMMMMMM
10              |yutte: .hhh
                 said.and
        o.g.:   MMMMMMm
        mai:    |nods twice
                say 'Oh, ((I)) saw it',
11              >m demo< ky̲asuto ga (.) k̲awaru  toka.
                but    cast    PART    replace like
        o.g.:   nNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN
                but, like, the cast will be replaced.
```

At the end of *are sa̲:* ('uh:m') in line 04, at the first ROP, although no response is produced vocally, both recipients simultaneously make a slight nod. Ori, using the ROP, mentions the source of the projected talk by using a name, *a̲i chan* ('Ai') in line 04. Although Ai is a common acquaintance of both Ori and Nao, Mai does not know her. After the person is introduced by name, a potential ROP is provided at the end of the *kedo* ('though', pronounced as *kedo_*, punctuated with a markedly flat intonation of the final sound) in line 05. Even though Mai slightly nods following *kedo_*, an explanation of who the person is, addressed to Mai, is added so quickly that no space is created for a response. In a manner similar to that found in lines 07–08 of Excerpt 17, this explanation does not make a response to it relevant; another ROP is provided at the end of it (line 06), at which Mai nods clearly instead of responding vocally. Ori, with the postpositional item *ga̲:* , then proceeds by continuing simply from the item that the particle *ga̲:* can mark postpositionally, that is, the name *a̲i chan* ('Ai'). At the end of *ga̲:* , yet another ROP is provided, at which what Ori said is added before what Ai said. After the enactment of the exchange between Ori and Ai, from which Ori obtained the information that she is revealing (lines 07–10), there is yet another ROP, at which Ori launches the initially projected talk that contains this information (line 11). Thus, ROPs, together with the practice of returning to where one left off, are systematically utilised to suspend and recover the progressivity of the ongoing talk, and thus the orderliness of Ori's entire talk is maintained.

We notice the organisation of Ori's gaze that well fits the construction of her talk. When, in line 04, Ori projects a substantial talk to ensue with *are sa̲:* ('uh:m'), her gaze is directed at Nao (as represented by 'N'), but she turns away from Nao immediately after the production of the item (*are sa̲:*). During the explanation of who 'Ai' is, she gazes at Mai (line 06), but when she continues the self-interrupted talk with *ga̲:* , she returns to Nao. Then she turns away from Nao again during

line 08, but when, in line 11, she reconfigures her ongoing talk with *demo* ('but'), she returns to Nao again. Thus, Ori's talk in Excerpt 1a is, as a whole, organised as addressed to Nao, and gaze and talk are co-structured in the actual course of interaction.

## Concluding remarks

Many conversation analysts observe that a unit recognisable as a sentence can be distributed across multiple speakers' turns-at-talk (Hayashi, 2003, 2004, 2005; Kushida, 2006; Lerner, 1991, 1996, 2004; Sacks, 1992). In contrast, this study has focused on clausal constructions dispersed within a single turn-at-talk (see Local, 1992, for a similar phenomenon in English). I have described the orderliness of such dispersion by reference to response opportunity places (ROPs) and practices of returning to the interrupted unit. In addition, TCUs are 'semi-permeable' (Lerner, 1996) in particular manners in Japanese conversation. They allow for spaces both before and after postpositional particles that can be used for interactional work, addressing the issues of recipiency, recognition, and understanding (see Iwasaki, 2009; Morita, 2005). In fact, discussing the linguistic particularity of the Japanese language in this regard, Tanaka (1999) notes: "Even after the production of a case or adverbial particle, it is possible that the speaker would insert other non-projected phrases before the projected component is produced, partly as a reflection of the variability of word order in Japanese" (p. 186). Most relevant to the present study, Mori (2014) observes a distinctive behaviour of Japanese 'cleft-sentences'. Namely, frequently after the subject clauses of cleft-sentences, the items that follow are not those projected by these clauses, but rather are preliminary to them. Furthermore, what is projected by the subject clauses does not appear in the form that corresponds to this projection, that is, the sentential units that are initiated by the clauses are not completed. The designed turn-incompleteness creates a space for adding, before what the turn-so-far projects, preliminaries to this, and the turn-completeness of the ongoing turn is accomplished with sentential unity being broken.

ROPs are created around a point when the ongoing turn is both unit- and turn-incomplete. It appears that the orderliness of the dispersed clausal construction relies on the normativity of turn-completeness, rather than unit-completeness. In fact, as we saw earlier, unit-incomplete turns can be turn-complete. However, this fact does not deny the normative robustness of unit-completeness. Turns that are unit-incomplete, but turn-complete, are *specifically* designed to be 'parasitic' to, or dependent on, the prior or subsequent turn for unit-completion, by beginning with a postpositional item or soliciting a continuation from the recipient. These practices exploit, rather than destroy, the normative relationship

between unit- and turn-completeness, in which, *normally*, turns become possibly complete only when they are unit-complete (see Lerner, 1991).

The availability of ROPs for various interactional work is also crucial for the management of contiguity (Sacks, 1987). For example, in Excerpt 17, Kana was describing her daughter's strange behaviour. This description includes a joking complaint, which makes a certain appreciation relevant as the recipients' next action. By embedding the exchange that provides an explanation of the previously mentioned name within an ongoing turn-construction, the contiguity between the two action-types (i.e., a joking complaint and its appreciation) is sustained. If the explanation is placed following the completion of the ongoing telling, the contiguity is simply broken. Alternatively, if the explanation is placed prior to the telling, its status as a preliminary may be lost, and the speaker may not be able to obtain the chance to tell what is supposed to be told (see Schegloff, 1980). Thus, ROPs are the systematic loci useful for the administration of sequence organisation (Schegloff, 2007).

The complexity of the turn produced by a single speaker in Excerpt 1 is the result of the systematic use of ROPs for addressing interactional contingencies and of the practices of returning to the prior portion(s) of the ongoing turn. In this sense, the orderliness of the complex turn construction is also an interactional achievement.

## About the author

Aug Nishizaka is Professor of Sociology at Chiba University. His current research is concerned with Japanese interactions in various settings, including interactions among residents in the areas directly affected by the nuclear power plant explosions subsequent to the earthquake on 11 March 2011. His recent publications include 'Syntactical constructions and tactile orientations', Journal of Pragmatics (2016), 'The perceived body and embodied vision in interaction', Mind, Culture, and Activity (2017), and 'The moral construction of worry about radiation exposure', Discourse & Society (2017).

## Notes

1.  This article is an English version of Nishizaka (2008). The organisation and analyses have been changed to a certain extent.
2.  In the excerpts, each line is composed of three tiers. In the first tier, there is a Romanised version of the original Japanese. In the second tier, there are phrase-by-phrase glosses. In the third tier, a rough English translation is provided. The first tier of the transcript utilises Jefferson's (2004b) transcription system. In the second tier, the following abbreviations are used: INTR for 'Interrogative', HOR for 'Honorific', JD for 'Judgmental', NEG for 'Negative', PART for 'Particle', PAST for 'Past', PN for 'Proper Name', POL for 'Polite',

and QUO for 'Quotative'. The letters and Roman numerals in brackets next to the extract numbers indicate the identity of the data and the pages of the original transcripts.

3.  See Schegloff (2001) for the notion of an 'increment', which is dependent on the host TCU, and does not constitute an independent TCU by itself.

4.  I borrowed this term from Jefferson (2004a).

5.  The silence also embodies a feature of a dispreferred response (Pomerantz, 1984).

6.  Wakamatsu and Hosoda (2003) observe that the phrase *te yuu ka* can be systematically used to initiate a repair of a preceding portion of talk. Repair-initiations are instances of sequence- or utterance-trajectory shifts.

7.  This display of recipiency is similar to a 'continuer' (Schegloff, 1982), in that it does not constitute a full turn. However, it is different from the latter, because it is not produced at a possible turn completion. It displays the continuous recipiency of the ongoing turn, and neither takes a new turn, nor 'refrains' from taking a turn, only because an ROP is not a place at which the recipient should take (or can, therefore, refrain from taking) a turn.

8.  See Mazeland (2007) for similar examples.

9.  See Jefferson (1972) for different practices of returning to an earlier portion of the ongoing talk.

10. Ori's gaze directions in the extra tiers are designated as 'o.g.' In these extra tiers, 'M' and 'N' indicate whether the gaze is directed toward Mai or Nao, respectively. Small letters in these tiers indicate the transition of gaze directions. Mai's and Nao's nods are designated as 'mai' and 'nao' and their starting points are indicated by the sign '|'.

## References

Goodwin, C. (1981). Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers. New York: Academic Press.

Hayashi, M. (2001). Postposition-initiated utterances in Japanese conversation: An interactional account of a grammatical practice. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 317–343). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sidag.10.15hay

Hayashi, M. (2003). *Joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sidag.12

Hayashi, M. (2004). Discourse within a sentence: An exploration of postpositions in Japanese as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, *33*, 343–376. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404504043027

Hayashi, M. (2005). Referential problems and turn construction: An exploration of an intersection between grammar and interaction. *Text, 25*(4), 437–468. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2005.25.4.437

Hayashi, M., & Kushida, S. (2013). Responding with resistance to *wh*-questions in Japanese talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 46*(3), 231–255. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2013.810407

Iwasaki, S. (2009). Initiating interactive turn spaces in Japanese conversation: Local projection and collaborative action. *Discourse Processes*, *46*, 226–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530902728918

Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294–338). New York: Free Press.

Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica*, *9*(1), 47–96. https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.9.1.47

Jefferson, G. (2004a). A note on laughter in 'male–female' interaction. *Discourse Studies*, *6*(1), 117–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445604039445

Jefferson, G. (2004b). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), Conversation analysis (pp. 13–23). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Kushida, S. (2006). *Sogokoi chitsujo to kaiwa bunseki* (*Interactional order and conversation analysis*). Kyoto: Sekai Shiso Sha.

Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences in progress. *Language in Society*, *20*, 441–458. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500016572

Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238–276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620874.005

Lerner, G. H. (2004). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *37*(2), 151–184. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3702_3

Local, J. (1992). Continuing and restarting. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 273–296). Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.22.18loc

Mazeland, H. (2007). Parenthetical sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*, 1816–1869. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.05.005

Mazeland, H., & Huiskes, M. (2001). Dutch '*but*' as a sequential conjunction: Its use as a resumption marker. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 141–169). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sidag.10.08maz

Mori, J. (1999). *Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Japanese: Connective expressions and turn construction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sidag.8

Mori, J. (2014). The re-examination of so-called 'clefts': A study of multiunit turns in Japanese talk-in-interaction. In K. Kabata & T. Ono (Eds.), *Usage-based approaches to Japanese grammar: Towards the understanding of human language* (pp. 193–222). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.156.14mor

Morita, E. (2005). *Negotiation of contingent talk: The Japanese interactional particles ne and sa*. Amsterdam: John Bejanmins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.137

Nishizaka, A. (2008). Hatsugen junban nai ni oite bunsan suru bun (Dispersed sentences within a turn-at-talk). *Shakaigengo Kagaku* (*Japanese Journal of Language in Society*), *10*(2), 83–95. DOI: 10.19024/jajls.10.2_83

Nishizaka, A. (2016). The use of *demo*-prefaced response displacement for being a listener to distressful experiences in Japanese interaction. *Text & Talk*, *36*(6), 757–787. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2016-0033

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., & Thompson, T. (Eds.). (1996). Interaction and grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620874

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1978). Some technical considerations of a dirty joke. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 249–270). New York: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-623550-0.50017-3

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 34–69). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation* (2 vols.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696–735. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York: Irvington.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist, 70*, 1075–1095. DOI: 10.1525/aa.1968.70.6.02a00030

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261–286). New York: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: 'Can I ask you a question?' *Sociological Inquiry, 50*, 104–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1980.tb00018.x

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71–93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2001). *Conversation analysis: A project in process – increments*. Forum Lecture, LSA Linguistics Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208

Schegloff, E. A. (2010). Some other 'uh(m)'s. *Discourse Processes, 47*, 130–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530903223380

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., &. Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*: 361–382. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wakamatsu, M., & Hosoda, Y. (2003). Sogo koi, bunpo, and yosoku kanose (Interaction, grammar, and projectability). *Goyoron Kenkyu, 5*, 31–43.