UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Repetitional Agreement and Anaphorical Agreement:

Negotiation of Affiliation and Disaffiliation in Japanese Conversation

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts

in Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language

by

Kaoru Hayano

2007
ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Repetitional Agreement and Anaphorical Agreement:
Negotiation of Affiliation and Disaffiliation in Japanese Conversation

by

Kaoru Hayano

Master of Arts in
Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language
University of California, Los Angeles, 2007
Professor Charles Goodwin, Chair

Adopting the framework of Conversation Analysis, this study explores interactional motivations and consequences of two alternative formulations of agreement in Japanese conversation: repetitional agreements, which repeat the core word(s) of the first statement, and anaphorical agreements, which refer to the first statement with an anaphor “soo”. Analyzing tape recorded or videotaped spontaneous conversation between Japanese native speakers, the study demonstrate that parties to interaction deploy the two formulations systematically to accomplish interactional consequences. A
repetitional agreement claims that the view was formulated independently of and/or prior to the first statement, and treats the view of the first statement as have already been shared. On the other hand, an anaphorical agreement presents the view as being formed after the articulation of the first statement and acknowledge the view of the first statement to be a new perspective. By conveying differential relationship of the agreement to the first statement, parties negotiate affiliation and disaffiliation between them. A repetitional agreement is a resource for proposing, negotiating, and establishing affiliation between the parties, whereas an anaphorical agreement is used to project and invite a coparticipant to deal with possible disaffiliation. It is further argued that the negotiation of affiliation and disaffiliation through the different formulations of agreement can be an embodiment of the negotiation of locally relevant social relationship, which should be regarded as interactional achievement. The study empirically illustrates how people handle the dilemma between affiliation and disaffiliation in talk-in-interaction.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Whenever a participant utters an assessment, a view, an observation, or an opinion about an object in everyday conversation, it becomes relevant for another participant to reciprocate with his or her assessment, view, or opinion about the same object. The second participant’s statement is understood as either an agreement or disagreement depending upon its compatibility with the preceding statement. The sequence of the adjacent statements by the two participants is a form of joint activity in which they co-experience the object, coordinate their views, and take stances toward the object and toward each other (Pomerantz 1984; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987). Agreements can be characterized as affiliating and preferred enhancing, while disagreements represent disaffiliating and dispreferred (Pomerantz 1984; Sacks 1987).

However, the distinction between agreement and disagreement is not by any means the only concern involved with second assessments (Heritage and Raymond 2005). When (more than) two individual speakers present and coordinate their views about an issue, they take stances in terms of such issues as the following: the degree of agreement or disagreement (Pomerantz 1984), the kind of access to the subject of assessment that the participants’ views are based on (Goodwin and Goodwin 1987), which participant has the primary right to discuss the subject (Heritage and Raymond 2005; Raymond and
Heritage 2006; Stivers 2005), and whether the agreeing party formed the view independently or not (Heritage 2002; Heritage and Raymond 2005). Thus, it is quite possible for a speaker to align with a coparticipant at the basic content level and simultaneously disalign in terms of these issues. Diversity in the way first statements and (dis)agreements are formulated in a given language can be regarded as reflections of such concerns.

In this study, I explore interactional motivations for and consequences of the use of different formulations of agreements in Japanese conversation. With Conversation Analysis (CA) as its theoretical and analytical framework, the study focuses on a central and almost obligatory variant of agreement in Japanese—whether a speaker repeats the core word(s) used in the first statement (repetitional agreement) on the one hand, or refers to it with an anaphor “そお” (anaphorical agreement) on the other. It will be demonstrated that parties to conversation distinguish the two formulations to differentiate the agreements’ relation to the first statements. They choose repetitional agreements to convey that they have had that view independent of the first statement or prior to its articulation. They use anaphorical agreements to convey that they hadn’t held the view until they had listened to the first statement. The two formulations will be shown to be a means of negotiating affiliation and disaffiliation between the participants’ views and of negotiating and balancing their desires for solidarity and difference in their social relationship. The analysis will exhibit the advantage and robustness of the analytical
framework of CA, which allows us to empirically approach the processes of construction and reconstruction of the social relationships that develop turn-by-turn in everyday conversation.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Chapter 2, I review the relevant background for the study, and in Chapter 3, I introduce the database and the analytical framework the study adopts. Chapter 4 presents the analysis, starting from the description of sequential distribution of the target phenomena, and then demonstrates how speakers utilize the available linguistic resources in interaction. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of the study and discusses their significance in a larger perspective.
Chapter 2

Background of the Study

2.1 Agreement as a Multidimensional Action

When a speaker makes an assessment, states a viewpoint, or offers an interpretation about an issue in conversation (henceforth, the “first statement”) it becomes relevant for another speaker to reciprocate with his or her view about the same issue (henceforth, the “second statement”). Thus, the consecutive statements compose an “adjacency pair” (Schegloff and Sacks 1973). While the first statement can be a vehicle for various actions such as compliments and complaints, the significance of a second statement is conditioned by the first statement, and it is inevitably understood as either an agreement or disagreement with the first statement (Pomerantz 1984:63). Researchers have investigated characteristics of agreement in contrast with disagreement and have pointed out that they are not symmetrical, unprejudiced alternative responses. Instead, agreement is not only socially but also structurally preferred to disagreement (e.g., Pomerantz 1984; Heritage 1984b; Sacks 1987; Schegloff 2007; Mori 1999). When an agreement is produced, the gap between it and the first assessment is minimized and it contains explicit components of agreement, while disagreements are usually delayed and do not contain explicit components of the action.
The distinction of agreement and disagreement is the most basic and perceptible stance marked by a second statement, but it is not the only relevant stance. Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) call assessment sequences “an assessment activity” to capture diverse types of actions involved other than assessment per se, which may include achievement and display of congruent understanding of the events, achievement of social organization, and achievement of organization of affect and emotion. Agreement, therefore, can be regarded as an action in which a variety of stances of the speaker are embodied.

Heritage (2002) focuses on one aspect of such stances relevant to the design of agreements in English conversation: whether an agreeing speaker claims to have “epistemic independence”—i.e., independent access to an issue on which an evaluation is made—and who claims to be the “epistemic authority”—i.e., relative knowledgeability about an issue. According to Heritage, speakers of agreements tend to be inferred to be “merely agreeing” and epistemically dependent upon the speaker of the first assessment (Heritage 2002:200). A change-of-state token oh (Heritage 1984a) prefacing an agreement is shown to be a means of overriding that inference and claiming epistemic independence, or, in some contexts, claiming the epistemic authority. Later, Heritage and Raymond illustrate other English linguistic resources speakers deploy to upgrade or downgrade epistemic stance in first and second assessments, such as tag questions, negative interrogatives, evidential markers, and full or partial repeats with agreement tokens (Heritage and Raymond 2005; Raymond and Heritage 2006). They demonstrate
the multi-dimensionality involved in assessments, claiming that “even within sequences of action designed to achieve agreement (which are preferred) participants can become involved in complex negotiations concerning the management of their relative rights to knowledge and information” (Raymond and Heritage 2006:684). In the same line of research, Stivers (2005) shows repeats in the second position to be a way of claiming primary rights—i.e., socially attributed entitlement to the object.

Another issue has to do with “who is agreeing with whom”, as compared with who is in the position to confirm whom (Schegloff 1996; Heritage and Raymond 2005). Schegloff (1996) demonstrates that repeating the previous turn by another speaker can be a practice that he calls “confirming allusions”; a repetition claims that what the other party has just said is what he alluded to in his previous turn, and thus he is not just agreeing with the other party but is also confirming that the other’s understanding of his previous talk is correct. In such cases, repetition is shown to be a means of resisting being in a subordinate position and of claiming autonomy.

As these studies propose, agreements involve multi-dimensional interactional concerns, which are reflected by the composition of agreements. Hence, exploration of composition of agreements in a given language allows us to approach the considerations to which its speakers attend as they agree with others in conversation. This study focuses on one of the available variables for formulating agreements in Japanese: repetitional agreements versus anaphorical agreements. As will be illustrated in Chapter 4, the use of
repetition in an agreement in Japanese as opposed to the use of the anaphor resonates with the use of repetitions as opposed to agreement tokens (e.g., “yes” or “yeah”) in English conversation.

2.2 Formulating an Agreement in Japanese

Japanese has a rich repertoire of grammaticalized resources to mark different affective or epistemic stances, and speakers are required to make a series of choices every time they formulate agreements: the use or non-use of a copula, a nominalizer, turn-initial interjections, and final particles. The choices of these linguistic resources have significant interactional consequences. In this section, I quickly review previous studies on sentence final particles, which are the linguistic resource that has been studied most intensively, and then I identify the variable on which this study focuses.

2.2.1 Sentence Final Particles Ne, Yone, and Yo

Among the variables, final particles have attracted researchers’ interest more than any other resource, especially the ones most commonly used in ordinary conversation: ne, yone, and yo (e.g., Kamio 1990, 1998; Kinsui and Takubo 1997, 1998; Morita 2002, 2005; Kanai 2003; Tanaka 2000). Many of these researchers agree that the particles mark some aspect of epistemic stance of the speaker. For instance, Kamio (1990, 1998) says that the particles are used to mark which speaker’s “territory” a piece of
information belongs to. For instance, when a speaker describes the inner state of the hearer, the use of *ne*, which is argued to mark information that belongs to the hearer’s territory of information, is obligatory. Morita (2002) adopts Goffman’s (1981) notion of “authorship”, which roughly corresponds to the notion of “epistemic authority” in Heritage (2002) and in later works (Kanai 2003; Morita 2005), and argues that *yo* marks the speaker’s strong authority, *ne* marks “weak or incomplete authority in relation to the other speaker” (Morita 2002:226), and *yone* functions as the combination of *yo* and *ne*. These previous studies lead us to reasonably assume that these final particles are used to mark different stances in terms of “socioepistemic authority” (Stivers 2005:132)—i.e., knowledgeability based on social identity or expertise.

However, the final particles are not the only epistemic marker within a turn. Other components such as a copula, nominalization, interjections, and the choice of descriptive words also contribute to the overall stance embodied in the utterance. Thus, although researchers tend to argue about the overall stance of an utterance by examining only these particles, the significance of the turn as a whole is determined by the combination of all the components of it.

As an attempt to fill in this gap, this study focuses on another variable for formulating an agreement in Japanese, which consists of different ways of referring to the core of the first assessment or what it is agreeing with—repetition of a descriptive term used in the preceding first assessment as opposed to the use of an anaphor “*soo*” in
referring to it. Hereinafter, an agreement that includes the former will be called a repetitional agreement, and one with the latter will called an anaphorical agreement. Both repetitional and anaphorical agreements can include all of the three final particles (as will be shown in excerpts (1) through (6) in the next section), which indicates that the choice between the two formulations reflects a stance that is independent of the stance marked by the particles. In what follows, I illustrate how repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements look.

2.2.2 Repetitional Agreement

Excerpts (1) to (3) are examples of repetitional agreements, in which the speaker repeats the descriptor adopted in the first statement. Stance markers that follow may or may not be the same as the ones used in the first statement.

(1) Two sisters are talking about how much an orchestra to which their acquaintances belong practices.

04 Mari: kowai ne.=
scary FP
It's scary.

05 -> Nami: =kowai yone:. dakara ne=
scary FP so FP
It’s scary. So,

06 =nanka oga-chan wa nanka soko made yaru no wa=
like Oga-END TP like that till do N TP
=nanka chotto,
like a little
Like Oga (was) saying like doing that much is like a little, hard, so, or something, (it’s) a little

(2) Sisters (Kayo and Saki) are driving on a freeway, and a car has just passed them:

01 -> Kayo: sugoi ne.
amazing FP
(The car that passed them) is amazing.

02->> Saki: sugoi yo.yappari ano bariki ni wa=
amazing FP after all that horse power DP TP

03 =ikura nandemo [kate nai].
no matter how win not
(It) is amazing. After all, (I/my car) can’t beat that horsepower no matter what.

(3) Sisters-in-law (Aki and Rika) are discussing plum wine that Rika had given Aki when they met last time.

01 Aki: an dake atta no ni kire::ini non jatta no.
that much existed N but clearly drink AUX FP
I drank it all though there was that much (of the wine.)

02 sukkarakann da mon.
penniless CP FP
(The bottle) is empty.

03 -> Rika: oishii mon ne:.
delicious FP FP
(It’s) delicious.

04->> Aki: oishii mon ne:.
delicious FP FP
(It’s) delicious.
As was mentioned in Section 2.1, repetition as a form of agreement in English conversation has been extensively studied by conversation analysts. Heritage and Raymond (2005:23–6) show that repetitions accompanied by agreement tokens can be a way to claim that the view was “previously held”. Stivers (2005) focuses on what she calls “modified repeats”—repeats of the prior statement by another speaker with stress on the copula or an auxiliary—and regards them as a means of asserting the primary right to evaluate the issue. Schegloff (1996) shows that by repeating the exact words of a preceding turn, the speaker claims that she is treating the preceding turn not as an independent statement but as a candidate understanding of what she already said. In all of these accounts, repetition is shown as a means of resisting the secondariness or dependence that would otherwise be assigned to the turn because of its sequential position relative to the first statement. The current study, by examining repetition as an agreement, in contrast to anaphorical agreements in Japanese, empirically investigates the cross-linguistic relevance of these arguments. As will be shown in Chapter 4, Japanese speakers are found to accomplish quite similar interactional consequences with repetitions.
2.2.3 Anaphorical Agreement

The alternative formulation of agreements involves an anaphor soō. It is a variation of a deictic term, so, which refers to an object that belongs to the hearer, in contrast with a, which refers to an object that does not belong to either the speaker or the hearer, and ko, which refers to an object that belongs to the speaker. When soō is used as a discursive anaphora, it refers to the other speakers’ context (Hayashi 1983), and accordingly it is the only deictic form that is used for response tokens and back-channels (Noda et al. 2002). Soō in an agreement is accompanied by various epistemic and affective stance markers, such as a nominalizer, a copula, final particles, or tag question markers, as is illustrated in excerpts (4) to (6). Thus, an anaphorical agreement states the speaker’s various attitudes toward what was said in the first assessment (cf. Noda et al. ibid.).

(4) R has told L that she once found a total stranger sleeping in her doorway;

12 -> L: **hehehe demo warui hito ja nakute yokatta desu ne.**
but bad person TP not good CP FP
*But it was lucky that (he) was not a bad person.*

13->> R: **n:: honto soō desu ne, un.**
yeah really that CP FP yeah
*Yeah, that really is true.*
(5) Daughter, Mother, and Aunt are talking about a toy called “bowlingual”.

27 -> Daugh: ningen no kotoba ni honnyaku dekiru to iu jite-human L language DP translate can QP say point-
At the point where (they) think (dogs’ language) can be translated into human language,

28 omou jiten de machigatteru yo[ne think point at wrong FP
 it’s already wrong.

29->> Mom: maa soo da yone well ANA CP FP
Well that is true.

(6) Sisters are talking about lending their children their cars;

06 -> Kayo: nanka, nai to komaru no yone. like not then troubled FP FP
Like, (I) get troubled if (the car) is not there.

07 ->> Saki: iya dakara soo na no yo. no so ANA CP N FP
No, so, that’s true.

The selection between the alternatives is almost obligatory in most agreement tokens, but there are ways to agree that do not involve this choice, such as the use of an agreement token (e.g., “hai/un (yes/yeah)”) or a descriptor that is similar to but different from the one used in the first assessment. However, such forms are not recognized as a fully aligning, complete agreement, or are recognized to involve disalignment to some
degree. The majority of agreements include either repetition of or anaphorical reference
to the descriptor in the first assessment.\textsuperscript{2}
Chapter 3

Methodology and Data

3.1 Analytical Framework

This study investigates agreements in Japanese conversation using the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA). Differences between repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements cannot be identified by reference to grammatical or semantic rules, for most of the occurrences of one of the forms could be replaced by another without violating such rules. Nonetheless, speakers constantly make choices as to which form to use in a particular sequential environment. The CA framework relies on detailed examination of the action accomplished by a turn by reference to its position in the sequence organization as well as its composition (Schegloff 2007:20), asking the question “why that now” (Schegloff and Sacks 1973:299). This approach allows us to investigate underlying motivation for the choices made in formulating an agreement, as well as the consequences of the choices with regard to the subsequent interaction, which would otherwise be treated as interchangeable or equivalent.

3.2 Data

The data I examine in this study consist of different sets of ordinary conversation: talk between friends, sisters, and family, in natural environments such as at
a family’s dinner table or in a students’ lounge on campus. Two excerpts (excerpt (4), reproduced as (15) and (15)’ and excerpt (23)), are drawn from a corpus of semi-spontaneous conversation collected as a part of a large research project; participants in this corpus were asked to talk about a topic specified by researchers—namely, “the most surprising thing that has happened to you”. All conversations were either tape recorded or videotaped and then transcribed following the conventions developed by Gail Jefferson. Transcription symbols and abbreviations are provided in the appendix. In all, 24 cases of repetitional agreements and 20 cases of anaphorical agreements were analyzed.
Chapter 4

Analysis

4.1 Initial Observations: Interactional Motivations for Repetitional Agreements and Anaphorical Agreements

This section identifies the basic situational and sequential environment in which repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements typically occur. It demonstrates that the key factor that motivates the choice between the two forms of agreement can be accounted for by reference to the kind of significance a first statement has with respect to an agreement.

4.1.1 Repetitional Agreements: Presentation of Views as Independently and/or Previously Formed

The most evident difference between the distributions of repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements is that when the object of statements is present in the interactional situation and the interactants evaluate it “here and now”, the second statement takes the form of repetitional agreement, with no exception in our data. In each of the examples provided below, parties experience and assess the object together.
(7) Mari, Kay, Yuu, and Yuri are getting ready for their end-of-quarter sushi party. Mari opens the wrapping of the sushi plate and makes an assessment at line 01

01 -> Mari: sugo::i:.  
Great

02 (1.0)  ((Kay takes a look at the sushi plate))

03 ->> Kay: sugo::[::i  
Great

04 ->> Yuri: [sugo::i.=  
Great

05 Mari: ii kanji jan yottsuzutsude.  
good like TAG four each with  
It’s nice, four for each (topping).

(8) Kay, Mari, and two other students have just started to eat sushi;

20 -> Kay: oishii::  
Delicious

21 ->> Mari: oishii:.  
Delicious

(9) Nami and her younger sister Mari are looking at a magazine with pictures of different hairstyles, discussing which one would look good on Nami. The following is about one of the hairstyles:

01 Mari: kore toka mo sugoi suteki da kedo.  
this etc. also very nice CP but  
This is also nice.

02 -> oneesama kei.[nagai] ne  
lady like long FP  
Like a lady. It’s long ((the model has long hair)).
Yeah, it’s long.

(10) Sisters (Kayo and Saki) are driving on a freeway. A car going fast has just passed them:

01 -> Kayo: sugoi ne.
   amazing FP
   (The car that passed them) is amazing.

02 ->> Saki: sugoi yo.yappari ano bariki ni wa=
   amazing FP after all that horsepower DP TP
   =ikura nandemo [kate nai].
   no matter how win not
   (It) is amazing. After all, (I/my car) can’t beat that horsepower no matter what.

03 Kayo: [(   )] itte goran.
   go see
   Try going(   ).

05 Saki: i kou ka. oshi
   go AUX QP fine
   Shall (I/we) go? All right.

In above examples, first and second statements are direct products of the joint activity in which parties are engaged: opening wrappings of sushi (7), eating sushi (8), looking at pictures in a magazine (9), and driving on a freeway (10). The speakers of the repetitional agreements clearly have direct experience of and access to the object being assessed. A
first statement prompts the sequence and the second statement responds to it, but the agreement does not rely on the first statement in terms of its epistemic access to the object or formulation of the view. This type of sequences are consecutive statements of independent views.

However, the presence of the object in the interactional setting is not a necessary condition for the occurrence of a repetitional agreement. A repetitional agreement is also found when its speaker has implied the view prior to the articulation of the first statement and thus has the ground to claim that she had had the view before she listened to the first statement. Excerpt (11) is an example in which sisters-in-law are talking about plum wine that Rika had given Aki when they met last time.

(11)

01 Aki: **an dake atta no ni kire::ini non jatta no.**
that much existed but clearly drink AUX FP
*I drank it all though there was that much (of the wine).*

02 **sukkarakan da mon.**
penniless CP FP
*(The bottle) is empty.*

03 -> Rika: **oishii mon ne:.**
delicious FP FP
*(It’s) delicious.*
At lines 01 and 02, Aki says that she finished the plum wine although there was a lot in the bottle. This report clearly suggests that she enjoyed it very much. Rika’s statement about the taste of the wine at line 03 articulates what was “alluded to” (Schegloff 1996) by Aki. Here, Aki has the ground to claim that she had that view prior to the articulation of Rika’s first statement. In this sequential environment, that is, when the speaker of an agreement has previously alluded to the view articulated in the first assessment, repetitional agreements are normatively used. The same pattern is found in excerpts (12) and (13), both of which are segments from a conversation between sisters Nami and Mari, who are in their early twenties.

(12) Nami and Mari are talking about their mutual friend Saibaa, who was recently found to have gotten married

01 Nami: **saibaa kekkon yubiwa shiteru shi.**
    Saibaa marriage ring doing and
    *Saibaa is wearing a wedding ring.*

02 **itsu no(h) ma(h)[ni(h)].**
    when L while at
    *while (I) didn’t know.*
03  Mari:  [(   )]

04  Nami:  hhh

05->  Mari:  hayai na:.  
          fast    FP  
          (Time passes) fast.

06->> Nami:  hayai na:.  
             fast    FP  
             (Time passes) fast.

07    (0.4)

08  Nami:  suzukisan mo moo kekkon shiteru shi.  
          Suzuki-HT also already marriage doing and  
          Mr./Ms. Suzuki is already married and.

(13) Nami has been describing for Mari how much an amateur orchestra some of whose members they know practice

01  Nami:  sonnani renshuu shite >datte<  
          that much practice do cuz  
          Practicing that much, because,

02  karera umai kuseni so(h)nnani renshuu shite  
    they good despite that much practice do

03  doo su n da yo tte kanji ja(h)nai.  
    how do N CP FP QP like TAG not  
    They are (already) good, it's like "what would they want practicing 
    that much," isn’t it?

04    (.)

05  Nami:  .hhh
In (12), Nami reports to Mari that she found their friend married and wearing a wedding ring while she didn’t even know when he or she got married. After the possible completion of the sentential “turn constructional unit” (Sacks et al. 1974) at line 01, in which Nami reports the objective facts she had observed, she adds a phrasal turn constructional unit “itsu no ma ni (while (I) didn’t know)” (line 02). This is an idiomatic phrase to express surprise that something happened so fast that one didn’t even know it. Thus, Nami has established a ground to claim that she already held the view that “time passes fast” before Mari says so.

In (13), Nami tells Mari about an orchestra to which Nami’s friend belongs and how much they practice. Both of the sisters play violins, so they have a basis to evaluate the amount of their practice. At lines 01 and 03, Nami expresses her amazement by articulating her internal speech (“karera umai kuseni sonnani renshuu shite dousun da yo (what would they want practicing that much, they’re already good)”), and this amazement is presented with some flavor of scorn rather than respect (the connective “kuseni (despite)” at line 02 often prefaces disrespectful behavior of a person, and the
final particle よ is used to make the utterance sound rough and almost complaining in this case. Mari makes a negative assessment, capturing what was implied by Nami. Here again, Nami repetitionally agrees with Mari. There is no way to examine whether or not “くわい (scary)” was the exact word that Nami had in her mind, but Nami adopts the word immediately, which seems to indicate that it completely captures the view she previously had.

To sum, repetitional agreements are employed when speakers have a ground to claim that the view was formed independently of the first statement, and/or they had that view prior to the articulation of the first. Such a claim is typically relevant when the object is present in the interaction (excerpts (7) to (10)) or when the view was alluded to prior to the first statement (excerpts (11) to (13)).

In English conversation, a repeat followed by an agreement token (e.g., “yes” and “yeah”) can be a resource to claim that the position was previously held or settled, which represents a claim for epistemic rights (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 23). In contrast, none of the repetitional agreements in my Japanese data are followed by an agreement token. Also, many of them (8 cases out of 24) employ the same stance markers as those used in the first statements, and only one of them uses the sentence final particle よ, which represents a claim of full epistemic authority. It seems that the use of repetitional agreements in Japanese conversation are oriented toward the achievement of affiliating, symmetrical stances between the interactants, rather than to the superior right
of the speaker compared with the coparticipants. We will come back to this point later in Section 4.2.1.

4.1.2 Anaphorical Agreement: Presentation of Views as “Newly Formed”

The sequential environment in which anaphorical agreements are typically found is contrastive with the one in which repetitional agreements are found. Anaphorical agreements are typically used when the first statements have provided a participant with a new perspective that he hadn’t had before. Thus, a speaker abandons or withholds the view she has held or presented when she anaphorically agrees, and it is most clearly the case when first statements present views as different from or incompatible with the views that have been alluded to by the agreeing party. For instance, in excerpt (14), Nami states a view at lines 10 to 12 that is different from the one suggested by Mari at line 26. So, Nami’s agreement with Mari at line 27 involves a shift in her view.

(14) Nami has just finished telling Mari a hearsay story about the sisters’ common acquaintance Mr. Soga, a conductor of an orchestra. Nami has told Mari that a part leader of Soga’s orchestra is so enthusiastic that s/he turns down Soga’s suggestion for a break, and other members are unhappy about it. We know from their previous conversation that Soga is an overweight person who sweats a lot during a practice.

10  Nami:  de: sousuruto sono funniki o sacchi shite: nanka
and then that atmosphere O feel do like
Then (Mr. Soga) senses it (that other members need a break), and like
At lines from 10 to 12, as she tells the hearsay story, she indicates that Soga suggests a
break because he feels that other members need it. The view Mari suggests at line 26 is an alternative to this, which says that it’s Soga himself who needs a break more than anyone else. Thus, Nami has to abandon what she said before in order to align with this newly proposed idea. This is an environment in which an anaphorical agreement is recurrently found. In this case, as well as some of the cases we will examine later (excerpts 15 and 16), the speaker of the first statement designs the turn to be disjunct from and disaligning with the coparticipant by prefacing it with “demo (but)”. Therefore, both parties are oriented to the fact that the first statement addresses a view that is not shared by the agreeing party. In that sense, Mari and Nami in this excerpt are taking matching, aligning stances, while dealing with the disalignment at the same time.

In excerpt (14) above, Nami completely abandons her previous view (that Mr. Soga suggests a break for the sake of other members) in favor of Mari’s alternative view suggested by Mari; she supplies an account for the view, which shows her understanding of and commitment to it (line 29). In other cases, however, a speaker merely withholds her original view as she agrees with the different view, but soon goes back to it. That is the case with excerpt (15), in which R has been telling L that she once found a drunk stranger sleeping in her doorway inside her apartment. She explained that the stranger turned out to be a neighbor living in the same apartment building, and he was so drunk that he took R’s room to be his. R is finishing her story, summing it up by saying that “well, such a scary experience or a surprising experience, I had” (lines 16 and 18). In
response to this story, L suggests an alternative, positivistic way of seeing the event, which does not really match R’s description of it ("kowai (scary)" or "bikkurisita (surprising)"). This first statement is again prefaced by "demo (but)".

(15) R has told L that she once found a total stranger sleeping in the doorway inside her apartment

13  R: [de oshiire no oku no hoo de:, .h katama(.ttete:], and closet L deep L way at hardened
    and (the cat) was (sitting deep inside the closet as firm
    as firm as a rock,

14  n:, hh na[(h)nka sugoku:].hh
    uhm like very
    Uhm, like, very.

15  L: [hhh hhh]

16  R: ano souiu kowa(h)i kei(h)ke(h)n, [te iuka:(h),
    well that scary experience QP or
    well, such scary experience, or

17  L: [a- na(h)ruhodo(h)
    oh indeed
    Oh I see.

18  bikkurishita keiken o shimasita:(h)=
    surprising experience O did
    surprising experience, I had.

19 -> L: =.h[hhh<demo warui] hito ja nakute=
    but bad person TP not
    But that (he) was not a bad person,
Note that in both excerpts (14) and (15), the speakers of anaphorical agreements have better epistemic access to the objects that they are discussing than their coparticipants. In (14), Nami is the teller of the hearsay story, and she heard it from her friend whom Mari knows through Nami. In (15), R is the one who experienced the event and L has just heard about it. Thus, what is at stake seems not their relative access to the object of the statements itself, but is the access to the view on it.

Below is another example from conversation between two female graduate students, Kay and Jay. Jay is thinking about getting a new cell phone. She tells Kay that
she has been using the one from a company called Tuka because its monthly fee is cheaper than other companies, and asks Kay which company has good cell phones. At line 07, Kay suggests that Jay get a new cell phone from Tuka again, so that she won’t have to change her phone number. Jay turns down this suggestion, explaining that someone—who turns out to be her boyfriend—told her that she shouldn’t get a phone from Tuka because she would get the same, bad connection that she has had (lines 09–13).

(16)

01 Kay: kore wa nan datta? Tsuuka?:
this TP what CP Tuka
What’s this one (that you are using now)? Tuka?

Tuka CP FP
(It’s) Tuka.

03 (0.2)

Tuka cheap N CP FP
Tuka is cheap.

05 Kay: datte denwa sa:,(0.2) bangoo kae taku nai jan.
because phone FP number change want not TAG
Because (you/we) don’t want to change the phone number.

06 Jay: kae taku nai yo[ne:].
change want not FP
(I/We) don’t want to change (it).
Kay:  

dakara Tsuukaa ni shi na yo.  

so Tuka DP do IMP FP  
So, get a (cell phone from) Tuka.

(0.8)

Jay:  

demo dakara ne,  

but so FP  
But because,

Tsuukaa no onaji kishu-onaji: kaisha datta ra:,  

Tuka L same kind same company CP then  
if (I get) a kind same with Tuka-, (one) from the same company.

kae temo:,<imi nai toka iu no.  

change though sense not etc. say FP  
Ø says it would be useless.

(0.7)

Jay:  

tsuuji nai kara.=  

connect not so  
Because it wouldn’t have a (good) connection.

Kay:  

=a a:: sokka sokka so- aa soo da yone[:sooo da yone:].  

oh oh that Q that Q that oh that CP FP that CP FP  
Oh, oh, (I) see (I) see, that’s true, that’s true.

Yeah.

Jay:  

un.  

Yeah.

(0.9)
Although Jay’s utterance (lines 09–13) presents the view (that it would be useless to get a phone from the same company) not as her own idea but somebody else’s, it is relevant for Kay to agree or disagree with it. At line 14, Kay expresses that she has just understood and is convinced by the quoted view through “a a:: (oh, oh),” a “change-of-state token” (Heritage 1984b), followed by a news receipt token “sokka sokka (I see I see).” Then she gives an anaphorical agreement, conveying that she has shifted her opinion after listening to the preceding turn. At line 18, Kay makes an anaphorical
agreement once again, and then—now that she understood that Jay would have to pay more and change her phone number in exchange for better connection—suggests that Jay really does not have to get a new phone after all. Jay repetitiously agrees with this (line 19); although she hasn’t clearly alluded to this view, she has implied a preference for keeping the current phone by saying that Tuka is cheap (line 04) and that she wouldn’t want to change her number (line 06). Thus, she has a ground to claim that she has had that view prior to Kay’s first statement.

4.1.3 Summary and Implications of Initial Observations

These initial observations suggest that the distribution of repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements is not arbitrary but systematic and contrastive. Speakers employ the two formulations of agreements to embody differential relationships of agreements to the first statements. With a repetitional agreement, a speaker claims that the agreement is not dependent upon the first statement but was formed independently of and/or prior to the first statement. With an anaphorical agreement, a speaker claims that he did not have that view until listening to the first statement, thus treating the view as something new to which she hadn’t had an independent access.

This analysis is compatible with the compositions of the two types of agreements. A repetitional agreement does not syntactically rely on the preceding first assessment in order to convey its content. Nothing but its sequential positioning presents
it as a secondary response to the first assessment, corresponding to its basis on the speaker’s independent access to the assessable object. On the other hand, the composition of an anaphorical agreement itself reflects its indexical and dependent relationship with regard to the first assessment; one needs to have access to the first assessment in order to understand the referent of the anaphora “soo”.

Our analysis is supported also by the distribution of upgrading and downgrading modifiers. While anaphorical agreements are often upgraded or downgraded (see excerpts (17) through (19) below), no repetitional agreement in our data accompanies an upgrader or downgrader. This uneven distribution can be accounted for by reference to the action accomplished by them. Because a repetitional agreement marks the accordance of the first and second statements, if a repetitional agreement involves upgrading or downgrading of the first statement, it conveys that the first statement did not exactly captures the agreeing party’s view. Thus, upgrading and downgrading a repetitional agreement can be a disaligning move, which is incompatible with the action accomplished by a repetitional agreement. On the other hand, it is relevant to upgrade or downgrade an anaphorical agreement, for it accepts the first statement as a new view that the speaker has not previously held. Upgrading an anaphorical agreement simply marks a stronger alignment, while downgrading marks a weaker alignment.
(17) “honto (really) upgrades the agreement:

21 -> L: hehhehe demo warui hito janakute yokatta desu ne.
    but bad person not good CP FP

But it was lucky that (he) was not a bad person.

(18) “maa (well)” marks hesitation, thus downgrading the agreement:

27 -> Daugh: ningen no kotoba ni honnyaku dekiru to iu jite-
           human L language to translate can QP say point-

28 -> omou jiten de machigatteru yo[ne
       think point at wrong FP

It’s already wrong at the point where (they) think it can be
translated into human language.

(19) “ma (well)” marks hesitation, thus downgrading the agreement. the sentence-final
    connective “kedo (but)” also indicates some reservation about the view:

10 -> an- maa somosomo kookoo no toki kara
    well in the first place high school L time from
    Well, when (she was) a high school student.

11 -> sono soyou wa atta yone.
    that talent TP was FP
    she (already) had that talent (to live freely)
It should also be pointed out that first statements preceding repetitional agreements and those preceding anaphorical agreements tend to exhibit different characters. When repetitional agreements occur, the preceding first statements tend to be very short, often consisting of only a descriptor followed by particles (see excerpts (11), (12), and (13)). I argue that first statements preceding repetitional agreements can be short and simple because the agreeing party’s preceding turn gives the first statement speaker a ground to presuppose alignment between them, and therefore they do not find it necessary to give accounts or support for their views in pursuit of an agreement. On the other hand, first statements preceding anaphorical agreements tend to include accounts and specifications of the object, and thus they tend to be much longer because the speakers do not have a basis for presupposing alignment or have a basis for presupposing disalignment. Therefore, the speakers of the first statements and those of anaphorical agreements in excerpts (14), (15), and (16) share the same stance toward the current state of their alignment. In short, speakers of first statements seem to be oriented toward whether their views are already shared by their co-participants or not.
However, parties to conversation do not always use the formulations of agreements conformingly in accordance with the sequential context, nor do they always agree on the relative stances between the first and second statements. Instead, as will be demonstrated in the following section, they can mobilize these formulations as linguistic resources to negotiate and coordinate relevant stances.

4.2 Interactional Consequences: Negotiation of Affiliation and Disaffiliation Through Repetitional Agreements and Anaphorical Agreements

By selecting either a repetitional agreement or an anaphorical agreement as they align with the first statements, speakers indicate their stances toward the views presented by their coparticipants. However, in interaction, stances are not always the matter of individual speaker’s attitudes that are determined prior to utterances. Instead, they are subject to interactional negotiation. In this section, I demonstrate that repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements can be deployed as linguistic resources through which interactants negotiate and coordinate their stances in terms of affiliation and disaffiliation between their views.

4.2.1 Repetitional Agreements as a Resource for Negotiating Affiliation

It has been demonstrated that a repetitional agreement is used to claim that the view was formed independently of and/or prior to the articulation of the first statement,
whereas an anaphorical agreement presents its view as being formed after the first statement. It was also shown that the use of a repetitional agreement is found to be recurrently relevant when its speaker has alluded to his view in his previous turn. In this section, we will see that the use of a repetitional agreement and marking such a stance can be a resource for negotiating strong affiliation with a coparticipant.

To claim that the agreeing party has had the view before the other party articulates the first statement can be a way of accentuating her commitment and upgrade the agreement. Consequently, the use of a repetitional agreement can propose strong affiliation with a coparticipant. That is demonstrably the case when a speaker alludes to her stance as she gives a report or a story and repetitionally agrees with the recipient’s responsive comment on it. Let us see how that is the case with excerpt (12), seen earlier and reproduced here as (12)’.

(12)’

01 Nami:  saigaa kekkon yubiwa shiteru shi.
Saigaa marriage ring wearing and
Saigaa is wearing a wedding ring.

02 itsu no(h) ma(h)[ni(h)].
when L while at
(I didn’t know)when(he/she got married/started to wear the ring).

03 Mari:  [ ( )]
Nami’s report about their friend’s marriage (lines 01–02) does not include an explicit descriptor, although, as was illustrated earlier, it implicitly expresses Nami’s surprise at how fast things can change. Instead, Nami invites Mari to articulate the view first. Mari’s first statement at line 05 (“hayai na: (Time passes fast)”) incorporates and aligns with Nami’s implicitly conveyed view. Therefore, at this point, Nami has already gotten Mari oriented toward establishing affiliation between them. Yet, the final particle “na” makes the utterance sound spontaneous and thus makes a claim that the view was independently formed. Then Nami repetitionally agrees with it using the same final particle (line 06), conveying that Mari’s first assessment exactly captures the position Nami has independently had. This pattern of exchange consisting of the three turns (i.e., a report or story with an implicit display of a stance, a responsive first statement, and a repetitional
agreement) can be a way of negotiating and establishing strong affiliation between two parties.

Similarly, in excerpt (13), reproduced here as (13)’, a repetitional agreement follows Mari’s response to the story, which is designed as her spontaneous reaction to what she has just heard but displays alignment with Nami’s view allusively embedded in the story.

(13)’

01 Nami:  *sonnani rensuu shite >datte<*
    that much practice do cuz
    *Practicing that much, because,*

02       *karera umai kuseni so(h)nnani rensuu shite*
    they good despite that much practice do

03       *dou su n da yo tte kanji ja(h)nai.*
    how do N CP FP QP like TAG not
    *They are (already) good, it’s like what would they want practicing that much, isn’t it?*

04

05 Nami:  .hhh

06 -> Mari:  *kowai ne.*=
    scary FP
    *It’s scary.*

07 -> Nami:  =*kowai yone:. dakara ne=*
    scary FP so FP
    *It’s scary. So,*
In both (12)' and (13)', Nami, the teller of the report or the story, chooses not to provide an “initial characterization” (Sacks 1974) or a “prospective indexical” (Goodwin 1996) — i.e., her stance relative to the event she describes that would provide an interpretive framework for the story to the recipient. Instead of expressing her own stance, she invites Mari to “voluntarily” come up with the view and articulate it first (“hayai na (fast)” in (12)' and “kowai ne (scary)” in (13)’). In other words, she yields to Mari the first statement position, which inherently makes a claim for the primary right to evaluate the issue (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 16). Then Nami immediately gives repetitional agreement, claiming that she had independently had the same views. Through this exchange, the sisters establish that they “respectively” and “spontaneously” come to share the same view about the issue, producing a sense of strong affiliation.

For the majority of the occurrences of repetitional agreements, the speaker’s claim that the view was formed independently of or prior to the first statement is grounded either on the situational context (i.e., co-presence of the object) or the sequential context (previous allusion to the view). However, there are cases when a repetitional agreement is used with neither of these contextual grounds. Such ungrounded claims for an independent access to the view in such cases are vulnerable to the other participants’ challenge and attack. In some such cases, the speaker preempts the challenge by demonstrating or claiming his independent access to the view (e.g., excerpt (20)). In other cases, she does confront a challenge and eventually gives the stance up
(e.g., excerpts (21) and (22)).

Excerpt (20) is an example of the former cases; Mari repetitiously agrees with Kay’s first statement that a cup of soup would be nice to have with their sushi (line 03) and she claims independent access to the view by adding that she thought about the same thing before she heard Kay say it (line 04). Such “coincidental” agreement allows participants to share a sense of affiliation.

(20) Kay and Mari are eating sushi with two other graduate students.

03 -> Kay:  
*aa kappu- kappu osuimono toka hoshii ne.*

Oh, cup-, cup soup would be nice.

04 ->> Mari:  
*hoshii ne [atashi mo [omotta sakki.]*

Nice, I thought so, too, a while ago

05 Kay:  
*n: [nanka ma- ma o] toru tameni.*

Yeah. like int- interval O take for

Yeah, in order to take, like, intervals.

06 M:  
=nhhhhh

In other cases, an agreeing party faces a challenge by a coparticipant and is prompted to give up the claim for independent access to the view. Such a negotiation process can be observed in excerpt (21), in which Mari seems to be rejecting Nami’s repetitional agreement.
(21)

38 -> Mari: mas- masuda to sa:,
Mas- Masuda and FP

39 -> aizawa[san] mo honto nagai shi sa:.
Aizawa HT also really long and FP
Mas- Masuda and, Ms./Mr. Aizawa have been dating long, too.

40 Nami: [n:].
Yeah.

41 ->> nagai yone:.
long FP
(They have been dating) long.

42 -> Mari: ma ikkai wakaretari shiteta kedo ne.
well once break up doing but FP
Well, (they) broke up once, but

43 Nami: n:
Uh-hum

44 Mari: ( )[( )].

45 ->> Nami: [a] soo na n [da].
oh that CP N CP
Oh really.

46 Mari: [un un].
Yeah yeah

As the sisters discuss the fact that many of their friends are getting married, Mari mentions a couple, “Masuda” and “Ms./Mr. Aizawa” (lines 38–39), commenting on how
long they have been together. Nami knows the couple as well, but Mari seems to be closer to them. Although she has not alluded to her view, at line 41 Nami agrees with Mari with a repetitional agreement (“nagai yone (They have been dating) long.”), claiming that she has independently had that view and treating Mari’s first statement to have already been shared. This move is not treated as affiliating by Mari. Mari’s utterance at line 42 can be seen as her challenge to Nami’s stance; by providing a new piece of information that conflicts with or at least modifies her own previous utterance—i.e., the news that the couple once broke up and got back together—Mari seems to be undermining the validity of Nami’s view (line 41) as well as her own previous statement (lines 38–39). It turns out that Nami didn’t know that the couple had broken up before. She admits her ignorance by giving a news receipt token (line 45), which makes the sisters’ knowledgeability of the couple clearly asymmetrical and thus makes disaffiliation rather than affiliation more relevant.

Excerpt (22) below is another such example. It is a segment from a conversation between the sisters-in-law, Rika and Aki. Rika is agreed to be a better cook than Aki is, and Aki often learns new recipes from Rika. Here, Rika has been teaching Aki how to cook Ratatouille. The segment starts after Rika has gone through steps of the recipe. The relationship between Rika and Aki during the instruction can be characterized as one between an instructor and a student—Rika provides information and, Aki receives it, sometimes checking her understanding.
(22) Rika has been introducing a new recipe to Aki. Rika and Aki are sisters-in-law, and Mari is a daughter of Rika.

01 Rika: **soide (o.2) ko:u yatta ra ohiru ni ne::**, and this did and lunch for FP
   And when (I) did (it) like this, for lunch,

02 **sore yatta ra papa oishii ttsutte kore [kaketeta].**
   that did and dad tasty QP say this put on (I) did that, then Papa ((husband of Rika)) was saying (it’s) delicious and was putting it on ((a toast)).

03 Aki:

04 Mari:

05 Rika: **oishii tte, yasai,** delicious QP vegetable
   (He said it was) delicious, vegetables,

06 -> **sorede sugoi herushii janai?**
   and very healthy TAG
   And it’s very healthy, right?

07 ->> Aki: **a:: herushii da yo[ne:].**
   oh healthy CP FP
   Oh, (it’s) healthy.

08 Rika: **[u:n] . oriibuoiru dake da mon.**
   yeah olive oil only CP FP
   Yeah, (it) only (uses) olive oil.

09 Aki: **un.**
   Yeah
Rika: *ato wa suibun iranai [shi::]*, rest TP water unnecessary and *Other than that, (it) doesn’t need water, and*

Aki: *[a sou da yone.]* oh that CP FP *Oh that’s right.*

Rika: *yasai no s- (.*) aji.* vegetable L s-taste. *The taste of vegetables.*

Rika’s statement that the dish is healthy at line 06 is followed by Aki’s repetitional agreement—Aki is treating Rika’s statement as something she already shared, not something new to learn. Thus, Aki now seems to be oriented toward affiliation with Rika, abandoning the asymmetrical relationship of an instructor and a student that had been relevant. Aki refuses to align with this stance, however. At line 08, she gives the reason why Ratatouille is healthy, referring to the recipe again (that it only uses olive oil) which shows that she is still giving Aki instructions and that their stances haven’t shifted to more affiliating symmetrical ones. Aki’s anaphorical agreement at line 11 seems to indicate that she gave up the affiliating stance and went back to the “student” stance.

### 4.2.2 Anaphorical Agreements as a Resource for Negotiating Disaffiliation

In the last section, we found that a repetitional agreement and its claim for independent access to a view can be utilized as a linguistic resource for negotiating and establishing affiliation with a coparticipant. When a coparticipant accepts the stance, the
affiliation is established, but when the coparticipant does not, the use of repetitional agreement can be regarded as an intrusive move, and its speaker may be urged to give up the stance.

These interactional consequences of repetitional agreement become clearer once we compare them with those of anaphorical agreements. It was shown that an anaphorical agreement presents its view as being newly formed after prompting by the preceding first statement. In other words, it treats the view of the first statement as something new and previously not shared. Such a stance can be a means of acknowledging that the view of the first statement is new and credible, if the speaker completely accepts the view and abandons the position she had previously held, if any (see excerpt (14) for example). However, in other cases, it can also be a means of dissociating one’s view from the other’s, and marking disaffiliation from the other. Let us examine excerpt (15).

(15)’

16  R: ano souiu kowa(h)i kei(h)ke(h)n, [te iuka:(h),
    well that scary experience QP or
    well, such scary experience, or

17  L: [a~ na(h)ruhodo(h)
    oh indeed
    Oh I see.
bikkurishita keiken o shimasita:(h)=
surprising experience O did

surprising experience, I had.

But that (he) was not a bad person.
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agreement. In the same turn, R adds a negative assessment “iya (annoying)” with a report of an annoying consequence of the event, which disaligns with the positive view proposed by L. This addition is again prefaced with “demo (but)” (line 22), indicating that R as well as L is aware of and attending to the disalignment between them. Thus, R’s anaphorical agreement is pre-disalignment as well as post-disalignment—through an anaphorical agreement, R disaffiliates herself from the view that she is agreeing with.

Here is another example. Excerpt (23) is an exchange between female college students. They were requested by researchers to talk about “what was most surprising”, and L has told R that it was surprising to her to see more than one brides in their wedding dresses at the same time at the cafe where she works. To the story, R responds to the story by saying, “How nice” (line 06).

(23)

05 L he[hhe u(h)h soo]=
    Yeah.

06 -> R [.hh e: :::::::: ]ii na:[:=
        good    FP
        How nice ((I envy you)).

07 L [u=--

08 L =[e-
    What,

09 -> R =[atashi hanayome-san toka sugoi akogareru
I dream of brides.

(It) would suit you ((You would make a pretty bride)).

But so, it’s nice that you can see (brides).

Oh, oh, that’s true.

Yeah.

But, (it’s) like,

suprise do

FP
(It’s) surprising (to see brides in the cafe)

22. ->>  L  

[bi(h)kkuri su(h)ru yo[(h) hhh]
surprise do FP
(It is) surprising.

23  R  

[.hhh kafe]=
cafe

24  =ni i nai mon ne [fu(h)tsuu(h) hehhe
at be not FP FP usually
There aren’t brides at a cafe usually.

25  L  

[kafe (h) hhh
cafe
(Not at) a cafe.

26  L  

shikamo(h)hhh, a, aisukoohii de, toka
moreover oh iced coffee with etc.
(They are) like, “(Uhm, I’ll have) iced coffee,”

L, responding to R’s comment on the story, first initiates a repair, showing that she is having difficulty in understanding (lines 07 and 08). An other-initiated repair can be a precursor to a disagreement, and it gives its recipient an opportunity to adjust his or her position in order to get an alignment (Schegloff 2007:100–106). R deals with this possible disalignment by offering a personal reason for her statement (that she dreams of brides) and indicates that she does not expect everyone to share her view (lines 10 and 12). At line 14, L anaphorically agrees with R, conveying that she hadn’t previously shared that view but is now agreeing with it. But then she starts to present a disaligning
view at line 17, prefacing it with “demo (but)”. Given these signs of disalignment, R
aligns with L by co-completing the sentence referring to L’s earlier characterization of
the story, “bikkuri suru yone (it is surprising)” (lines 20-21). This time, R repetitionally
agrees and alignment between them is restored. In this example, an anaphorical
agreement is deployed to take a non-committal, disaffiliating stance, allowing its speaker
and recipient to implicitly negotiate and deal with possible disalignment between them.

4.2.3 Summary and Implications: Negotiation of Locally Relevant Social
Relationship

In this section, we have explored interactional motivations for the use of
repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements in Japanese, and illustrated how
speakers utilize them as resources for negotiating affiliation and disaffiliation between
them. A repetitional agreement is used when a speaker has a ground to claim that her
view has been independently formed and/or was formed prior to the articulation of the
first statement. It can thus be a resource for suggesting, negotiating, and establishing
affiliation. On the other hand, an anaphorical agreement is used when the first statement
provides a view that the speaker of the agreement did not previously hold. By treating the
first statement as being new, it can suggest that there was a gap between the speakers’
views, which allows interactants to deal with the disaffiliation and sometimes negotiate
and restore affiliation without making the process explicit.
Stivers (2005) suggests that interactants’ concerns about relevant interactional or social roles motivate them to attend to who has the primary right to evaluate the issue in question. This also provides us with an insight into the practices on which this study has focused. That is, by negotiating affiliation and disaffiliation with regard to an issue, parties to talk negotiate whether or not they are in a symmetrical, affiliating relation or an asymmetrical, disaffiliating relation. If that is the case, then repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements can be regarded as linguistic resources through which they negotiate and reconstruct social relationship that is relevant by reference to what they are discussing at a given moment of interaction. In everyday conversation, parties negotiate and establish intersubjectivity with regard such issues as whether they are being a teacher and a student or two housewives (excerpt 22), or, whether they are equally close friends with another person or not (excerpt 21).
Interactants are observed to be motivated to enhance solidarity or affiliation while avoiding disaffiliation (Heritage 1984b: 265-280, Heritage and Raymond 2005: 15–16). Agreements are preferred over disagreements, compliance with a request is preferred over rejection, and acceptance of an offer or invitation is preferred over refusal. Brown and Levinson (1987) call this orientation “positive face”. However, people also have a want to be different from others and to not be impeded by them: “negative face”, to use Brown and Levinson’s terminology. Heritage and Raymond (2005) argue that the dilemma between affiliation and disaffiliation is practically handled in interaction. Parties to talk are shown to be sensitive to “the distribution of rights and responsibilities regarding what participants can accountably know, how they know it, whether they have rights to describe it, and in what terms is indirectly implicated in organized practices of speaking” (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 16). The findings of the current study provide an empirical basis for proposing that there is a cross-linguistic relevance to their argument. It was demonstrated that Japanese speakers handle the dilemma involved in agreements by employing practices very similar to those used in English conversation.

Parties to talk are concerned about whether they are in an affiliating position with respect to their coparticipants in terms of the current topic in an asymmetrical and
disaffiliating position, and this concern significantly influences the composition of an agreement. However, it is not constantly predictable or predetermined which one of the orientations is relevant at a given moment and with regard to a particular topic. As we have seen, parties negotiate such matters turn by turn in interaction, and therefore the locally relevant stances and their social relationships are in a reflexive relationship with their social conducts. The distinction between repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements in Japanese conversation is one of the resources through which parties negotiate, construct and reconstrukt social relationship between them.
Notes

1 While many of the previous studies on agreements and disagreements that this study draws upon have focused on assessment sequences (Pomerantz 1984; Heritage 2002; Heritage and Raymond 2005; Raymond and Heritage 2006), I included in the scope of this study those sequences in which a first speaker makes an assessment, expresses a view, or offers an interpretation of an issue and a second speaker agrees or disagrees with it.

2 Some first statements do not have a repeatable descriptor (e.g., single-word adjective, adverb or verb phrase) available for a repetitional agreement, and in such cases the agreeing speakers seem to have an option to adopt a contracted form of agreement that allows them to avoid the use of the anaphor “soo”. Such turns have only a final particle with or without a copula and are regarded as incomplete and casual as sentences. Although it will require an empirical study to establish this point, it should be suggested here that the option between a repetition and anaphora does not seem to be contingent upon the existence of a repeatable descriptor.

3 This example is drawn from “Mr. O Corpus”, which was collected as a part of the project “Practical and Theoretical Studies on Culture, Interaction, and Languages in Asia,” Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research(B) (1) (2003–2005)
supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports, and Culture, Project No. 15320054, in which I participated as a research assistant. The example this study addresses is a dyadic conversation between a college teacher (R) and a college student (L). Both of them are female, and they met for their first time for the data collection.

4 Aki’s utterance at lines 1 and 2 seems to be a compliment to Rika, who made the tasty plum wine. Thus, it is somewhat unusual that Rika, the recipient of a possible compliment articulates the statement at line 3. On the other hand, lines 1 and 2 can also be understood to have a flavor or self-mockery, for Aki confesses that she drank a lot in a short period of time. That makes it relevant for a recipient to volunteer an excuse for Aki, which explains the Rika’s first statement. The final particle in the first and second statements “mon”, which is often attached to an excuse, makes this account reasonable.

5 Mari’s statement at line 26 does not include a descriptive word that could be repeated in the next turn. However, an anaphorical agreement is not the only option for Nami at line 27, because there are forms in Japanese that seem functionally equivalent to repetitional agreements. They consist of copula (da/desu) and final particle(s), or the final particle by itself, without the anaphor soo. Although am empirical study would be needed to confirm this point, they
seem to be used to present a view as being independently formed, just as a repetitional agreement is. Examples are provided here; in (24), Aunt has described a toy that translates dogs’ barks into human language, and both Mom (i.e., the sister of Aunt) and Daughter (i.e., niece of Aunt) start to voice their suspicion about the toy. Mom’s turn at line 07 is an agreement with Daughter’s preceding statement, but Mom has already stated to state her negative position at line 05, which is in overlap with line 06. Thus, Mom has a ground for claiming previous and independent access to the view when she agrees using the self-standing final particle “ne”.

(24)

01 Aunt:  [kou]nanda yo tte oshiete kureta no.
          this CP   FP QP   teach   AUX   FP
          (She/He) taught me “(it’s like) this.”

02   (0.4)

03 Mom   :  fu:[:::n. ]
         uh-huh

04 Aunt :  [(cough)]

05 Mom   :  do[no teido?] 
          which extent
          to what extent?
Daugh: [mayutsu]ba da yone:=
   doubtful  CP  FP
   (It's) doubtful.

Mom: =ne.[dono=  
   FP  which
   Yeah. which

Aunt: [n::  
   uhm

Mom: =dou na n da rou nee.  
   how  CP N CP  AUX  FP
   (I wonder how (good) it is.

In (25), Mari uses the form of a copula followed by the final particle *yone* in order to indicate that what Nami tells her as a news report at lines 01 and 02 is not really a news to her (line 05).

(25)

01 Nami: sou ano ni rittoru gurai no:, ano=  
   yeah that  two  litter about  L  that

02 =pettobotoru o mottekiteru rashii n da yone(h).=  
   pet bottle  O  bringing  AUX  N CP  FP
   (I hear) (he) brings that, that pet bottle of about 2 litters.

03 Mari: =a:[  
   yeah

04 Nami: [itsumo  
   Always
Jay’s turn at line 06 in excerpt (16) can also be seen as a repetitional agreement. Here, Jay has not alluded to her view that she wouldn’t want to change her phone number, but nonetheless, her repetitional agreement does not result in any interactional problem. This repetition occurs in the environment in which Kay and Jay have been discussing what Jay should do with her cell phone. Thus, when Kay says that Jay or people in general do not want to change their phone numbers (line 05), she seems to be speaking on behalf of Jay rather than stating her personal view. This explains why it is relevant for Jay to confirm or disconfirm whether that (i.e., she wouldn’t want to change her phone number) is what she has had in her mind; in this case, she utters a repetitional agreement relevant.

(16)'

05 -> Kay: *datte denwa sa:, (0.2) bangoo kae taku nai jan.* 
*Because phone* FP number change want not TAG
*Because (you/we) don’t want to change the phone number.*

06 ->>> Jay: *kae taku nai yo[ne:].* 
*change want not FP* (I/We) don’t want to change (it).*
APPENDIX

1 Transcript Symbols

[  starting point of overlapping talk
::  lengthened syllable
,  continuing intonation
.  falling intonation
?  rising intonation
;  semi rising intonation
(0.0)  length of silence in tenths of a second
hh  audible outbreath
.hh  audible inbreath
=  latched utterances
-  glottal stop
>  <  increase in tempo
<  hurried start
words  relatively stressed
(  )  inaudible word(s)
(words)  words that do not appear in the original data but are supplied to make English translation grammatical or intelligible
((words))  contextually relevant information supplied by the author, or, a rather free translation by the author to capture the implication of an utterance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations used for gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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