

**The Use of English Loanwords in Question-Answer Sequences of  
Question Time in the Japanese Parliament**

**Katsuhiko Kitada**

**A Scholarly Paper**

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of  
Master of Arts in Second Language Studies**

**Department of Second Language Studies**

**University of Hawai'i at Mānoa**

**First Reader: Dr. Gabriele Kasper**

**Second Reader: Dr. Haruko Minegishi Cook**

**Spring 2022**

### **Abstract**

This paper analyzes the use of English loanwords in question-answer sequences of Question Time (QT) in the Japanese Parliament. Research on English loanwords has been done in several areas, however, none has been conducted in political settings. QT is a dyadic political debate between prime ministers and other Parliament members in the Diet of Japan. I will describe how their lexical choices of English loanwords orient towards certain institutional goals, and how the choices are aligned with dimensions of questioning and answering. Through this analysis, I conclude that English loanwords can function as not only the part of political questions in a formal and professional way to elicit a clear answer but also a technical term to construct a question and highlight a political argument in the process of questioning. In addition, they are also used to diminish negative images of political claims, and also form more favorable grounds in order to display political arguments in the process of answering. It can be said that lexical choices of English loanwords in a question sequence and following answer sequence are deeply interrelated to each other.

### **1. Introduction**

Political debates are categorized as “institutional talk,” which is distinguished from ordinary conversation. The notion of institutional talk has been specified by Drew and Heritage (1992) and Heritage and Clayman (2010). According to them, there are three basic features of institutional talk: (1) goal-orientation, (2) special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions, and (3) inferential frameworks and procedures in specific institutional contexts. The first feature means that participants are usually involved in specific goal-orientations that are tied to their institution-relevant identities (e.g., teacher-student, doctor-patient, etc.). The second feature indicates that regardless of the speech exchange system (e.g., interviews and formal

meetings), topics must be relevant to the meeting's agenda or the type and purpose of the interview (Kasper & Wagner, 2014, p. 194). Lastly, in terms of the third feature of institutional talk, Kasper and Wagner (2014) note that "the same interactional conduct may generate different inferences" (p. 192). For instance, the withholding of stance displays can be seen when professionals such as journalistic interviewers are expected to maintain a formally neutral or "neutralistic" posture (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

While much of the way in which English loanwords are employed by speakers in institutional contexts remains unexplored, some research has investigated lexical choices in institutional talk. Heritage and Clayman (2010) argue that "lexical choice implies that alternative lexical formulations are available to reference the same state of affairs" by quoting Sacks (1992), who looked into the way in which speakers reference themselves using "I" or "We", the latter choice often being used to index that they are speaking on behalf of an institution. In addition, they also show an example of law enforcement in which the selection between "police" and "cops" is sensitive to whether the speaker is testifying in court (Jefferson 1974) or talking with adolescent peers (Sacks 1979). To add to these studies, Kasper and Wagner (2014) also argue that institution-specific registers are inextricably connected to professional identities and to epistemic access and authority when speakers select lexical items in institutional talk, referencing Mishler's (1984) study of medical interaction and Nguyen's (2012) study of pharmacy consultations. Moreover, Bushnell (2012) examined how participants in conversation analysis (CA) data sessions in Japan utilize CA register and CA terminology in Japanese and English in order to not only deal with given tasks but also to construct their institutional identities and community membership. Thus, it can be said that lexical choices in institutional talk are deeply interrelated with particular institutional registers and the participant's

positionality in given contexts. In a nutshell, it is always worth asking, “Why that now?” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), or for this study, “Why did they use this word now?” Adopting this viewpoint, this paper examines participants’ lexical choices, specifically those involving English loanwords in institutional talk, as a key resource that shapes a socio-political world.

In order to focus on interactions in institutional settings rather than non-institutional or ordinary interactions, I extracted data from political debates because interactions in political contexts can be categorized as a social interaction that is public and regulated by a public and highly codified rules of conduct (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Japanese society has been experiencing an enormous influx of English. In this sense, it would be insightful to observe how Japanese Parliament members using English loanwords in political debates.

## **2. English Loanwords in Japanese**

When it comes to the actual use of English in daily conversation in Japanese, it is quite rare that a turn is constructed completely in English. Rather, English lexical items are inserted into the turn as “English loanwords.” In fact, the Japanese language has been significantly influenced by English. Daulton (2011) shows that about 10% of the modern Japanese lexicon comes from English. To highlight this, Stanlaw (2004) also argues that Japanese today cannot adequately be spoken without the use of English loanwords or English-based lexical items. However, previous research has not argued that this significant influx of English into Japanese causes a negative impact on all Japanese speakers. It is rather essential from the perspective of critical language awareness for communication among non-English speakers (Kubota & McKay, 2009).

Tengse and Gakkula (2021) argue that many loanwords have been absorbed and adapted from English into Japanese due to the economic, political and cultural influences of the UK and

US on Japan. Those adopted words, which come from foreign languages including English, are called *gairaigo* (foreign words). The lexicon of Japanese consists of three classes: *wago* (native Japanese lexical items), *kango* (Sino-Japanese lexical items), and *gairaigo*. While *kango* are also loanwords that were derived from Chinese characters and morphemes from long ago, *gairaigo* are treated as categorically different from *kango* as the term refers to more recent and Western loanwords. Native speakers of Japanese use a variety of *gairaigo*, especially English lexical items, in a wide range of social contexts including in political talk. A published dictionary of *gairaigo* (Japanese words loaned from abroad) includes 50,000 such loanwords in the Japanese lexicon.

In addition to English loanwords, Japanese has also developed *wasei-eigo* (Japanese pseudo-Anglicisms) which are not just simple loanwords from English but are blended with Japanese words (Tengse & Gakkula, 2021). As the Japanese language has absorbed a certain amount of English loanwords into its lexicon, this influx has led to the unique creations of *wasei-eigo*. For example, *sarariiman* (salary + man ‘regular office workers who are paid a salary’), and *defure* ‘deflation’. Native speakers of Japanese barely distinguish *wasei-eigo* from *gairaigo* in the actual use of loanwords. Hoffer (1990) refers to *wasei-eigo* as the “Nipponicization of loanwords,” stating that “the absorption of English vocabulary has, it would seem, reached the point where the next step will be the further nativization of the loans so that eventually their uses and functions will be indistinguishable from all other vocabulary.” Thus, although *wasei-eigo* is rarely mentioned in the debates over the use of *gairaigo* (Hosokawa, 2015), it is reasonable to include these words as a type of English loanword because they are also derived from English. It should also be noted here that there are English loan words that Japanese speakers use because a Japanese counterpart is extremely redundant or has no equivalent *wago* and *kango*. In this case, it

cannot be observed how Japanese speakers choose a particular *gairaigo* in a particular context. Since this study investigates how speakers select English loan words from lexical choices during an interaction, it would be rational to exclude such English loan words that do not have an equivalent Japanese counterpart from the focus of the analysis.

In terms of the sociolinguistic roles of English loanwords used in Japanese, Honna (1995, p. 52) mentions three major types of usage: (a) as technical terms; (b) as neologisms denoting totally new and pseudo-/semi-new things, concepts, events, movements and states, etc., and as coinages to create a new image of an old thing; and (c) as euphemisms. Examples of category (a) include *makuro* ‘macro’, usually used when native speakers of Japanese talk about the economy, and *wakuchin* ‘vaccine’, used as a medical term. According to Nishi (2019), category (b) is for loanwords that are used to create new and sophisticated images, often for commercial purposes. For instance, using the loanword *kicchin* ‘kitchen’ instead of the Japanese counterpart *daidokoro* ‘kitchen’ is an example of a word in this category. Regarding category (c), Honna (1995) refers to the Japanese word *shakkin* ‘borrowing money’, which is rephrased by lending companies as the English loanword *roon* ‘loan’ to avoid the negative images, such as poverty and moral impropriety, that are associated with the word *shakkin* ‘loan’.

In this sense, English loanwords used in Japanese serve important roles depending on a given discourse and context. Scherling (2016, p. 290) argues that the use of loanwords is not limited to a narrow domain, but that they can be employed in various creative contexts to generate new and manifold meanings. Therefore, it is critical to investigate not only what but how English loanwords are actually utilized within interactions in Japanese for meaning-making and achieving specific goals in given contexts. Previous research on English in Japanese has highlighted performative and ideological roles of English lexical items and expressions. For

instance, Pennycook (2003) described how English lexical items are mixed into the lyrics of Japanese hip-hop music in a performative way. Through this analysis, he argued that the lyrics are put together for very particular effects - cultural, aesthetic, commercial - and as such are very much “performed” (p. 17). Regarding the cultural perspective, Furukawa (2015) investigated stylized pronunciation of English by Japanese speakers on TV shows in Japan. He revealed how these stylized English pronunciations are utilized in interactions as resources in the social construction of “cool identities.” While research has been conducted on the use of English loan words in entertainment and TV shows, research has not been conducted, to the best of my knowledge, on the use of these kind of words in settings such as political debates where those words are usually utilized in a similar manner as in entertainment, TV shows, as well as daily interactions. Based on the discussion so far, I will explore the following two questions:

- (1) How do English loanwords function in question-answer sequences in political debates?
- (2) What actions or stances do the loanwords evoke in the observed sequential environments?

#### **4. Data and Methods**

##### **4.1 Data**

The data corpus of this paper comes from dyadic political debates between prime ministers (PM) and the leaders of opposing political parties in the Diet of Japan since 1999. I have selected these cases because (1) they allow for an investigation of the variety of English loanwords actually used in political debates, and (2) it is possible to observe ways in which English loanwords are used and designed within institutional registers as PMs and the leaders of the political parties need to organize their talk in the debates in order to not only refute opponents but also convey political messages to citizens.

The Diet of Japan holds “Question Time” (QT, 党首討論, *tōshu tōron*) in which the leaders of the opposition parties in the Parliament question the PM on a variety of political issues. Japan’s QT started in 1999, modeled after the U.K, and is broadcast-across the country. Although QT was originally supposed to be held every week while the Diet is in session, it is often canceled when the PM has other official duties. Each QT lasts 45 minutes, and time is allocated to the opposition parties based on the number of seats each political party holds in the Diet at that time. In QT, although the PM is also allowed to address questions to the opposition, it is primarily a time for the PM to answer questions from the opposition. The PM and the leaders of the opposition parties are also allowed to share resources such as scripts, notes, and pictures in order to ask and answer in the debate; however, the PM usually does not know what is being asked in advance. During the discussion in QT, the PM and the members of the opposition are not allowed to interrupt each other (it occasionally happens, but such conduct is regularly treated as disruptive by the opposing parties) or begin talking until nominated by the Chairman. They stay seated and listen to the speaker while facing each other when not nominated. Once they are nominated, they approach the podium and begin to talk. There are also other members of Parliament in the audience. They are not allowed to talk during the discussion, but they sometimes express various affective stances, both positive and negative, through audible responses, applause, booing and so forth. The members’ seats are divided into two sides: the ruling political parties to which the PM belongs on one side and the opposition parties on the other.

QTs have been held 68 times from 10 November 1999 to 9 June 2021, and the videos of the QTs are available on the Japanese government internet television channel, which can be freely accessed by anyone (see <https://nettv.gov-online.go.jp/index.html>). However, the oldest

video on the website available for viewing is dated 18 October 2006 although written transcriptions (meeting minutes) of all 68 QTs are accessible through a specialized “search engine for the meeting minutes of the Diet” (国会議事録検索システム, *kokkai giziroku kensaku sisutemu*), which is also free to access (see <https://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/#/>). I chose to focus only on the video data of the QTs since 18 October 2006, which results in 29 recordings for the dataset.

In addition, during the QTs, each speaker’s turn is usually extremely long because they tend to not only ask questions and answer to questions but also address political backgrounds and issues that are not sometimes directly related to a focal question and answer in their own turn. Thus, it might not be efficient to accurately analyze the use of English loanwords in a particular question-answer sequence through observation of entire turns consisting of multiple units. Therefore, when I explored the data, I specifically looked at the closings of the opposition’s questions and the openings of the PM’s responses immediately following the questions. Through careful exploration of the closings and openings in the QTs, I chose four excerpts, which will be shown in the analysis section.

## 4.2 Methods

The methodology used in this study is conversation analysis (CA). Data analysis was conducted consistent with institutional CA (Heritage, 2005), which draws on the findings of basic CA to examine how institutions in a given setting are “talked into being” (Heritage, 1984, p. 290). This study draws on political debates in which opponents address questions to prime ministers. Adopting the theoretical and methodological frameworks of multimodal conversation analysis (Streeck et al., 2011; Mondada, 2019), I paid close attention to how English loanwords are used in the process of designing questions and answers. Clayman and Heritage (2002)

formulated “dimensions of questioning and answering” based on data from interviews in which journalists ask questions to politicians. In such dimensions, journalists should be appropriately adversarial (Heritage & Clayman, 2010) because they need to prevent the interview from becoming a kind of platform or soapbox from which political leaders can get away with putting their own spin on events (p. 227). This feature can be applied to QTs since they have the same question-answer structure as in political interviews. Thus, it can be said that the opposition in the QTs should also be adversarial towards the PM and their essential role is to question public figures on behalf of the public (Clayman, 2002, p. 198).

On the other hand, politicians in such interview settings need to be deliberate if they wish to save face and stay on message since interviewers are often drawn to questions that are unflattering or oppositional. This is also quite similar with QTs in which prime ministers always have to be careful of their own conduct when interacting with opponents. As prime ministers are obligated to answer questions even if the questions are unfavorable, they must use multiple strategies such as resistant response and agenda shift (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 247). Therefore, to better understand how English loanwords are utilized in QTs, the data will be analyzed with consideration to how opponents’ questions and prime ministers’ answers are designed for specific goals.

The four excerpts in this paper are transcribed according to conversation analytic conventions (Jefferson, 2004). The transcripts of this study adopt a three-tiered format based on that used in Nguyen and Kasper (2009). The first tier structures a Romanized version of the Japanese, and the second tier represents a word-by-word translation and symbols used in morpheme-by-morpheme glosses of the first tier similar to that shown in Greer et al. (2017). Moreover, an additional tier right above the first tier provides description of the embodied

actions of the participants (Burch, 2014). Finally, because English and Japanese have grammatical and word order differences, idiomatic translations in English are shown at the end of each turn in the transcript.

## 5. Analysis

In this section, I analyze how English loanwords are actually used in the construction of questions and how they are treated in the answer structure. Namely, I investigate how their lexical choices of English loanwords orient to certain institutional goals, and how the choices are aligned with dimensions of questioning and answering.

The first two excerpts demonstrate the use of English loanwords in question sequences in which opponents formulate a question to the PM and how the PM responds to the question. The latter two excerpts focus on the use of English loanwords in answer sequences in which the PM answers a question from the opposition.

### 5-1. The Use of English Loanwords in Questions

The first excerpt is extracted from the QT on 18 May 2016 in which Shii (Shi), leader of an opposition party, asks then Prime Minister Abe (PM) whether he will raise a consumption tax under economic deterioration. Before this excerpt, Shii asked the PM the same question, but the PM did not clearly answer yet. In this excerpt, I focus on how the following loan words, *iesu* ‘yes’ and *noo* ‘no’, are utilized in a question sequence.

(1) [*iesu ka noo*]

- 1 Shi:           ano: watashi ga       kiite iru  
                  uhm     I        TP   have been asking
- 2 Shi:           koto   ni okotae ni natte   nai(.)  
                  thing to   answer+POL        NG
- Shi:        +put opened RH around chest--
- 3 Shi:           <+riiman shokku                   ka>  
                  the 2008 financial crisis or

- Shi: -----
- 4 Shi: **daishinsai no youna**  
Tohoku earthquake LK like
- Shi: -----
- 5 Shi: **jitai ni narana kereba(.)**  
situation to become CND
- Shi: -----
- 6 Shi: **<keiki akka> ga**  
economic deterioration SB
- Shi: -----
- 7 Shi: **meihakuna baai demo**  
obvious in case even
- Shi: +open up B arms
- 8 Shi: **+ageru to iu n desu ka to**  
raise QT say SP Q QT
- 9 Shi: **kite iru n desu(.)**  
ask+PROG CP
- Shi: +points at PM by RH
- 10 Shi: **-> >+iesu ka noo ka<(.)**  
yes or no Q
- 11 Shi: **>kotaete kudasai<(.)**  
answer please
- Shi: +points at PM by RH
- 12 Shi: **>+sore o kiita n desu<**  
that O asked CP
- 13 Shi: **hayaku kotaete kudasai**  
quickly answer please
- You haven't answered what I have been asking. I am asking whether you are going to raise (the consumption tax) even when Japan obviously faces economic deterioration if the situation does not become like the 2008 financial crisis or the Tohoku earthquake. Please answer by yes or no. That's what I asked. Please answer quickly.  
私が聞いていることにお答えになっていない。リーマン・ショックか大震災のような事態にならなければ、景気悪化が明白な場合でも上げるというんですかと聞いているんです。イエスかノーか、答えてください。それを聞いたんです。早く答えてください。
- 14 Chair: **jikan ga kite orimasu no de**  
time SB pass+PROG+CP since

15 Chair: **kanketsu ni shuuryou shite**  
 compactly finish do

16 Chair: **itadaka nakereba narimasen**  
 you have to+POL

Chair: **no de yoroshiku onegai itashimasu**  
 since thank you in advance

Since we are running out of time, (answer) compactly. You have to finish. Thank you in advance.

時間が来ておりますので、簡潔に。終了していただくかなければなりませんので、よろしくお願いたします。

PM: +stands up and goes to the podium with raised RH

17 Chair: **+Abe naikaku souri daijin**  
 Abe PM  
 Prime Minister Abe

18 PM: -> **ano:: kore wa >iesu ka noo ka<(.)**  
 uhmm this TP yes or no Q

19 PM: **to iu koto de wa**  
 QT thing CP

20 PM: **tanjunna mondai de wa**  
 simple problem CP

21 PM: **nakute desu ne(.) e: tsumari kore wa**  
 NG COP+IP uh I mean this TP

22 PM: **sou iu joukyou ga**  
 that kind of situation SB

23 PM: **okite iru no ka(.)**  
 happen+PROG LK Q

24 PM: **sou iu eikyou ga**  
 that kind of influence SB

25 PM: **dete kuru no ka to iu koto**  
 would occur LK Q QT thing

26 PM: **ni tsuite wa kore wa**  
 about TP this TP

27 PM: **masani senmonka no**  
 surely specialist of

28 PM:        **minasama    ni(.) bunseki   o**  
                  people+POL   by        analysis O

29 PM:        **shite itadaka nakereba nara nai**  
                  have to be done+POL

30 PM:        **to        iu koto    de gozaimasu**  
                  QT   like thing        CP+POL

This is not a simple problem like yes or no. I mean this is surely the thing that has to be analyzed by specialists in terms of whether that kind of situation is happening and whether that kind of influence would occur.

これはイエスかノーかということでは、単純な問題ではなくて、つまりこれは、そういう状況が起きているのか、そういう影響が出てくるのかということについては、これはまさに専門家の皆さんに分析をしていただかなければならないということでございます。

Shii first argues that the PM did not answer his question in the prior turn (lines 1-2). Then, Shii repeats the question that he has been asking the PM (lines 3-9). After a slight pause, he says “*ies ka noo ka*” ‘yes or no’ with relatively speeded up sounds in order to elicit the PM’s clearer answer (line 10). Here, *ies* ‘yes’ and *noo* ‘no’ are English loanwords which both have native-Japanese counterparts such as *hai* ‘yes’ and *iie* ‘no’. However, if Shii used *hai* and *iie* instead of *ies* ‘yes’ and *noo* ‘no’ here, it might be an unfitting expression in a political debate because it could be seen as an informal and unprofessional way to ask the PM to answer as if asking a child to answer a question. Thus, it can be said that Shii purposefully uses these English loanwords to maintain the institutional talk. At line 12, Shii subsequently requests the PM to answer his question by yes or no, and emphasize his request twice (lines 12-13). To use the English loanwords “*ies ka noo ka*” ‘yes or no’ and put so much emphasis on this in a formal and professional way, he seems to be orienting the PM to this yes-or-no question to make sure to elicit his answer in the next turn. Thus, it can be understood that Shii is setting a clear agenda for the question (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 229) to which the PM must respond.

In response to Shii's question, the PM argues that it cannot be answered with yes or no by using the same expression with the English loanwords "*ies ka noo ka*" 'yes or no' that Shii has just used in his question (lines 18-21). Then, in order to justify his argument which is an oppositional stance against Shii, he mentions that it is necessary to ask specialists to analyze the situation (lines 22-30). In other words, it can be said that the PM withholds a clear-cut, type-conforming response to the preceding polar question in order to adjust the question to fit his intended response (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 256). Heritage and Clayman (2010) also argue that participants' understandings are not always transparent, and sometimes this is by design. Thus, it can be assumed that the PM decides not to display a clear preference with regards to the particular question even though he has a choice to do that (meaning "yes or no"), indicating that he may be avoiding negative consequences that could result in answering straightforwardly.

The next excerpt will show another example of the use of English loanwords in a question sequence. The excerpt is extracted from the QT on 30 November 2011 in which Tanigaki (Tani), leader of an opposition party, asks then Prime Minister Noda (PM) about an environmental assessment for the relocation plan of the Futenma military base in Okinawa Prefecture. Right before this excerpt, Tanigaki criticized an indiscreet comment by the chief of the Okinawa Defense Bureau who was appointed by the PM. In this excerpt, I focus on how an English loan word *asesumento* 'assessment' is utilized in a question sequence.

(2) [*asesumento*]

- 1 Tani: -> kono: kankyou asesumento(.)  
this environmental assessment
- 2 Tani: nennai kono mama odashi ni  
in this year as it is release+POL
- 3 Tani: naru n desu ka(.) to iu koto wa  
do+CP+POL Q QT like the thing TP

- 4 Tani: **kore dake Okinawa no katagata no(.)**  
like this Okinawa in people+POL of
- 5 Tani: **kimochi o humi nijitte**  
feeling O trample on
- 6 Tani: **shinrai kankei o(0.2)**  
trust relationship O
- 7 Tani: **ushinatta toki ni**  
lost when O
- 8 Tani: **dekirundesu ¿ka(.) to iu koto**  
could do+CP+POL Q QT like the thing
- 9 Tani: **o watashi wa toitaindesu(.)**  
O I TP want to ask+CP+POL
- 10 Tani: **souri mada: souri ni nararete**  
PM yet PM O became+HON
- 11 Tani: **kara desu ne ichidomo Okinawa ni**  
since COP IP once Okinawa to
- 12 Tani: **itte orare nai(.)**  
have been+HON NG
- 13 Tani: **seishin sei to ossharu**  
with all your heart QT say+HON
- 14 Tani: **naraba(.) souri mizukara**  
CND PM yourself
- 15 Tani: **Okinawa ni tobarete(.)**  
Okinawa to fly+HON
- 16 Tani: **soshite Okinawa no katagata ni(.)**  
and Okinawa in people+POL to
- 17 Tani: **seishin sei shazai sareru**  
with all your heart apologize do+HON
- 18 Tani: **tokoro kara(.) sai shuppatsu**  
place from restart
- 19 Tani: **sarena kereba sikata ga nai n ja**  
has to do+HON there is no point CP
- 20 Tani: **naidesu ¿ka(.) soshite**  
NG+CP+POL Q and
- 21 Tani: **Okinawa no kagataga no(.)**  
Okinawa in people+POL of
- 22 Tani: **rikai ga erare tara(.) sono tokini(.)**  
understanding SB get CND at that time





Defense Bureau allegedly made about the government's plan to relocate the Futenma military base in Okinawa Prefecture (lines 10-20). After the criticism, Tanigaki claims that the environmental assessment should be released after Okinawa citizens accept the PM's apology (lines 21-24). In line 21, he says "*asesu o dasu*" 'to show the environmental assessment' with stress sounds. This "*asesu*" is a shortened version of *asesumento* 'assessment' which Tanigaki used in line 1. Note that it is not an uncommon phenomenon to shorten English loanwords. For example, *fesu* from *fesutibaru* 'festival', *masu komi* from *masu komyunikeishon* 'mass communication', and *defure* from *defureishon* 'deflation'. Even if they are shortened, the meanings do not change. Thus, both *asesumento* and *asesu* have the same meaning 'assessment'. The word *asesumento* 'assessment' is relatively a new concept that was imported from western countries to Japan. Although it means evaluation in general, it often refers to the evaluation of the nature in some contexts such as when people talk about an environmental issue and influence. In this sense, it can be said that Tanigaki tactfully uses the English loanword as a technical term (Honna, 1995) to construct his question and stress that it is not a general evaluation but the evaluation of the nature which is a critical matter for people in Okinawa. In response to Tanigaki's question, the PM acknowledges that he has to apologize to people in Okinawa as Tanigaki has requested (line 29-33). Then, the PM also states his view that the PM needs to explain about the environmental assessment to people in Okinawa before releasing it while the audience displays disagreement with booing (lines 34-40). Amidst the booing, the PM then argues that he is going to show the environmental assessment document before the end of the year (lines 41-44). In line 41, the PM says *kankyō eikyō hyōka syō* 'the environmental assessment document' which represents the name of an official government document about the environmental assessment. Typically, the official names of government documents are *kangō*

(Sino-Japanese lexical items) such as *ryoken* (旅券) for *pasupooto* ‘passport’, and *sashou* (査証) for *biza* ‘travel visa’ even though Japanese speakers normally use the English loanwords, *pasupooto* and *biza* in daily use. When the official name of a government document is in a Sino-Japanese word and not in an English loanword, it implies that the speaker refers to a particular document from the government official business. Thus, it can be said that the PM seems to purposefully address *kankyō eikyō hyōka syō* ‘the environmental assessment document’ as an official government document in order to justify and defend his political stance against Tamaki in a polite manner.

### 5-2. The Use of English Loanwords in Answers

In the previous section, I investigated how English loanwords are utilized in the process of questioning and how they are tactically reformulated in the following turn in order to answer the question on preferable grounds for PMs. In this section, I will examine the use of English loanwords in answer sequences. To highlight the strategic use of English loanwords in the process of answering, I chose examples in which the PMs prefer using English loanwords even though opponents have not used the words in the prior turn. The following excerpt comes from the same QT with Excerpt 2 which is on 18 May 2016. Shii (Shi), leader of an opposition party, asks then Prime Minister Abe (PM) to share his view on the fact that consumption among citizens has decreased more than expected. In this excerpt, I do not focus on the use of *defure* ‘deflation’ as a focal English loanword because Japanese speakers usually use this loanword due to the lack of an equivalent Japanese counterpart. Thus, I rather focus on how *maindo* ‘mindset’ is utilized to design a reasonable answer to a critical question.

(3) [*defure maindo*]

- 1 Shi: **¿sangatsu mikka no(0.2) sangiin**  
March 3rd on the House of Councilors
- 2 Shi: **yosan iinkai de(.) waga tou**  
Budget Committee at our political party
- 3 Shi: **giin no sitsumon ni taishite(.)**  
Member of question against
- Shi: +GZ to PM
- 4 Shi: **+souri wa(0.2) <hachi paasento no hikiage>**  
PM TP eight percent of rise
- 5 Shi: **de(.) <yosou ijou ni>**  
due to expectation more than 0
- 6 Shi: **shouhi ga ochikonda no wa jijitsu**  
consumption SB dropped LK TP true
- Shi: +GZ to PM
- 7 Shi: **+de ari(.) <yosou ijou ni>**  
CP expectation more than 0
- Shi: +GZ to PM
- 8 Shi: **nagabiite iru no mo jijitsu +to(.)**  
drag on+PROG LK also fact QT
- Shi: +RH moves around his chest
- 9 Shi: **omitome +ni narimashita**  
admit+POL O did+POL
- Shi: + RH moves in front of his chest
- 10 Shi: **yosou(.) ga +>¿hazureta koto(.)<**  
expectation SB wrong thing
- Shi: +RH stays above the pondium
- 11 Shi: **+mitomeraremashita(0.2)**  
admitted+HON+POL
- Shi: +BH open to PM----->
- 12 Shi: **+sokode ukagaimasu(0.3)**  
So, (I will)ask+POL
- Shi: ----->
- 13 Shi: **<shouhi no ochikomi ga>**  
consumption of drop TP
- Shi: -----
- 14 Shi: **yosou ijou(.) >souteigai ni<(.)**  
expectation more than unexpected to
- Shi: +Neck slightly tilts to R
- 15 Shi: **natta no wa(.) +naze ka(.)**  
became LK TP why Q
- Shi: +RH moves vertically

16 Shi: +sono geiin o dou okangae ni  
that cause O how think+POL O

17 Shi: natte iru no ka(0.2)  
doing LK Q

Shi: +RH points to PM

18 Shi: +>tantekini okotae kudasai<  
shortly answer+POL please

At House of Councilors on March 3rd, the PM admitted that it was true that consumption dropped more than expected due to the rise of the consumption tax from 8% (to 10%) and also admitted that the situation has been dragging on longer than expected. (The PM) admitted that the expectation was wrong. So, I will ask you now. Why did consumption drop more than expected, beyond expectations? And what do you think was the cause? Please provide a concise answer.

三月三日の参議院予算委員会で、我が党議員の質問に対して、総理は、八%の引き上げで予想以上に消費が落ち込んだのは事実であり、予想以上に長引いているのも事実とお認めになりました。予想が外れたことを認められました。そこで伺います。消費の落ち込みが予想以上、想定外になったのはなぜか、その原因をどうお考えになっているのか、端的にお答えください。

19 Chair: Abe naikaku souri daijin  
Abe PM  
Prime Minister Abe

PM: +BH open

20 PM: e: +wareware wa e:: nisen juu ninen no  
well we TP uhh 2012

21 PM: juu nigatsu ni seiken o  
December on administration of

22 PM: -> <tantoushite irai> defure(.)  
in charge of since deflation

23 PM: kara dakkyaku o shi soshite  
from escape O did and

24 PM: shotoku o huyashi mata a: shoku o  
income O increase and um job O

25 PM: huyasu(.) kono chousen o  
increase this challenge O

26 PM: tuzukete kita wakede gozaimasu(.)  
has been continued surely CP+POL

27 PM: -> e soshite >defure dewa nai to iu joukyou<  
uh and deflation not QT situation

PM: +upper body turs to R

28 PM: +o tsukuru koto ga dekita  
O make thing SB could

29 PM: node gozaimasu ga  
CP+POL though

- PM +BH raised and upper body turns to Shi
- 30 PM: -> **+defure dakkyaku(0.2) ni wa(.)**  
deflation escape LK TP
- 31 PM: **itatte(.)inai wake de arimasu**  
has not achieved surely CP+POL
- 32 PM: -> **sono defure dakkyaku ni wa**  
that deflation escape LK TP
- 33 PM: **itatte inai naka ni oite(.) e:**  
has not achieved in uh
- 34 PM: **shouhizei o hikiageta koto(.)**  
consumption tax 0 has raised thing
- 35 PM: **ni yotte iwaba mada**  
by so-called still
- 36 PM: -> **>defure maindo ga nokotte iru naka ni oite<**  
deflation mindset SB remains in
- 37 PM: **shouhi(.) nitsuite kokumin no**  
consumption about citizens of
- 38 PM: **minasama ga hijouni shinchouni natta**  
everyone SB very careful became
- 39 PM: **douzi ni(.) ;keieishano katagata mo**  
at the same time manager everyone also
- 40 PM: **toushi ni taisite shinchou ni natta**  
investment to careful became
- 41 PM: **no mo jijitsu(.) de arou**  
LK as well fact would be
- 42 PM: **to(.) e: omoimasu**  
QT uh think+POL

Since the start of this administration in December 2012, we have continued this challenge to escape from deflation, increase income, and also increase jobs. Although we have reached a situation that is not deflation, we have not achieved an escape from deflation. By raising consumption tax in the situation that we have not escaped from deflation, a so-called “deflation mindset” still remains and citizens have become very wary of consumption. At the same time, I think it is true that financial managers have also become wary of investment.

我々は、二〇一二年の十二月に政権を担当して以来、デフレから脱却をし、そして所得をふやし、また職をふやす、この挑戦を続けてきたわけでございます。そして、デフレではないという状況をつくることはできたのでございますが、デフレ脱却には至っていないわけでありまして。そのデフレ脱却には至っていない中において消費税を引き上げたことによって、いわばまだデフレマインドが残っている中において、消費について国民の皆様が非常に慎重になった、同時に経営者の方々も投資に対して慎重になったのも事実であろうと思います。

After clarifying the date and place of the meeting (line 1-3), Shii says “*sori wa*” ‘PM + topic maker’ to put emphasis that the following opinion was said by the PM (line 4). Shii consequently quotes the PM’s view (line 4-8). In this quotation, he places emphasis on three segments with a slowed speech rate: (1) “*hachi paasento no hikiage*” ‘the raising of the consumption tax from 8% to 10%’, (2) “*yosou ijou ni*” ‘more than expected’, and (3) “*yosou ijou ni*” ‘more than expected’ repeated a second time. What Shii is doing here by referring to the PM’s view seems to be a sort of accusation through the ascription of negative consequences to the PM and a request to determine the cause of the drop in consumption among citizens. In order to put more emphasis on this point, Shii restates that it is true that the PM admitted his expectations were wrong (line 8-10). It can be understood that there are two purposes to Shii’s argument: (1) to criticize the PM’s administrative failure by showing the fact that raising the consumption tax might have caused the decrease in consumption in Japan and (2) to elicit PM’s further responses about the causes which Shii has just determined. In other words, Shii seems to establish a critical presupposition (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 231) to put the PM into a difficult position. After establishing this presupposition that reflects Shii’s criticism of the PM, he moves on to the question part (line 12), which is clearly distinguished by “*sokode ukagamimasu*” ‘so I will ask’. He also puts emphasis on “*yosou ijou*” ‘more than expected’ with a brief pause after the expression so that he can highlight the PM’s failure in foreseeing the current situation (line 14). In sum, this utterance seems to have two phases. First, he not only presupposes that the cause of the drop in consumption among citizens but also criticizes the PM, who was not able to successfully deal with the issue (line 1-11). Then, Shii moves on to the question phase with this declared presupposition and “adversarialness” (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 238), stating that the PM has failed (line 12-18).

In response to Shii's question about the drop in consumption, the PM starts to list items that his political party has addressed since the beginning of his administration instead of immediately answering his question (line 20-26). The PM names "*defure kara dakkyaku*" 'escape from deflation', "*shotoku o huyashi*" 'to increase income' and "*shoku wo huyasu*" 'to increase jobs' as achievements that his administration has accomplished. Through the PM's countermove listing those achievements while not mentioning the cause of the drop in consumption among citizens, he seems to reform the unfavorable presupposition Shii has just made because it seems disadvantageous. To reinforce his own standpoint, the PM also states his understanding of the current situation, which is no longer in deflation (line 27-29).

Then, the PM turns to the next phase with *ga* 'however' in line 29. After describing the current economic situation "*defure dakkyaku ni wa itatte inai*" 'we have not achieved an escape from deflation' (lines 30-31), he finally starts to mention his view in order to explain why consumption among the people has dropped which Shii has asked the PM. Although he addresses the rise of the consumption tax as Shii did (line 34), he immediately rephrases "*sono defure dakkyaku ni wa itatte inai naka ni oite*" 'in the situation we have not achieved an escape from deflation' to "*mada defure maindo ga nokotte iru naka ni oite*" 'the deflation mindset still remains' (line 35-36). This immediate paraphrase can be seen as the PM's attempt to narrow down the cause of the drop in consumption from his view point. In the attempt, he uses a combined English loanword *defure maindo* 'deflation mindset' (line 36). While *defure* 'deflation' does not have an equivalent Japanese counterpart, Japanese speakers often use *shikou* (思考) 'thinking' or *seishin* (精神) 'mind' instead of *maindo* 'mindset' such as *purasu shikou* 'positive thinking', *mainasu shikou* 'negative thinking', and *hangurii seishin* 'hungry mind'. Generally speaking, Japanese speakers have heard the loanword *maindo* 'mindset', it could be

unclear whether or not they understand the exact meaning of the word. However, such vagueness of the English loanword can be used as euphemisms to avoid negative images (Honna, 1995). In other words, it can be said that the PM uses *maindo* ‘mindset’ instead of *shikou* (思考) ‘thinking’ or *seishin* (精神) ‘mind’ in order to diminish the possibility that his argument about the cause of the drop in consumption might be perceived as negative imagery.

The last excerpt shows another example of the use of English loanwords in the response. This excerpt comes from the same QT with excerpt 2, which was held on 4 December 2013. Kaieda (Kai) and then Prime Minister Abe (PM) discuss a bill called the Act on the Protection of Specially Designated Secrets (APSDS), designed to prevent unauthorized disclosure of information concerning Japan's national security. The bill allows the government to set up a committee that has the function of checking which information needs to be protected or not. In this excerpt, I focus on both *saado paatii ruuru* ‘third-party rule’ and *interijensu* ‘intelligence’ as focal English loanwords in an answer sequence.

(4) [*saado paatii ruuru*]

- 1 Kai: kore ga <hontou ni>(.) sore koso amerika no  
this SB really just America of
- 2 Kai: rei o yoku dashi masu keredomo(.)  
example O often bring up+POL though+POL
- 3 Kai: amerika no(0.2) enuesushii no  
America of NSC of
- Kai: +opens a book on a podium
- 4 Kai: +moto koukan wa(0.2) <nihon no>(.)  
former dignitary TP Japan of
- Kai: + GZ down to the podium
- 5 Kai: +kono ima junbishite imasu(0.2)  
this current prepare+PROG+POL
- Kai: +RH raises
- 6 Kai: +kono(.) tokutei himitsu hogo houan(.)  
this APSDS

- 7 Kai: kore wa <kokusai kijun kara mite>  
this TP international standard from see
- 8 Kai: >oo:i ni mondai ga aru to iu koto o<  
seriously problem SB exist QT thing O  
AD: [sou da]  
That's right
- 9 Kai: itteru n desu yo(.) kore wa(0.2)  
say+PROG+POL IP this TP  
AD: [souda]  
that's right
- 10 Kai: sou iu koto mo humaeta  
that thing as well considering
- Kai: +close the book
- 11 Kai: hontou ni+ kore wa  
really this TP
- Kai: +RH waives
- 12 Kai: +daisansha kikan toshite  
third-party organization as
- 13 Kai: kinou >suru noka dou na no ka<  
work LK+Q or not LK Q
- 14 Kai: sono koto ni tsuite okotae o  
the thing about answer+HON O
- AD: +applause---->
- 15 Kai: itadakitai.(.) +shikkari shita  
want+HON solid
- AD: -----
- 16 Kai: okotae o itadakitai  
answer+POL O want+HON

This is really, the example of the U.S. is often brought up, but a former dignitary of the NSC in the U.S. is saying that this APSDS (Act on the Protection of Specially Designated Secrets) that Japan is now preparing has serious problems from the view of international standards. I would like you to answer whether this will really function as a third-party organization or not, considering that statement. I would like to get a solid answer from you.

本当に、それこそアメリカの例をよく出しますけれども、アメリカのNSCの元高官は、日本の今、準備していますこの特定秘密の保護法案、これは国際基準から見て大いに問題があるということを行っているんですよ。そういうことも踏まえた、本当にこれは第三者機関として機能するのかどうか、そのことについてお答えをいただきたい。しっかりしたお答えをいただきたい。

- AD: ->applause-----
- PM: +stands up and goes to the podium with raised RH
- 17 Chair: +Abe Naikaku sori daijin  
Abe PM  
Prime Minister Abe
- PM: +LH palm opebs
- 18 PM: e:: tima masani Kaieda daihyou wa

- Well now just Kaiede President TP
- PM: +LH palm opens
- 18 PM: **+juuyouna ten o(.) shiteki sareta**  
important point O suggest+POL
- 20 PM: **to(.) e: kono you ni e omou wake de e**  
QT uh like this uh think surely uh
- 21 PM: **e arimasu(0.2) >↑touzen desu ne<**  
uh CP+POL of course+COP+IP
- 22 PM: **<daisansha> teki to ittemo**  
third person like QT say
- 23 PM: **ii n desu ga daisansha kikan**  
possible+POL though third-party organization
- 24 PM: **to ittemo <ii n darou> to**  
QT say seems possible QT
- 25 PM: **kono you ni omou wake de arimasu ga(.)**  
like this think surely CP+POL though  
AD: [( )]->
- PM: +LH raises up & down
- 26 PM: **>¿sokode desu ne< sokode+**  
then+POL+IP then  
AD: ->[( )]->
- 27 PM: **hitotsu no kadai wa desu ne**  
one of task TP COP+POL+IP  
AD: ->[( )]->
- 28 PM: **hitotsu no kadai wa(.)**  
one of task TP  
AD: ->[( )]
- PM: +Upper body turns to R
- 29 PM: **+jouhou no koukan o okonau**  
information of exchange O do
- PM: +RH moves
- 30 PM: **tokiniwa kihonteki ni +kaigai no**  
when basically foreign
- 31 PM: **jouhoukikan to jouhou**  
intelligence services with information
- 32 PM: **koukan o okonau baai wa(.)**  
exchange O do in case TP
- 33 PM: -> **saado paatii ruuru ga atte(.)**  
third-party rule SB exist
- PM: +RH moves from out to in->

- 34 PM: -> **saado paatii ni +watasu no de areba**  
third party to pass LK COP+CND
- PM: -----
- 35 PM: **watasenai(.) to iu koto o**  
Pass+NG like the thing O
- 36 PM: **¿zentei ni jouhou koukan o**  
on the premise information exchange O
- PM: +Upper body turns to L
- 37 PM: **okonaimasu(.) +sore o**  
do+POL that O
- 38 PM: **nomenai no de areba watasenai.(.)**  
agree+NG LK COP+CND pass(information)+NG
- 39 PM: **to iu no wa kore wa**  
QT like LK TP this TP
- PM: +BH opens
- 40 PM: -> **+interijensu no sekai de wa.(.)**  
intelligence of the world in
- PM: +LH opens in front of his chest-->
- 41 PM: **+joushiki +to itte mo ii(.)**  
common sense QT say possible
- AD: [( )]->
- PM: -----
- 42 PM: **wake de(.)arimasu**  
surely CP+POL
- AD: -[( )]->
- PM: -----
- 43 PM: **shikashi sono naka ni oite desu ne**  
however that in CP+POL
- PM: -----
- 44 PM: **sono naka ni oite shiitekina**  
that in arbitrary
- PM: +Upper body turns to the front
- 45 PM: **+unyou ga(.)**  
management SB
- 46 PM: **nasarete wa naranai(.) ¿no wa(.)**  
be done TP must not LK TP
- 47 PM: **gen o matanai(.) wake de arimasu**  
word O wait+NG surely CP+POL

Well, I surely think that Representative Kaieda has just suggested an important point. Of course, it is possible to say it is a third party, I surely think that it seems possible to say it is a third-party organization. Then, one task is that when we exchange information, basically, in the case we exchange the information with intelligence services in foreign

countries, there is a third-party rule, we exchange information on the premise that we cannot pass it on to a third party. If we cannot agree on that, we cannot pass on (the information), that is common sense in the world of intelligence. However, needless to say, management must not be arbitrary in that setting.

今まさに海江田代表は重要な点を指摘された、このように思うわけでありませう。当然、第三者的と言ってもいいんですが、第三者機関と言ってもいいんだらうと、このように思うわけですが、そこで一つの課題はですね、一つの課題は、情報の交換を行うときには、基本的に、海外の情報機関と情報交換を行う場合は、サードパーティールールがあって、サードパーティーに渡すのであれば渡せないということを前提に情報交換を行います。それをのめないのであれば渡せないというのは、これはインテリジェンスの世界では常識と言ってもいいわけでありませう。しかし、その中において恣意的な運用がなされてはならないのは、言をまたないわけでありませう。

Kaieda first introduces a quote describing how the bill is seen from the perspective of a former dignitary of the National Security Council (NSC) that was an American nonprofit safety advocate (line 1-9). In this quote, Kaieda put much emphasis on “*kokusai kijun kara mite*” ‘from an international perspective’ with a slow speech rate (line 7). With this, Kaieda stresses how the bill transgresses international standards and criticizes the PM forcing the bill through Parliament. Some members of the audience vocalize the agreement token “*sou da*” ‘That’s right’ (Lerner, 2002) in response to Kaieda’s criticism against the PM (line 8), which indicates the degree to which the PM’s political acts are treated as a serious problem at this moment. Following this criticism through the quote, Kaieda poses the concrete issue whether the committee to be established based on the bill would work as a *daisansya kikan* ‘third-party organization’ (line 12-13) and asks the PM to give him a clear answer (line 14-16). Kaieda’s question seems to encompass the points that (1) the bill has serious problems according to international standards, and (2) the committee based on the defective bill would not work as a third-party organization.

In response to Kaieda’s question, the PM first acknowledges that Kaieda has mentioned an important point (line 18-21). Then, from line 22 to 25, although the PM refers to *daisansha* ‘third-party’ and *daisansha kikan* ‘third-party organization’ that Kaieda brought up in his turn, he does not address whether the committee would work as a third-party organization or not. It seems that the PM is trying to make time for himself to think how to answer Kaieda’s question while repeating the same expression that Kaieda has just used with partial acknowledgment of

Kaieda's opinion. In line 26, he says "*sokode*" 'then' twice while raising both hands in an attempt to shift the topic while the audience is still booing. Although he says the phrase "*hitotsu no kadai wa*" 'one of the tasks is' twice (line 27-28) to continue his talk amidst the booing, he manages to start to describe an example of information exchange (line 29) in order to display a concrete task related to the bill. While the PM does not answer Kaieda's question, he seems to reformulate the question by putting "*hitotsu no kadai wa*" 'one of the tasks is' with stress in order to steer the question in a more desirable direction (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 256).

Right after the topic shift, the PM suddenly uses the English loanword phrase *saadopaatii ruuru* 'third-party rule' (line 33). Choosing to use this English loanword phrase at this particular moment after having just used *daisansha kikan* (the Sino-Japanese counterpart of 'third-party'), it can be said that it was a strategic decision to use English loanwords instead of the Shino-Japanese word. This is seemingly influenced by Kaieda's criticism that the bill is problematic by international standards. Thus, in order to refute him on the same grounds, the PM utilizes this English loanword as a technical term (Honna, 1995) to stress that his view contains the international perspective. He then subsequently borrows another English loanword *interizhensu* 'intelligence' with stress to emphasize that this kind of information exchange is common sense among intelligence professionals internationally (line 40). Through the example of actual practices described using technical English terms, the PM seems to not only put emphasis on the fact that he understands the international perspective but also attempts to undermine Kaieda's argument, which criticizes the bill from the perspective of international standards. In addition, since both the PM and Kaieda in this excerpt refer to viewpoints from western countries where English loanwords come from, it can also be said that Japanese speakers might tend to use

English loanwords rather than Japanese counterparts when they talk about issues, concepts, or perspectives which are related to western countries.

To summarize the construction of the question and answer sequence in this QT, Kaieda first sets the presupposition whereby he criticizes the problematic bill from an international viewpoint and poses his question to the PM on oppositional grounds. In response, although the PM initially acknowledges Kaieda's point, he maneuvers the critical question into a more concrete agenda based on the PM's own perspective in order to highlight his internationality through the use of technical terms in English. This does not mean that he completely changes the subject by proposing that the question is inappropriate; however, he seems to refuse to answer the question in the way in which it was framed, rather attempting to form more favorable grounds to show his own political arguments by using particular English terms. In this sense, it can be said that the use of English loanwords is shaped by a given question and structurally oriented toward the action of answering.

## **6. Conclusion**

This paper has shown some of the ways in which English loanwords are used in political debates and contributes to the research on both English loanwords and CA of institutional talk through the analysis on how Japanese Parliament members utilize English loanwords as resources to construct political questions and answers. To answer the research questions, the analysis has found that English loanwords can be used to strategically formulate political questions and arguments in question-answer sequences. For instance, in excerpts 1 and 2, which primarily display the construction of questions, we have seen that English loanwords can function as not only the part of political questions in a formal and professional way to elicit a clear answer but also a technical term to construct a question and highlight a political argument.

Moreover, in excerpt 3 and 4, it has been observed that English loanwords are used as euphemisms to diminish negative images of political claims, and also form more favorable grounds in order to display political arguments in the process of answering. In such question-answer sequences in political debates, the use of English loanwords is structurally interwoven between them, and those lexical choices that strategize the use and disuse of English loanwords can be applied to highlight political positions or counter opponents' arguments.

Additionally, the use of English loanwords can be related to participant's identities as the PMs and opposition speakers in the excerpts above seem to explicitly or implicitly categorize themselves into oppositional stances against each other. This study has focused on only the closings and openings instead of the whole turns. Thus, the relationship between the use of English loanwords and speakers' identities could be further unraveled through an analysis of multiple units in their debates. Either way, English loanwords can function in meaningful ways in Japanese discourse, which means that they are also valuable resources for research on interaction in political settings.

### **Notes**

1. The EIKEN tests: EIKEN is an abbreviation of Jitsuyo Eigo Gino Kentei (Test in Practical English Proficiency), one of the most widely used English-language testing programs in Japan. It is offered at 7 levels: Grade 1, Grade Pre-1, Grade 2, Grade Pre-2, Grade 3, Grade 4, and Grade 5.

### **Acknowledgments**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Dr. Gabriele Kasper for the constant support of my M.A. study, and for her motivation, inspiration, and immense knowledge. Her guidance and feedback always helped me throughout my M.A. study and the writing of this paper. I could not have finished my M.A. study in the COVID-19 Pandemic without her. I would also like to thank Dr. Haruko Minegishi Cook, for her considerate comments and thoughtful

suggestions to edit this paper, which encouraged me to further elaborate my research to include various perspectives. My appreciation also goes to Junichi Yagi, Joshua Jurrens, and Young Chun, who provided insightful views with me for the analysis and kind suggestions to modify my English sentences. Without their precious support, it would not have been possible for me to write this paper. Also, I thank my fellow SLS members for supporting me throughout the writing of this paper, and all of my two-year M.A. study. To my family, particularly my parents, thank you for your love, support, and unwavering belief in me. Without you, I would not be the person I am today. Last and foremost, I wish to thank my wife, Yuika, for her love and constant support, and for all the late nights and early mornings, and for keeping me sane over the past few months. Thank you for being my ariadne, assistant, and sounding board. But most of all, thank you for being my wife. I owe you everything.

### References

- Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Public speaking and audience responses: some techniques for inviting applause. In J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp.370–409). Cambridge University Press
- Burch, A. R. (2014). Pursuing Information: A Conversation Analytic Perspective on Communication Strategies. *Language Learning*, 64(3), 651-684.
- Bushnell, C. (2012). Talking the talk: The interactional construction of community and identity at conversation analytic data sessions in Japan. *Human Studies*, 35, 583–605.
- Coupland, N. (2001). Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society*, 30, 345-375.
- Clayman, S. (2002). Tribune of the people: maintaining the legitimacy of aggressive journalism. *Media, Culture, and Society*, 24, 191–210.
- Clayman, S. & Heritage, J. (2002). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on*

*the Air*. Cambridge University Press.

- Daulton, F. (2011). On the origins of gairaigo hias: English learners' attitudes toward English-based loanwords in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 35(6), 7-12.
- Furukawa, G. (2015). "Cool" English: Stylized Native-Speaker English in Japanese Television Shows. *Multilingua*, 34(2), 265-291.
- Greer, T. & Ishida, M. & Tateyama Y. (2017). *Interactional competence in Japanese as an additional language*. National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analyzing data. In David Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Analysis: Issues of Theory and Method* (pp. 161-182). Sage.
- Heritage, J. (2005). "Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *In Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp.103–147). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Heritage, J. & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: interactions, identities, and institutions*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heritage, J., & Maynard, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Communication in medical care: Interaction between primary care physicians and patients*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J., & Sorjonen. M. L. (1994). Constituting and Maintaining Activities across Sequences: And-Prefacing as a Feature of Question Design. *Language in Society*, 23(1), 1-29.
- Hiramoto, M. (2013). English vs. English conversation: Language teaching in modern

- Japan. In Lionel Wee, Robbie B. H. Goh & Lisa Lim (Eds.), *The politics of English: South Asia, Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific* (pp. 228–248). John Benjamins.
- Hoffer, B. (1990). English loanwords in Japanese: Some cultural implications. *Language Sciences*, 12(1), 1–21.
- Honna, N. (1995). English in Japanese society: Language within language. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development*, 16(1-2), 45-62.
- Hosokawa, N. (2015). Nationalism and Linguistic Purism in Contemporary Japan: National Sentiment Expressed through Public Attitudes towards Foreignisms. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 15(1), 48-65.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 2, 181–199.
- Jefferson, G. (1990). List construction as a task and interactional resource. In George Psathas (Eds.), *Interaction Competence*. University Press of America (pp. 63–92).
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Eds.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp.13-31). John Benjamins.
- Kasper, G & Wagner, J. (2013). Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 34, 171-212.
- Kimura, D., & Malabarba, T., & Hall, J. K. (2018). Data collection considerations for classroom interaction: a conversation-analytic perspective. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(3), 185-204.
- Kubota, R. (2002). Impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In David Block & Deborah Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*, 13–28.

Routledge.

- Kubota, R. & Sandra L. McKay. (2009). Globalization and language learning in rural Japan: The role of English in the local linguistic ecology. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(4), 593-619.
- Lerner, H. G. (2002). Turn-Sharing: The Choral Co-Production of Talk-in-Interaction. In Ford, C. E & Fox, B. A & Thompson, S. A (Eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, (pp.225-256). Cary: Oxford University Press, Incorporated.
- Mishler, E. (1984). *The discourse of medicine: Dialectics of medical interviews*. Ablex.
- Nishi, H. (2019). English within Japanese: Loanwords from English in Japanese as a vocabulary pool for EFL education. *Journal of Asian Pacific communication*, 29(2), 211-229.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2008). Sequential organization as local and longitudinal achievement. *Text and Talk*, 28(4), 501–528.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2012). Social interaction and competence development: Learning the sequential organization of a communicative practice. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1, 127–142.
- Nguyen, H. T., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives*. National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Park, J. S. Y. (2009). Illegitimate speakers of English: Negotiation of linguistic identity among Korean international students. In Angela Reyes & Adrienne Lo (Eds.), *Beyond yellow English: Toward a linguistic anthropology of Asian Pacific America*, (pp.195–212). Oxford University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2003). Global Englishes, Rip Slyme, and performativity. *Journal of*

- Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 513–533.
- Robinson, J. (2013). Overall Structural Organization. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 257–280). Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. (1979). Hotrodder: a revolutionary category (edited by Gail Jefferson from a Lecture delivered at the University of California, Los Angeles, Spring 1966). In George Psathas (Eds.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 7–14).
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7, 289-327.
- Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Scherling, J. (2016). The creative use of English in Japanese punning. *World Englishes*, 35(2), 276-292.
- Stanslaw, J. (2004). *Japanese English: Language and culture contact*. Hong Kong University Press.
- Tengse, A. R., & Gakkula, M. K. (2021). An Analysis of English Loan Word Inflow into Japanese Language. *Language in India*, 21(7), 307-315.
- Turner, J. C. & Hogg, M. A. & Oakes, P. & Reicher, S. D. & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorisation theory*. Blackwell.
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1992). The interactional organization of calls for emergency assistance. In Paul Drew and John Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Social Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 418–469) Cambridge University Press.

## Appendix

### Verbal transcription (Jefferson, 2004)

[	Point of overlap onset
]	Point of overlap ending
(number)	Silence, measured in tenths of a second
(.)	Micropause (0.1s or less)
( )	Unintelligent speech or unidentifiable speaker to transcriber
.	Falling intonation
ˊ	Slightly rising intonation
?	Rising intonation
<u>word</u>	Emphasized segment
<word>	Slowed down sounds compared to the surrounding talk
>word<	Speeded up sounds compared to the surrounding talk
:	Prolongation or stretching of the sound. The more colons, the longer the stretching

### Symbols used in morpheme-by-morpheme glosses (Greer et al., 2017)

IP	Interactional particle (e.g., ka, ne, sa, yo, na)
Q	Question marker
O	Object marker (-wo, -ni)
CP	Copula (e.g., da, desu, masu)
SB	Subject particle (-ga)
TP	Topic marker (-wa)
LK	Linking particle (no)
PT	Other particle
QT	Quotation marker (to, tte)
HON	Honorific
POL	Polite speech level
PROG	Progressive
CND	conditional
NG	negative

### Special Conventions (Burch, 2014)

H	hand(s)
F	finger
R	right
L	left
B	both

GZ	gaze
+	place where action begins, description of action
+	place where action begins in relation to talk
—	holding gesture or gaze in place