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This study explores a range of vocal and visual practices deployed by Japanese speakers during the course of a word search in naturally occurring conversation, and shows how such embodied practices provide publicly available resources for recipients to organize their relevant participation in the ongoing word search. In particular, this study addresses the following three main issues: (a) how speakers mobilize their gaze to invite or not invite recipients’ coparticipation; (b) how distal demonstrative pronouns (e.g., are “that one,” asoko “that place”) and/or gestures are deployed to index a particular domain of words to which the searched-for item belongs; (c) how recipients utilize the projective resources made available through the speaker’s vocal and visual conduct to achieve a collaborative solution of the ongoing search.

The relationship between language and the body has been studied from a number of different perspectives. Some researchers investigate bodily...
conduct, particularly gesture, in terms of how it correlates with the psychological functioning of a single speaker’s mind in the process of speech production (e.g., Freedman, 1977; Goldin-Meadow, 1997; Kita, 1993, 2000; McNeill, 1985, 1992; among others). In this type of research, the link between language and the body is viewed primarily as a psychological/cognitive one. That is, bodily conduct is examined as an externalization or a by-product of fundamentally private, psychological phenomena in an individual’s mind.

Others are concerned with the role of bodily behavior in organizing social copresence of multiple participants in everyday encounters (e.g., Erickson & Shultz, 1982; Kendon, 1977, 1990; McDoermott, Gospodinoff, & Aron, 1978; Scheflen, 1973, 1974; Streeck, 1983). This line of work, which is sometimes referred to as “context analysis” seeks to investigate how participants draw from repertoires of behavioral practices (talk, gesture, orientation, posture, etc.) to organize occasions of interaction. In this approach, the bodies of multiple parties are viewed as a resource to jointly create, sustain, and alter the spatial-orientational arrangement in terms of which participants routinely achieve behavioral coordination in interaction. Note, however, that although it investigates language as an important part of its analysis, work in context analysis tends to focus “less on the content of talk than on the methods by which participants achieve the conditions under which talk is made possible as a concerted activity” (Streeck, 1984, pp. 116–117).

More recently, work has emerged that investigates the intricate relationship between language and the body by paying close attention to both the sequential organization of talk and the role of bodily conduct in the organization of social interaction (e.g., C. Goodwin, 1981, 1986, 2000; M. Goodwin, 1980, 1983; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Heath, 1986, 1992; LeBaron & Streeck, 2000; Lerner, 1996, 2002; Schegloff, 1984, 1998; Streeck, 1993, 1994, 1995; Streeck & Hartge, 1992; among others). Based on the close examination of participants’ vocal and visual conduct situated within specific activities in specific sequential contexts, these studies show how the temporary unfolding stream of speech, changing body and gaze orientation, and deployment of gesture mutually contextualize one another, and provide a resource for participants to organize relevant action in concert with each other within an ongoing activity. In this line of research, then, the relationship between language and the body is examined in terms of the process of mutual contextualization, which provides public resources for social organization in the moment-by-moment unfolding of interaction.

Pursuing this last line of research from a perspective of conversation analysis, this study explores the relationship between language and the
body through a close examination of a particular domain of practices such as word searches in naturally occurring conversations among speakers of a particular language, that is, Japanese. A general goal of this study is to demonstrate (a) that speakers’ conduct observed during word searches (both vocal and visual) is deployed and understood as *social practices*, which provide a public window into what are otherwise *private* mental processes, and (b) that such publicly observable, embodied practices provide crucial resources for participants to accomplish collaborative action in an ongoing word search. To demonstrate these points, this study examines a number of instances of word searches in Japanese conversation and explicates the following processes:

1. How speakers deploy language and bodily conduct to index a particular domain of words to which the searched-for item belongs, and thereby help recipients see what the success of the ongoing word search will look like

2. How speakers deploy bodily conduct (particularly, gaze) to contextualize relevant moments for recipients’ coparticipation during the course of an ongoing search

3. How recipients attend to the unfolding course of speakers’ conduct mentioned above and utilize it as a resource to make a collaborative entry into an ongoing word search

Through discussion of these processes, this study makes the following contributions. First, the past work on the relationship between language and the body in naturally occurring interaction has focused predominantly on English-language data (notable exceptions being Streeck 1993, 1994). A close examination of Japanese-language materials presented in this study provides an opportunity to test the validity of the findings made in the previous studies with regard to English-language materials and expand the scope of generalizability of such findings. This work is a part of a growing body of research exploring the cross-linguistic applicability of conversation-analytic findings to languages other than English (e.g., Besnier, 1982; Daden & McClaren, 1978; Egbert, 1996; Hakulinen, 1993; Have, 1999; Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991; Kim, 1993, 1999; Kim & Suh, 1994, 1996; Lindström, 1994; Moerman, 1977, 1988; Park, 1998, 1999; Selting, 1996; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen, 2001; Sorjonen, 1996; Wu, 1997, 2000 to name just a few), especially to Japanese (e.g., Ford & Mori, 1994; Fox, Hayashi, & Jasperson, 1996; Hayashi,
Second, this study does not merely replicate the findings on word-search practices reported in previous studies (e.g., M. Goodwin, 1983; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1986; Lerner, 1996; Streeck 1993), but it also unveils a word-search practice in Japanese that does not appear to be available to English speakers—the use of distal demonstrative pronouns (are that one, asoko that place, etc.) as a “place-holder” for the searched-for item during the course of producing an utterance. By explicating the workings of this practice as a resource for collaborative action during word searches in Japanese, this study provides a new contribution to the growing body of work on the relationship between language and the body in general and to the work on practices for word searches in particular.

This article is organized as follows. In the second section, I first discuss several kinds of vocal and visual practices that are commonly observed during word searches in Japanese conversation, and show how speakers deploy some of those practices to invite or not invite others’ coparticipation in word-searches-in-progress. A close examination of these instances demonstrates that, by orienting to speakers’ gaze and gesture as a resource, recipients can accomplish a precisely timed production of a candidate item for the searched-for word, thereby achieving the coconstruction of the utterance-in-progress.

The third section introduces and describes one linguistic practice that is recurrently employed by Japanese speakers during word searches and does not appear to be available to English speakers, that is, the use of distal demonstrative pronouns as place-holders for the searched-for items. I argue that the deployment of such a demonstrative pronoun serves as what Charles Goodwin (1996) calls a “prospective indexical.” That is, it indexes a particular domain of words to which the searched-for item belongs, and at the same time, projects a future course of action, that is, a prospective specification of the referent of the demonstrative. I then show that this linguistic practice is mobilized by recipients as a resource for achieving a collaborative entry into a word-search-in-progress.

The fourth section presents a single case analysis that draws together the issues addressed in the second and third sections. To be more specific, I discuss an instance in which a speaker produces a distal demonstrative pronoun as a place-holder and indexes a particular search domain, while simultaneously deploying a gesture that enhances the projectability and specifiability of the searched-for item. It will be shown, then, that a recipient utilizes
these projective resources provided by the speaker’s linguistic and bodily practices to accomplish a collaborative participation in the ongoing search.

The fifth section concludes this article with a discussion of some implications of the findings of this study for the study of language and the body in social interaction and possible directions in future research.

The database for this study consists of approximately 13 hours of videotaped casual conversations among adult peers who are native speakers of Japanese (the participants including speakers of the Tokyo and Kansai varieties of Japanese).

**INITIAL OBSERVATIONS OF LANGUAGE AND THE BODY IN WORD SEARCHES IN JAPANESE**

This section provides an initial description of the relevance of the speaker’s embodied conduct to the organization of word searches in Japanese conversation. To this end, it examines the moment-by-moment unfolding of speakers’ vocal and visual conduct during word searches in Japanese and shows how such publicly observable conduct provides a socially available resource for recipients to organize their relevant participation in the ongoing word search in concert with the speaker.

Just as in English (cf. Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977, p. 367), word searches in Japanese are typically initiated with some indication of trouble by the speaker in producing a next item due in an ongoing utterance, such as sound stretches, word cutoffs, intraturn pauses, and so forth. These speech perturbations may co-occur with, or be followed by, several recognizable features in the speaker’s talk and bodily conduct, such as:

1. “Delaying device” like *ano* (uhm), *nanka* (like), and so forth
2. Self-addressed questions for recollection like *nan da(tta) kke* (What is/was it), and so forth
3. Orientational shifts, typically aversions of gaze away from the addressee (cf. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986, for word searches in English)
4. A variety of manual and facial gestures, including iconic gestures that represent some aspect of the searched-for item, as well as a characteristic “thinking face” (cf. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986, for word searches in English)
It is argued in this article, along with several earlier studies on word searches in English (cf. C. Goodwin 1987; M. Goodwin 1983; Goodwin & Goodwin 1986; Lerner 1996), that these behaviors are not simply the external manifestations of cognitive processes in the speakers’ private minds. Rather, the very fact that they are deployed in front of other participants has significant interactional consequences. Specifically, these publicly observable displays of trouble in producing a next item due mark a shift in the activity that participants engage in at the moment, from whatever has been going on (e.g., storytelling) to one in which a solution to word-finding trouble is pursued. This shift in activity invokes a different participation framework in which collaborative participation by recipients in the solution of the speaker’s word-finding trouble might become relevant. In the remainder of this section, I will show, with instances of word searches observed in Japanese conversation, how recipients attend closely to this unfolding course of the speaker’s vocal and visual conduct during word searches and mobilize it as a resource to achieve a precisely timed entry into the search-in-progress.

Consider Fragment 1, in which the participants are discussing taking a sauna. In line 1, Akira makes the assessment that Seiji copes with hot temperatures well and solicits agreement from Seiji. While not agreeing with the assessment entirely (line 3), Seiji does agree that he takes a sauna every once in a while (line 5). In line 7, then, Seiji displays some indications of trouble in finding a next element of talk, which mark an initiation of a word-search activity. Our focus is on how he organizes his involvement in a word search through a variety of vocal and visual practices, and how the addressed recipient, Akira, coordinates his participation in the search in line 11 with the unfolding course of Seiji’s conduct.¹

(1) [RKK 28]

1 Akira: seiji san atsui no kekkoo tokui da na;
Seiji TL hot N rather good.at CP FP
“Seiji, ((you)) can take hot temperature pretty well, can’t ((you)).”

(0.6)

2 [ ]

3 Seiji: iya soo demo [nai kedo:::,
well so PT not but
“Well, not really, but...”

4 Harumi: [ii ne:::::]
good CP FP
“Good ((for you)).”
5 Seiji: hairu koto mo aru ne.="
"(I) take ((a sauna)) sometimes.”
6 Akira: = [(a::! )]
"(Oh::!)
7 Seiji: = [>nanka] :: hijooni:: (;) nani :
"like extremely what
8 (2.0) ((Seiji withdraws gaze from Akira; cf. Figure 2))
9 koo hi-
"like, hi-
8 (1.2) ((Seiji brings gaze back to Akira; cf. Figure 4))
10 → Akira: ase kakitai hi?
"The day when ((you)) want to sweat?”

In line 7, after initiating a new unit of talk with nanka: (like), Seiji produces the adverb hijooni:: (extremely) in a relatively high pitch and stretches the final vowel in the same high pitch. While the continuing high pitch as well as the grammatical property of the adverb strongly project a forthcoming item—a descriptive element of some sort—in the unfolding utterance, the sound stretch and the following micropause suggest that Seiji might be having some trouble in producing the projected item. The trouble becomes progressively more visible when he goes on to produce a self-addressed question, nani: (Wha:t), followed by a withdrawal of his gaze from the addressed recipient, Akira, during the 2.0-sec silence (line 8; cf. Figures 1 and 2). The 2.0-sec silence here is contextualized by both the preceding talk and the concurrent bodily conduct as a particular type of moment within a particular type of activity. That is, positioned after the self-addressed nani: (Wha:t) and accompanied by the maintained gaze aversion, the silence here can be seen by recipients as a moment in which the speaker is engaged in what might be called a “solitary word search” (cf. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). This, then, makes relevant a particular form of coparticipation by the recipients. On the one hand, by showing to the recipients that although he is not speaking at the moment, it is not an empty moment, but a moment in which he actively engages in a word search; the speaker invites the recipients’ continued attention to this ongoing activity. On the other hand, by contextualizing the search as a “solitary” one, he shows that he is not soliciting recipients’ active coparticipation in the form
of attempting a joint solution to the ongoing word-finding trouble. Indeed, during the silence the addressed recipient, Akira, maintains displayed attentiveness to the speaker (cf. Figure 2), while not actively attempting to participate in the search.

When Seiji breaks the 2.0-sec silence and vocalizes what is recognizable as an attempt to produce the searched-for item, that is, koo hi- (like hi-) in line 9, he still maintains the gaze aversion from Akira, as seen in Figure 3. When his attempt to produce the searched-for item has ostensibly failed (cf. the cutoff on hi-), Seiji becomes silent again (line 10). However, his bodily conduct contextualizes this silence as a very different kind of silence from the prior 2.0-sec one. That is, during this 1.2-sec silence, Seiji brings his gaze back to Akira, as seen in Figure 4. In other words, instead of displaying his continuing involvement in a solitary search, Seiji now makes Akira’s active coparticipation in the search relevant. It is at the precise moment in which Seiji’s gaze reaches Akira and establishes mutual gaze between the two participants (cf. Figure 4) that Akira delivers a candidate item for the searched-for item, as shown in line 11. The precise
synchronization between Seiji’s gaze shift and Akira’s delivery suggests that Akira attends closely to the unfolding course of Seiji’s vocal and visual conduct during the word search achieving precise coordination of his entry into the ongoing activity.

This instance thus shows how the speaker’s embodied conduct progressively shapes relevant forms of coparticipation by others in an ongoing word search, and how a recipient orients to the unfolding course of the speaker’s conduct as a resource to accomplish a precise placement of his delivery of a candidate item as a collaborative solution of the search-in-progress.

The next fragment presents an instance in which another kind of bodily conduct, that is, a gesture, helps shape the form of coparticipation by a recipient in an ongoing word search. This instance shows that a “pre-positioned gesture,” that is, a gesture occurring prior to the production of its vocal counterpart, or “speech affiliate” (Kendon, 1980, 1983;
McNeill, 1979; Schegloff, 1984; Streeck, 1988), provides a recipient with an opportunity to accomplish a collaborative entry into an ongoing word search.

Fragment 2 is taken from a larger sequence of telling in which Kaori talks about her late mother-in-law. Kaori’s talk in this fragment is a part of her telling about how proper her late mother-in-law was. Our focus is on Kaori’s deployment of a gesture during a word search in line 2, which invites Akiyo’s coparticipation in joint utterance construction at line 3.

(2) [KOB 29]

1 Kaori: . . . honde, maiban chanto ohuro haitte
   and every.night regularly bath take:and
   “... And, every night ((she)) took a bath, and...”

2 kichi:: tto- () ano () [kigae: : :] te:,
   neatly QT uhm change:and
   “... neatly/properly (. ) uhm (. ) changed ((her clothes)).”
   [ ]

3 ➔ Akiyo:
   [kigaete?] change:and
   “changed ((her clothes))?”

In this segment, Kaori discusses what her mother-in-law used to do every night. Having mentioned the mother’s nightly bathtaking in line 1, Kaori produces an adverb, *kichi:: tto* (neatly, properly), at the beginning of line 2. This adverb is delivered with great emphasis and in an affectively loaded manner (cf. the sound stretch and high pitch on the middle syllable), and it presents Kaori’s positive assessment of some action by her late mother-in-law. Note then that some perturbations occur in her unfolding talk in line 2. Kaori self-interrupts her talk with a glottalized stop at the end of the adverb *kichi:: tto* (indicated by a hyphen). At the moment at which she self-interrupts her ongoing talk, she initiates a gesture—she brings a hand to her chest and touches her clothes several times (cf. Figures 5 and 6)—while vocally producing the delaying device *ano* (uhm).

These recognizable features in Kaori’s talk and bodily conduct make it visible that she is searching for a word, and more precisely, a predicate (e.g., a verb) denoting her late mother-in-law’s action, which she positively assesses with the adverb *kichi:: tto*. Unlike the previous instance, however, the speaker does not display a “solitary” engagement in the word search through gaze withdrawal from the recipients. Rather, she maintains mutual gaze with one of the recipients of her talk, that is, Akiyo (cf. Figures 5 and 6). The configuration of talk and the body at this moment, that is, mutual
orientation between the speaker and the addressee, accompanied by the speaker’s deployment of a gesture and the delaying device *ano* (uhm), appears to indicate that the addressee’s coparticipation in the word search is relevant and may indeed be invited. Following a micropause after *ano*, then, Akiyo provides a candidate item for the projected predicate (line 3).

Here it appears that Akiyo mobilizes the projective resources provided by the speaker’s talk and gesture to accomplish a collaborative entry into the ongoing word search. First, as Tanaka (2001) demonstrates, the deployment of an adverb (especially a manner adverb) strongly projects a
predicate (e.g., a verb) to be produced as the next item in an unfolding utterance. Second, a number of studies on the relationship between language and gesture have shown that the deployment of a gesture typically precedes the production of its vocal counterpart, or “speech affiliate” (cf. Kendon, 1980, 1983; McNeill, 1979; Schegloff, 1984; Streeck, 1988). Indeed, Schegloff (1984) talked of the prepositioned gesture as providing a “projection space” in which an upcoming speech affiliate is “in play.” Our examination of Fragment 2 appears to indicate that this finding based on English-language interaction holds for Japanese interaction. That is, Akiyo in line 3 can be seen as utilizing the projection space provided by the prepositioned gesture (as well as the projection provided by the manner adverb kichi::: tto) to achieve a precisely timed, socially coordinated entry into the ongoing word search.

The instances examined in this section thus show how vocal and visual practices are deployed and oriented to as a public social window into what are otherwise private mental processes during the activity of a word search. They demonstrate that the unfolding course of the speaker’s embodied conduct progressively contextualizes relevant forms of coparticipation by recipients, and that recipients utilize the speaker’s talk, gaze, and gesture as resources to achieve a precisely timed collaborative entry into an ongoing word search. These observations of the workings of vocal and visual conduct in word searches in Japanese confirm the process of mutual contextualization of language and the body during word searches reported in other studies based on English and other languages (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Streeck, 1993; among others). Our examination of Japanese-language materials presented in this section thus expands the scope of generalizability of the findings reported in the past conversation-analytic studies on word searches.

Having laid out the basic workings of vocal and visual practices deployed during word searches in Japanese, I will now turn to one linguistic practice for organizing word searches in Japanese that does not appear to be observed in word searches in English. The next section describes this practice and suggests that it can serve as a resource for collaborative coparticipation by multiple participants in an ongoing word search. In the section following this, I will return to the relationship between vocal and visual conduct during word searches. I will show how the bodily practices discussed in this section and the linguistic practice described in the next section work together to furnish recipients with substantial resources to project the outcome of a word-search-in-progress thereby providing for their collaborative participation in the ongoing activity.
This section focuses on one linguistic practice recurrently employed during word searches in Japanese conversation, that is, the use of distal demonstrative pronouns such as are (that one) and asoko (that place). Through a close examination of this practice, I show that a distal demonstrative deployed during word searches works as a prospective indexical (Goodwin, 1996), which (a) indexes a particular domain of words as a relevant domain of search, (b) projects a specific course of subsequent action, that is, a prospective specification of its referent, and thereby (c) provides recipients with resources for coparticipation.2

Goodwin (1996) argued that, in conversation, speakers sometimes deploy a linguistic expression whose specific sense is not yet available to recipients, but instead must be discovered subsequently as the interaction proceeds. A prototypical example of such an expression is found in a “story preface” (Sacks, 1974). For instance, when a speaker says, “A funny thing happened to me today!” the recipients set the task of attending to subsequent talk in order to find what specific event is foreshadowed by the expression “a funny thing” on this particular occasion. Goodwin (1996) termed these expressions prospective indexicals and stated that:

The occurrence of a prospective indexical...invokes a distributed, multiparty process. The cognitive operations relevant to the ongoing constitution of the event in process are by no means confined to speaker alone. Hearers must engage in an active, somewhat problematic process of interpretation in order to uncover the specification of the indexical that will enable them to build appropriate subsequent action at a particular place. (pp. 384-385)

Thus, a prospective indexical mobilizes recipients’ attention to subsequent talk and engages them in an active process of uncovering the specification of what the indexical refers. In this process, it provides clues as to what recipients should listen for in the subsequent talk and how they should respond to it, such as to laugh at the projected climax of the story characterized as funny.

In what follows, I describe the workings of distal demonstrative pronouns deployed during word searches in Japanese, and I show how they work in a similar way to prospective indexicals. I then show how this practice is
mobilized by recipients as a resource to accomplish a collaborative participation in an ongoing word search.

Unlike English, which has a two-way distinction in demonstratives (e.g., *this* vs. *that*), the grammatical paradigm of the Japanese demonstratives has a three-way distinction, as seen in the following partial list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object/Event</td>
<td><em>kore</em> (this one)</td>
<td><em>sore</em> (that one)</td>
<td><em>are</em> (that one over there)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td><em>koko</em> (this place)</td>
<td><em>soko</em> (that place)</td>
<td><em>asoko</em> (that place over there)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the terms “proximal,” “medial,” and “distal” are useful glosses for the three categories, there are further aspects to the distinction that are not adequately captured by such glosses. Generally, the three categories differ in the following way: in their deictic use (i.e., their use for referring to things, places, etc., in the physical setting in which the interaction takes place); the proximal *ko*-series is used to refer to something near the speaker; and the medial *so*-series refers to something closer to the hearer. The distal *a*-series indicates something at a distance from both the speaker and the hearer. In their anaphoric use (i.e., their use for referring to something that has been mentioned in prior discourse), the medial *so*-series is used as an unmarked form for referring to something mentioned in prior discourse (Martin, 1975, p. 1067), while the proximal *ko*-series is used to refer to something “as if the object being talked about were visible and were at the speaker’s side” (Kuno, 1973, p. 290). The use of the distal *a*-series indicates that the referent is well known to both the speaker and the hearer.

Now, the use of the distal *a*-series demonstratives in word searches discussed here is neither deictic nor anaphoric in that the demonstrative is not used to refer to something that exists in the physical setting of the interaction or something that has been mentioned in prior discourse. Rather, it has a *prospective* orientation in the following way. When speakers have trouble finding or formulating a next item in their ongoing utterance, they sometimes produce a distal demonstrative pronoun, most typically *are* (that one), in the grammatical slot in which the item being sought would be produced, and continue the utterance, often to its syntactic completion. Subsequently, the speaker provides the originally unavailable item, which retroactively specifies the referent of the earlier demonstrative. Thus, a distal demonstrative in this use is deployed as a place-holder for an item that is for some reason unavailable to the speaker when it is due, and its
deployment projects a prospective specification by the speaker that “replaces” the place-holding demonstrative.

The following two Fragments—3 and 4—illustrate the use of distal demonstrative pronouns in word searches. In these fragments, the “a”-arrow points to the use of a distal demonstrative pronoun as a place-holder, while the “b”-arrow indicates the subsequent specification of its referent. The demonstrative in question and the item produced for its specification are presented in boldface. Note that these fragments do not involve a multiparty solution to a word search through joint utterance production; rather, they are meant to provide characteristic instances of how distal demonstrative pronouns work as place-holders.

(3) [FHG 4]

1 Yoohei: demo SONO mae ni WA: : but that before at TP
“But before THAT,”

2 a➔ (0.6) ano: : : (0.5) are ga atta n desu yo uhm that.one SP existed N CP FP
“(0.6) uh::m (0.5) there was that one” (Lit., “That one existed”)

3 ano: : (1.0) ee : : : : : : : : to ne, uhm well FP
“uh::m (1.0) well::::::::::ll, …”

4 warito ano (1.0) nan te yuu n desu ka (1.0) rather uhm what QT say N CP Q
“… sort of, uhm, (1.0) what do ((you)) call ((it)), (1.0)”

5 b➔ ongaku BANgumi toka. music program etc.
“… music programs, etc.”

In Fragment 3, the speech perturbations at the beginning of line 2, that is, the intraturn silences and the delaying device ano::: (uh:::m), show that the speaker has some trouble in producing the next item after the utterance in line 1. He then deploys the distal demonstrative are (that one), marks it with the subject particle ga, and goes on to produce the rest of the utterance. At the end of line 2, Yoohei’s utterance is brought to syntactic completion. However, it is recognizably incomplete in that the referent of are (that one) has not been specified. Indeed, both the speaker and the recipient appear to display their understanding that the prospective specification of the referent of the demonstrative is projectably relevant: The recipient does not show any vocal or nonvocal sign of attempting to gain the next speakership at the end of line 2, while the speaker continues his talk.
displaying his ongoing involvement in the search for the item for which the demonstrative serves as a place-holder. After producing a variety of “word-search items” in lines 3 and 4 (e.g., ano:: uh::m, ee:::::::::to ne we:::::::::ll, etc.), Yoohei finally produces a noun, ongaku BANgumi (music programs), which retroactively specifies the referent of the earlier demonstrative. Figure 7 is a schematic representation of the workings of are and its subsequent specification in this instance.

The next fragment presents an instance in which the distal demonstrative pronoun for place, that is, asoko (that place), is used in a word search.

(4) [HR 2]

1 Tomoe: indo iki tte yuu no ga a- aru no?
India for QT say N SP exist FP
“Is there ((a direct flight)) to India?”

2 Ryoko: eeto ne: doko haitta kke: iki wa::
well FP where entered Q the.way.to TP
“Well, where did ((I)) fly into… On the way to ((India)), …”

3 a→ asoko:: °kara haitta n ya (asoko)° (1.5) °shuto.°
that.place from entered N CP that.place capital
“((I)) flew into that place, (°that place°) (1.5) °the capital° …”

4 b→ (0.5) derii(h):
Delhi
“(0.5) Delhi(h)”

In response to Tomoe’s question in line 1 about the existence of direct flights to India from Japan, Ryoko, who has recently gone on a trip to Nepal via India, starts to search for the name of the place that she flew into (cf. the self-addressed question doko haitta kke:: Where did ((I)) fly into? in line 2).
At the beginning of line 3, then, Ryoko deploys the distal demonstrative for place *asoko* (that place) and brings the ongoing utterance to syntactic completion that is, *iki wa:: asoko kara haitta n ya* (On the way to ((India)), ((I)) flew into *that place*). She then displays her continued involvement in the word search through first repeating the demonstrative *asoko*, then inviting the coparticipants’ aid by providing a clue about the searched-for item *shuto* (capital), while continuing a gesture of tapping on the thigh with a finger (not shown here) throughout her utterance in lines 3 and 4.

After the 0.5-s silence, then, Ryoko finally produces the outcome of the search, which retroactively specifies the referent of the earlier demonstrative. Figure 8 is a schematic representation of the workings of the deployment of *asoko* in this instance.

The examination of the preceding fragments showed how distal demonstrative pronouns are used as place-holders for a more specific item being sought by the speaker in the word-search activity. I argue that this use of distal demonstratives in Japanese shares several important properties with the practice described by Goodwin (1996) as prospective indexicals.

First, note that the most crucial aspect in the workings of the distal demonstratives in word searches in Japanese is their capacity to build a prospective link to a forthcoming item in the subsequent talk. That is, while demonstratives in general are more commonly used either anaphorically (i.e., referring back to something in the preceding talk) or deictically (i.e., referring to something in the physical settings in which talk is produced), the distal demonstrative in this use projects a specific future course of action, that is, [deployment of demonstrative $\rightarrow$ subsequent specification of referent].4 This projected course of action mobilizes recipients’ attention to

![Figure 8: Diagram of the deployment of *asoko*](image)
the subsequent talk and engages them in a process of discovering the forthcoming specification of the referent of the demonstrative.

Second, the practice of deploying a distal demonstrative in a word search does not simply project a prospective course of action; it also indexes a particular domain of words to which the searched-for item belongs thereby providing clues as to what recipients should listen for in the subsequent talk to locate the referent of the demonstrative. There are at least two resources for such an indexing of a search domain. First, through its “type” (e.g., are for object/event/etc. vs. asoko for place), the demonstrative projects certain kinds of items as qualified candidates for the searched-for item and disqualifies others. For instance, if asoko is deployed as a place-holder, items in the subsequent talk that do not refer to a place will not be heard by recipients as a candidate for the searched-for item. Second, other materials in the utterance within which the demonstrative is embedded can provide information about what would qualify as a candidate for the searched-for item. For instance, in Fragment 3, the demonstrative is embedded within the utterance, are ga atta n desu yo (That one existed), in which are (that one) is presented as the subject of the verb atta (existed). Now, in Japanese, the verb atta is used only with inanimate subjects. Because of this grammatical property of the verb atta, then, items in the subsequent talk that do not refer to inanimate things will not be heard by recipients as a candidate for the searched-for item. In summary, the practice of deploying a distal demonstrative in a word search in Japanese shares some crucial properties with the deployment of a prospective indexical (e.g., a story preface), such as (a) projecting a future course of action and mobilizing recipients’ attention to the subsequent talk; (b) providing a “guide” (e.g., semantic, syntactic, etc.) that gives recipients clues as to what recipients should listen for in that subsequent talk; and (c) proposing a motivation for engaging in such listening, that is, locating the item that concludes the activity-in-progress.

Now, Goodwin (1996) argued that these properties of prospective indexicals provide recipients with resources to prepare themselves to produce a relevant action at a particular moment. For instance, a story preface like A funny thing happened to me today projects laughter at the climax of the story as a relevant recipient action, and it engages recipients in an active process of locating an appropriate place at which they can relevantly produce such a projected action. In the case of the use of distal demonstratives in word searches in Japanese, a “relevant action” by recipients can sometimes take the form of assisting the speaker in the ongoing word search by producing a candidate for
the searched-for item. That is, the use of distal demonstratives does not simply prepare recipients to find a subsequent specification of its referent in the speaker’s talk (as in Fragments 3 and 4), but it also engages them in an active process of searching for the looked-for item along with the speaker. This sometimes results in a collaborative participation in an ongoing word search.

Let us examine an instance that demonstrates such a process. Fragment 5 is taken from a four-party conversation (the conversation from which Fragment 2 is also taken). At the beginning of this fragment, one participant (Takie) addresses her utterance about the company called Tokyu Amenikkusu to another participant (Shiho).

(5) [KOB 4]

1 Takie: 

\[
\text{tookyuu } [\text{ame}] \text{nikkusuyuu } [\text{no wa}]: (-.) a [\text{no } : : : : : : ]
\]
Tokyu Amenikkusu say N TP uhm
“Tokyu Amenikkusu i:s (-.) uh:::::m,”

2 Shiho: 

\[
[\text{un. }] [\text{u::n. }]
\]
“Uh huh” “Uh huh”

3 Kaori: 

\[
[(\text{wa.}) \text{FP}]
\]
“Sorry. ((I))’ll have ((this)).”

4 Akiyo: 

\[
[>\text{a! doozo<}]
\]
oh please
“>Oh! Please<”

5 a\rightarrow Takie: 

\[
[\text{(asoko ya)}]
\]
there CP
“(there)”

6 b\rightarrow Akiyo: 

\[
\text{hagi[waradai.]} \]
Hagiwaradai
“in Hagiwaradai.”

7 c\rightarrow Takie: 

\[
[\text{ee } : : : to] \text{hagiwaradai.}
\]
uhm Hagiwaradai
“Uh::::m in Hagiwaradai.”

After Takie produces \textit{tokyuu Amenikkusu yuu no wa:} (Tokyu Amenikkusu i:s) in line 1, she displays trouble in producing a next item
(cf. sound stretches, a pause, a delaying device at the end of line 1). While an unrelated exchange takes place in lines 3 and 4 between two other participants, that is, Kaori (a guest who is about to have a bite of a cake in front of her) and Akiyo (the hostess who has offered the cake to Kaori), Takie continues her word search by deploying the distal demonstrative asoko (that place) in line 5, indicated by the “a”-arrow.

As described above, the deployment of a distal demonstrative in a word search projects a prospective specification of the referent of the demonstrative, while indexing a search domain and thereby providing recipients with clues as to what that subsequent specification will look like. In the case at hand, a reference to a place is indexed through the type of demonstrative (asoko that place rather than are that one), and its specification in the subsequent talk is projected. Utilizing these projective resources, then, one of the recipients, Akiyo, opts to actively participate in the ongoing word search by producing a word (i.e., hagiaradai, the name of the town in which the company Tokyu Amenikkusu is located) that fits both the type of the demonstrative (i.e., place) and the syntactic and semantic structure of Takie’s utterance in progress. Takie then confirms Akiyo’s contribution to the search by repeating the place name (“c”-arrow). This instance thus illustrates the way in which the deployment of a placeholder demonstrative during a word search can be oriented to and mobilized by recipients as a resource to accomplish collaborative action, that is, joint utterance construction across speakers during a word search.

In this section, I described the practice of deploying distal demonstrative pronouns during word searches in Japanese conversation, and I showed that the demonstratives in this use work as what Goodwin (1996) has described as prospective indexicals. I also showed that the projective resources provided by this practice, that is, the projection of the subsequent course of action (i.e., [distal demonstrative] ➔ [subsequent specification of referent]) as well as the indexing of a search domain (e.g., place vs. object/event, animate vs. inanimate, etc.), can be utilized by recipients for organizing their relevant action during an ongoing word search, which sometimes takes the form of supplying a candidate for the searched-for item.

In the next section, I examine a single instance which draws together the issues that have been discussed in this and last sections, that is, the relevance of visual conduct to the organization of a word search as well as the use of a distal demonstrative pronoun as a prospective indexical. Through this examination, I show how a variety of word-search practices discussed so far can concomitantly enhance the projectability and specifiability of
what the outcome of an ongoing word search will look like, and that it can be mobilized by a recipient to achieve a collaborative solution to the search-in-progress.

**THE INTERACTION BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND THE BODY DURING WORD SEARCHES REVISITED**

The following fragment presents an instance in which (a) the deployment of the distal demonstrative pronoun *are* (that one) during a word search indexes a particular search domain and projects a subsequent specification of the referent of the demonstrative, while (b) a simultaneous production of an iconic gesture helps enhance the specifiability of the searched-for item. It is shown that a recipient who attends to the unfolding course of the speaker’s vocal and visual conduct utilizes these projective resources to supply a candidate word for the searched-for item.

Fragment 6 is taken from a conversation among three graduate students in economics (the conversation from which Fragment 1 is also taken), and in this segment, the participants are discussing the kind of research that uses videotaping as a method of data collection. In lines 1, 2, 5, and 8, one of the participants, Seiji, presents his opinion about that type of research by saying that it is a “nuisance” when it comes to making observations after collecting data. In line 9, another participant, Akira, begins his response to Seiji’s comment. The focus of our analysis is on lines 9-12, in which Akira engages in a word search that develops into a multiparty activity with another participant, Harumi, joining in.

(6) [RKK 10]

1  Seiji:  
   
   well like this video take

2  yaru choosa tte sa::=  
   do research QT FP
   “Uhhm, .hh well, research like this that uses video...”

3  Harumi:  
   =u::n.
   “Uh huh”

4  (0.7)

5  Seiji:  
   ato ga taihen na n da yo ne!  
   after SP nuisance CP N CP FP FP
   “... ((it))’s a nuisance afterwords.”
In response to Seiji’s assessment presented in lines 1, 2, 5, and 8, Akira initiates his utterance with *demo::: (bu:::t)* in line 9 thereby projecting some sort of disagreement forthcoming. He then deploys the distal demonstrative *are*, marks it with the subject particle *ga*, and brings the ongoing utterance to syntactic completion: *demo::: are ga dekiri kara na* (Bu:::t *that thing* is possible/doable). Through the use of the distal demonstrative *are* as a prospective indexical, Akira projects a prospective specification of the referent of the demonstrative as a relevant next action. Also, embedded within particular syntactic and semantic frameworks of the utterance in line 9 occurring in a particular sequential context, *are* indexes a particular domain of words as a relevant domain in which the searched-for item is to be found. That is, *are* is contextualized as referring to some event that is “possible” or “doable” and whose possibility or doability can constitute a basis for a disagreement with (or perhaps, a qualification to) Seiji’s earlier assessment.

Now when Akira produces *are* in line 9, Akira starts to rotate his right hand in a “winding” movement (cf. Figure 9) and maintains this winding hand movement throughout the utterance in line 9 as well as the following 0.5-s silence in line 10.
Note that this gesture occurs in a specific sequential context. It is produced while the speaker’s vocal conduct (i.e., the deployment of *are* as a prospective indexical) is making it visible to the recipients that the speaker is engaged in a word search, and that the speaker is projecting a specification of the referent of *are* as a relevant next action. Placed within this ongoing word search, the gesture is seen as representing a certain feature of the searched-for item thereby narrowing down the range of possible candidate items. In this sense, the gesture provides a further resource, in addition to the projective resources provided by the speaker’s vocal conduct discussed above, for the interpretive work in which the recipients engage to discover the referent of the demonstrative *are*. In other words, the gesture is serving to elaborate on what is happening in the talk. On the other hand, the “meaning” of the gesture, that is, what it might be representing, is also
constrained and elaborated by the surrounding talk. That is, if it occurred in isolation without accompanying talk, it could be interpreted in many different ways. However, occurring with the utterance in line 9, which displays the speaker’s involvement in a particular activity (i.e., a word search), the meaning of the gesture is narrowed down to something that is doable and that can constitute a basis for a disagreement with or a qualification to Seiji’s earlier assessment. Thus, there is an ongoing process of mutual elaboration and specification between talk and the gesture, each being used to constrain the other. Such mutual elaboration enhances the projectability and specifiability of the searched-for item.

Indeed, after the 0.5-sec silence (during which Akira maintains the winding hand gesture thereby displaying the continued relevance of the gesture to the ongoing activity), a nonaddressed recipient, Harumi, joins in the ongoing word search with a candidate item for the searched-for referent of the demonstrative are. She produces an item (ripulei replay) that fits the projections provided through Akira’s earlier talk and gesture. That is, a replay is an “event” therefore qualifying as a referent of the type of demonstrative to which are belongs. It is doable and its doability provides a positive aspect to the kind of research that utilizes videotaping, therefore constituting a basis for a qualification to Seiji’s earlier assessment that using such a research method is a nuisance. It also adequately contextualizes the meaning of the winding hand gesture on this particular occasion because replaying a videotape involves the winding movement of the reels. Thus, although the specific word she chooses is not adopted by Akira in his subsequent turn in line 12, it nonetheless provides a close enough specification of the demonstrative are in line 9, as well as providing a specification of the concurrent winding gesture deployed by Akira. This then demonstrates that Harumi attends closely to the unfolding course of Akira’s conduct making use of the enhanced specifiability of the target of the word search provided through the process of mutual contextualization between language (the prospective indexical are) and the body (the winding hand gesture) to accomplish a collaborative solution to the ongoing search.

In this section, I examined a single case in which the speaker who engages in a word search deploys multiple practices in different semiotic modalities (i.e., linguistic and gestural) simultaneously, each of which contributes to foreshadowing what the successful outcome of the search will look like. The analysis showed that these different practices work together to mutually elaborate one another and narrow down the domain of words to which the searched-for item belongs. This then provides enhanced projective
resources for recipients to anticipate and to produce the target of the ongoing word search.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

This study explored a range of situated practices deployed during the activity of word search in Japanese conversation, and showed how such practices provide publicly available resources for recipients to organize their relevant participation in the ongoing word search in concert with the speaker. In particular, I demonstrated the following: (a) ways in which speakers mobilize their gaze to invite or not invite recipients’ participation in an ongoing word search; (b) ways in which speakers deploy distal demonstrative pronouns and/or gesture to index a particular domain in which the search is taking place; and (c) ways in which recipients utilize the projective resources made available through the speaker’s talk and bodily conduct achieving a collaborative solution of the ongoing search by supplying a candidate item for the searched-for word. By way of conclusion, I will discuss some implications of the findings reported in this article and possible directions for future research.

1. The present analysis of the workings of language and bodily conduct during word searches underscores the view that human conduct in interaction, vocal or visual, is not simply the outcome of psychological phenomena in individuals’ private minds, but that they are *public* practices that are constitutive of human action in social interaction (cf. C. Goodwin, 1995, 1996, 2000; M. Goodwin, 1980; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Heath, 1986, 1992; LeBaron & Streeck, 2000; among others). The structures of language and bodily conduct are not merely structures of cognitive processes in individuals’ private minds, but they are publicly visible structures that multiple parties see and act upon. Participants make use of such publicly visible structures in the emerging stream of speech and bodily conduct to coordinate their actions in concert with one another and accomplish socially coordinated participation in an activity-in-progress.

What this tells us, then, is that, while we cannot deny the importance of examining psychological/cognitive aspects of language use, it is equally important not to forget that those psychological/cognitive processes are always situated in the social matrix in which they occur. It is therefore at
least conceivable for us to study cognition as situated social practice in everyday interaction.

2. At the heart of language and bodily conduct as public resources for social coordination is the projectability of human conduct (cf. Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 1996; Ford & Thompson, 1996; Hayashi, 2000, 2003; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Streeck, 1995; Tanaka, 1999). Projectability allows participants to foresee the future course of another participant’s action and produce a specific form of action that fits into the unfolding structure of another participant’s ongoing action. The analysis presented in this article suggests, then that to fully understand how a projection of the future course of action is accomplished, we must take into consideration a wide range of projective resources including talk, gaze, gesture, body orientation, and spatial frameworks, which are deployed in conjunction with one another when people conduct social interaction. In this perspective, language and the body are not static, atemporal objects, but rather things that invoke a dynamic, multiparty process of interpretation and action that extends through time. If we are to understand language and the body as part of larger resources for human social interaction, we must come to terms with the prospective orientation toward future courses of action (i.e., projectability) provided through the structure of linguistic and bodily conduct.

This last point has particular relevance to linguistics. In traditional linguistic analysis, the notion of temporality in language in the sense that language provides projective resources for future courses of action and allows for multiparty social coordination has been neglected. For instance, demonstratives in Japanese have rarely, if ever, been analyzed in terms of their capacity to provide for socially organized participation in interaction. I hope that further studies of language in interaction will fill this gap and shed light on the relevance of temporality and projectability to the ways in which individual utterances are structured, and also to the ways in which the grammar of a language is structured.

3. The discussion of distal demonstrative pronouns used as prospective indexicals during word searches points us to a promising area of future research, that is, research that explores different linguistic practices available to speakers of different languages to deal with what could potentially be a universal interactional contingency, that is, word-finding trouble in ongoing talk-in-interaction. While distal demonstrative pronouns do not appear to be employed by English speakers as prospective indexicals during word searches, there is some evidence (cf. Kim & Suh, in press; Wong, 1986) that Korean and Mandarin Chinese speakers use demonstratives
during word searches in ways similar to how distal demonstratives are used in word searches in Japanese. Detailed descriptions of similarities and differences in the use of demonstratives during word searches among these three languages and the analysis of the implications of such similarities and differences must await future research. In any event, given that word-finding trouble is such a common problem in talk-in-interaction in any language, it will be interesting to investigate how different language structures affect the way in which participants organize the activity of word search. Research in this area will contribute to furthering our understanding of how grammatical resources and interactional practices mutually shape one another.

NOTES

1 The following abbreviations are used in the interlinear glosses: CP = copula; FP = final particle; N = nominalizer; POL = politeness marker; PT = particle; Q = question particle; QT = quotative particle; SP = subject particle; TP = topic particle; and TL = title marker. The elements in the double parentheses in the translation lines indicate those contextually recoverable elements that are not expressed in the original Japanese utterances. They are provided for the reader’s ease of comprehension.

2 As far as I am aware, there are only a few previous studies that have described this practice (cf. Fox, Hayashi, & Jasperson, 1996; Kitano, 1999; Uemura, 1996), and none of them discusses it as a resource for collaborative participation in word searches.

3 As discussed below, there are cases in which recipients do start up when the speaker brings the utterance containing a distal demonstrative to syntactic completion. In such cases (cf. Fragments 5 and 6), the recipients proffer candidate items for the referent of the demonstrative, which demonstrates their orientation to such specification as relevant next action. Thus, rather than undermining my argument here, those cases lend support to the claim that the production of an utterance containing a distal demonstrative during a word search makes the prospective specification of the referent of the demonstrative projectably relevant.

4 This statement should not be taken to suggest that the projection of this future course of action (i.e., [deployment of demonstrative ➔ subsequent specification of referent]) is provided simply by a distal demonstrative itself. As I hope will be clear from the discussion in the next paragraph, the focus of my argument here is not on single lexical items, that is, demonstratives, but rather on the practice of producing a Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) within which a distal demonstrative is deployed as a place-holder for a searched-for item. Undoubtedly, the demonstrative, the grammatical structure in which it is embedded, the sequential context in which the grammatical
My argument here is based on the assumption that a word search is a type of repair, which is “a sequential phenomenon involving repair—‘segments’ in the course of ongoing talk—segments which have an organization of their own, including, as segment parts, ‘initiation’ and ‘outcome’” (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977, p. 365). Thus, once a word search is initiated, participants orient to an outcome (i.e., solution) as relevant next action or “segment part.” Such relevant next action might be produced by the speakers themselves, as seen in Fragments 3 and 4, or by recipients through collaborative participation in the search, as seen in Fragments 5 and 6.

The fact that Akira does not adopt the term proffered by Harumi may have to do with the way in which he conducts the word search. That is, in terms of both talk and body orientation (cf. Figure 9), Akira has been targeting his conduct at a particular person, that is, Seiji, before and throughout the search activity. Harumi has in effect been cast as an overhearer in this particular sequence of talk, and Akira not adopting Harumi’s rendition of the searched-for item appears to reinforce such a participatory configuration at that moment.

This does not mean that English speakers do not employ a practice of using a place-holder for the searched-for item during a word search. For instance, the expression *whatchamacallit* can be deployed as a place-holder as seen in the following:

```
Ava: H’llo:?
Bee: hHi:,
Ava: Hi:?
Bee: hHowuh you:?
Ava: Oka::y?hh=
Bee: =Good.=Yih [ou:nd ] hh
Ava: =>[<I wan']dih know if yih got a-uh:m

whatchimacallit. A:: pah (hh) kling place “th’s mornin’. hh
Bee: A pa rking place,
Ava: Mh _hm, (TG: 01:01-10)
```

Here are some examples, one from Korean and another from Mandarin Chinese. (Korean; taken from Kim & Suh, in press.)

H and K are Korean graduate students studying in the United States. Prior to this segment, K asked H whether he (H) had any research topic in mind that might be suitable for a newly offered graduate course in sociolinguistics. In the following excerpt, H suggests a possible research topic for K. H deploys the distal demonstrative *ce-ke* (that thing) as a place-holder in line 1 (at the a-arrow), and after a confirmation-request sequence in lines 3-5, he begins to specify the referent of the place-holding demonstrative (at the b-arrow). (ATTR = attributive; COMM = committal; CONN = connective; DM = discourse marker; INST = instrumental; MOD = modal; NECESS = necessitative; NOM = nominative; NOML = nominalizer; PL = plural; POL = politeness marker; QUOT = quotative; RETROS = retrospective; and TP = topic.)
The participants have gathered for lunch, and they are discussing what kind of meat one should use to make the dish they are eating. The distal demonstrative na-ge (that) is deployed as a place-holder at the beginning of line 2, and its referent is specified toward the end of the same line (“Repaisi” appears to refer to a brand of meat). (CL = classifier and CRS = current relevant state.)

Then, later ((we)) found out that (1.2) if ((you)) really buy that, what’s that called? (1.0) (Repaisi ), rib-eye. Tch:: ( ), ((it’s)) really great.”
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