

## ***Méiyǒu-/Búshì-* ('No-') Prefaced Turns in Talk Show Interaction— Constitutive Elements of Entertainment Broadcasts in Taiwan**

Hsin-fu Chiu  
*Pomona College*

The paper investigates ways in which *méiyǒu-/búshì-* ('No-') prefaced turns are respectively utilized to construct various interactional actions in one entertainment talk show. In order to better answer the question of “why that now” (Schegloff & Sacks 1973:299), a conversation-analytic approach based on Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) as well as calculation of frequency of occurrence are adopted to investigate (1) the kinds of actions respectively constructed in the two types of negator-prefaced turns, (2) the frequencies of occurrence of these various actions embodied in the two types of target turns. Qualitatively and quantitatively analytic results synthetically indicate that (1) the negator-prefaced turns mostly appear in the post-expansion sequence; (2) *méiyǒu* is far more frequently utilized than *búshì* by the participants in the show to preface a turn to construct certain actions (i.e. negating, resuming-seriousness, repairing, self-ratifying, floor-retrieving, detailing, and topic-proffering) in second and post-second sequential positions in conversation; (3) ONLY if the guest needs to come up with a rebuttal, justifying himself against the hosts' follow-up challenges or sneers, will *búshì* be preferred and selected more frequently than *méiyǒu* to preface their justifying turns. Holistically, the emergence of these particular actions and their frequencies of occurrence are “constitutive” (Clayman & Heritage 2002:95) of this talk show as a form of entertainment on TV.

Key words: *méiyǒu-/búshì-* ('No-') prefaced turns in interaction, sequence organization, talk and social institution

### **1. Introduction**

From the perspective of Chinese syntax, *méiyǒu* and *búshì* are treated as two negators which help to produce the negation of the portion or of the entire proposition that is embodied in a declarative sentence (Biq 1989, Li & Thompson 1981, Teng 1973a, 1973b, 1975, Yeh 1995). Focused in those studies are the prototypical ways in which the two negators are logistically used on the sentential level. The pragmatic manipulations of the negators, either beyond the sentential level or in relation to the authentic contextual environments, have yet to be fully discussed. More recent studies on the Chinese negators



- 11 Dr<sub>1</sub>:       duì ah.  
              **'Yes.'**
- 12 Dr<sub>2</sub>:       nà- nà wǒ zěnmē [(                    )]  
              **'then how come I (                    )'**
- 13 Fr:                               [rúguǒ- rúguǒ měitiān] (0.5)  
                                      **'If (you) start (by)**
- 14                               bèi dānzi. měitiān (0.5)  
                                      **memorizing key words everyday**
- 15                               niàn Yīngwén zhèyàng °kāishǐ dehuà.°  
                                      **studying English everyday,**
- 16                               háishi kěyǐ xué dào.  
                                      **(you) would still be able to learn (something),**
- 17                               dànshì:: zhège yào hěndà de yìlì.  
                                      **but, this requires a lot of perseverance.'**
- 18 Dr<sub>1</sub>:       duì ya:, bàituō, °zhè wǒ yíge líbài°  
                                      **'Yeah. Come on,**
- 19                               >°jiù shòubùliǎo le.°<  
                                      **I will give up in one week.'**
- 20                               (0.8)
- 21 Dr<sub>2</sub>:       [ehhahaha        ] ehhahaha=
- 22 Fr:                               [zhēnde zhège,]  
                                      **'Really,**
- 23                               =[dú- dú Yīngwén zhēnde búshì nàme jiǎndān.]  
                                      **learning English is really not that easy.'**
- 24 Dr<sub>1</sub>: -> [e:i búshì] la, wǒ gēn nǐ jiǎng la.                    ]  
                                      **'No, let me tell you,**
- 25       -> xiànzài hěnduō rén zài Táiwān yíyàng kěyǐ bǎ  
                                      **Now, many people can learn English**
- 26       -> Yīngwén xué de hěnhǎo    >°hǎobùhǎo.°<  
                                      **equally well in Taiwan!'**
- 27                               (1.2)
- 28 Fr:                               dànshì yángé jiǎng qīlái la.  
                                      **'But strictly speaking,**
- 29                               (0.5)
- 30                               huánjìng háishi yǒu chā la.  
                                      **the environment still makes a difference.'**
- 31 Gt:                               uhm.

The fact that a relative is coming to Los Angeles to learn English for one year triggers the excerpted discussion at the dinner table. After the father and the two daughters' exchange of ideas on how it would be possible to learn English well within one year (lines #7-21), the father launches a turn of assessment (lines #22-23), saying that learning English is not that easy. Simultaneously, D<sub>1</sub> is also launching a new turn (lines #24-26), prefaced with *búshi*, saying that Taiwan can also be an ideal place for those who want to learn English well. Adjacently and syntactically, this *búshi*-prefaced turn does not serve to negate, reject or refute any prior turn of talk. However, when the analysis is based on the sequence organization of local interaction, it becomes obvious that the father's assessing turn (line #22-23) sequentially functions as a "sequence-closing third" (Schegloff 2007:187), launched to wrap up the immediately prior exchanges of talk. Since the prior sequence is cooperatively being brought to an end, the daughter is subsequently launching a new "topic-proffering sequence" (Schegloff 2007:169) as the relevant next action in the local interaction. The initiation of the negator-prefaced turn embodies this particular import in the local interaction. This issue has been left unexplored in previous Chinese syntax studies or in the previous literature on the uses of Chinese negators in discourse.

Retrospectively contingent upon the closure of the prior sequence, and prospectively making a contribution to the local interaction, the import of this *búshi*-prefaced turn (lines #24-26) cannot possibly be elucidated if a broader view of the local interactions' sequence organizations is not taken into consideration. This is the very stance that I shall take in this paper as the point of departure, to touch upon ways in which the two negators are utilized, to preface turns of talk interaction, and to fulfill participants' local demands in interaction. In addition, to better answer the question of "why that now" (Schegloff & Sacks 1973:299), given the two negators at the speaker's disposal, statistics of frequency of occurrence will also be integrated in my discussion. Qualitatively and quantitatively, this paper will thus further shed light on the authentic uses of the two negators in real-life discourse in general, and in social institutional talks in particular.

## 2. Data

The data corpus for this paper consists of 450 minutes (ten episodes) from an entertainment talk show in Taiwan. In this particular TV program, the multiparty interaction always takes place when one male and one female host together interview a panel of guests, discussing a particular issue in a particular episode. Every episode of the talk show lasts about 45 minutes. Whereas parties to interaction in the talk show are mostly Chinese native speakers in Taiwan, the talk show guests also include Chinese native speakers from Mainland China, Singapore, Malaysia, as well as Chinese expatriates from Canada and the United States.

In this paper, I ground my microanalyses on full-fledged (or verbal-phrase and beyond) turns, prefaced with *méiyǒu* and *búshì* as “turn-constructural units” (or “TCU” hereafter) (Schegloff 2007:4-5). The negator-preface turn, as a whole, embodies one particular action. Four types of turns are eliminated from my analysis: (1) the uses of the two negators standing alone as a turn, (2) minimal turns, prefaced with the two negators, simply comprising a noun phrase or an adjective phrase, and (3) turns, prefaced with the negators, failing to research completion because of unexpected interjections from the other participants. In addition to those three types of turns, (4) formulaic negator-prefaced turns are also excluded. The following excerpts illustrate the turns that are not analyzed in this paper.

Excerpt (2): Negator standing alone

MH: male host; RG: ratified guest; NG: non-ratified guest

- 05 MH: uh zài jùzhōng búshì gēn tāmen àimèi ma,  
‘Isn’t it that you have an ambiguous relationship with them in the drama?’  
06 NG: -> méiyǒu.  
‘No.’  
07 RG: búshì wǒ.  
‘Not me.’

Excerpt (3): Minimal negator-prefaced turn

MH: male host; RG: ratified guest; NG: non-ratified guest

- 05 MH: uh zài jùzhōng búshì gēn tāmen àimèi ma,  
‘Isn’t it that you have ambiguous relationship with them in the drama?’  
06 NG: méiyǒu.  
‘No.’  
07 RG: -> búshì wǒ.  
‘Not me.’

The next excerpt takes place when the ratified guest is describing a picture, which portrays a messy closet at her home. She is now referring to a big pile of messy clothes in the closet.

Excerpt (4): Abandoned turn

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest, Cindy;

NG: non-ratified guest

- 01 RG: ránhòu yīfú yǐjīng duō dào mǎn dào  
**‘and then the clothes have already been piled up to the extent,**
- 02 jiùshì yǐjīng huì (.) gàizhù wǒ guà de yīfú °zhè yàngzi.°  
**that is, (the pile) has piled as high as the hanging clothes.’**
- 03 MH: Cindy zhèyàng wǒ huì shēngqì eh.  
**‘Cindy, this way, I will be mad.’**
- 04 RG: -> **búshì** [jiu (hh) ]  
**‘No, (it’s) just’**
- 05 FH: [jiù lián nǐ] dōu shòu bù liǎo duìbúduì.,  
**‘Even You can’t put up with this right?’**
- 06 MH: yīnwèi zhè ge (.) huì zhǎo bú dào yī [fú a:h,]  
**‘Because I can’t find out my clothes in this.’**
- 07 NG: [dui:: ]  
**‘yeah!’**
- 08 RG: méiyǒu wǒ hái shì zhǎo dé dào e:h.  
**‘No, I can still find them!’**

The turn in line #4 is interjected and is never completed. Even though it is prefaced by a negator, it is not a full-fledged turn.

Excerpt (5): Formulaic use of negator

MH: male host; RG: ratified guest; NG: non-ratified guest

- 05 MH: uh zài jùzhōng búshì gēn tāmen àimèi ma,  
**‘Isn’t it that you have an ambiguous relationship with them in the drama?’**
- 06 NG: méiyǒu.  
**‘No.’**
- 07 RG: -> **búshì** wǒ.  
**‘Not me.’**

In addition to eliminating those four type of negator-prefaced turns, I shall not pay full attention to the interactional imports of such Chinese particles as “*ei*,” “*la*,” “*ah*” that precede or are preceded by the two negators. Whenever the turn-initial negators collocate with any of these three particles, I shall treat them altogether as a unit.

### 3. Methodology

The theoretical approach of *Conversation Analysis* (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974) and the concept of *Participation Framework* (Goffman 1981) will be drawn upon, to complete my qualitative investigations of the “participation status” (Goffman 1981: 137) of the parties to the interaction and of the interactional imports of the negator-prefaced turns that are realized on a moment-to-moment basis. Central to theoretical conversation analysis is—but not limited to—a meticulous look at “how particular courses of action are initiated and progress and, apart from this, how particular actions opportunities are opened up and activated, or withheld from and occluded” (Heritage 1997:169). Manifesting developmental trajectories of actions in interaction, sequence organizations of conversation function as the primary point of departure, from which analyses on conversation will start. Schema #1 outlines the base “two-turn adjacency sequence” (Schegloff 2007:22) and “post-expansion sequence” (Schegloff 2007:115), in relation to the focal talk show.

01	H:	Turn #1	Question	->	base FPP
02	G:	Turn #2	Response	->	base SPP
03	H/G:	Turn #3	Thematically relevant follow-ups	->	post-expanded FPP
04	H/G:	Turn #4	Response to Turn 3	->	post-expanded SPP
					. ((the post-expansion may therefore be close, or another post-expansion sequence will be launched afterwards))

**Schema 1:** Sequence organization in the talk show

Due to the nature of the talk show, the base sequence of two turns always starts with a first pair part (hereafter FPP, Schegloff 2007:13) that embodies a question exclusively from a host. Once the hosts' FPPs are launched, two actions will be and should be immediately and contemporaneously brought about. First, a particular guest (or sometimes one of the two hosts) is officially ratified (or re-ratified) as the relevant next speaker. Second, an alternative topic is introduced into discussion with this ratified speaker. In this entertainment talk show, topic-continuity is well managed throughout the whole episode. The hosts rarely ask highly independent or isolated questions randomly. All topics are thematically closely related, and there exists a sequential relationship in interaction amongst all the topics that are brought up in one particular episode. In principle, topics change sequentially and gradually on a moment-to-moment basis. The next topic can be a focus that has been “embedded, immersed, or touched upon” in the prior sequence. Topic shift of this kind can be deemed as “sub-topic nomination” and it is always accompanied by a “new-speaker ratification.” Aside from this, chances are that the next topic, rather

than a focus embedded in the prior sequence, is a fresh focus that is “reciprocally independent” from (but still thematically related to) the focus of the prior sequence. Topic shift of this kind may not necessarily be accompanied by the ratification of a new speaker. The same speaker may continue the same status of participation. The base FPP in this chapter embodies either of the two topic shifts. Triggered by an FPP, a second pair part (Schegloff 2007:13; SPP hereafter) is adjacently situated next, embodying a response exclusively from a guest.

Under most of the circumstances, the local interactions will not therefore come to an end. Instead, after the completion of a base sequence, (lines #1-2), either one of the two parties, the hosts (H) and the guests (G), will produce a “post-expanded FPP” that triggers a post-expansion sequence. The topic introduced in the post-expanded FPP is always a focus embedded in the guests’ base SPP, and it is this “subtopic” in the base SPP that thematically contributes to the post-expansion. The sequentially relevant next is the post-expanded SPP that either one of the two parties will produce. Whereas most of the post-expansions will come to an end after the completion of Turn #4 (or the post-expanded SPP), chances are that the post-expanded SPP will further trigger another post-expansion sequence. As a result, multi-layers of post-expansion sequences will be launched as this particular multi-party interaction develops in the talk show. It should be noted that the sequence organization in the schema above is hypothetically ideal. In real-life multi-party interaction in the talk show, variations are highly expected, and these variations will show up in the following excerpts.<sup>1</sup> The negator-prefaced turns that I am targeting in this section mostly appear in the third and fourth positions. My corpus also includes target turns that are positioned in the fifth position and thereafter. I realize that the target turns will appear in every position in the multi-tiers of post-expansion, but it is beyond the scope of this paper to illustrate all the positions where the target turns appear and to classify the actions in relation to all those positions. To make my main point clear, I shall use the rubric term “post-second position” to include the third position and those thereafter.

Grounding my analyses on actions with reference to the sequence organization of local interactions, I conclude that, as will be illustrated in the next section, embodied in the target turns (prefaced with either *méiyǒu* or *búshì*), there are EIGHT different actions. The eight conversational actions, I propose, further collectively formulate TWO major categories. In this paper, I call these two categories *Interactional Pragmatics*<sup>2</sup> and *Interactional Manipulation*. *Interactional Pragmatics* (IP, hereafter) is the conversational-metalinguistic speech action type contingently embodied in a local turn of talk.

---

<sup>1</sup> Discussing the various sequential organizations of all the excerpts is not the focus of this paper, but whenever necessary variations to the ideal organization will be discussed in footnotes.

<sup>2</sup> I express my gratitude to Professor Hongyin Tao, who came up with this term for me to categorize the speech-related type of actions.

Conversational participants (or in this paper, the program guests) launch *IP* actions exclusively to respond to the “locutionary meaning” or the “illocutionary force” (Austin 1962) implicated in another party’s immediately prior turn of talk. On the other hand, *interactional manipulation* (hereafter *IM*) is not simply a speech-related action type. When *IM* actions are constructed, participants are not only responding to another party’s immediately prior turn of talk but, more importantly, making conversation mechanisms operate subsequently in local interaction. This operation may cause, for example, subtle changes in local structure of conversation, ratification of a (portion of) participant(s), and/or reciprocally-determined topics in the next stretch of talk. Along with my discussions and analyses in the rest of the paper, the categorization in action types summarized here will become apparent.

#### **4. Data analysis**

From a corpus of 450 minutes of conversations, I collected in total 428 negators involving both *méiyōu* and *búshì*. It should be noted that multiple sayings (Stivers 2004) of a particular negator at one time do appear in my corpus. When such a situation arises, the multiple sayings of a negator are counted once. Out of the 428 negators, 199 instances, which occur under one of the four circumstances I highlighted above, were eliminated. 229 negators (or 229 negator-prefaced turns) were thus counted as valid data samples. These valid data samples were initially explored in relation to their respective sequential positions in their local conversational environments. Their interactional imports were later registered with further regard to the local participation status of their respective producers, as well as ways in which the other co-present participants are oriented to the target turn in interaction.

##### **4.1 Second-position turns and actions**

Out of the total of 229 valid turns, 24 turns are found to be situated in the base SPP. The base SPP embodies a responsive action to its adjacently prior base FPP, which, as pointed out above, (1) contemporaneously nominates a sub-topic and ratifies a new recipient/guest (e.g. excerpt [6] below), or (2) initiates a fresh topic for discussion with the same old recipient/guest (e.g. excerpts [7], [8] below). In responding to either of two kinds of FPPs, the ratified guests will, if necessary, subsequently initiate *méiyōu-/búshì*-prefaced turns, so as to (1) negate the propositions/ “illocutionary force” (Austin 1962) embodied in the hosts’ questions, (2) justify themselves against the accusations/challenges/sneer/mockery incorporated in the hosts’ questions, and (3) detail their responses to the hosts’ WH-prefaced questions. The following three excerpts help to

illustrate the ways in which these three types of actions are constructed. Across the three examples, the FPP is launched either after the prior sequence has come to an end, or is being contingently abandoned. In the following illustrations, the target sequence starts with an alternative topic/focus.

The first example is excerpted from the episode in which a panel of guests are divided into two subgroups, representing hygienic and sloppy types of people in their private lives. Even though Dennis, the ratified guest, is included in the hygienic group, the outfit he is wearing now is found to be wrinkled.

Excerpt (6): Justifying “NO”

MH: male host; FH: female host, Cathy; RG: ratified guest, Dennis;

NG: non-ratified guest

- 01 MH: yīnwèi nǐ kàn (0.5) Cathy nǐ kàn zhè biān liǎng- sǎn-  
**‘Because you see Cathy, you see the two male (guests) on this side,**  
02 liǎng ge nánshēng. Dennis de chènshān yě shì zhòu de a::h?  
**Dennis’ shirt is also wrinkled!’**  
03 FH: [kěshì Denn-]  
**‘but Denn-’**  
04 NG: [zhēnde: ] [: ]  
**‘True!’**  
05 FH: [méiyǒu] Dennis kàn qīlái fēicháng ài gānjīng.  
**‘No, Dennis seems to like to be clean**  
06 nǐ kàn tā liǎn duō bái ah.  
**You see how white his face is!’**  
07 MH: F Dennis nǐ chènshān shì zhòu de. ((turning to Dennis))  
**‘Dennis, your shirt is wrinkled?’**  
08 RG: -> [méiyǒu] gānggāng diào de shíhòu  
**‘No, when it was hung up moments ago, it was**  
09 -> yǒu bùxiǎoxīn yā dào. Láibùjǐ le.  
**wrinkled by mistake, and it was too late (when I discovered).’**

After his exchanges of talk with the female host (lines #1-6), the male host launches an FPP (F) (line #7) that not only ratifies Dennis’ status of participation but also challenges his hygienic traits: a hygienic person is not supposed to wear a wrinkled shirt (that has been made clear earlier in the host’s FPP to the female host). Responding to the host’s challenge, the ratified guest prefaces his turn with *méiyǒu* (->), excusing himself from the query that is embodied in the host’s FPP (line #7). This type of “challenge-implicated” question is different from the kind of question that only seeks verification/validation from

the recipient. The following excerpt aims to illustrate this point.

In excerpt (7), the two hosts are interviewing Ian and Helen, who participate in the talk show to promote another talk show that they will co-host. Prior to the sequences excerpted, the two hosts are discussing other issues with Ian and Helen. From the way in which Ian and Helen interact with each other, the male host now concludes that Ian is under the control of Helen (lines #1-3), a new issue to be discussed next.

Excerpt (7): Negating “No”

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest, Ian;

NG: non-ratified guest, Helen

- 01 MH: búguò gǎnjué gāngcái He-Helen gēn (0.2) Ian: de (0.2)  
**‘But (I) feel that (from) the interactional relationship**  
02 hù- hùxiāng de guānxī hǎoxiàng shì  
**between Helen and Ian just now, (it) seems that**  
03 Helen zài zhǐhuī Ian °de yàngzi.°  
**Helen has been controlling Ian, things like that.’**  
04 FH: shì: tā >yìzhí shuō< >nǐ jiǎng nǐ jiǎng<  
**‘Yes, she kept saying like, you, go ahead, go ahead,**  
05 nǐ [mófǎng] shémede.  
**try to imitate, things like that.’**  
06 MH: [duì ]  
**‘Yes.’**  
07 MH: (duìya) nǐ yòu- nǐ yòu cuò guò láilóngqùmài.  
**‘Yes, again, again you miss the cause and effect**  
08 nǐ yào xiān jiǎng >nà ge< shéme shìqíng [°zhè yàngzi.°]  
**You need to talk about that first, things like that.’**  
09 FH: [duì duì. ]  
**‘Yes, yes.’**  
10 NG: hehehehehehehehe  
11 MH: F suǒyǐ Ian nǐ shì- (0.8) nǐ shì bèi- (0.5)  
**‘So, Ian, it’s that you are-**  
12 F bèi tā kòngzhì de duìbúduì.  
**under her control, aren’t you?’**  
13 RG: -> méiyǒu ah, búhuì bèi tā kòngzhì ah.  
**‘NO, (I) will not be under her control.’**  
14 MH: zhēnde?  
**‘Really?’**  
15 RG: tā zěnme huì kòngzhì wǒ ne.  
**‘How will she control me?’**

After co-enacting Ian and Helen's prior interaction (line #1-9) with the female host, the male host utters a declarative conclusion that precedes a tag question (lines #11-12), specifically to Ian, as a way to see if the host's prior observation is correct. As a ratified guest, Ian disconfirms what has been presupposed in the host's FPP (F) as the relevant next. The guest's SPP (->) is prefaced with *méiyǒu*, followed by the rest of the TCUs in this negating turn.

The third type of target turn is constructed in a way that the guests' detailed responses are provided after the hosts' questions, framed in the WH-question type. In this excerpt, the two hosts exchange talk after a male guest—who is about six feet four inches and who is just being introduced to the audience—is hugged by the female host, as a welcoming ritual.

Excerpt (8): detailing “No”

MH: male host; FH: female host

- 01 MH: F ei. zhème gāo de nánshēng yīnggāi zěnmè bào  
**‘How should such a tall guy hug you**  
02 bǐjiào gāo- ràng nǐ gāoxìng.  
**so that you would be satisfied?’**  
03 FH: -> méiyǒu jiùshì zhè yàngzi yǒu diǎn wā:nyāo  
**‘No, it’s just that he will stoop over a little bit,**  
04 -> ránhòu jiùshì >nǐ zhīdào< ràng wǒ juéde zìjǐ hěn jiǎoxiǎo.  
**and then you know, make you think that you are petite.’**

Right after the welcoming ritual, the female host contingently plays the role of the interviewee, being asked about the appropriate ways in which a tall guy should hug a petite lady such as herself. In responding to the HOW-question (F), the female host prefaces her answering turn with *méiyǒu* (->) in the SPP. With NO “disalignment-implicated” in the negator-prefaced turns, this kind of implementation of the negator is specialized and relatively rare in second position (with reference to the occurrence frequencies of the two type of uses illustrated above as well as the occurrence frequency of the detailing *no* in “post-second position”). However, there still exists the legitimacy to categorize this particular way of utilizing the negators to preface an SPP turn. This is a point I shall discuss later in this paper.

The previous three excerpts depict the three types of actions that are constructed in the target turns with a negator-preface. Sequentially, the target turns are positioned in the SPP as a response to the hosts' prior turn of talk, a “base” FPP (as opposed to post-expanded FPP discussed later) which contributes to (1) the obvious shift in “topical domain” from the one in the prior sequence, and/or (2) the apparent ratification of a particular guest's

“participation status” (Goffman 1981:137) in the target sequence. Distinctive from each other in quality, the three types of actions occur with different frequencies, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Second position action and frequency of occurrence<sup>3</sup>

			Méiyōu preface	Búshì preface	Total
Interactional Pragmatics	2 <sup>nd</sup> position justifying	(G)	10	1	11
	2 <sup>nd</sup> position negating	(G)	9	1	10
	2 <sup>nd</sup> position detailing	(G)	3	0	3
	Total		22 (92%)	2 (8%)	24 (100%)

In this base SPP position (or second position), the negator-prefaced turns are mostly launched to construct the rebuttals (11 out of 24) and denials (10 out of 24) against the hosts' FPP. Disproportionately fewer are the actions of detailing (3 out of 24). Contrasting the respective occurrence frequencies of *méiyōu*-/*búshì*-prefaced turns, I find out that *méiyōu*-prefaced turns are constructed in disproportionately large numbers (22 out of 24), compared to the relatively low numbers of *búshì*-prefaced turns (2 out of 24). From these two pieces of evidence, it becomes evident that in second position, *méiyōu* is almost the one and only selection by guests to begin a turn and to construct *IP* actions, in responding to the hosts' prior turn of talk, when an interactional contingency arises.

The fact that the negator-prefaced turns in the SPP merely take up 24 cases out of 229 indicates that there exists another group of target turns that is NOT situated in second position and is excessively LARGE in number. My focus will now switch to address the issues raised by this second group of negator-prefaced turns.

#### 4.2 Post-second position turns and actions

Out of the total of 229 valid negator-prefaced turns, 203 turns are found to be situated next to the completion of a base sequence. In other words, as a relevant next to the guests' base SPP, post-expansion sequences are usually launched in interaction in this show. Also in post-expansions, various actions (of both *IP* and *IM* types) will be constructed in the target turns, and they can be embodied in the turns of any co-present participants, ratified or non-ratified, the hosts or the guests. Table 2 outlines the interactional variety in post-expansion sequences. There are two cases/turns that do not belong to any of the categorized actions, so the conversational idiosyncrasies of the two cases/turns will not be further discussed in this paper.

<sup>3</sup> The capital letter in parentheses represents the primary parties who construct the actions in the target turns.

**Table 2:** Post-second-position action and frequency of occurrence

			<i>Méiyǒu</i> preface	<i>Búshì</i> preface	Total
Interactional Pragmatics	Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> justifying (G)		20	29	49
	Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> negating (G)		33	5	38
	Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> detailing (G)		11	0	11
Interactional Manipulation	Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> resuming seriousness (G)		31	8	39
	Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> repair (H/G)		16	9	25
	Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> self-ratifying (G)		14	2	16
	Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor-retrieving (G)		13	1	14
	Post 2 <sup>nd</sup> topic-proffering (H)		7	4	11
Total			145 (71%)	58 (29%)	203 (100%)

Amongst the eight different actions registered in post-second-position turns, what occurs most frequently are the ratified guests' turns to justify themselves (49 out of 203), to resume seriousness<sup>4</sup> (39 out of 203) and to negate the proposition in the adjacently prior interrogatives or declaratives (38 out of 203). Secondary to these three most commonly constructed actions are the actions of repair (by the hosts or by the guests) (25 out of 203), "participation-status-self-ratifying" (by the 'non-ratified' guests) (16 out of 203), "floor-winning-back" (by ratified guests) (14 out of 203). The fewest cases are the actions of alternative topic/focus proffering (by the hosts) (11 out of 203) and answer detailing (by the ratified guests) (11 out of 203). In the following sections, twelve excerpts will be shown to illustrate the eight conversational actions that I classify here. Before moving on to the illustrations, I want to highlight the significance of Table 2, in relation to the statistics in Table 1.

First, when target turns occur (prefaced by either *méiyǒu* or *búshì*) in second position, exclusively *IP* actions (24 out of 24) are constructed in interaction (Table 1, reviewed horizontally).

Second, when a "base-adjacency-pair" (Schegloff 2007:10-12) sequence is post-expanded (Table 2, reviewed horizontally), *IM* actions (105 out of 203) may additionally be constructed in addition to *IP* actions (98 out of 203).

Third, as pointed out above, in second position, the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turn occurs 22 times out of 24, whereas there are only 2 occurrences of the *búshì*-prefaced turn, so *méiyǒu* is the one and only negator to be selected to construct actions (that belong only to *IP* type).

Fourth, in post-second position where both *IP* and *IM* actions are possibly constructed, the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turn takes up 145 out of 203 cases, whereas the *búshì*-prefaced turn

<sup>4</sup> I frame this term from Schegloff's (2001) idea of "getting serious" turn-initial *no* in English. More details will be offered later in this paper.

takes up 58 cases. It therefore becomes understandable that *méiyōu* still takes over and become absolutely dominant to preface the turns that are to construct any of the all *IM* actions (grey portion in Table 2, reviewed horizontally), and such *IP* actions as negating and detailing. Under these circumstances, there is little room for *búshì* to appear in interaction.

Fifth, most of the time, the participants in the show prefer *méiyōu* over *búshì*. However, when the guests' turns are launched to disalign themselves against accusations, sneer or irony embodied in the hosts' prior turn, *búshì*-prefaced turns (29 out of 49) slightly outnumber their counterparts (20 out of 49).

Identified and listed above are the subtle but holistic differentiations between *méiyōu* and *búshì* in interaction, categories of actions that the two types of negator-prefaced turns respectively embody at different interactional contingencies, and preference of the conversational participants to select one negator over the other to construct the correspondent action when a contingency arises. The sections what follow will continue such meticulous analyses on the various actions that are embodied in the target turns at different contingencies in post-second positions.

#### 4.2.1 Post-second position sneering/justifying

Statistics frequency of occurrence shows that when a base sequence is post-expanded, the hosts will most likely initiate a turn of FPP to challenge or mock the ratified guests because of what they have said in the base SPP. In response to the challenges from the hosts, the guest will then produce a turn of rebuttal, justifying what he has said or what he has done, as described in the base SPP. Excerpt (9) help to illustrate this point. This interaction is excerpted from an episode in which a panel of guests (drama actors) comes to the talk show to promulgate their upcoming new drama. In this particular interaction, the hosts are asking a female guest who is the leading actress in the drama.

##### Excerpt (9): Politically correct

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest;

NG: non-ratified guest, Julia; CP: co-present participants

- 01 MH: F<sub>1</sub> suǒyǐ (. ) nǐ pái- nǐ guà tóupái,  
**'So is it that you are cast as the leading actress**  
02 ránhòu Julia guà èrhào nǚzhǔjiǎo ma.  
**and then Julia is cast as the supporting actress?'**  
03 RG: S<sub>1</sub> oh méiyōu méiyōu >méiyōu méiyōu< wōmen (0.3)  
**'Oh no, no, no, no, we-**

- 04 wǒmen yīnggāi suàn píngqǐpíngzuò.  
**we may be regarded as equal.**
- 05 méiyǒu zhèzhǒng (huh)jiù(h)shì(h)=  
**There is no such type (of ranking), huhh, it's just'**
- 06 NG: =huh huh= ((clearing throat))
- 07 FH: F<sub>2</sub> =suǒyǐ dìyī nǚzhǔjiǎo shì.  
**'So the first leading actress is?'**
- 08 RG: S<sub>2</sub> jiù Julia ah.  
**'Julia definitely.'**
- 09 CP: (1.5)hehahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha
- 10 MH: nàge=  
**'that'**
- 11 NG: S<sub>2</sub> =qíshí wǒmen dàjiā dōushì zhǔjiǎo.  
**'Actually, we all are the leading actors.'**
- 12 (): [( )]
- 13 RG: [duì hěnduō rén.]  
**'yea, many people.'**
- 14 NG: [yīnwèi wǒmen shì zhěngge ]=  
**'because we are the whole='**
- 15 MH: -> [uh jiǎng guānfāng huà. ]  
**'Uh? Aren't you simply being politically correct?'**
- 16 FH: -> =↑duì yā,=  
**'That's right!'**
- 17 NG: [zhěngge juāncūn °de rén dōushì°. ]  
**'the whole (family) in a village, and we all are.'**
- 18 FH: -> [wǒmen dàjiā dōushì zhǔ ] jiǎo lei.  
**'We all are the main actors?!'**
- 19 -> gēn shéi xué de ah.  
**'Whom did you learn that from?'**
- 20 NG: --> >[búshì] yīnwèi< wǒmen háiyǒu shàngyí dài yǎn wǒmende  
**'No because there is an older generation who play our**
- 21 --> bàba māma huòzhěshì yéye nǎinai de.  
**fathers, mothers, or grandpas and grandmas.'**

In the transcript, (F) and (S) are used to label the FPP and SPP in the base sequence; “->” and “-->” are used to respectively label the FPP and SPP in the post-expanded sequence. After the ratified guest's response to the male host's question turns out to be jokes (evidenced by her own outburst of laughter and Julia's joking by throat clearing in lines

#5, #6), the female host then recycles the question (line #7)<sup>5</sup> for a clearer answer (line #8). The short exchange of talk brings about a roar of laughter in the interaction, after which, the non-ratified guest, Julia, revises the ratified guest's answer by saying that all the actors in the show are leading actors in the drama (line #11). Julia's turn-in-progress (or sentential TCU) immediately triggers the hosts' challenge and sneer (lines #15, #16, #18-19). As a relevant next, Julia launches a *búshì*-prefaced turn (lines #20-21), explaining that the drama is about the whole village and the story centers around both the young and the old generations. This turn embodies a rebuttal, justifying Julia's previous saying that they are the main actors (line #11). In this excerpt, *búshì* is the negator, utilized to construct the justifying turn.

As Table 2 indicates, *méiyǒu* is the other indispensable alternative, and it is employed in the next excerpt, taken from the same episode in which a panel of guests shows up for their new drama.

Excerpt (10): Did you drink?<sup>6</sup>

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest, Anthony;

NG: non-ratified guest; Mark: a relevant outside party; CP: co-present participant

- 01 MH: F<sub>1</sub> Anthony yīnggāi méiyǒu zài zhuīxīng ba. ((to Anthony))  
**'Maybe Anthony didn't chase after (movie) stars,**  
 02 dāng xuéshēng de shíhòu.  
**as a student?'**  
 03 RG: S<sub>1</sub> zhēnde méiyǒu eh.  
**'No, really.'**  
 04 NG: ↑hu:↓hh.  
 05 RG: S<sub>1</sub> [°zhēnde méiyǒu.° ]  
**'No, really.'**  
 06 MH: F<sub>2</sub> [sh- kěshì nǐ dāng xuéshēng] de shíhòu  
**'But as a student,**  
 07 zìjǐ shì míngxīng shíbúshì.  
**you were a star yourself right?'**  
 08 RG: S<sub>2</sub> méiyǒu ah. ((sitting up straight from the bored sitting posture))  
**'No.'**

<sup>5</sup> The sequential organization of this example differs from the ideal organization. Since the "first pair part reworking post-expansion" (Schegloff 2007:162) is not the focus of my analysis, I shall not touch upon this type of expansion here.

<sup>6</sup> There exists a post-expanded FPP (lines #9) that aims to rework the FPP (Schegloff 2007:162) (lines #6-7), even though this post-expanded FPP is not oriented to by the ratified guest.



- 31 FH: =háishi rùxihěns hēn shìbúshì.  
          **'(You are) still lost in the drama right?'**
- 32 RG: hái mán shēn de.  
          **'Pretty deeply, still.'**

In the beginning of this example, the male host was wondering whether Anthony (the ratified guest in this example, the leading actor in the drama, and a model in real life) chased after movie stars when he was a student (lines #1-2), and whether he was a star himself when he was a student (lines #6-7). Because of the consecutive dis-preferred answers (line #3, #5, #8), the male host reworks his question (line #9). While the question is being reworked, Anthony continues on with his elaborated, multi-unit dis-preferred answers (#10-13). After Anthony finishes this multi-unit turn, the sequence is further post-expanded as the female host jumps in (->), sneering at him, wondering if now he is drunk at the moment, talking (line #14) and behaving indecently (lines #17-18, #20). Facing the confrontation, the guest justifies himself (-->), reasoning out why he cannot help but behave this way (lines #21-23, #26, #28, #30). In this excerpt, the guest's rebuttal is initiated in the turn prefaced with *méiyǒu*.

Across these two excerpts, the guests' rebuttals are constructed to confront the hosts' sneer in the post-expanded FPP, and the rebuttals are embodied in the guests' negator-prefaced turns in the post-expanded SPP. As I mentioned earlier, when constructing such rebuttals, the guest will more likely select *búshì* to launch the turn. In addition to this preference to *búshì* under this circumstance, what immediately follows *búshì*, more often than not, is an insertion of *yīnwèi* ("because" in English), before the introduction of a rebuttal. In other words, *búshì* and *yīnwèi* will frequently show up together, preceding a rebuttal that is embodied in the rest of the turn. Statistically, there are 16 cases out of 29 in which *búshì* is followed by *yīnwèi*. On the other hand, the cooccurrence of *méiyǒu* and *yīnwèi* is relatively rare, evidenced by only 2 cases out of 20 in my corpus.

As a separate note on the sequence organizations in those two excerpts, in excerpt (9), before Julia's turn reaches its transition-relevant place (reference cite), the hosts have already been co-constructing challenges. This excerpt illustrates a common way in which a sneering post-expansion is initiated in this talk show. Once the "sneerable" appears, the post-expansion is immediately launched, regardless of the completion of the guests' base SPP. On the other hand, in excerpt (10), sequentially, two (or three) tiers of post-expansions are launched one after another. The target "sneering post-expanded FPP" this time is not launched until Anthony's multi-unit turn is completed. Between these two excerpts, there exists a subtle difference in terms of their sequence organization in which sneering-justifying is embedded. What is common is that the post-expansion is launched AFTER the guests' initiation of a base SPP. It is based on this commonality that I categorize these

two excerpts as “post-second sneering expansions.” There is a subtle difference between these two excerpts that will not be further discussed here but future studies could be conducted to examine these differences.

#### 4.2.2 Post-second position directing-into-cheerfulness/getting-serious

As mentioned previously, whenever the hosts discover any “sneerable” TCU(s) from the guests’ base SPP (in progress or in completion), the hosts will then launch the sneering post-expansion. Statistically, this secondary type of post-expansion is “directing into cheerfulness/resuming seriousness” sequences (Schegloff 2001). This type of post-expansion is launched when (1) the hosts, discovering any “laughable” TCU(s) in the guests’ base SPP (in progress or in completion), isolate the “laughable” TCU(s) in their post-expanded FPP, triggering a roar of laughter from all participants, or (2) the ratified guests themselves produce a laughable response, similarly triggering a roar of laughter from all participants. The laughs will last for a while, and then a ‘serious’ turn will be launched afterwards.<sup>7</sup> I call the first type of situation “other-initiated cheerfulness,” and the second type “self-initiated cheerfulness.” The following two excerpts respectively illustrate the two types of interaction.

In the following excerpt, the guest is talking about his past experience of recording a play. This reflection is triggered by the male host’s question about whether he will need to brush his teeth after this show. This original topic of brushing teeth moves to the play-recording reflection, from which a laughable TCU occurs.

##### Excerpt (11): Playing a role with a suit

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest; NG: non-ratified guest  
CP: co-present participants

- 01 MH: F    hǎo suǒyǐ nǐ xiànzài (0.8) nǐ xiànzài shàngwán zhèjí jiémù  
          **‘Ok, so now after you are done with the episode,**  
02            búyòng zài shuāyá ma, yīnwèi  
          **(you) don’t need to brush your teeth since**

---

<sup>7</sup> In some senses, the host’s sneering turn and directing-into-cheerfulness turn may feel alike. Since all the conversations take place in an entertainment talk show, what people say in the episodes is usually for fun. Even though the hosts sneer at the guests, their sneering is also meant to create a cheerful atmosphere in the show. However, the key feature that helps to separate apart the two types of sequences is the obvious roar of laughter, following the directing-into-cheerfulness turn. After the roar of laughter, there comes an obvious shift in the tone of the conversation while the previously interrupted topic is resumed.





- 05 RG: S<sub>1</sub> ránhòu bèi yǔ línshī ránhòu zài nàbiān wěn ah bàoláibàoqù.  
**'soaked by the rain, kiss and hug each other there.'**
- 06 ----- data of 3.5 seconds omitted -----
- 07 MH: F<sub>2</sub> suǒyǐ ne (.) rúguǒ shì Mary bǎ nǐ tuīdào qiángshàng qù,  
**'So if Mary pushes you up against the wall and then**
- 08 ránhòu zhuàngqiáng. (0.2) bèng yìshēng. >ránhòu tā jiù<-  
**pushes you against it. Bang! and then she- she kisses you.**
- 09 tā jiù wěn le zhèyàng. (0.2) Léidiànjiāojiā.  
**She does it this way, (in the night with) heavy thunder/lightning.'**
- 10 RG: S<sub>2</sub> -> (wāh nà wǒ ) kěyǐ xiǎng bàojīn ma(hh),  
**'Wow, then ( ) may I call the police first?'**
- 11 CP: (1.5) hehahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahah
- 12 RG: [tài cūlǚ le(h). ]  
**'That is too rude.'**
- 13 CP: [hahahahahahaha ]
- 14 CP: (1.3) hahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahah
- 15 RG: --> méiyǒu wǒ huì jiào tā- jiào tā jiùshì=  
**'No, I will then ask her- what I will ask her is'**
- 16 FH: =lěngjìng xiálái, Mary, lěngjìng lěngjìng.=  
**'calm down, Mary, calm down calm down.'**
- 17 RG: --> =qǐng(hh) lěngjìng, Mary.  
**"please calm down, Mary,**
- 18 --> duì wǒ, (0.5) wēnróu yìdiǎn.  
**treat me a bit more tenderly."**

When the ratified guest is asked the kind of circumstance under which he most expects his first kiss to take place (lines #1-2), the guest's 'funny' answer, in a serious tone, brings about a roar of laughter from the co-present participants (line #4). In the follow-up interrogation, (lines #7-9), the male host incorporates the guest's answer (lines #3, #5) into the hypothetical circumstance, under which Mary, a chubby, middle-aged co-present female guest, is "arranged" as a protagonist. In response, the ratified guest produces a second base SPP (S<sub>2</sub> ->) in a particular way that brings about another substantial roar of laughter (lines #11-14). Contingently, this second base SPP (S<sub>2</sub> ->) also functions as if post-second-directing-into-cheerfulness FPP, suddenly making the local interaction cheerful. After the substantial roar of laughter with the tone shifting back to seriousness, the ratified guest reworks his post-expanded SPP (->) in a serious and elaborated manner (lines #15, #17-18). In this excerpt, it is the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turn that makes this shift.

This type of post-expansion, other-initiated (excerpt [8]) or self-initiated (excerpt [9]), is characteristic of this talk show. Schegloff (2001) identified the similar use of “turn initial no,” making “a transition from non-serious to serious talk” (ibid., p.1948) in daily English conversation. In this particular entertainment talk show, the phenomenon of “getting non-serious” and then “getting serious” commonly occurs, temporarily diverting participants’ focus from a moderate issue to a joke that has just been highlighted. The frequent occurrence of this phenomenon indexes the entertaining nature of the institute in which this talk show takes place. In terms of the occurrence frequencies of the two negator-prefaced turns, *méiyǒu* (rather than *búshì*) is most likely the equivalent “getting-serious” ‘no’ in Chinese (Schegloff 2001). Statistically equivalent to this special action is negating in post-second position, an epistemically default function of the target turn.

#### 4.2.3 Post-second position negating

This excerpt is the same as excerpt (10) above in which the male hosts asked whether Anthony, the ratified guest, chased after movie stars when he was a student (lines #1-2).

##### Excerpt (13): Were you a star?

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest, Anthony;  
 NG: non-ratified guest; Mark: a relevant outside party

- 01 MH: F<sub>1</sub> Anthony yīnggāi méiyǒu zài zhuīxīng ba.  
**‘Maybe Anthony didn’t chase after (movie) stars,**  
 02 dāng xuéshēng de shíhòu.  
**as a student?’**
- 03 RG: S<sub>1</sub> zhēnde méiyǒu eh.  
**‘No, really.’**
- 04 NG: ↑hu:↓hh.
- 05 RG: S<sub>1</sub> [°zhēnde méiyǒu.° ]  
**‘No, really.’**
- 06 MH: F<sub>2</sub> -> [sh- kěshì nǐ dāng xuéshēng] de shíhòu  
**‘But as a student,**  
 07 F<sub>2</sub> -> zìjǐ shì míngxīng shíbúshì.  
**you were a star yourself right?’**
- 08 RG: --> méiyǒu ah. ((sitting up straight from the bored sitting posture))  
**‘No.’**



**4.2.4 Post-second position repair-initiation/repair-completion:  
The unconscious and conscious third/fourth position repair & first pair  
part reworking**

Repair sequences are launched as a post-expansion sequence when the hosts' turn (usually in a form of a follow-up question) next to the guests' SPP display their misunderstanding of (a portion of) the guests' SPP. In responding to the hosts' troubles with understanding, the guests, in the post-expanded SPP, will initiate their correcting turn, prefaced with either of the two negators. In this first type of repair, the hosts "unconsciously and incidentally" initiate repair with the follow-up question in their post-expanded FPP, and the guests' post-expanded SPP is launched to complete the repair. The second type of repair is what Schegloff (1992) called "third/forth position repair." It takes place, according to my data corpus, either after or in the midst of the guests' elaborated base SPP, usually in the form of a narrative. At the end of the narrative SPP or when the elaborated SPP is constructed in progress, the hosts may initiate an understanding-check-post-expanded FPP, so as to eliminate their confusion from the guests' narrative. In this second type, it is the hosts who "consciously and purposefully" initiate the repair, and it is again the guests who complete the repair. The third type of repair corresponds to what Schegloff (2007: 162) called (base) "first pair part reworking." Reworking of base FPP (that exclusively embodies questions) is solely done by the hosts when they encounter the guests' "pre-SPP" (ibid., pp.162-168) that embodies dis-preferred answer (line #8 in excerpt [13]), challenges, or when the hosts think the guests' has misinterpreted their question in the base FPP. Repair initiation of this type is embodied in the guests' prior responsive (pre-expanded, base or post-expanded) SPP. The guests can consciously or unconsciously trigger the hosts' completion of repair in the next turn. Three excerpts will be selected here to illustrate these three structurally different types of repair sequences in the post-expansion.

In the first episode, after the ratified guest finishes explaining why he was sent out to a small city to study in high school, the female host proposes a follow-up question (lines #9-10), which, from the guest's perspective, displays her misunderstanding of part of what he has said in the base SPP (lines #2-6).

Excerpt (14): I was not bad

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest; NG: non-ratified guest

- 01 FH: F nǐ wèishéme huì bèi yùn dào yú- yílán niàn [shū.]  
           ‘Why would you be transported to Yilan (a small city) to study?’  
 02 RG: S [uh ]

- 03 jiùshì: yěshì bǐjiào (.) gāozhōng shíqí  
**'(It's) just that in high school, (I was) also rather**
- 04 bǐjiào pànnì. bǐjiào wánpí °yìdiǎn.°  
**rather defiant, and rather a bit naughty.**
- 05 ránhòu: (´hh)jiùshì: bàba juéde yào bǎ wǒ sòng qù yílán,  
**And then my dad thought that (he) needed to send me to Yilan,**
- 06 guān zài °xuéxiào° [zhùxiào (.)°duìa:° ]  
**locked at school, to live in the dorm, yeah.'**
- 07 MH: [yǒu zhè yí pài de jiùshì bǎ tā yuǎnlí]  
**'There exists this school of thought. That is,**
- 08 táiběi fánhuá nà zhǒng [°de:° ]  
**that type to keep him away from the prosperity in Taipei.'**
- 09 FH: --> [suǒyǐ biàn-]  
**'So, (you) became-**
- 10 --> dào yílán zhīhòu zhēnde yǒu guāi ma.  
**after you went to Yilan, did you really become good?'**
- 11 (0.5)
- 12 RG: --> méiyǒu °ye° jiùshì qíshí yě búshì bùguāi,  
**'No, (it's) just, actually I was not bad either,**
- 13 --> jiùshì bǐjiào: (´hh)[gèxìng bǐjiào] (.) chòng yìdiǎn.  
**but it's just I was rather a bit brave and fierce,'**
- 14 NG: [biànběnjiǎli. ]  
**'(Your temper was) further intensified.'**
- 15 RG: --> bǐjiào: pànnì °la.° bǐjiào bù xǐhuān bèi shù°fú° ( )  
**'relatively rebellious, disliked to be constrained ( ).'**

In the “third position” (Schegloff 1992), the guest deals with the “repairable” (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977:363), embedded in the female host’s post-expanded FPP (line #9-10), and launches a repair-completion SPP (-->), prefaced by *méiyǒu* (lines #12-13, #15), in the post-expansion. The key feature of this first type is the hosts’ “unconscious display of misunderstanding,” embedded in their post-expanded FPP (or follow-up questions). The misunderstanding (or an unconscious initiation of repair) triggers the hosts’ post-expanded SPP that clarifies the hosts’ confusion and complete the repair. Characteristic of the second type of repair is the hosts’ “conscious initiation of repair” with an understanding-check-post-expanded FPP, illustrated in the next excerpt.

This excerpt starts with a base SPP by Eric (one of the two ratified guests), who has just taken over the turn from Peter (the other ratified guest and Eric’s roommate), and continues with the topic of his affection for housework, the topic introduced by the male host’s base FPP (not shown below).

Excerpt (15): Washing all clothes

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG<sub>1</sub>: ratified guest #1, Eric;

RG<sub>2</sub>: ratified guest #2, Peter; NG: non-ratified guest

- 01 RG<sub>1</sub>: S zhēnde wǒ juéde shì yì zhǒng tiānxìng.  
**'Really, I think that's a kind of human nature (of myself).**
- 02 <érqiè wǒ hǎo ài xǐ yīfú oh (.)  
**Also, I love to wash clothes very much.**
- 03 (h)wǒ měitiān yíding yào bǎ yīfú zhèyàng xǐ de  
**I have to wash the clothes**
- 04 >gāngānjìngjìng de.< ránhòu diào qǐlái=  
**well everyday, and then hang them up (to make them dry).'**
- 05 MH: -> =>děngyìděng< nǐ xǐ yīfú shì zhǐ xǐ zìjǐ de  
**'wait, (when you said) you wash clothes, (what you mean) is only**
- 06 -> [háishì qítā. ]  
**washing yours or (you wash) the others?'**
- 07 RG<sub>1</sub>: --> [méiyǒu. tōngtōng] xǐ. (. ) [wǒ gēn tāde.]  
**'No, wash all, mine and his (Peter's).'**
- 08 NG: [huhh:: ]
- 09 MH: [Peter de yě ] xǐ ma,  
**'(You) also wash Peter's?'**
- 10 RG<sub>1</sub>: [yìqǐ xǐ.]  
**'(I) wash them together,'**
- 11 NG: [wā sèi::]  
**'Wow!'**
- 12 RG<sub>1</sub>: ránhòu [tōngtōng diào qǐlái. ]  
**'and then hang them all up.'**
- 13 NG: [Peter de nèikù ] yě xǐ oh,  
**'(You) also wash Peter's underwear?'**
- 14 RG<sub>1</sub>: nèiyīkù yě dōu [shì wǒ xǐ ránhòu diào qǐlái, ]  
**'Underwear is all washed by me, and then I hang them up.'**
- 15 RG<sub>2</sub>: [quánbù dōu xǐ tā xǐ ah, ]  
**'All inclusively is washed. He washes.'**
- 16 RG<sub>1</sub>: ránhòu děng tā gān le zhǐhòu ne,  
**'And then after they are (hung) dry,**
- 17 wǒ zài bǎ tā zhé hǎo. (0.5)  
**I will then fold them (Peter's clothes) well,**
- 18 ránhòu zài fàng dào tāde fāngjiān lǐmiàn.  
**and then put them in his room.'**

While Eric is detailing his affection, talking about his daily routine of washing clothes (lines #2-4), the male host, intervening his talk, launches a question (lines #5-6) to clarify his confusion, and to secure the correct understanding of what has just been described in Eric's base SPP. After the repair is initiated in the post-expanded FPP (->), Eric, the ratified guest, utilizes *méiyǒu* to preface his repair-completion SPP (line #7), clarifying the confusion embodied in the host's understanding-check-post-expanded FPP. Whereas in the previous two types, it is primarily the guests who complete the repair, in this third type, the repair is completed by the hosts as the contingently relevant next to the guests' initiation of repair in the base SPP.

Excerpt (16): Neither of them

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest; NG: non-ratified guest

- 01 FH: F suǒyǐ pángbiān- zuǒyòu zhè liǎng ge nánshēng  
 'So these two boys on your two sides,  
 02 nǎ yí ge shì nǐ xǐhuān de.  
 Which one do you like?'  
 03 RG: S dōu búshì(hhhh).  
 'No, neither.'  
 04 NG: dōu búshì  
 'Neither.'  
 05 MH: uh zài jùzhōng búshì gēn tāmen àimèi ma,  
 'Isn't it that you have an ambiguous relationship with them in the drama?'  
 06 NG: méiyǒu.  
 'No.'  
 07 RG: búshì wǒ.  
 'not me.'  
 08 FH: -> méiyǒu wǒ shì shuō zhēnshí shēnghuó.  
 'No, I mean in your real life (which one do you like).'  
 09 RG: --> ↑méi(h)yǒu(H) la(h).  
 'No!'

Initially, the female host asks the (female) ratified guest which one (of the two male guests sitting on the two sides of her) is her type of ideal date (lines #1-2). Her negative response (line #3) triggers the first tier of post-expansion, initiated by the male host (lines #5-7), which subsequently triggers the second tier post-expansion that I am targeting in this excerpt. In this second tier of expansion, the female host, oriented to the negative response in the base SPP (line #3) and the first-tier-post-expansion (lines #5-7), launches another post-expanded FPP (->) that reworks her question in base FPP (line #1) and at the

same time completes the repair (line #8).

Before I move on to the next section, I want to leave some space for two important notions, deriving from my analyses above so far.

The term “repair” in this section includes base “first pair part reworking” (Schegloff 2007:162) (as in excerpt [16]) and “the third/fourth position repair” (Schegloff 1992), initiated by the hosts unconsciously (as in excerpt [14]) and consciously (as in excerpt [15]). Even though they are roughly categorized under the same rubric of action in this paper, the three types of repair are in fact distinctive from one another, in terms of different ways in which their respective “trouble- sources” or “repairables” (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977:363) are sequentially situated in interaction and are oriented to by participants.

So far, I have discussed four types of actions: “justifying,” “negating,” “resuming seriousness,” and “repair.” Syntactically speaking, the post-expanded FFPs (that trigger sneering, follow-up questioning, directing into cheerfulness and initiating repair respectively) look similar to each other: these FFPs are all in the form of interrogatives. However, the conversational actions embodied in these four types of post-expanded FFPs are quite distinctive from one another, in that they reciprocally and subsequently trigger different responsive actions from their recipients. The interrogative that triggers the recipient’s rebuttal and a roar of laughter are deemed as embodying the actions of sneering and directing into cheerfulness; the interrogative that triggers the recipient’s negative response and further clarification are regarded as embodying questioning and initiating repair. From these, it becomes evident that the theoretical framework of *Conversation Analysis* offers an alternative and powerful way of classifying or identifying the type of function or action that a particular linguistic unit (lexical, phrasal and sentential) pragmatically embodies in a real life interaction.

#### **4.2.5 Post-second self-ratifying and floor-retrieving**

The next categories of action, with lower frequencies of occurrence in post-second-position, are self-ratifying and floor-winning-back. In the default pattern of the multi-party interaction in this talk show, the turn allocation system is not strictly constrained to the pattern of one party exclusively asking questions and the other exclusively producing responses. More often than not, the guests (and sometimes even the two hosts) autonomously take over the floor, currently belonging to the ratified guests, and make “on-topic” contributions to the local interaction. The self-allocation (sometimes in a rushed manner) for a turn takes place either at the moment when the prior turn reaches its “transition relevant position” (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974:703), or at the moment when the current turn is still in constructive progress. Excluding the hosts, the guests who are rushing to take over the floor, are obviously the contingently non-ratified

guests. The moment they succeed in winning the floor, making contributions, their status is immediately ratified. Their shift in status is not completed in the turn officially assigned to them by the hosts, but the change is completed in the turn, which they “autonomously” take over from (or sometimes win from) the ratified guests. Turns of this kind can be prefaced with either one of the two negators, and I call this action self-ratifying. In addition, there are also chances when the “floor competition” (either by the co-present non-ratified guests or by the hosts) from the ratified guests fails, or when the ratified guests’ turn-in-progress is unexpectedly overlapped by the non-ratified guests’ or the hosts’ outburst of talk. When situations like these arise, the ratified guest, attempting to uphold the current floor, will re-continue their talk (that was just about to be abandoned), prefaced with the negators. The target turns of this type contingently embodies the current ratified guest’s refusal of the others’ outburst of talk and further helps them shut down any unwelcomed interrupt. To illustrate the two types of actions, two excerpts are presented below.

In the next excerpt, a guessing game is played in interaction. What happens before the excerpted exchanges of talk is a narrative by Ruby, the primarily ratified guest. She describes the particular way in which she got to know a male actor (a co-present guest), with whom she was first familiar (amongst all the other actors) in the drama, promoted in this episode. Her particular skill was to guess the male actor’s birthdate. She claims that, on her first try, she touched upon the right answer. It is this unexpected success that brought them closer. After she finishes this story, the male host asks Ruby (line #1) why she did not try the same strategy to get to know the leading actor, Billy, another co-present guest in this episode.

Excerpt (17): A historical event

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest, Ruby;

NG<sub>1</sub>: non-ratified guest #1, Billy; NG<sub>2</sub>: non-ratified guest #2, Kelly;

NG<sub>3</sub>: non-ratified guest #3, Nancy

- 01 MH:        nà nǐ zěnmé méiyǒu shǐchū cāi shēng rì zhè yì zhāo,  
                 ‘Then why didn’t you use the strategy of guessing (right his) birthday?’
- 02 RG:        tch um::
- 03 FH:        cāi bù chū lái [°shìbúshì° ]  
                 ‘(You) can’t guess right, right?’
- 04 NG<sub>1</sub>:        [nǐ cāi:,        ] >zài cāi.<  
                 ‘Go ahead and have a try.’
- 05 RG:        °nǐ oh.°  
                 ‘About you?’

- 06 NG<sub>1</sub>: wǒ hěn hǎo cāi de.  
**‘It’s easy to guess mine correctly.’**
- 07 FH: èryuè shíqī.  
**‘February seventeenth?’**
- 08 NG<sub>1</sub>: ((shaking head))
- 09 MH: wèi(h)shé(h)me(h) èr(h)yù(h)°shí(h)-qī(h).°  
**‘Why February seventeenth?’**
- 10 RG: yīyuè èrshí qī.  
**‘January twenty-seventh?’**
- 11 NG<sub>1</sub>: um. ((shaking head, meaning “no”))
- 12 RG: sānyuè shíwǔ.  
**‘March fifteenth?’**
- 13 MH: děng(h) yì(h) děng(h) quán(h)bù(h)  
**‘wait, (you guys)**
- 14 yào(h) yì(h)[zhí(h) cāi(h) dào(h)] shí(h)èr(h)yùè(h) sān(h)shí(h)hào(h).  
**want all dates to be named until the date of December thirtieth?’**
- 15 RG: [jiǔyuè shíbā. ]  
**‘September eighteenth?’**
- 16 NG<sub>1</sub>: jiējìn jiējìn.  
**‘(It’s)close, close.’**
- 17 FH: jiǔyuè èrshíwǔ  
**‘September twenty-fifth?’**
- 18 NG<sub>1</sub>: ((shaking head))
- 19 MH: nǐ(h) gēn(h) rén(h) jiā(hh) ( ) ((to the female host))  
**‘What the heck are you ( ) with others?’**
- 20 RG: jiǔyuè [èrshí. ]  
**‘September twentieth?’**
- 21 NG<sub>3</sub>: [jiǔ èr jiǔ ]  
**‘September twenty-ninth?’**
- 22 NG<sub>2</sub>: -> méiyǒu yǒu yí jiàn dà shì. [°(nà yì tiān)° ]  
**‘No, there is a historical event (on that date).’**
- 23 FH: [jiǔ yī sì. ]  
**‘September fourteenth?’**
- 24 RG: [jiǔ èr yī. ]  
**‘September twenty-first’<sup>9</sup>?’**
- 25 NG<sub>1</sub>: [yǒu yí jiàn ] dà shì.  
**‘There is a historical event.’**

<sup>9</sup> There was a devastating earthquake that hit Taiwan on September 21, 1999.

- 26 RG: [jiǔyuè èrshíyī oh? ]  
          **'September twenty-first?!'**
- 27 MH: [wǔ èr-                   ] wǔ èr líng ma.  
          **'May- May twentieth<sup>10</sup>?'**

After the guessing game is initiated (line #4), several runs of turns are launched mostly by Ruby and the female host, who attempt to guess Billy's correct birthday (lines #7-21). During these trial runs, Kelly, a co-present guest, maintains her status as a non-ratified guest. After several attempts (by Ruby and by the female host) fail to touch upon the right date, as the relevant next, Kelly launches a turn, prefacing it with *méiyǒu* (->), offering a hint for those who have been participating in the game. With this negator-prefaced turn (line #22), Kelly's participation status is preliminarily ratified in the turn she self-allocates to herself. Shortly and reciprocally, this self-ratification is legitimized, when Billy incorporates what she said in his next turn (line #25). "Self-ratifying" is what the negator-prefaced turns embody here. In this excerpt, the non-ratified guest succeeds in taking over the floor and making contributions to the local guessing game. Failure to win a turn and to self-ratify their status is also possible. To discuss this failure, the next excerpt is provided.

This excerpt takes place when the two hosts are guessing which group (out of two) of guests hold a clean and neat image both in public and in private (and which group maintains a dirty image in private). At the beginning of this excerpt, the male host is wondering why a guest (Dennis) in the "clean group" is wearing a wrinkled shirt in the show, proposing a question (lines#1-2) to the female host (Cathy). In what comes next, the female launches a responsive turn to express her way of thinking.

Excerpt (18): True!

MH: male host; FH: female host, Cathy; NG: non-ratified guest;  
RG: ratified guest, Dennis

- 01 MH: F yīnwèi nǐ kàn (0.5) Cathy nǐ kàn zhè biān liǎng- sān-  
          **'Because you see, Cathy, you see the two male (guests) on this side,**  
02           liǎng ge nánshēng. Dennis de chènshān yě shì zhòu de a::h?  
          **Dennis' shirt is also wrinkled!'**
- 03 FH: S [kěshì Denn-]  
          **'but Denn-'**
- 04 NG: -> [zhēnde:       ] [::       ]  
          **'True!'**

---

<sup>10</sup> The presidential inaugural ceremony occurs on May 20 in Taiwan.

- 05 FH: --> [méiyǒu] Dennis kàn qǐlái fēicháng ài gānjìng.  
 ‘No, Dennis seems to like to be clean’
- 06 --> nǐ kàn tā liǎn duō bái a:h.  
 You see how white his face is!’

While the female host is constructing her SPP in progress (line #3), a non-ratified guest is also confirming what the male host has just said (lines #1-2), blurting out a turn (line #4) that overlaps the female host’s SPP in progress (->). Stopping the non-ratified guest from continuing, winning back the conversation focus, the female host produces a negator, *méiyǒu*, (->) and then re-starts her turn of talk (lines #5-6). Intervening, declining and continuing take place during the period of the two interjecting talk (lines #4-5). Continuing or “focus switching back” is made possible in the turn almost exclusively in the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turns in post-second position, as statistics indicate. Different from the non-ratified guest in previous excerpts, this guest fails to win the floor to make further contributions. Her outburst is immediately rejected and there is no uptake to her turn (line #4), while the ratified speaker (the female host) is completing her own talk.

Those two actions, embodied in the negator-prefaced turns, are also characteristic of this talk show. Even though the guests’ turns are theoretically assigned by the hosts, more often than not, the non-ratified guests will autonomously self-allocate, take over, or even compete for a turn, so as to self-select themselves as the relevant next speaker or to self-ratify their status of participation. After contrasting the respective frequencies of the two kinds of target turns that embody these two types of actions, I want to make it clear again that *méiyǒu* is still the only selection for the participants to preface the turns and to complete these two actions. What will be the foci in the next section are the lowest frequency actions that are still noteworthy.

#### 4.2.6 Post-second topic-proffering & detailing

Even though their occurrence frequencies are relatively low, these two actions are characterized by features worth discussing. Two excerpts will demonstrate the actions of the hosts’ topic-proffering post-expanded FPP as well as the guests’ detailing post-expanded SPP. The first excerpt is, again, from the episode in which the guest stars’ hygienic habits are the topic. Before the exchanges of talk excerpted, the ratified guest (who is a mother and a wife in her real life, but was grouped as an unhygienic member) is illustrating a picture of the messy closet in her house where clothes are not organized and are piled up high.

Excerpt (19): Cockroaches!

MH: male host; FH: female host; RG: ratified guest; NG<sub>1</sub>: non-ratified guest#1;

NG<sub>2</sub>: non-ratified guest #2; CP: co-present participants

- 01 RG: S ránhòu wǒ pópó shuō  
**'then my mother-in-law says that**
- 02 zhēnde nǐ yào zhěnglǐ nà yì duī.  
**you really need to re-organize that load,**
- 03 nàge wǒ chángcháng kàn [dào zhāngláng] °cóng lǐmiàn° ]  
**(because) I frequently see cockroaches come out from there.'**
- 04 MH: [nǐ shì bǎ yǐnxíngyǎnjìng ná diào yǐhòu ]  
**'After you take off your contact lenses,**
- 05 nǐ jiù kàn bú jiàn le °duìbúduì,°  
**you can't see anything, right?'**
- 06 (0.5)
- 07 RG: jiùshì nà diào=  
**'(It) is just that taking'**
- 08 MH: =zhāngláng fēiláifēiqù  
**'(There are) cockroaches flying around'**
- 09 FH: -> <ei [méiyǒu] kěshì [nǐ zhīdào wǒ xiànzài ]  
**'No, but you know what, now, I'**
- 10 RG: [°duì a::h° ]  
**'Yes.'**
- 11 FH: wǒ chuángtóu yíding huì fàng yì bēi shuǐ  
**'I always put a glass of water on the head of my bed,**
- 12 ránhòu rúguǒ niào wán niào  
**so that if I am done using the toilet at night,**
- 13 wǒ jiùhuì shùnbìan hē yì kǒu. 'hhh  
**I may have a drink in passing.**
- 14 ránhòu nǐ zhīdào wǒ hē nà bēi shuǐ  
**and then you know, when I am drinking that water,**
- 15 wǒ dōu shì mào zhe shēngmìng wéixiǎn zài [he. ]  
**I am putting my life in danger when drinking water.'**
- 16 RG: [hehehehe ]
- 17 FH: yīnwèi wǒ yǒu yíci jiù hē wán zhīhòu ma  
**'because there was one time, after I was done drinking,**
- 18 ránhòu jiù yǐjīng hē le yíban  
**it was half full,**



feature characterizes this type of negator-prefaced turns that are constructed to proffer topics. Statistically, *méiyǒu*, as expected, still outnumbers *búshì* in terms of occurrence frequencies, but when the hosts attempt to preemptively proffer an alternative topic, *búshì* somehow reaches the level of consideration. In contrast, when the action of detailing is contingently necessary in post-second position, *méiyǒu* is exclusively used to preface a turn, with no exception. To address the issue, a final excerpt comes next.

This exchange of talk is excerpted from the episode in which the guests are talking about their childhood experience of chasing after a star. The excerpt starts with a follow-up by the host, oriented to the ratified guest, to clarify whether she was the most “loyal” fan (line #1-2) in her middle school class.

Excerpt (20): How to let all know?

MH: male host; RG: ratified guest

- 01 MH: F    nà (0.2) dāngshí yǐ nǐ zuì fēngkuáng ma,  
                   ‘**Then at that time, were you the craziest one,**  
 02                    >jiùshì< (0.2) [zhuīxīng. ]  
                   **In terms of chasing after stars?’**
- 03 RG: S                                    [duì wǒ- ]  
   ‘**Yes, I-**
- 04                    duì wǒ zài guózhōng de shíhòu shì  
                           ‘**Yes, when I was in middle school, (it) is,**  
 05                    jiùshì quán bān dōu zhīdào  
                           **that is, the whole class all knew**  
 06                    wǒ xǐhuān Jay Zhou de nà yì zhǒng.  
                           **that I liked Jay Zhou, that kind of thing.’**
- 07 MH: ->    <nà (.) yào zěnmeyàng ràng quán bān dōu zhīdào.  
                           ‘**Then what (did you) need to do to let all the class know that?’**
- 08 RG: --> >méiyǒu yīnwèi< (0.2) jiùshì (0.2) pén- tóngxué zhīdào ah.,  
                           ‘**No, because classmates knew that,**  
 09                    --> ránhòu dàjiā dōu huì jiǎng a:h,  
                           **then they circulated the information.**  
 10                    --> ránhòu wǒ yě huì qù- jiù měitīan pīnmìng zài tīng  
                           **then I would also, that is, desperately listen to**  
 11                    --> Jay Zhou de gē ránhòu xiě tāde gēcí nà zhǒng.  
                           **Jay Zhou’s songs, jot down his lyrics, that kind of thing.’**

After the ratified guest confirms the proposition in the male host’s question, the male host once again launches another tier of post-expansion, wondering about the ways in which

her classmates all knew who her idol was (line #7). This follow-up question, framed in the WH-prefaced question fashion (->), triggers an elaborated answer (lines #8-11), in the turn prefaced with *méiyǒu* (-->). As I have just mentioned, under this circumstance, *méiyǒu* is the only choice for the participants to detail answers. Out of the 167 cases of the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turns in total, the action of detailing, regardless of their position, is embodied in 14 cases of the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turns. Disproportionately fewer than the rest of the actions as detailing is, it is absolutely the only action that is exclusively specific to the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turns. In other words, under no circumstances will the participants in the show preface the detailing turns with *búshì*. It is this particularity that makes this action, although of the lowest frequency, thought provoking. Schegloff & Lerner (2009) recently reported ways in which *well*-prefaced responses to WH-prefaced questions in second position “operate as general alerts that indicate nonstraightforwardness in responding” (ibid., p.91) in English conversation. Seemingly aligning with the report are the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turns in Chinese, embodying the action of detailing both in second and in post-second position. Comparative research on the uses of ‘*méiyǒu*’ and ‘*well*’ in future studies will help to settle this issue.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, I adopt an eclectic approach to address the uses of two Mandarin negators to preface turns of talk in an entertainment talk show broadcast in Taiwan. Conversational-analytic approach is primarily taken to examine sequence organizations in conversation from which various actions in interaction are built up (in the negator-prefaced turns) and are oriented to by the co-present participants in the talk show. Through meticulous analyses, I hope that I have made clear the necessity of a closer look at sequence organizations in interaction for future Chinese discourse studies, in which *Conversation Analysis* (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974) is taken as a theoretical approach. In addition to taking care of the target turn’s position in the sequential structure of conversation, I also pay attention to particular lexical choices, under certain circumstances, between the two negators to initiate a particular action in interaction. The respective frequencies of occurrence of the two kinds of target turns help to offer insights into participants’ preference to select one negator over the other to construct a certain action when a contingency arises.

The disproportionately higher frequency of occurrence of *méiyǒu* (than that of *búshì*) and varieties of actions that the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turns embody in interaction deserves further discussion on meaning modifications of *méiyǒu* in real life interaction. Let’s take a one more look at the frequencies of occurrence of actions, particularly embodied in the *méiyǒu*-prefaced turns. In second position, *IP* actions are the only type that will be

constructed. In post-expansion sequences, *IP* actions still regularly appear (64 out of 145), *IM* actions, however, noticeably take over and become dominant (81 out of 145). Namely, once the sequence is post-expanded, the *méiyōu*-prefaced turns are more likely to embody the type of actions that move beyond what Searle (1969) calls “speech acts.” Drawing from these pieces of empirical evidence, I suggest that the original meanings of *méiyōu* are undergoing some changes or modifications, and that *méiyōu* has been in the process of “grammaticalization” (Hopper & Traugott 2003), and (what I propose) “interactionalization” (where the original meaning of a word may seemingly disappear, and its pragmatics and/or conversational function(s) are highly contingent upon or grounded in local interactions). Unlike *méiyōu*, *búshì* has not gone through similar trajectories of meaning modifications. This assumption may help to answer a central question in *Conversation Analysis*, the question of “why that now” (Schegloff & Sacks 1973) out of, say, two negators in Mandarin at conversational participants’ disposal to preface a turn, to construct an interactionally relevant action at a local moment.

As a form of institutional talk, entertainment talk shows are constituted by the interaction between two parties with reciprocal social roles: the host and the guest. In the talk show analyzed in this paper, “interactional asymmetries” (Heritage 1997:175) are revealed when the two parties’ respective turns and tasks in interaction are complementarily assigned. Across all the excerpts illustrated in the previous sections, the hosts are essentially launching FPPs, base or post-expanded turns, that embody, for example, interrogating, sneering, or topic-proffering. The guests, on the other hand, are primarily initiating SPPs so as to construct negating, detailing, justifying, and repairing with the negator-prefaced turns. Even though “displacement” of turn allocation between the two parties may appear once in a while, the host’s initiating role and the guest’s responsive role are observable across these excerpts. In line with the principle of “asymmetries of participation” (Heritage 1997:175), the TV program is constituted as a talk show. Moreover, what distinguish this talk show from, for example, a news interview (Clayman 1988, 1992, Heritage 1985) or a courtroom interaction (Atkinson & Drew 1979) are the hosts’ lack of “neutrality” (Clayman & Heritage 2002:150), and the guests’ public display of “autonomy.”

As these excerpts have illustrated, the hosts in this talk show are not constrained to the interactional right of asking questions. When appropriate occasions arise, they sneer at the guests (excerpts [9], [10]), mock them (excerpt [11]), and disrupt (excerpts [9], [11], [19]) the guests’ multi-unit responses that the guests are theoretically entitled to launch. On the other hand, whereas the guests are constrained to their interactional obligation to respond, they may not simply wait for their turns to be assigned. The non-ratified guests, for example, autonomously compete for the floor (excerpts [17], [18]) and/or further make contribution to the local interaction (excerpt [17]). Endowed with the right to ask,

the hosts are not constrained to exclusively asking. Obligated to respond to the questions, the guests do not merely wait for their turns to be assigned. It is these specific ways of interacting, along with the constant shifts in interactional tones (excerpts [11], [12]), that are “constitutive” (Clayman & Heritage 2002:95) of this talk show as a form of entertainment on TV.

Lastly, in this talk show, topic domains in interaction are sequentially connected to one another. The fact that the negator-prefaced turns occur far more frequently in post-second positions helps to index the good management of topic flows in the local interaction. It is not clear if the hosts’ have decided their question types, numbers, and proposing orders prior to every episode, but from the fact that post-expansions occur highly frequently, I believe that it is the panel of guests that altogether locally and sequentially decide and control discussion domains in a particular episode. The hosts’ authority to continue or to disrupt topical progression is contingent upon the guests’ collaboration. Power asymmetries exist between the two parties regarding interaction in the talk show, but not categorically.

## Appendix: List of transcription conventions

(Schegloff, <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/TranscriptionProject/index.html>, accessed December 10, 2011)

[ ]	overlapping or simultaneous talk
=	latched utterances
(0.5)	length of silence in tenths of second
(.)	micro-pause
.	falling intonation
?	rising intonation
,	continuing intonation
¿	rising intonation stronger than a command but weaker than a question mark
::	the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them (the more colons, the longer the stretching)
-	a cut-off or self-interruption
<u>word</u>	some form of stress or emphasis, wither by increased loudness or higher pitch (the more underlining, the greater the emphasis)
°°	the talk following it was markedly quiet or soft
↑↓	sharper rises and falls in pitch
><	the talk between them is compressed and rushed
<>	a stretch of talk is markedly slowed or drawn out
<	the immediately following talk is “jump-started,” i.e. sounds like it starts with a rush
hhh	aspiration
(hh)	aspiration inside the boundaries of a word
˙hhh	inhalation
(( ))	transcriber’s description of events
( )	uncertainty on the transcriber’s part

## References

- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell, and Paul Drew. 1979. *Order in Court: The Organization of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: Macmillan.
- Biq, Yung-O. 1989. Metalinguistic negation in Mandarin. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 17.1:75-95.
- Clayman, Steven E. 1988. Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems* 35.4:474-492.
- Clayman, Steven E. 1992. Footing in the achievement of neutrality: the case of news-interview discourse. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, ed. by Paul Drew & John Heritage, 163-198. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, Steven E., and John Heritage. 2002. *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. Footing. *Forms of Talk*, 124-159. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Heritage, John. 1985. Analyzing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an "overhearing" audience. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 3: *Discourse and Dialogue*, ed. by Teun A. van Dijk, 95-117. London: Academic Press.
- Heritage, John. 1997. Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analyzing data. *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, ed. by David Silverman, 161-182. London: SAGE.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hsu, Pei-Chia. 2005. *A Discourse-Pragmatic Study of 'Meiyou' and 'Bushi' in Taiwan Mandarin Conversations vs. TV/Radio Interviews*. Taichung: Providence University MA thesis.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1978. Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, ed. by Jim Schenkein, 219-248. New York: Academic Press.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1992. Assisted storytelling: deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology* 15.3:247-271.
- Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplist systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50.4:696-735.

- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1992. Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *The American Journal of Sociology* 97.5:1295-1345.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2001. Getting serious: joke → serious 'no'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33.12:1947-1955.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*, Vol. 1: *A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2011. Transcription module. Online at <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/TranscriptionProject/index.html>. Accessed December 10, 2011.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Gene H. Lerner. 2009. Beginning to respond: well-prefaced responses to wh-questions. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 42.2:91-115.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Harvey Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8.4: 289-327.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53.2:361-382.
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2004. 'No no no' and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research* 30.2:260-293.
- Teng, Shou-Hsin. 1973a. Negation and aspects in Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1.1:14-37.
- Teng, Shou-Hsin. 1973b. Scope of negation. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1.3:475-478.
- Teng, Shou-Hsin. 1975. Negation in Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 2.2:125-140.
- Wang, Yu-Fang. 2008. Beyond negation—the discourse-pragmatic functions of *meiyōu* and *búshì*. *Language Sciences* 30.6:679-713.
- Wang, Yu-Fang, Pi-Hua Tsai, and Meng-Ying Ling. 2007. From informational to emotive use: *meiyōu* ('no') as a discourse marker in Taiwan Mandarin conversation. *Discourse Studies* 9.5:677-701.
- Yeh, Ling-hsia. 1995. Focus, metalinguistics negation and contrastive negation. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 23.2:42-75.
- Yu, Anne Jui-Ying. 2004. *Discourse Functions of Negative Meiyōu in Taiwan Mandarin*. Taipei: National Taiwan Normal University MA thesis.

[Received 4 October 2010; revised 15 February 2011; accepted 29 March 2011]

Hsin-fu Chiu

Asian Languages and Literatures  
Pomona College  
550 N. Harvard Avenue  
Claremont, CA 91711  
USA  
[hsin-fu.chiu@pomona.edu](mailto:hsin-fu.chiu@pomona.edu)

# 「沒有」、「不是」引領之對話言句 所承載之語用與娛樂功能—— 以台灣一訪談性綜藝節目為例

邱新富

波莫納學院

以對話分析 (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974) 以及詞頻統計為方法，以台灣某一知名綜藝節目對話內容為主要探討對象，本文試圖解釋以中文否定詞「沒有」、「不是」為首之對話言句 (conversational turns) 各自該節目流程中，所承載的語用功能。研究分析結果歸納如下。首先，中文否定詞引領之對話言句，基本上以較大比例的情況出現於後啓對話序列 (post-expanded conversational sequences)。其次，相較於「不是言句」在多數情況下的低比例使用，「沒有言句」則廣泛地在該節目中使用。雖說「不是言句」的使用多半趨於相對弱勢，但當該節目的與會來賓企圖針對主持人所追加的言語譏諷、調侃做出回擊時，「不是言句」此時卻也會以強勢之姿出線。

關鍵詞：「沒有」、「不是」為首之對話言句，對話序列與結構，言談與社會機構