

# An Argument Culture and Harmonious Culture: Tactics in Talk Exchanges

Yuka Shigemitsu \*

This is a pilot study for researching the cultural concept that underlies talk exchanges in Japanese and English. If the concept is metaphorically structured, it can be assumed that English verbal behavior is metaphorically structured as the concept of conflict or war and Japanese verbal behavior is metaphorically structured as harmony. In this study, which verbal strategies and speech exchange system support each frame of talk exchanges are in focus. Then, the gross differences between English and Japanese will be demonstrated. The data was taken from political debate shows in English and Japanese. The analysis is mainly done to the opening and ending of arguments and question and answering pattern. In the English program, both opinions and each point of view have a polarized perspectives. On the contrary, in Japanese data, a collision of views is not identified, even if it is existed. The discussion moves by exchanging each participant's idea and does not show conflict overtly. The points for future research are also suggested.

## 1. Introduction

This is a pilot study for researching the cultural concept that underlies talk exchanges in Japanese and English. Deborah Tannen (1998) regards American culture as an argument culture. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) state that the word argument has a lot of war concept as in "He attacked every weak point in my argument. His criticisms were right on target. You disagree? OK, shoot!" On the other hand, generally, Japanese does not seem to be an argument culture. Moreover, Japanese does not seem to have a war concept in argument, even in discussing situation. If the situation is intercultural, as in US-Japan business situation, these differences may induce several problems. This paper first demonstrates the concept of 'talk' in each culture, and then analyzes the TV programs in which people with two conflicts idea talk. Finally, some critical points will be suggested for further research.

## 2. Background

Deborah Tannen (1998) calls American culture as an argument culture.

The best way to discuss an idea is to set up a debate; the best way to cover news is to find spokespeople who express the most extreme, polarized views and present them as "both sides"; the best way to settle disputes is litigation that pits one party against the other; the best way to begin an essay is to attack someone; and the best way to show you're really thinking is to criticize (Tannen, 1998: 3-4).

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) say 'Many of the things we *do* in arguing are partially structured by the concept of wars. Though there is no physical battle, there is a verbal battle, and the structure of an argument—attack, defense, counter attack, etc—reflects this (p.4).' 'The concept is metaphorically structured, the activity is metaphorically structured, and consequently, the language is metaphorically structured.'

Harmony is said to be a key concept to understand the Japanese culture. Harmony is one of the unique characteristics, the keynote, especially in the Japanese interaction. I have been studying the concept of harmony in Japanese culture (Shigemitsu, 2001, 2002).

---

\* Associate Professor, General Education and Research Center, Tokyo Institute of Polytechnics,  
Received, Sept. 9, 2002

There are many types of speech events. Conversation is an informal talk in which people exchange news, feelings and thoughts. Discussion is a talk about something with someone or a group in order to exchange ideas or to decide something. Debating is discussion or argument on a subject that people express different opinions. Argument is a situation in which two or more people disagree, often angrily with some acts of disagreeing or questioning something. Participants give a set of reasons to show that something is true or untrue, right or wrong etc. Thus argument may have some different key among other talk exchange situations. A quarrel, a fight, a disagreement, a dispute, a spat, and a squabble are kinds of argument. If American culture prefers two conflict views in every speech event, from exchanging unimportant everyday matter to a political debate, participants always do arguing to some extent. Therefore, every single speech situation involves argument. 'When you're having an argument with someone, you're usually not trying to understand what the other person is saying, or what in their experience leads them to say it. Instead, you're readying your response: listening for weaknesses in logic to leap on, points you can distort to make the other person look bad and yourself look good. Sometimes you do this because you're angry, but sometimes it's just the temptation to take aim at a point made along the way because it's an easy target (Tannen, 1998: 9).' Therefore, the talk is structured to suit to attain the goal of the argument.

Japanese is said to have a different talk structure from English. Argument is translated as '*ronso*', or '*Giron*'. *Ronso* is exchanging words to follow others his/her ideas, to force others to agree with his or her own opinions. This concept literally translated as '*hanashi au*'. When we refer these words in Japanese, we find the common words '*au*.' They literally means 'fit', 'correspond', 'to shape.' As shown here, the direction of the discussion is to fit each other, compromise, harmonize, but not win and lose. It can be said that non-argument is harmony. In a meeting, Japanese do not have an argument with which people try to disagree with someone in words in an angry way. Participants try to understand what the other person is saying. Participants try to understand what leads them to say it. If participants hear some weaknesses in logic, they try to reconstruct the missing part without asking the speaker. Participants do not distort to make the other participants look bad. They try to save others' faces as they do for themselves. Therefore, talk exchanges may go absolutely different way from the English. It is hypothesized that Japanese verbal behavior is framed in harmonious atmosphere where as verbal behaviors in American culture is framed in conflicting atmosphere. If the concept is metaphorically structured, Japanese verbal behavior is metaphorically structured as the harmonious concept and American verbal behavior is metaphorically structured as the conflict or war. In this pilot study, which verbal strategies and speech exchange system supports each frame of talk exchange is in investigation. The gross difference between English and Japanese will be demonstrated.

### 3. Data

One of the aims of this research is to find out the effective data and analyzing method for investigating such differences in verbal behaviors. In order to investigate the underling concept in talk, the debate and discussion type of TV program are chosen. For this study, *Crossfire* for English data and 'Nichiyo-toron (Sunday debate)' for Japanese data are chosen. Both of them are political live talk shows and can be regarded as a model of each culture's norm.

*Crossfire* is broadcasted on CNN every weekday. As Deborah Tannen (1998:27-28) mentions, 'the ads of *Crossfire* tell Americans that issue can be understood as having two—and only two—diametrically opposed and warring sides, rather than having many sides that reflect complex interacting forces and interests. The two ads end: "Watch what happens" and "Now watch the sparks really fly," sending another

message. The data for analysis is broadcasted on May 3, 2002 in USA. The first topic 'Should Pilots have guns?' is analyzed. The participants are two male hosts in and a guest speaker, a female democratic delegate. Since the program is not broadcasted in Japan and the videotape is not available for the study, the transcript of Crossfire on the CNN website is used for the analysis.

Japanese data was videotaped from a political live talk show called '*Nichiyo-toron* (literally Sunday debate)' which is a one-hour live show without CM interruptions. *Nichiyo-toron* tries to create the arguing setting with the participants having conflicting opinions and different experiences on the issue. As we have few such debating programs, the data was obtained from this show. The data was broadcasted on August 18, 2002. The topic is about the Japanese new school reform started in April, 2002. The participants are Minister of Education (female), a principal of Junior High school who is also the head of Junior high school principal association in Japan (male), a schoolteacher in primary school and a professor of education (male) at Tokyo University. Although title of the program literally translated as a 'debate show,' the tone of the show is an exchanging opinions symposium. There seems to be no win and lose atmosphere.

#### 4. Analyses and Discussion

The TV shows are examined at the level of the sequences of action that comprise it. Clayman and Heritage (2002) suggest multidimensional approach. The data is analyzed from the point of action sequence. The components of analysis are based on action sequences: Openings, Question-Answers, and Terminating. If an argument relates to a conflict, it is very worthy of note which part of the debate, such as opening or ending, or middle, has one the most characteristics in each data. If argument is war, question has an offensive function and answer is a defensive function. Comparing each component will clarify the argument style in English and Japanese.

##### 4.1. Openings

Arguments in the both TV program offer the topic to be discussed in the beginning. In both programs, an announcer who does not appear in the screen start the program.

###### (1) [Crossfire]

1 ANNOUNCER: CROSSFIRE. On the left, James Carville and Paul Begala. On the right, Robert  
2 Novak and Tucker Carlson. Tonight, would you feel safer flying if you knew your pilot had a  
3 gun? The debate over arming commercial airline pilots takes off in Congress.

As in (1), the audiences clearly see that the participants are divided into two opinion groups and they are going to fight against each other by arguing. Participants are introduced by their name. The guest debater is not introduced yet. The topic is audience-directed by asking a yes-no question. A puzzle is posed by raising an initial question. Yes-no questions are answered with yes or no. So there sure are two conflict ideas. Audience may feel getting involved in the talk show. The announcer states the show is debating (line 3).

###### (2) [Nichiyo-toron]

1 ANNOUNCER: Gakko itsuka sei no moto zettai hyouka nado aratana seidoga hajimatte imasu.

2 Toyama Monbu Kagaku Daijin to Gakko Kyoushi, Senmonka ga toron shimasu.

(translation: The new school system, five days a week school system and introduction of absolute evaluation system started. Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Ms. Toyama

and school teachers, an authority (of education) is going to conduct of a debate.)

In Japanese data, the topic is presented in line 1. However, it is not in question form. Therefore, the audience could be puzzled what problem lies in the reform system. Question form may capture the audience's attention more effectively. The four participants are also introduced in the headline, but by their occupation or roles, not by their names.

#### 4.1.2 Introduction and Greetings

After the headline, the hosts in Crossfire introduce the participant and greet. They are responsible for keeping their program.

(3) [Crossfire]

1 PAUL BEGALA, CO-HOST: Good evening. Welcome to CROSSFIRE, coming to you live from the  
 2 George Washington University in beautiful downtown Washington, D. C. Tonight in the  
 3 CROSSFIRE,  
 ((Several lines omitted))  
 4 First, flying the not-so-friendly skies, would you feel safer if pilots were armed? One  
 5 outspoken congressional critic is against having guns in the cockpit. We're going to introduce  
 6 her now. Please welcome, Eleanor Holmes Norton, the Democratic delegate from the District  
 7 of Columbia. Ms. Norton, thank you, welcome back.

In (3), first greeting, 'good evening,' 'welcome' and 'coming to you' is to the audience directed. In line 4, when the topic is introduced again here, the question is also directed to the audience 'Would you feel...?' After the topic and its problem are introduced, the guest debater is introduced. She is an 'outspoken congressional critic' and has opinion against the topic. In line 5, the speaker introduces her to the audience. These are attention-getting tactics. Then in line 6, the greeting to the guest speaker begins and after that her name and her title and some descriptions are introduced. Then greeting with address form and 'thank you' and 'welcome back.' On the contrary, in Japanese data, still the announcer who is not a host and never appears in the program read the guest status and their name. The announcer's (female) utterance starts from line 1 and ends at line 7 which ends with 'desu (sentence ending particle).'

(4) [Nichiyo-toron]

1 ANNOUNCER: Goshusseki wa monbu kagaku daijin, Toyama Atsuko san.  
 2 Toyama Ohayo gozaimasu  
 3 ANNOUNCER: Tokyo Daigaku Kyoju Fujita Hidenori san  
 4 Fujita: Ohayo gozaimasu  
 5 ANNOUNCER Tokyo-to Setagaya-kuritsu Yahata-chugaku kouchou de zen nihon chugaku  
 6 kouchou kai kaichou Hoshi Masao san  
 7 ANNOUNCER Tokyo-to Adachi-kuritsu Hanaho-shugakkou kyoyu Kosano Masaki san desu.  
 8 Kosano Ohayo gozaimasu

(Translation: 1 Those who present are Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Ms. Atsuko Toyama, 2, Good morning, 3, Professor of Tokyo University, Mr. Fujita Hidenori, 4, Good morning, 5-6, A principal of Public Junior High school, in Setagaya, Tokyo and also President of All Japan Junior

High school Principals Association, Mr. Hoshino Masao, 7, A teacher of Hanaho Public Elementary School in Adachi, Tokyo, Mr. Masaki Kosano)

Multiple participants are introduced at this point. The announcer reads their name hierarchically. Each is explicitly presented by their names and titles along with other descriptive items. Each participant who has just introduced inserts the greeting words '*ohayo gozaimasu* (good morning).' The greeting expressions used all participants in the same way. We do not see the audience-directed expressions in (4). Moreover, the audience knows only their names, status and occupation. To some extent, we might know who has which opinion if we know him already and from their status and occupation. However, in the beginning, there stances are not exposed.

#### 4.1.3 Background and Lead-in

Each program offers the background of the topic. During the headline, Nichiyō-toron showed the taped segment and let the audience know how the educational transform has done. Although the video tape is not available for the research, Crossfire does not offer the taped segment before the topic starts.

(5) [Nichiyō-toron]

1 Host : Ohayo gozaimasu. Kono shigatsu kara shouchugakko no atarashii gakushuu shidouyouryou ga  
 2 jissini utsusaremashita. Gakko ga yasumini naru doyoubi o dou katuyousureba  
 3 iinoka, kodomotachino gakuryoku ga teika suru shinpai wa nainoka, saisho no ichigakki ga  
 4 owatte natsuyasumi ni haitta ima kyouiku genba dewa jissai no torikumi o humaete  
 5 mondaiten o mouichido toraenaosoutoiu ugokimo deteorimasu. Sokode kesa wa kono  
 6 kyoikukaikaku no genjo to kadai ni tsuite toyama monbu kagaku daijin to genba no minasan ni  
 7 hanashiatte itadakitaito omoimasu. Mazu sono atarashii gakushu shidouyouryou de nani ga  
 8 kawattanoka chotto osaraiwo shiteokimasuto mazu kyouikunaiyou ga sakugen saremashite  
 9 kouritu no shouchugakko dewa gakko no kanzen itsuka sei ga dounyu sarete doyoubi wa  
 10 maishu yasumi to iukoto ni narimashita. Koushita koto no nerai wa desu ne, gakko kyouiku ni  
 11 yutori o tsukutte sono naka de ma, mizukara ikiru chikara o tsukeyou to iutoiu koto de shigatsu  
 12 kara hajimatta wakedesu keredomo , daijin ne, ichigakki ga owatte maa mada hyouka o  
 13 kudasu no wa hayai to omoimasu ga atarashii gakushu shidouyouryou ma kou neraidoori  
 14 susunndeiru to goranni natteimasuka?

(Translation: 1, Good morning. 2-5, From this April, new national curriculum standard started. Some people try to review the topic based on the opinion of teachers and schools; 'How we should spend no-school Saturday', 'Is there decline in academic ability of students?' 5-7, Today, We would like Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Ms. Toyama, and teachers exchange opinions. 7-10, First, let us begin to review what point is reformed. First, some teaching content was cut. Public elementary school and junior high school has 5 school days a week. There is no school on Saturday. New general education program started. 10-14. The aim of the reform is to give away the tight school schedule and to give children the fortitude to live and the reform started from this April, Minister, now the first term finished and it is to early to evaluate the reform, but what do you observe the reform goes as to fulfill the goal?)

The headline and background has already offered. But in (5), the host restates them again. His utterance begins with the greeting '*ohayo-gozaimasu* (good morning).' Then he retells the background of the topic in line 2-5. After that, he says the aim of the program. In the announcer's monologue in (2), we

should notice that '*toron* (debate, the kanji character to-ron means fight+argument)' is used. However, in (5), more soft word '*hanashiai* (talk exchange, the kanji means talk+fit, correspond) is used. Next, detailed background of the topic offered again for the audience. The line 10-14 is lead-in part. In line 10, he uses the '*ne* (particle which sounds casual and intimate). This footing shift shows that from 10-14, the utterance target changes from the audience to the participants in the program. Address term '*daijin ne* (Minister + ne)' marks that the next turn is going to the Minister. First question which leads to the first turn change is in line 10-14. However, '*do goran ni natte imasuka* (what do you observe...?)' is not a direct question on the topic. English translation sounds a direct question. However, the question is oriented to Minister's feeling.

(6) [Crossfire]

- 1 TUCKER, CO-HOST: Now, Ms. Norton, the majority, the vast majority of commercial airline pilots are
- 2 strongly in favor of carrying guns in the cockpit on commercial airliners. You're against it.
- 3 What do you as a delegate know about operating a commercial airliner that the majority of
- 4 commercial airline pilots don't know?

Immediately after (3), the speaker changes to Tucker. 'Now' functions as the topic shift. Address term is used to challenge the guest speaker. In (3), the theme or thesis is presented 'the vast majority of commercial airline pilots are strongly in favor of carrying guns in the cockpit on commercial airliners. Then the host clarifies that the guest speaker's opinion is against it. So from the beginning two polarized view is shown. In Japanese data, we do not identify such conflicts clearly. They are gradually emerges during the course of the show.

## 4.2 Component of action

### 4.2.1 Doing Questions

Turn-taking constructions of question-and-Answer are typical news-interview interactions Since programs for this study are debating show, this is not a news-interview show. For crossfire, hosts question to the guest speaker. For *Nichiyo-toron*, the chair mainly asks questions to a target-participant.

(7) [Crossfire]

- 1 CARLSON, CO-HOST: Actually, actually, pilot after pilot after pilot has said—the head of the Pilots
- 2 Union has said he's aware that—or air marshals on virtually no flights except the ones that are
- 3 required in and out of Washington. The point is, why not add more security? The pilots are
- 4 already in charge of the airplane, why not give them more authority?

(8) [Crossfire]

- 1 BEGALA, CO-HOST: If a criminal overpowers a prison guard, the criminal has a prison guard, and that
- 2 is all. If a terrorist overpowers a pilot, he has an airplane, he has a weapon of mass destruction.
- 3 And I don't want just a front line of defense. But why not give them the same training we give
- 4 our air marshals? Our - 70 percent of our commercial pilots already have military experience,
- 5 and allow them to be just another air marshal on every flight?

(9) [Crossfire]

- 1 BEGALA, CO-HOST: (( (some lines omitted)) The last line of defense today is an F-16. Vice President

2 Cheney, in his odd exercise of authority outside the chain of command, gave the order on  
 3 September 11, we know now from Mr. Cheney's interview with Tim Russert that he gave the  
 4 order to shoot down civilian airliners. That today is that last line of defense. I guess I'd rather  
 5 move one line up and have the last line be, God forbid we might need the F-16s, why not have  
 6 a pilot who is well trained with a weapon?

(7), (8), (9) are the questions from the hosts. As shown, all questions are 'why not' form. This question require the opponent some logical explanations. The askers fight against the weakness in the opponent theory so they aggressively ask 'why-question' to attack the weak and unpersuasive points. The opponent also uses 'why question' to the opponent. Immediately after (8), (10) follows. (10) is the only one that has question form in a guest speaker's turn.

(10) [Crossfire]

1 NORTON, A Guest: The major reason you shouldn't do it now is at best it is premature, at worst it's  
 2 over the top. I'm on the subcommittee. The committee has asked the Transportation Security  
 3 Administration and the Justice Department to look at this issue and tell us to weigh the harm  
 4 versus the benefit. They haven't come in yet. Why would we want to, excuse me, jump the gun  
 5 and put guns on airplanes before the experts tell us what the cost/benefit is?

#### 4.2.1.2 Question--Asking opinions

Let us see the Japanese data. In line 13-14 in excerpt (5), the chair asks the question. As mentioned above, 'do goran ni natte imasuka (what do you observe...?)' is not a direct question on the topic. English translation sounds a direct question. However, the question is oriented to Minister's feeling as in 'what is your impression?' The chair asks 'goran ni natte imasuka'-form question several times. In the program, we have the following varieties of question form. The most frequent form is 'do-desu ka?' The meaning of this question is very ambiguous. 'Goran-ni natte imasuka?' also has an ambiguous meaning. It can be literally translated 'what do you feel for'. It can be interpreted as 'what do you make of this?' 'How would you describe it?' as well. Therefore, this question require participants' opinions as in (11) and (12).

(11) [Nichiyō-toron]

1 Chair: ((several lines omitted)) Kore wa umaku susunde iru to iu huuni goran ni natte imasuka?  
 (Translation: Is this going well? Do you regard it as going well?)

(12) [Nichiyō toron]

1 Chair: Soko no tokoro o daijin ni ukagatte mimashouka. Yutori no kyōuiku to iukotowo iu ippoude,  
 2 gakyōyokuno koujōmo, yutori no sokonotokoro wa dou nande shouka. Houkou no tenkan toiu  
 3 koto ga atta n desu ka.

(Translation: Let us ask Minister at that point. Whereas we need more spare time in school schedule, we require progress in learning. What do you make of this?)

#### 4.2.1.3 Yes-No question

There are two types of yes-no question. One is asking the truth as in (13) and (14).

(13) [Nichiyō-toron]

- 1 Chair: Hoshi-sensei. Koucho sensei no otachiba kara mite doudesuka? Atarashii shidouyouryou wa
- 2 umaku itte imasuka?

(Translation: Mr. Hoshi, from a principal's point of view, does new education reform system work well?)

(14) [Nichiyō-toron]

- 1 Chair: ((several lines omitted) Kono kyōiku naiyou o kiso kihon ni shibotta to iukotode desu ne, souiu
- 2 kōkaga deteiru no de shou ka.

(Translation: Since the content of teaching material consists of very basic matter. Is it effective?)

In some yes-no-question, the asker shows sympathy and understandings. In (15),

(15) [Nichiyō-toron]

- 1 Chair: zettaihyōka to iuno wa tsukeru hou no sensei no hou ga kurou ga oinode wa naidesuka?

(Translation) Doesn't absolute evaluation give the teachers who fill the report card a difficult time?

#### 4.2.1.3 Why-question

(16) [Nichiyō-toron]

- 1 Chair: ((several lines omitted)) Gakko genba ni yutori ga umareruka to omoimashitara sakihodo no
- 2 ohanashi de wa zenzen sounatte inaito kore wa doushite nandesukane.

(Translation: In school, we thought leeway comes in school schedule. According to a talk before, it does not. Why?)

There is one 'why' question. However, it does not direct to the other participant. Impersonalising, it directs to the content of the question.

We have seen question type in the Japanese data. Many varieties of question styles are found. However, their targets are not the weakness in opponent logic and theory. There should be conflict. However, the conflict does not appear from the words. It is because they ask about the content of the topic that does not belong to any participants.

#### 4.1.2.4 Doing answering.

English data, answers are in strong affirmative form.

(16) following (6) [Crossfire]

- 1 NORTON, the guest: It is true that until the end of time now you can put doomsday scenarios forward
- 2 which will have you, with nuclear bombs on every plane.

(17) following (7), [Crossfire]

- 1 Norton, the guest: The major reason you shouldn't do it now is at best it is premature, at worst it's over the top.



On the contrary, in Japanese data, what point is asked is ambiguous and the answers are given by their own interpretation, the answers are also off-target. Usually, they are their opinions '-*omoimasu* ( I think). As a result, the debate proceed exchanging opinions. Through the program, we may find out some participants have different opinions each other. But they are not explicitly identified. Detailed analysis of answer style requires more spaces, so this will be the future topic of research.

### 4.3 Terminating

Endings themselves become noteworthy incidences. The co-hosts in Crossfire and the chair in the *nichiyo-toron* are interactionally positioned to manage the closing process, since there is limited time in the program. In English-data, conflicts emerged at the beginning and the polarized perspective remains during the course of the program. The two conflicts are never tried to merge. However, in Japanese data, the conflicts, although they are never clearly stressed during the program, are merged, and participants end in understanding each other.

#### (18) [Crossfire]

- 1 BEGALA, a co-host: ((several lines omitted)) That today is the last line of defense. I guess I'd rather  
 2 move one line up and have the last line be, God forbid we might need the F-16s, why not have  
 3 a pilot who is well trained with a weapon? Norton, a guest debater: I'll make a deal with both  
 4 of you guys. If we wait until the people whose job it is to tell was whether or not guns will  
 5 work on airplanes, and they say, look, exactly what you said, more good than harm, considering  
 6 that you might have to shoot down a plane, then I'm very open to listening. The reason I'm  
 7 opening to listen is that they train these pilots, you know, they would be like cops, I don't  
 8 object to cops having guns, I don't object to security guards having guns. But I object to  
 9 putting guns in the hands of pilots before we know what a study would tell us, whether or not  
 10 they work.  
 11 CARLSON: We will take you up on that offer, Eleanor Holmes Norton. Thank you  
 12 very much for joining us. We appreciate it.  
 13 BEGALA: Thank you.

#### (19) [Nichiyo-toron]

- 1 CHAIR:Korekara sono imi de monbu kagaku shou ni chumon to iimasu ka nani o ichiban kitai suru no  
 2 ka hito koto zutu, mazu kochoukai to shite mazu Hoshi-san.  
 3 HOSHI:Ano, shoninzu shido no 20 nin kibo no gakushu shudan ni motozuku shidosha no haken,  
 4 ((several lines omitted)), maedaoshi de susumete itadakereba arigatai,  
 5 CHAIR:Kosano-san,  
 6 KOSANO:Mazu wa gakushu shido youryou de komakani kimeteimasuyone,  
 7 kyouiku no naiyo o kono sidojitai o yahari kento shi naosanakereba ikenainjanai toiu no wa  
 8 watashi wa rikakyouikuno gurupu ni zokusite imasuga, kaku kyokade, taihen yutakana keiken  
 9 no chikuseki ga takusan arundesu yo, monkasho de yaritoriga dekiruyouna shikumi ni  
 10 kaetehoshii toiunoga mazu daiichi desune.  
 11 CHAIR:Fujita san wa doudesu ka,  
 12 FUJITA: Saikin no gutaiteki na kaikakuteian ni tuite wa pojitibu ni toraete imasu ga, honto ni nerai to  
 13 shiteiru mono ga tassei sarerutame no seido tekina tatoeba juken no mondai toka ((omitted))

14 kaette megumareta hito dake ga megumare ta kyouiku o ukeru toiu koto ni natteimasu.

15 CHAIR:Iroiro na chumon ga demashitaga, korekara shidouyouryouwo kenshoushinagara susumete

16 hoshii to iu kotode shouka.

17 MINISTER:Sono tooridesune. ((omitted)) zehi bakku appu o shite itadakitai. Monbukagaku gyousei

18 to shite junan ni taio shite ikitai to kangaete orimasu.

19 Chair: Jikan ga mairimashita. Kesa wa doumo arigato gozaimashita. (Translation: 1-2 Please say one word each what you may have to ask MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology) to do or you may expect to MEXT. The president of principals, Mr. Hoshi, 3 Well, small class size, about 20 students, we appreciate if more instructors are sent earlier than the time you planned. 6. How about you, Mr. Kosano, 6-10, First, review of the curriculum standard has detailed description. The content of teaching, and this education system should be reviewed, and should be corrected if required. I belonged to a science teaching group. Each teaching group has a lot of experiences. First, I would like to ask MEXT to change the system in which teachers and officers can communicate each other. 11, How about you, Fujita-san, 12-14, As for the recent reform for decline for learning academic achievement is regarded as positive matter. The system is still insufficient. For example, entrance exams and so on. Rich and talented people can receive the advantaged education, can't they? 15-16 Participants have various demands. From now on, will the curriculum standard reviewed and practiced? 17-18 That's right. Please give us your backup. I think that MEXT will be ready flexibly to meet any expectations. 19. It's time to finish. Thank you very much.)

## 5. Conclusion

We have compared English and Japanese TV debate programs. In the English program, both opinions and each point of view have polarized perspectives. Each participant pronounces supporting statements that strengthen their assertion. When they find the weak point in the opponent claims, they ask questions about them. Each side does not reach any compromise. Even in the end of the program, they never settled down. They even tell that this argument will continue. On the contrary, in Japanese data, a collision of views is not identified, even if it is existed. The discussion moves by exchanging each participant's idea. During the exchange, conflicts and differences of idea are not overtly uttered. They show their understandings of the other participant's ideas that are different from their own and sometimes sympathize them. In the end of the program, they still exchange ideas and try to understand each other.

As shown, Japanese and English argument have different metaphorical structure. It might be too exaggerate to say that argument is a war in English and that argument could be a dance in Japanese, however, their approach to exchange different opinions are contrasting considerably. The future research should be conducted in the following way in order to find out the system differences in each way of argument. The suggested point of research should include: Role-based identity, first topic (Where does first question comes? Question? Or other.), evaluative assessments, summarizing the gist and upshot, the way of agreeing and disagreeing, responses (expressions of surprise), evasion, attacks on other participants, denying the other participants' statements, at interviewers regularly preface their turns with, thus drawing interviewers into a situation of disagreement. footing, neutralizing the conflicts, and other speech exchange system, such as order of speech, interruptions, control, small responsive acts 'mm-hm', 'really', 'oh' and 'yes.' Also research of action and their accomplishment should be done for generalization.

Tannen says that 'in an argument culture aggressive tactics are valued for their own sake (Tannen, 1998: 22).' She also says that all human relations require us to find ways to get what we want from others

without seeming to dominate them. Allowing others to feel they are doing what you want for a reason less humiliating to them fulfills this need (Tannen, 1998: 23). The argument culture is both a product of and a contributor to this alienation, separating people, disconnecting them from each other and from those who are or might have been their leaders (Tannen, 1998: 25). Japanese harmonious way of argument may contribute to fit this idea.

<References>

Clayman, S. and Heritage, J. (2002). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shigemitsu, Yuka (2001). *Self-presentation in Japanese conversation: Self-assertiveness and Repair*. Academic Report. Vol. 23 Tokyo Institute of Polytechnics.

Shigemitsu, Yuka (2002). *Rethinking of the Harmony: A comparative study of the concept of Harmony in the East and the West*. Academic Report. Vol. 24. Tokyo Institute of Polytechnics.

Tannen, Deborah (1998) *The Argument Culture: Stopping America's War of Words*. NY: Ballantine Books.  
Website <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~compose/faculty/pedagogies/argument.html>