REFUSING REQUESTS IN JAPANESE:
ANALYSIS AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

A Thesis
Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Master of Arts in the
Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By
Mistako Suzuki, M.A.

The Ohio State University
1997

Master’s Examination Committee:
Dr. Charles J. Quinn, Jr., Adviser
Dr. Mari Noda

Approved by

Department of East Asian Languages & Literatures
ABSTRACT

This thesis discusses how Japanese refusals to requests are performed, which factors affect their performance, and how they are related to Japanese language pedagogy.

Very few studies have been done on Japanese refusals as of today. Previous studies of Japanese refusals all conclude that refusals in Japanese are performed indirectly. Moreover, they do not consider the difference of the preceding speech act(s) preceding the refusals. It may not be appropriate to generalize that refusals to requests and refusals to other speech acts, such as invitations, are performed in the same way. In order to understand Japanese refusals in a contextually more nuanced way, this thesis focuses on Japanese refusals to requests.

Sixty nine conversations, which include refusals to requests, were collected from one Japanese movie and twelve Japanese TV dramas to analyze Japanese refusals to requests. The results show that the majority of refusals were performed indirectly, but there were some tokens of refusals which were performed directly as well. Again, it has been suggested in previous studies in Japanese refusals that Japanese refuse indirectly. My feelings suggest that this somewhat stereotypical idea should be reconsidered, because Japanese do refuse directly in certain situations.

The relationships, including power relationships, between speakers, affect how they refuse. If the speakers regard each other as in-group, and their relationship is close, they can be frank and refuse directly. If the speakers are mutually out-group, or if a speaker regards the addressee as out-group, refusals are performed either indirectly or directly, depending on the situation. If the speakers are acquainted with each other and
know that they will deal with the addressee again at some later time, they try to behave politely and tend to use indirect refusals when they refuse. On the other hand, if the speakers are total strangers and they know that they will not deal with each other any more, they may be straightforward and blunt, and refuse directly.

Refusals are considered as a face threatening act (FTA), and they may offend the interlocutor. If refusals are difficult to perform even in one’s native language they may be still more difficult for learners of that language; but only if the learners understand the parameters and consequences --social and otherwise-- of their options in refusing. Without proper instruction in such matters, learners will tend to use strategies which are appropriate and acceptable in their native culture. As a result, they may offend native speakers of Japanese with no intention of doing so. Learners of advanced Japanese in particular are likely to be victims of this problem. When native speakers of Japanese were offended by learners of advanced Japanese, they tended to mistakenly assume that the learners meant to offend them. Since advanced-level learners’ Japanese sounds quite good, with very few errors in grammar, native speakers of Japanese do not usually regard learners’ inappropriate behavior as "mistakes".

In order to prevent such miscommunication, in addition to teaching grammar and vocabulary, Japanese language instruction should consider the importance of teaching the sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of the Japanese language, in ways that are culturally specific. Japanese learning materials should be designed to incorporate these aspects as well. What learners cannot figure out by themselves is when to say what. Instructors of Japanese should model authentic and appropriate behaviors, and provide the learners a variety of different settings in which refusals are likely to occur, in order to let them practice performing speech acts of refusal as much as possible.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Studies of Japanese refusals

Speech act theory, which took off as an area of inquiry mostly following Searle in 1969, influenced studies in pragmatics, and many studies on speech acts have been conducted since then. Research on speech acts also has been applied to studies of interlanguage, and some comparative studies on speech acts between non-native speakers and native speakers have been done. The field of Japanese pragmatics is no exception, and studies of speech acts, such as requests (Yutodo, 1992; Kashizaki, 1992; Murakami, 1993; Kamataai, Kawaguchi & Sakamoto, 1993), apologies (Kandaichi, 1987; Miyake, 1994), invitations (Szatrowski, 1993a, & b), and more have been published. However, very few studies have been done on Japanese refusals.

1.2 Problems in previous studies in Japanese refusals


---

1 Speech act is “the performance of a certain act through words” (Gass, 1995).
First, they all note that Japanese refusals are performed indirectly. Second, they all mention which type of four speech acts, invitation, request, suggestion, and offer, are likely to be followed by a refusal.

These two points are problematic. First, these researchers do not clearly define what they mean by "indirectly". It seems that they use the word "indirectly" because the refusals that they observed do not include straightforward such expressions as Dekimasen 'I can't do that' (lit 'It can't be done'). However, directness and its degrees may be to a considerable extent culture-specific. The studies of Ikoma & Shimura, like Yokoyama's, seems to characterize Japanese refusals as indirect in comparison to the way American people refuse. Directness, however, must first be considered in its own cultural contexts, if we are to understand what it means for the people who live there. It therefore seems necessary to reconsider what "indirectly" refers to before reaching the conclusion that "Japanese refuse indirectly".

Second, even though they mention which speech acts precede each refusal, these studies do not consider differences among the preceding speech acts when they form conclusions concerning how Japanese refusals are performed. One is left with the impression that Japanese people refuse in the same way no matter what speech act precedes refusal. If this is the case, then why identify the preceding speech act at all? In order to understand precisely how Japanese refusals are performed, it may be necessary to study refusals toward each type of preceding speech act. As a step toward such a more detailed understanding of refusing in Japanese, the scope of this thesis has been narrowed down to refusals to requests.

1.3 Relevance to language instruction

Refusing a request is, all things considered, a difficult task. It is a face-threatening act (FTA) because it threatens the initiator's (i.e., the person who makes a request) positive
face, the positive self-image that people have and their need to be respected by other people. When one makes a request and is rebuffed, one loses face. For this reason refusals have to be performed in a manner that will not offend the requester, if the relationship is to continue on a good footing. However, it is seldom immediately obvious what the most suitable way of doing so is, in each situation. And if a speech act is difficult for one to perform in his/her native language, it must be more difficult for people who perform the act as a foreign language. Beebe and Takahashi (1989) suggest that foreign language learners face the risk of offending their interlocutors, as well as miscommunicating when they perform FTA. Learners of Japanese need to learn accepted and effective ways of refusing in Japanese; otherwise, they may use strategies which are inappropriate in their native culture, but which may result in offending native speakers of Japanese --- even though they do not intend to do so.

Native speakers of Japanese are often ready to accept learners' mistakes in pronunciation and grammar. However, when a learner makes a sociolinguistic mistake, that is, when what s/he says seems inappropriate in a particular situation, native speakers may not consider that the misbehavior is caused by the learner's lack of linguistic knowledge or of pragmatic competence in Japanese, but instead may consider it to be due to a problem in the learner's personality. When what the learner says does not clearly appear as a mistake in word choice or structure, native speakers will assume that the learner is rude or ill-mannered. This is perhaps truer for foreign learners with advanced skills.

Native Japanese, like natives in most cultures, will tend to think that if a learner speaks their language fluently and with structural, phonological, and lexical accuracy, that s/he means what s/he says. They usually do not realize that the sociolinguistic rules of speech vary from culture to culture. Therefore, when a learner's linguistic behavior is inappropriate, a native speaker will tend to interpret that behavior in terms of his/her own culture, and concludes that the learner is socially out of line, and intentionally so.
In order to minimize misunderstanding or miscommunication between learners of Japanese and native speakers of Japanese, it is necessary for learners to gain a working knowledge of "face-work" and experience it in interaction with native speakers. Japanese language pedagogy should consider anew the importance of teaching not only grammar and vocabulary of the Japanese language but also its sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic aspects. However, very few Japanese textbooks can be said to respond to this issue, and very little instruction in the classroom or out, is devoted to letting learners learn and practice performing speech acts appropriately in culturally authentic settings. It is unusual for foreign learners of Japanese to become native-like speakers of Japanese, even after many years of study. A more realistic and useful goal is to function effectively in Japanese culture, in other words, to be able to communicate in ways which makes native speakers of Japanese feel understanding and understood---, in a word, comfortable. Instructors of Japanese should take this goal into consideration, and should conduct their classroom instruction in a way which is consistent with this goal. They should provide culturally authentic settings in which a particular speech act is likely to occur, present models, and let learners practice the speech act until they can utilize it in other similar settings as well.

This thesis discusses how Japanese refusal as a request are performed, based on a study of sixty nine cases of request - refusal pairs from more than eighty five hours of Japanese movie and television dramas. In interpreting each of these pairs, it examines what factors influence speakers in deciding how to perform refusals appropriately. The movie and all TV dramas were produced in 1990s. Although the setting of each drama varies, (e.g., family, school, a law court, and so on), all of them can be considered as situation comedies. My data therefore probably lacks variety in terms of genre, and the conversation exchanges in my data did not occur in a "natural setting" in a strict sense because the conversants are directed to perform these conversation. However, these conversants are not biased toward refusals. In other words, none of them were informed
that their conversation was to be used for the study of Japanese refusals. In addition, unlike DCT (discourse completion test), which does not allow subjects to negotiate, all conversations in my data are similar to the conversations which occur in natural settings. Thus, the conversations in my data are good source material to study the Japanese spoken language.

Refusals are difficult to perform, even for native speakers of the language. It must be difficult for learners of that language to perform the speech act without offending the native speakers of the target language. In addition to analyzing and describing Japanese refusals, this thesis also discusses the importance of teaching how to perform speech acts (especially FTAs) in Japanese and how they should be taught in classroom instruction.
2.1 Definition of refusal

The concept of the adjacency pair, proposed by Schegloff and Sacks in 1973, is one of the devices which is used to organize conversation. Adjacency pairs are constituted of a sequence of two utterances by different speakers. These two utterances (i.e., the first turn and the second turn) are adjacent. The first turn comes before the second turn (Schegloff, 1984), but they do not have to be immediately in order. Some utterances are found to co-occur. For example, a question is usually followed by an answer. In this case, the question is the first turn of an adjacency pair, and the answer is the second turn. The speakers can coordinate turn taking, the introduction and changing of topics, and the opening and closing of the conversation because of these adjacency pairs (Clark, 1979).

There are some options for the utterance which appears as the second turn. For example, the second turn to the first turn of a question can be a non-answer as well.

---

1 Zimmerman & Boden (1991) point out that the response to a request, the second pair part may occur after another adjacency pair of question/answer which elicits information about the request. As the following conversation shows, the second turn of an adjacency pair does not have to come right after the first turn.

1A: May I have a bottle of Mich?  
2B: Are you twenty-one?  
3A: No.  
4B: No.  

(Geis, 1995: 191)

In this example, the second turn of an adjacency pair for 1A is not 2B, but 4B. The combinations of the two adjacency pairs are: 1A - 4B (Request - Refusal) and 2B - 3A (Question - Answer).
Refusal is also one of the options which is assigned to be a second turn to the first turn of invitation, request, suggestion, and offer.

Houck and Gass (1995) argue that refusal is "a highly complex speech act" because it often involves extensive negotiations and face-saving maneuvers (49). Refusal is readily recognized by the speakers, and it is against the hearer's (i.e., initiator's) will (Okazaki, 1995). As refusal works unfavorably to the initiator (i.e., the speaker of the first turn), it makes him/her lose face. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), refusal is a face-threatening act (FTA). It threatens an initiator's positive face, the positive self-image that people value and want to be valued by others.

In sum, refusal is a face-threatening act which threatens an initiator's positive face, and it is perceived by the speakers (i.e. both initiator and the responder). It follows an initiator's speech acts such as invitation, request, suggestion and offer, and it works against the initiator's will.

2.2 Direct refusal vs. Indirect refusal

"Japanese avoid direct refusal" or "Japanese refuse indirectly" are the most commonly used expressions to describe the way Japanese people refuse. However, by what criteria do people decide whether a certain type of refusal is direct or indirect? Before moving on to further discussion of Japanese refusals, it is necessary to define what these two types of refusals are.

2.2.1 Direct refusal

According to Searle (1975), direct speech acts are recognized when the speaker says a sentence and it means exactly and literally what s/he says. Therefore, a direct refusal consists expressions which include the performative verbs such as "refuse" or "reject".
However, direct refusal is also realized without the performative verbs as long as it indicates the responder’s inability, unwillingness or distaste.

Clark (1979) points out that direct speech acts have just one meaning or illocutionary force. The speaker aims at producing a certain illocutionary effect on the hearer. The speaker makes the addressee recognize his/her (i.e., the speaker’s) intention of producing the illocutionary effect with his/her (i.e., the addressee’s) knowledge of the lexicon and grammar rules of the language used in the conversation.

If direct expressions are used after some hedges, apologies and/or excuses, (e.g., Ano, sumimasen kedo, tyotto watasi ima isogasii kara, dekinai n desu kedo... ‘Um, I’m sorry, but, I’m busy now, so, I can’t’), the degree of directness decreases, and the refusal on the whole sounds less straightforward. Therefore, for this paper, in addition to expressions which include performative verbs like Okotowari simasu ‘(I) refuse’, or indications of the responder’s inability, unwillingness, or distaste, I suggest that direct refusal is perceived by the speakers when it comes right after the initiator’s utterance.

2.2.2 Indirect refusal

An indirect speech act on the other hand, is realized when a speaker means more than, or something other than, what s/he says. Contrary to direct speech acts, indirect speech acts always have more than one meaning or illocutionary force, which Clark (1979) has represented as M1: literal meaning and M2: indirect meaning, respectively. Certain indirect forms are conventionally used in order to perform certain acts (Blum-Kulka, et al., 1989). In the case of the Japanese refusal, conventionalized expressions, such as tensyo simasu ‘I will take the appropriate steps in this matter’ spoken by politicians, come under this pattern.

Refusers avoid saying “No” directly; therefore, the speakers of a conversation may have to take several turns until the initiator recognizes the refuser’s intention of rejection.
The clear, direct expression of refusal may be used if the initiator does not sense refusal in a conversation. The refusers show their rejection non-verbally as well. For example, Rubin (1983) and Bilems (1998) argue that silence or the lack of response is taken to imply refusal. Davidson (1990) considers silence as pre-rejection (152).  

For this paper, I define indirect refusal as any verbal and/or nonverbal behavior which implies refusal. It should not contain performative verbs like okotowari simasu ‘(I) refuse’ nor straightforward expressions of “No”, unwillingness, or inability, unless these follow indirect expressions which imply refusal.

2.3 Raohaburanakitto’s Study

Raohaburanakitto (1995) studied Japanese expressions of refusals and the way the Japanese refuse based on data he collected. He defines refusal as linguistic behavior by a person who rejects his/her interlocutor’s request, invitation, suggestion or offer. It occurs after a request or an invitation is made to the refuser, and lasts until the conversation ends or until the speakers change the topic of the conversation. He also argues that the main structure of refusals consists of two parts: the first part, which expresses the IMPOSSIBILITY, such as dekinai ‘can not do X’, iya da ‘don’t like/want it’, muri ‘impossible’ and the second part, which expresses the REASON for the refusal. By combining these two, there are four possible types of Japanese refusal. They are:

a. REASON ONLY
b. REASON + IMPOSSIBILITY
c. IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY
d. IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON

3 Although her study focuses on rejections to invitations and offers, I think a number of her points also apply to requests and suggestions.

3 He recorded telephone conversations performed by two native speakers of Japanese. He limited the setting of his data to invitations and requests.
In his data, the refusals which take the type a. are observed the most, and the ones which take the type d. the least. As the first two types (i.e., a. and b.) are observed more than the latter two (i.e., c. and d.) in the data, he concludes that the basic type of Japanese refusals is REASON ONLY and/or REASON + IMPOSSIBILITY. He also points out that the first two types are used with older persons or with somebody of the same age, and the second two types are used with younger person. He suggests that the result of his study implies that Japanese people state the reason first especially when they need to be concerned about the addressee’s feelings.

Another point that Raohaburanakitto made is that the way the Japanese refuse differs according to several factors such as personal relationship, possibility in terms of time and/or ability, and need. If one decides to refuse an invitation or a request even though s/he can handle them in terms of time and ability, in other words, if one simply does not feel like accepting them and decides to refuse without any good reason, s/he tends to use the type of IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY. S/he also asks for more information about the invitation or request in order to find a good reason to refuse, or gradually shows negative attitudes toward the invitation or the request so that the inviter or requester will realize the rejection.

On the other hand, if a refuser has to reject an invitation or a request due to a time conflict or his/her lack of ability even though s/he would like to accept it if s/he could, s/he can clearly state the reason of refusal. His/her manner and attitude of refusal are indubitable because s/he has a good reason to refuse.

Need also affects how a refuser rejects. If a requester asks something which nobody else but the refuser can do, or if the refusal will cause big problems to the initiator (i.e., the person who says the first part of an adjacency pairs, such as an inviter, requester, etc), there is a great need for the responder’s (i.e., the person who answers to the initiator’s utterance, such as a refuser) acceptance, and that makes the responder hard to refuse.
Conversely, if a refusal will not cause any trouble to the initiator, in other words, there is not much need for the responder to accept, the responder finds it is easier to state his/her refusal clearly.

Raohaburanakiso does not discuss the indirectness of Japanese refusals much. He does not indicate whether these four types of refusal should be considered indirect refusals or direct refusals. It seems that the type of REASON ONLY seems to be an indirect refusal while the one of IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY appears to be a direct refusal; however, he does not touch on that issue at all. What type of refusals are regarded as "direct refusal" or "indirect refusal" respectively?

2.4 Strategies of Japanese refusal: summary

Based on the previous studies of Japanese refusals, the following strategies are observed in Japanese refusals. As none of them include the statement of "No", it is appropriate to regard them as indirect refusals.

2.4.1 Using incomplete sentences

The Japanese tend to avoid making a direct refusal by making frequent use of incomplete sentences (Tatematsu, 1989; Kashizaki, 1993; Okazaki, 1995). Japanese conversation is characterized by hearer-based interaction. The speaker does not complete a sentence but leaves it open-ended so that the addressee will take it over before the speaker expresses his/her will or opinion (Lebra, 1976; Rose, 1992). Similarly, the addressee will sometimes understand the speaker's unspoken intention albeit without finishing the sentence for the speaker. By doing this, the speaker shows his/her politeness and respect to the addressee (Kobayashi, 1994). It also softens the tone of refusal (Okazaki, 1995).
2.4.2 Proposing alternatives

After both speakers have recognized that the request or invitation will not be accomplished, they often think of some alternatives. For example, if A requested that B lend him/her notes to a class, B may refuse by saying Anoi, watasi mo sono hi wa zangyou ni denakatta no. C-san ni kite mitara? ‘Well, I didn’t go to the class, either, that day. Why don’t you ask C (if s/he can?)’ Here, A is presenting to B different request, as an option to asking C (Okazaki, 1995).

2.4.3 Expressions of apology

According to Olshain & Cohen (1983), apology is performed when there is a certain behavior which has violated social norms. For example, when one offends somebody, one needs to apologize. Bergman & Kasper (1993) point out that “the more severe an offense, the more it warrants apology” (91).

Olshain & Cohen also add that an apology needs an action or an utterance which is intended to “set things right” (20). Likewise, Kobayashi (1990, 1994) mentions that the Japanese judgment takes the feeling of the other and that they tend to consider the feelings of other people and take an apologetic strategy to settle the problem.

Apologetic expressions are closely related to the concept of indebtedness. When one owes somebody something, s/he usually feels that s/he must return it. This feeling is referred to as indebtedness (This word is translated as kow in Japanese). One feels indebtedness when s/he gains something because of the addressee’s goodwill or burden, or when s/he puts the addressee at a disadvantage because of his/her fault. In both cases, one feels that s/he wants to, or has to return the indebtedness (Miyake, 1994), and his/her feelings are shown by apologetic expressions such as Gomen ne? ‘Sorry’, Sumimasen ‘I’m sorry’.
2.4.4 Asking for more information

Houck and Gass (1995) point out that a request for information may serve as an indirect means to avoid refusal. By asking for more information about a request (or an invitation, etc.), the responder has some time to check how important the request is to the requester, and to think about a good reason to refuse the request (Rhohaburakitto, 1995).

2.4.5 Gradual revelation of negative attitude

Rhohaburakitto also mentions that a responder shows his/her negative attitude. By doing so with an utterance that sounds like a reason to refuse, the responder tries to get the addressee to sense or judge the refusal.

2.4.6 Expressing empathy with the requester

The speakers (both the initiator and the responder) tend to find expressions which do not hurt the others' feelings or which avoid conflict with their addressee (Tatematsu, 1989). In the case of a request, for example, after s/he requests something, the requester often mentions something which will reduce the requestee's anxiety (Murakami, 1993). By using expressions such as *Isogasikattara, muri ni to wa iwami kedo...* 'If you are busy, I won’t force you to do it', they show their concern toward the addressee (Pon, 1996).

2.5 Classification of refusals

Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990: 72-73) classify refusals as follows:

I. Direct

A. **Performative** (e.g., I refuse.)

(continued)

Table 1. Classification of refusal (Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz, 1990)
Table 1. (continued)

B. Non-performative statement
   1. “No”
   2. Negative willingness/ability
      (e.g., I can’t; I won’t; I don’t think so.)

II. Indirect

A. Statement of regret
   (e.g., I’m sorry...; I feel terrible...)
B. Wish
   (e.g., I wish I could help you...)
C. Excuse, reason, explanation
   (e.g., My children will be home that night; I have a headache...)
D. Statement of alternative
   1. I can do X instead of Y
      (e.g., I’d rather...; I’d prefer...)
   2. Why don’t you do X instead of Y
      (e.g., Why don’t you ask someone else?)
E. Set condition for future or past acceptance
   (e.g., If you had asked me earlier, I would have...)
F. Promise for future acceptance
   (e.g., I’ll do it next time; I promise I’ll...; Next time I’ll...; -using “will” of
      promise or “promise”)
G. Statement of principle
   (e.g., I never do business with friends.)
H. Statement of philosophy
   (e.g., One can’t be too careful.)
I. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor
   1. threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester
      e.g., I won’t be any fun tonight. (to refuse an invitation)
   2. guilt trip
      e.g., (waitress to customers who want to sit a while)
      I can’t make a living off people who just order coffee.
   3. criticize the request/ requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or
      opinion): insult/attack.
      e.g., Who do you think you are?; That’s a terrible idea.
   4. request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the
      request.
   5. let interlocutor off the hook
      e.g., Don’t worry about it; That’s okay.; You don’t have to.
   6. self defense
      e.g., I’m trying my best.; I’m doing all I can do.
J. Acceptance which functions as a refusal
   1. unspecific or indefinite reply
   2. lack of enthusiasm
K. Avoidance
   1. nonverbal
      a. silence, b. hesitation, c. do nothing, d. physical departure
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Table 1. (continued)

2. verbal
   a. topic switch
   b. joke
   c. repetition of part of request, etc.
      e.g., Tomorrow?
   d. postponement
      e.g., I’ll think about it.
   e. hedging
      e.g., Gee, I don’t know.; I’m not sure.

Adjuncts to refusals
1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement
   e.g., That’s a good idea...; I’d love to...
2. Statement of empathy
   e.g., I realize you are in a difficult situation.
3. Pause fillers
   e.g., uhh; well; oh; uhh.

The types of refusals written in bold-faced type above were also observed in the experiments conducted by Raohaburanakitto (1995), Ikoma and Shimura (1993)⁴, and by Yokoyama (1993)⁵. Both Ikoma & Shimura and Yokoyama add “Gratitude” (as a refusal to an invitation or an offer) under Adjuncts to refusals, and they remark that the statement of alternative is used only when a refuser rejects a request. Yokoyama also adds “Embarrassment”, such as Komatta wa ‘I’m embarrassed, I’m in trouble’, under indirect refusals and “Ask for details” under Adjuncts to refusals.

The Japanese do refuse directly, as shown by the fact that elements under the direct refusal are (written in bold-faced type above). However, Japanese also use expressions

⁴ Ikoma and Shimura asked 10 native speakers of Japanese, 10 native speakers of English, and 10 advanced learners of Japanese to do a DCT (Discourse Completion Test). They provided several settings which required the responder’s refusal, and ask the subjects to write down how they would answer in such situations.

⁵ Yokoyama asked 40 middle-aged native speakers of Japanese (20 of them can speak English, and the remaining 20 people cannot speak any foreign language) to do two role-plays (refusing an invitation to a party and refusing a request to do the typing for the requester) twice: once with a native speaker of Japanese and the second with a native speaker of English who has good command of Japanese. The subjects talked with an interlocutor (i.e., the data-collector) of the same sex. All conversations were recorded in the tapes.
which themselves are not quite, but indicate, refusals. Although it depends on the situation, as the popular wisdom “Japanese refuse indirectly” suggests, Japanese use indirect refusal probably more often than direct refusal. They avoid using direct expressions of refusal by stating something which implies refusal, or by giving an ambiguous response. In those cases, how do they know whether the response is a refusal, even though it does not include a clear expression of refusal?

2.6 Hearer’s recognition of indirect refusals

Indirect refusals are clearly recognized by initiators (requesters). Now, the question is, how is this possible? In the conversation shown below, how does speaker A recognize speaker B’s utterance as a refusal, even though what s/he hears and understands can mean something different?

e.g. A male store manager (A) is asking a female part-time student worker (B).

A (male): Moku yoobi no yoru mo dete kurenai ka naa?
"Can you also come (to work) on Thursday night, please?"

B (female): Aaaz: Kin-yoobi ni tesuto ga aru n desu yo nee:..."
"Um, I have a test on Friday [is the situation], you see..."

According to Searle (1975), in a conversational exchange such as this one, the primary illocutionary act is performed in speaker B’s utterance, and it functions as a rejection of speaker A’s request. Speaker B performs a primary illocutionary act by performing the secondary illocutionary act of making a statement that she has a test on Friday. She performs the secondary illocutionary act by uttering a sentence which has a literal meaning that constitutes a performance of that illocutionary act. Therefore, the secondary illocutionary act is literal while the primary illocutionary act is non-literal.

How does speaker A understand the nonliteral primary illocutionary act from hearing the literal secondary illocutionary act? According to the Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975), the speakers need to make their remarks relevant to the
purpose(s) or direction of the conversation. Speaker A assumes that speaker B is cooperating in the conversation, thus her response is supposed to be relevant (i.e., it must be one of acceptance, rejection, further discussion, etc.). If speaker B’s literal utterance is not quite relevant, speaker A begins to assume that speaker B’s primary illocutionary point must be different from her literal one.

Goodwin & Duranti (1992) and Searle (1992) point out that background knowledge is necessary for comprehending individual speech acts. According to Searle, background knowledge consists of “sets of preintentional capacities that enable all meaning and understanding to take place” (145). After the speaker A understands the indirect illocutionary act of speaker B, with the help of some factual background information, he realizes that speaker B must study for the test on Thursday night, and that she cannot both work and study in one evening because each takes a large amount of time.

According to speech act theory, speech acts are subject to four types of felicity conditions including a propositional content condition and preparatory conditions. The formulations of these two conditions on requests for action (A) are represented as follows. H is the hearer and S is the speaker.

Propositional content condition: Future act A of H.
Preparatory conditions: H is able to do A
S believes H is able to do A.
It is not obvious to both S and H that H will do A in the normal course of events of his own accord.

(Geis, 1995: 58-59)

---

6 The other two conditions are: a sincerity condition (i.e., S wants H to do A), and an essential condition (i.e., Counts as an attempt to get H to do A). (Geis, 1995).

7 This is a portion of the structure of speech act which was proposed by Searle in 1969. Geis (1995) argues that Searle’s view on this should be revised, and proposes his Dynamic Speech Act Theory (DSAT). According to DSAT, the interaction structure is represented with different terms such as transactional effects (normally equal to Searle’s essential condition), interactional effect (constitutes the face-threats in relation to the act), and an initial-state condition (similar to Searle’s sincerity condition. It shows from where the requested act is launched).
A preparatory condition on the acceptance of a request is the ability to perform the act which is predicated in the propositional content condition. Therefore, speaker A realizes that what speaker B has said results in a non-acceptance of the request, and that the primary illocutionary point of speaker B is probably to refuse the request.

Wilson and Sperber (1986), Wilson (1991) also discuss how the hearer comprehends the speaker’s illocutionary force. They propose the principle of relevance, and according to this theory, the speaker intends to make his/her utterance as relevant as possible in these particular circumstances. As the hearer also wants to establish the relevance of an utterance, s/he will seek a context which produces contextual implication, that is, the implied conclusion of the speaker’s utterance.

The following is a duplication of the conversational exchange which was presented above.

A (male): *Moku yoobi no yoru no dore kurenai ka nna?* 
‘Can you also come (to work) on Thursday night, please?’

B (female): *Aaasi:. Kin yoobi ni tesuto ga aru n desu yo see:.:* 
‘Um, I have a test on Friday [in the situation], you see...’

The implicated conclusion of B’s utterance is:

1. B cannot work on Thursday night.
   in a context which contains the following:
   2. B has a test on Friday.
   
Speaker B believes his/her utterance is relevant because s/he expects it to be interpreted in a context which includes the items in number 2 above as assumptions*, and yields the item in number 1 as a contextual implication. Hearer A expects speaker B to be observing the principle of relevance: therefore, in order to comprehend speaker B’s

*Wilson and Sperber refer to this assumption as the “implicated assumption”.
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illocutionary force, he supplies specific contextual assumptions and obtains a specific contextual implication.

Figure 1. A flow chart on the hearer’s comprehension of addressee’s illocutionary force.
CHAPTER 3

MY STUDY

3.1 Focus on refusals to a request

Most previous studies on Japanese refusals mention that refusals follow an invitation, a request, an offer or a suggestion. Therefore, these studies are designed to allow the subjects to respond to each different speech act.\(^1\) They provide some situated examples of invitations, requests, offers and suggestions, and ask the subjects how they would refuse in these situations. However, although they provide the above four different types of settings, they simply gather the data from what they found in their experiment and form conclusions based upon what the Japanese refusals are. In other words, they do not seem to pay much attention to the difference among the type of speech acts which proceed refusals. This gives the impression that the studies believe the Japanese refuse in the same way no matter which speech acts proceed refusals.

However, as a native speaker of Japanese, I think intuitively that refusals to an invitation and to a request are not quite the same. According to the Dynamic Speech Act Theory proposed by Geis (1995), making a request is a face-threatening act (FTA) because it threatens the responders' negative face, i.e., the face-need which does not want the responders' freedom of action restricted. Therefore, the person responding do not express

\(^1\) Some studies provided just two situations (i.e., refusals to an invitation and to a request), and asked the subjects how they would respond in each situation.

20
thanks for asking the person requesting to do the requested task. In the case of invitation, on the other hand, the inviter pays respect to the invitee’s positive face, i.e., a face-need which wants to be valued and to have what they value be valued. Therefore, the responder expresses thanks for inviting them regardless of whether they accept it or not. This argument implies that the way people refuse a request and an invitation are not identical. Therefore, I will limit the focus of my study to refusals of requests.

3.2 Research method

For this type of analysis, there are several ways to collect data such as the DCT (i.e., Discourse Completion Test) and role-play. The DCT seems to be used frequently. The subjects are asked to write down what they would say or how they would respond in a particular situation which is written out for them. The DCT can collect a large amount of data quickly, and it is a good way to detect which semantic formulas are commonly used in the performance of a speech act (Beebe and Cumming, 1995).

However, there are some drawbacks to the DCT. Beebe and Cumming (1995) argue that the DCT biases the subjects to pack the whole refusal into the first turn, and to summarize their answers rather than elaborate them; therefore, neither hedges nor negotiations are observed. They also point out that because of its nature as a hypothetical exercise, the DCT does not show the “psycho-social” dynamics of an interaction between members of a group.” (77).

Houck and Gass (1995) point out that refusals are extremely complex speech acts because they may involve long negotiations, hedging, verbal avoidance, and so on. They assert that the richness of naturally occurring refusals cannot be adequately obtained with a formalized structure such as the DCT because the opening statement and a follow-up statement are already provided for the subjects in DCT. Therefore, the subjects are not
allowed to exhibit some strategies, such as request for repetition and request for additional information, which are found in naturalistic data.

Role-play is different from the DCT in terms of the mode of data provision. The subjects are asked to respond orally. There are two types of role-play. In a closed role-play, the subjects are given a situation and are asked how they would respond. Therefore, the subjects are not quite allowed to provide a free range of answers. In open role-plays, the subjects are allowed to engage in longer interaction with their interlocutor. However, the researchers set up situations in which a particular speech act is likely to occur; therefore, the subjects’ responses may be biased.

Ethnographic data collection is probably the best method of gathering the unbiased data because the data is collected in a naturally occurring situation. However, this method is more difficult than the DCT, and it takes a tremendous amount of time to get data which is necessary for research. The researcher cannot control the subjects’ speech nor can he predict when the desired speech act will occur.

Since my study is about how the Japanese convey their intention of refusal with words, I decided to look into some oral data rather than the written answers for the DCT, the answers of which usually do not include much elaboration. The DCT does not allow the subjects to negotiate or ask for more information or repetition, all of which are likely to occur in a real conversation. However, due to the difficulty of getting native Japanese people for the data gathering, for the purpose of this study, I will use data collected from Japanese TV dramas. Although the conversations in the TV dramas did not occur "naturally" in the strict sense of the word (i.e., the speakers (or actors) were directed to perform a particular speech act), they represent authentic spoken language.
3.3 Purpose of the study

The main purpose of my study is to figure out how the Japanese refuse a request. Raohaburanakito (1995) proposes that there are four types of refusals in Japanese, which are: REASON, REASON + STATEMENT OF IMPOSSIBILITY, STATEMENT OF IMPOSSIBILITY, and STATEMENT OF IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON. Also, the previous studies on Japanese refusals, which I mentioned in Chapter 2, discuss some strategies that are observed in Japanese refusals. I would like to see if these four types and strategies of refusals are observed in the data I collected. I would also like to see if there are some types or strategies which are not realized in the data, or which are realized in the data yet have not been mentioned in the previous studies in Japanese refusals. I will also examine in what situation each type and strategy of refusals is likely to be used.

In addition to finding out how Japanese refusals are performed, I would also like to see what factors affect the way people refuse. Gass (1995) states that factors such as gender, interpersonal relationships, age, status and degree of imposition are important to understand how people respond to favor-asking. I will examine all examples of refusals in my data from the perspectives of personal relationship, age, gender of the speakers and the content of the request to determine what factor(s) influence how people perform a speech act of refusal.
CHAPTER 4

TYPES AND STRATEGIES OF JAPANESE REFUSALS
IN THE DATA SAMPLE

4.1 Introduction

Several strategies of refusals have been discussed in the literature of Japanese refusals, and Raohaburanakitto (1995) proposed that there are four types of Japanese refusals. The purpose of my study is to examine whether these apply to the conversations in my data, and to find if there are any other types and/or strategies of refusals to requests, or if there are any which are not actually used in the data.

Raohaburanakitto’s study discusses how and in what order Japanese refusals are done. He points out that there are two elements, reason and impossibility, and that these lead to four different kinds of types of Japanese refusals.

On the other hand, the literature often refers to a strategy as a plan executed in order to conduct a refusal. There are several strategies, but a refuser does not have to use all of them to refuse. S/he needs to decide which ones to choose and how to arrange them to refuse effectively in the current situation. We can identify a strategy in each of Raohaburanakitto’s four types of refusals. For my study, I will define strategy as a plan to enact a refusal, and type as the form in which each strategy is arranged to form a refusal. In other words, strategies produce a form, or type.
4.2 Data description

4.2.1 Data source

All data was collected from one contemporary Japanese movie and twelve contemporary Japanese TV dramas.\(^1\) Fifty four settings, in which speech acts of refusals to requests were recognized, were selected to examine strategies and types of Japanese refusals. In some settings, instead of responding to a request, a refuser responds by making another request to a requester, such as the following:

\[ \text{e.g. (1) } \]

\[ \begin{align*}
1A: & \quad \text{Ohkitori kudasai.} \\
& \quad \text{‘Please leave.’} \\
2B: & \quad \text{Matte kudasai!} \\
& \quad \text{‘Please wait!’} \\
[\ldots] & \quad \text{Watasi ni nani ka, oteudai sasete hosii n desu.} \\
& \quad \text{‘I would like you to let me do something to help you.’}
\end{align*} \]

\(^{1}\) The analysis of the movie and the dramas are presented in Appendix A.

I analyzed such cases as including two different requests (in this example, A’s request of leaving and B’s request of helping A) in one setting, and I count them both individually. As a result, there are sixty nine samples of refusals to requests available for the analysis.

4.2.2 Types of conversation samples

Of all fifty four settings, only two of them are telephone conversations; the rest of the samples are face-to-face conversations. Since the data were taken from several different dramas, there is some variety in personal relationship among the participants in the conversations, as shown below.

\(^{2}\) This symbol shows that a part of the utterances are omitted.

\(^{3}\) This symbol shows that a part of the utterances are omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal relationship of the participants</th>
<th>Number of samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintances(^3)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business partners</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues(^4)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangers (^5)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor - student(^6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher - parent(^6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour conductor - customer(^6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Relationships between requester and refuser in the data.

The way Japanese people talk is said to be greatly influenced by personal relationships, especially in the parameters of relative social rank and that of in-group and out-group. The in-group is called achi in Japanese, and according to the literature, is generally referred to as people who have a close relationship to the speaker (Nakane, 1967; Miyake, 1994; Ueda, 1996), and/or people who belong to the same group or organization and see each other almost every day (Ueda, 1996). Within that group, people are frank with each other so that no reserve (enryō in Japanese) is observed among them. Therefore, family members, friends, and lovers belong to this category. On the other hand, the out-group is called soto in Japanese, and it is generally referred to as people

\(^3\) If both participants of the conversation know each other, yet still use language which creates some distance between them, I categorize their relationship as "acquaintance".

\(^4\) If both participants of the conversation work for the same company, I categorize them as "colleagues," and differentiate them from "business acquaintance," a relationship in which the participants of a conversation belong to different companies.

\(^5\) If both speakers in a conversation are meeting each other for the first time, I categorize their relationship as "strangers".

\(^6\) I didn’t include these three samples in "acquaintance", because Japanese people tend to pay special respect toward teachers and customers, whereas in the relationship of "acquaintance" there is little difference among speakers in terms of rank, choice of language, etc.
whom the speaker is acquainted with, yet their relationship is not as close as that of people in the in-group (Miyake, 1994). This group can be labeled as *seken* (society or the public) where reserve is required to some extent to maintain a good relationship (Ueda, 1996). Therefore, acquaintances, business partners and/or customers and so on are included in this category.

However, as Wetzel (1994), Bachnik (1994) and others have pointed out, the boundary of the in-group and out-group is not firmly set. It moves according to the situation. For example, a group of people who work for Company A usually regard one another as in-group members, especially when they are with people from Company B. A staff employee of Company A uses humble expressions to refer to his/her boss to people from Company B. Therefore, the boundary of the in-group and out-group is drawn between Company A and Company B. However, once people of Company B leave, the employee switches his speech style to honorific polite form when s/he is speaking to, or about, his/her boss. In this situation, the boundary is drawn based on the difference of social status between staff members and executives. Therefore, as the diagrams in the next page show, the boundary of the in-group and out-group shifts depending on the situation.

Jordon and Noda (1988) and Wetzel (1994) also proposed that *achi* is the deictic anchor point to identify the speaker’s ego. The *achi* shifts, that is, expands and contracts, the smallest unit being the speaker. Furthermore, *achi* and *soto* are distinguished by differences of speech style. Honorific polite forms are usually used by the speaker when s/he addresses and is referring to someone who is out-group (*soto*). Humble polite forms should be used when the speaker addresses someone who is *soto*, referring to someone who is in-group (*achi*).
Figure 2. A floating boundary between in-group and out-group (from the staff’s shifting viewpoint).
For my study, I will take Wetzel’s definition of *achı*, and will categorize the conversation samples in my data accordingly.

If the samples are divided into two, in terms of in-group and out-group, they will be as follows. In each case, the referent is also the addressee. As mentioned above, in order to include and exclude other people, *achı* expands and contracts. The following categorization represents my interpretation of each encounter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addresser is: in-group (<em>achı</em>) to speaker:</th>
<th>is out-group (<em>soto</em>) to speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleague7 2</td>
<td>Acquaintance 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 8</td>
<td>Business Partner 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend 7</td>
<td>Colleague7 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover 14</td>
<td>Prof. - student 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stranger 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher - parent 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tour C - customer 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 31 38

Table 3. Distribution of data according to group identification

Although the number of encounters where the addressee is out-group to the speaker slightly exceed those where the addressee is in-group, the variety of the collected data is almost evenly balanced.

---

7 Although "colleagues" work for the same company, in other words, they belong to the same organization, if there is a difference in the participants’ choice of language use, I distributed this conversation sample to the out-group.
4.3 Four types\(^8\) of Japanese refusals (after Raohaburanakitto, 1995)

As mentioned in Chapter Two, according to Raohaburanakitto (1995), there are four possible types of Japanese refusal: 1) STATEMENT OF REASON ONLY; 2) STATEMENT OF REASON + IMPOSSIBILITY; 3) STATEMENT OF IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY; and 4) STATEMENT OF IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON. Since his data consists of refusals in response to various types of speech acts (such as to an invitation or to a request), it is not quite clear that Japanese refusals to requests always take one, some, or all of the four types. In order to examine this, all sixty nine samples gathered for the present study were sorted out by the type. The result is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Imp + Reason</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76(^9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-group</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(achtu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-group</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(soto)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The refusal types observed in the data

As shown in Table 4, some of the data contained refusal types which do not belong to any of the four types proposed by Raohaburanakitto. Although Reason is used the most, especially by speakers who are from different out-groups, refusal types other than the four identified by Raohaburanakitto are used more by the speakers who are in the same

---

\(^8\) In his paper, he used a term "structure" instead of "type"; however, what he is describing is actually a "move" with a content (i.e., "state a reason"), and the structure of the "move". There is nothing purely structural about this; therefore, for this paper, I will use a term "type" instead.

\(^9\) Imp refers to imposibility.

\(^10\) Some conversation samples have two or more types in one setting; therefore, the total number is seventy six, instead of sixty seven.
in-group. Next to REASON, the OTHER category accounts for most of the conversations between speakers who are from different out-groups. This result suggests that Japanese refusals to requests do not necessarily follow the four types, and that there may be more than four types in Japanese refusals to requests.

In addition, the results show that stating impossibility only (i.e., the type of Imp only) is either the second or third most frequently-used type in each relation type. However, stating impossibility only, as in Dono 'No', Dekinai 'I can't' is often regarded as a direct refusal, especially when these expressions are used right after the request is made. Therefore, the data does not completely support the typical argument that Japanese refusals are conducted indirectly.

4.4 Other types of Japanese refusals to a request

In addition to the Rodeburransakito's four types of refusal, the following types were observed in the collected data.

4.4.1 Diversionary responses

4.4.1.1 Ignore

Instead of responding to a request, a refuser sometimes starts doing something irrelevant to the matter being discussed. In other words, s/he ignores the request which is being made to him/her. The data include several ways in which a requestee shows his/her inattentive attitude.

a. Silence.10

A refuser does not say anything to the request and remains silent to show that s/he cannot or will not do the favor for the requester. While doing this, the refuser tends to look

---

10 There are seven samples of this type. (Data: #1, 2, 7, 20, 25, 38, 42.)
down or turn his/her back to the requester so that s/he can avert his/her eyes from the requester. For example,

(2) 1A: "Hottikissa no desain o takeatte mita no desu ga, Sonoda-san ni mo go-iken o ukagaitai to omotte sareru. [Puts the design before Sonoda] ...Yorosiku onegaishimasu! [Bows]

'...I have designed a stapler, but I would like to hear your comment, too, Mr. Sonoda.'

2B: [Takes a look at the design, and puts it aside] (3.0)11

3A: Ano..,.., go-iken wa...?

'Well, may I have your comment?'

4B: [Remains silent, Keeps doing his job without looking at A] (2.0)

5A: ....., Shiuree simasu.....[Leaves]

'Excuse me.'

(BF)

Here, A wants B (i.e., Mr. Sonoda), to check the design which A drew, but since B is not interested in A’s design, he refuses her request by saying nothing (4B). In other words, he shows unwillingness to acknowledge the request. The refuser B does not make eye contact with A, the requester or on the design which he is asked to review.

b. Criticize.12

A refuser criticizes either the content of the request, or states that the requester has made a nonsense request to him/her, or s/he blames the requester for either or both. Some of the critical comments in response to a request include the verbal gerund form (the -te form, often with verbal of giving to the in-group, kureru, which is often used to make a request). However, most of the phrases in the data are rather conventionalized, and the person who uses such an expression often does so to recommend a behavior other than what the requester has displayed. In this way, it functions more as an indicator that the

---

11 The number in parenthesis indicates the time span in seconds.
12 There are nine example of this type in the data. (Data # 3, 4, 11(14), 22, 34, 38, 45, 48, 50).
requester’s behavior is inappropriate than as positive request. Therefore, in this paper, such conventionalized phrases which contain the verbal gerund form are not counted in “making a request” (cf., the next section).

Here are some examples of blaming.

(3) A and B (i.e., Akiko) are close friends, and they have fallen in love with the same man, Kawashima. Kawashima likes B; hence he broke off with Megumi, who is a mutual friend of A and B. The friendship between B and Megumi is not smooth these days. B is worried about it, and is discussing it with A.

1A: Zyaa, Akiko ga orite yo. ‘Then, why don’t you give (him) up, Akiko?’

2B: Sōo iu mondai sya nai! ‘That’s not the issue!’

3A: Zyaa, doo iu mondai? ‘Then, what IS the issue?’

(Hitonatu)

(4) A is thinking about marrying a young lady who attends the same university as his daughter, B. Both B and C, the daughters of A, do not like the idea of their father’s marriage and of his getting married to such a young (in comparison to his age) woman.

1A: Tosi ga aeketara...anoo...:...iido Midori-san to atte kurenai ka nā? ‘Sometime early in the new year, well, ...can you (two) meet Midori for me?’

[...]

3B: [Looking at C] ...Mayumi, ano, ...nimono no ki, yowaku site. ‘Mayumi, uh, turn down the heat on the pot.’

[...]

5A: Doo ka na? Haruka. ‘Can you...?, Haruka?’

6B: Moo, it kagen ni site yo! ‘Oh, that’s enough (of your nonsense)!’

(CN)

In example (3), the refuser B blames A for the content of her request, as not related to the point (2B), and she will not perform the requested action, that is break up with Kawashima. Notice that A’s request in this example includes the gerund, orite. In example (4), the refuser B condemns the requester A for being nonsensical (6B). The
gerund is observed in both the request with kurenaï (atte kurenaï ka ta?) and in the criticism (site yo?). Although the phrase li kogen ni site! contains the verbal gerund form, this is rather a conventionalized request expression that is used to tell someone to put a stop to their present behavior.

c. Change the subject13

In this response, the refuser starts talking about something irrelevant to the content of the request. In addition to a critical response, example (4) above also shows the refuser’s changing the subject. In this example, what the refuser in 3B says has nothing to do with the content of the request (i.e., to meet Midori). She ignores the request, and talks to her sister C about their cooking. By changing the subject, she shows her unwillingness to acknowledge the request, and goes on as if no request had been made. Other responses which are observed in the data that involve changing the subject, include abrupt leave-taking (example 5) and coming back with what the refuser wants to do instead (example 6).

e.g. (5) 1A: Tetudatte kudasaimasu wa yo ne?
‘Your are going to help me, aren’t you?’
2B: Ha... a... watasi, sorosoro kore de situree itasimasu.
‘Uh, well, I guess I’d better be going now.’
(Busu)

(6) 1A: Okaeri kudasai.
‘Please leave.’
2B: Naku narareta go-nyuzin no koto de o-ukagai sitai n desu ga.
‘I would like to ask you about your late husband but, (may I?)’
(J for A)

13 There are eight samples of this type. (Data # 4, 5, 6(12), 11(14), 15, 25, 33, 44).
d. Show refusal by action

In the data, there is one example in which the refuser responds to the request by both stating the reason why he cannot listen to the request, and doing what the requester asked him not to do at the same time (2B).

\[ \text{e.g. (7)} \]

1A: *Sumimasen, Ouchi-sensei wa iaida ma kaigiyasu na n desu. 'Excuse me, but Director Ouchi is in a meeting right now. (So please do not enter)'

2B: [Without looking at A] *Kotti mo kyyuoo da. [Enters Director Ouchi's office] 'I have urgent business, too!'

(J for A)

In this example, even though the refuser responds to the request by stating the reason why he cannot do so (in other words, does not completely ignore the request), he forces his way through to the Director's office at the same time. Therefore, his action ignores the request.

4.4.1.2 Make another request

A refuser responds to a requester by making another request. There are two types of this.

a. A counter-request (relevant to the original request)*14

A request which denies the content of the original request is made by the refuser in response, as in 4B in example (8) below. In this case, the participants of the conversation continue with the same main topic.

\[ \text{e.g. (8) Making a request (A conversation on the phone)} \]

1A: *Ano, moo tiido o-hanasi sitai n desu....Ima kangaete iru koto ka, iiroi, zenbu, atte o-hanasi sitai n desu. 'Uh...I would like to have a talk with you once more. I would like to meet you to talk about...like, what I'm thinking about, and so forth, everything.'

*14 There are seventeen examples which take this pattern. (Data # 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11(14), 18, 34, 35, 37, 38, 42, 48, 51, 52, 54, 56).
2B: *Ano...... kangaetaite itta yo ne?*
   ‘Um, didn’t I say that I want to think about it (our relationship)?’

3A: ....*Sore wa...... soo na n desu kedo....*
   ‘That’s......right, but...’

4B: *Moo sukosi matte kurenai ka na?*
   ‘Can you wait a little bit more for me, please?’ (CN)

In the next two examples, (9) and (10), the refusals take the form of commands. In my data, this sort of imperative expression is often observed when the refuser has a higher status than the requester, or when the conversation is between a couple and the refuser is a male.

(9) Command. A and B are lovers.

1A: *Tatsuya! Kanaraite yo! It wa ne?*
   ‘Tatsuya! Be sure to be there, please! OK?’

2B: *Meeree sun na yo. Ore wa anta no omoya cya nee zo.*
   ‘Don’t give orders to me. I’m not your toy.’ (Busu)

(10) A and B, colleagues, are talking to the president of the company with which they often do business.

1A: *Onegai ga arimasu. Kurisumasu kyanpeen no pahurisiti o moo itido Seo to watasi ni yaraseite kudasai.*
   ‘We have a favor that we would like to ask of you. Please let Seo and me do the publicity for the Christmas campaign again.’

2B: *Puran no motte kite orimasu. Zehi itido, o-hanasi o o-kiki itadakenai desuyo ko?*
   ‘We brought our plans with us here today. Could you please take time to look at it?’

3A&B: *Yorosiku onegai simasu! [Bows]*
   ‘We ask for your consideration!’

4C: ....*Sigoto no koto naru, sorecore no tantoo busyo o tosinasai.* [Leaves]
   ‘If it is about business, contact each section in charge.’ (Busu)
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b. A counter-request (irrelevant to the original request)\textsuperscript{15}

In this move, the refuser makes another request which is not quite related to the original request. In the data, the refuser makes another request by using the structure of /verbal gerund + kudasai/. There are also cases in which the refuser states what s/he wants the requester to do by using the type of /verb stem + tai + n + desu/, instead of taking up the original request. By stating what s/he wishes to do, s/he in effect makes a roundabout request. The following example shows both types.

e.g. (11) 1A: *Itido, yaraseite mise isadakemasen ka? Odoroku yoo na mono o kangaemazu kara!*  
‘Could you please let me try it once? I will come up with a great idea which will surprise you!’

2B: *Anta........komatte n no? Aso ne, iya, komateru n datara saa,; doo daro, uti no rezi de hataraitte kurenai ka naa;?*  
‘Are you.... hard up for money or something? Well, if you are, what do you say...about working for me as a cashier here?’

3A: *Kopii no sigoto ga sitai n desu!*  
‘What I want to do is work on creating advertising statements!’

4B: *Iya, iya, rezi dattara ne, asita kara demo sugu hostii n da ya nee;*  
‘No, no, if it’s a cashier, I want you to start even tomorrow.’  
(Buuu)

In this example, the female requestor, who is a very popular copywriter but currently is out of work, asks the owner of a supermarket to let her write some advertising copy for him.

Since the refuser B is not very much interested in paying money for a single one-line piece of copy, he refuses it by making another request, asking A to work as a cashier instead (2B). In this way, he changes the subject from the job of copy-writing to that of cashier.

However, A is not interested in B’s request; therefore, she reframes the moment in terms of what it is that she wants to do. Her extended predicate here serves to remind him of what

\textsuperscript{15} There are nine tokens of this type of request in the data. (Data \# 1, 4, 6(12), 9, 11(14), 15, 22, 44, 48).
the original request was, and to return to the original subject (3A). In response, however, B repeats his own strategy: he states what he wants in order to remind her of his request (4B).

To review, we note that in 2B, the refuser makes a request which does not correspond to the original request made by A. On the other hand, from 3A on, each speaker’s response does not correspond to the utterance which precedes his/hers, but simply repeats his/her original request (i.e., to work as a copywriter for A, and to hire a cashier for B). In other words, when each speaker makes a new, irrelevant request, s/he focuses his/her original request at the same time. The diagram below shows the flow of this conversation.

![Diagram of conversation flow](image)

Figure 3. The flow of conversation (11).

The two participants in this conversation try to change the subject with the extended predicate either by making another request or by stating what they want, so that they do not have to clearly state their refusal to the requests which are made to them.

In such cases, as the refuser does not make a response which addresses the original request, s/he in a way deflects the request. Therefore, the refuser ignores and makes an
irrelevant request at the same time. In other words, ignoring and making an irrelevant request often occur at the same time.

In addition to Raohuburanakitto’s four types, the above-mentioned diversionary responses are also observed in refusals to requests in my data. Both IGNORE (including Silence, Criti-ize, Change the subject) and REQUEST (relevant to original request), and the combination of the two (Ignore by making a new request), create a type of refusals by themselves. They are also occasionally combined with one of the four types, and become a part of the whole type of refusals. This suggests that Raohuburanakitto’s four types can be enlarged to include a category of diversionary responses.

4.5 Strategies of Japanese refusals: previous studies.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, according to previous studies on Japanese refusals, the following strategies are commonly used:

a. Use incomplete sentences
b. Gradually show negative attitude
c. Propose other options
d. Use apologetic expressions
e. Express empathy to addressee
f. Ask for more information

4.5.1 Using incomplete sentences

Of the sixty nine conversation samples collected, twelve samples include incomplete sentences, which are usually used for referring to the reason for refusal. Therefore, the utterances tend to end with the words “xx no de...” and “xx karu.....”, which roughly mean “because”, as in example (12).

e.g. (12) IA: Naku nararet ga -syuzin no koto de o-ukagai sitai n desu ga...
    “I would like to ask about your late husband, but (may I?)”
Such responses usually utilize incomplete sentences because the refuser omits the part where the expression of impossibility is expected, that is, at the end of the sentence. This tendency is also observed in utterances that do not include the words kara or no de. The following example (13) also omits overt statement of impossibility (cf. 3B - 5B, below).

By avoiding overt assertion, and using an intonation that indicates that the sentence is not completed, the utterances as a whole is softened. The refuser leaves it to the requester to complete the sentence, which is one way to show deference to the requester.

1A: Watsasi ni yarasete kudasai!
‘Please let me do it!’

2B: Motiron wareware mo soo negaitai no desu ga,
‘Of course, we wish we could do so, but,’

3B: Kaisya o o-yane ni natte, makkuku no horii no o-tatiba to
narimatsu no te:......
‘You left the company, and you are in a totally free position, then....(I don’t know about that)’

4B: Soo ia zenree ga nai mon desu kara........[looks down]
‘Since we’ve never had such a case before....(we don’t know).’

5B: Boku no itizon de wa....
‘(I cannot arrange it) on my own responsibility.’
(Busu)

Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that people have a negative face-need and a positive face-need. The first need is not to have their freedom of action restricted, and the second one is to be valued and to have what they value be valued. Refusing a request threatens the requester’s positive face. In order to show politeness to the requester, the
refuser tries to mitigate the face-threat. If s/he does not actually state the negative part of her response (i.e., assert the impossibility), s/he will not hurt the requestor’s feelings (i.e., she will not threaten the requestor’s positive face).

B’s intention to show his politeness can be observed in his word choice as well. He uses honorific polite forms such as o-yane ni naru (honorific polite of yameru ‘to quit’, o-tatiba (honorific prefix o plus tatiba ‘position’) (3B).

4.5.2 Gradual revelation of negative attitude

Most of the conversational exchanges in the data are quite short. This may be because of the time constraint of TV dramas helps to ensure that each scene is quite short and changes quickly. Furthermore, most scenes start in the middle of a conversation, that is, do not show how the speakers started the conversation. TV viewers must depend on their imagination to guess what might have been tanspired between the speakers before the portion of the scene that they are watching. For this reason, it is hard to know whether a refuser is revealing his/her negative attitude “gradually”. There is usually not a sufficient amount of time allocated to each scene for the participants to work through the negotiations that would get them to the point where viewers pick up the action. As a result, it seems that the speakers do not take very long to negotiate with each other in TV dramas. However, even in this genre, a conversation performed in a business setting, tends to be a little longer than those in other settings. In other words, the script makes a place for speakers to display negotiation. The following example is the longest conversational exchange in my data, and it shows several negotiation steps. Part of this conversation has already been presented in example (11) above.

e.g.  (14)

1A: Bao gen no tirasi to keppi o yarase to iizakemasen desu no ka?
   ‘Could you please let me write copy for your bargain sale advertising leaflet?’
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2B: Kopiite nani?
'What is "copy"?'

3A: Senden no kotoba desu.
'Advertising language.'

4B: Aa, senden monku?
'Ah, you mean, a sales message!'

5B: Iya, senden monku dattara ne? Boka ga kangaete iru n da yo.
'Well, if it's sales messages, what do we do, I think them up.'

[...]

8B: Iya; Konna monku ni nee; nan-boku-man no kakerenai no yo.
'You know, I can't pay millions of yen for such (trivial) things.'

9B: Motai nakute.
'it's wasteful...'

10B: Uta atari no mise zya sa; nee;?
'For a store on this scale, ...see?'

11A: Bido yarasete mite itadakemasen ka?
'Could you please let me try it once?'

[...]

12B: Anta... komatte n no?
'Are you... hard up for money or something?'

13B: Ano ne, iya;*, komatteru n dattara saa;*, doo daro, uti no rezi de hataraite kurenai ka naa;*?
'Well, if you are, what do you say about working for us as a cashier?'

14A: Kopii no sigoto ga sitai n desu!
'What I want to do is work on creating copy!'

15B: Iya, iya, rezi dattara ne, asita kara demo sugu hostii n da yo nee;*
'No, no, if it's as a cashier, I want you to start from tomorrow...'

16A: Kopii desu! Watasi no sigoto wa rezi zya nakute, kopii!
'it's copy! My work is copy, not cashiering!'

[...]

20A: Kono miti de wa atasi, ittayu na n desu.
'Actually, in this business, I am one of the best.'

21B [Laughs]

[...]

23B: Ano ne, zibun de ittayuu to sinturu ningen wa nakanaka inai yo.
'Tell you what. There aren't many people who believe that they are the best.'
24B: Atama ga okasii ka, ma, henmono ka, doti ka da ne.
   'Such people are) either crazy or, well, possibly the real thing. One or
   the other.'

25A: Wataai, atama, okasiku arimasen.
   'I am not crazy.'

26B: Iya, doti ni shitatte saa::
   'Well, whichever you are...'

27B: Itoryuu ni harau kane wa uti ni wa nai yo!
   'I don't have enough money to pay for a first-rate person!'

28A: Saiyo ik ken cyuu-man-en de doo desyoo ka?
   'How about 100,000-yen for one accepted piece of copy?'

[...]

30B: Zyoodan desyoo::?
   'You must be kidding.'

[...]

33B: Anta no, sono, itumo, sono, nan de mo nan-oku to iu sigoto
   bakkari sitetu kara,
   'You...hmm. since you...um, always do jobs which cost several hundred
   million-yen...'

34B: Atama ga sono, zureteru no to tigau?
   'Wouldn't you agree that your head has, uh, come a little unscrewed?'

35B: Uti atari no susaara zya ne, okusan-tati ga hyaku-garama gokkyaku-en no
   gyyunniku o kau no datte tuyutto siten no yo.
   'At a supermarket like ours, the housewives even hesitate to buy some
   beef which costs 500-yen per 100 grams.'

36B: Da kara, soo yuu kankaku o wassureya ne, atasitati, syoobai ni naranai wo?
   'So, if you lose a sense for things like that, you can't run a business!'

37B: Ne? Wakaru?
   'O.K.? You see?'

[...]

39A: Zya, sono okasama-tati o ato odorokaseru yoo na, sonna kopii o kangaete
   kimasu.
   'Then, I will come up with some copy that will take the breath away from
   those housewives.'

40B: Demo dotti ni shitatte ne, uti ni wa sonna kane nai kara.
   'Regardless the case may be, I don't have that kind of money (to pay for a
   first-rate copywriter), so...!'

41B: Ne? Ua.
   'O.K.? N.'

(Busu)
In this example, the refuser B shows a negative attitude quite often. First, he indicates that he has no interest in hiring somebody who engages in creating ‘copy’, which he has never heard of (2B). Then he paraphrases kopii as senden monku (4B). The word kopii ‘copy’ is a loanword, and it creates a modern, “with it,” and “cool” image. It is often the case in Japan that ad copy will become a ryuukoogo (a word in vogue), so a copywriter is sometimes regarded as a trendsetter, and can make a lot of money. On the other hand, the word senden monka sounds like a simple generic term of advertisement, and it does not have any fashionable and trendy nuance which the word kopii has. The refuser probably believes that advertisement statements do not have to be that fashionable or conty, and by using a generic term, he shows that he is also familiar with them and can handle them by himself (4B). He refers to the “copy” as konnai mono ‘such a thing as this’, i.e., something so trivial, to indicate that it is not worth paying money for.

Even after he shows his negative attitude toward the request, the requester does not give up, and she persists in asking him for a job writing advertising copy. In response, he brings up something else (12-15B) so that he can reframe the situation. Throughout the conversation, his attitude is rather rude. He is a store manager. The young woman can be one of his customers; therefore, it is more appropriate for him to speak politely to her. Furthermore, it is their first time to meet each other, and people usually speak in distal style in such an occasion. However, although it is their first time to meet each other, the refuser uses direct style. This speech style is usually used to people with whom one has an intimate relationship, with those who are of the same social rank as oneself, or to those who are younger, or have a lower social status than the speaker. Many viewers will probably assume that since the requester is a young woman, the refuser looks down on her, and speaks in an impolite way. The word ou is a less careful form of ou ‘you’, which on first meeting invariably indicates that the speaker looks down on the addressee.
In addition to that, it is impolite to ask someone whom you have just met whether she is ‘hard up’ for money.

The refuser also shows his negative attitude that he is not taking the whole thing seriously (30B). He laughs when the requester mentions that she is one of the best copywriters, and indicates that he thinks she is a little bit crazy (24B, 34B). Therefore, he checks to confirm whether she has really understood what he is saying as if he were talking to a stupid person (37B).

4.5.3 Proposing alternatives

In previous studies of refusals, proposing an alternative meant giving information about somebody else who might be able to do the favor instead of the refuser, such as, “Well, I’m afraid I can’t really help you, but A might be interested in that.” In this case, the content of the request still remains the same. My data indicate that there are some other types of ALTERNATIVES exercised in refusals to requests.

a. Making another suggestion

A refuser sometimes makes suggestion in response to the request. These suggestions indicate that the requester would be better off doing something else, specifically what is suggested by the refuser, rather than sticking his original request. For instance, in example (14), examined just above, the refuser suggests to the requester that she work as a cashier rather than as a copywriter (line 13B). With this move, the content of the original request (i.e., to work as a copywriter) is deflected, and the refuser does not have to address the hard process of performing a nice refusal to the original request. In this example, the suggestion is made in the form of a request, but in other situations, suggestions are also made in the form of an offer (15), in an imperative form (16) if the two speakers have a close relationship, or as a typical recommendation of the form /Verbal direct perfective + hoo ga ii / (17).
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e.g. (15) Offer
1A: Warui n as kedo, kaette kunna ki no na?
   'I’m sorry, but can you go home now?'

2B: Nee, watasi ni dekiru koto nai?
   'Hey, isn’t there anything I can do?'

3B: Nan demo suna kara.
   'I’ll do anything, so…'

   (CN)

(16) Suggestion/order
1A: Ore o omae n ti ni oite kunne ka na?
   'Will you let me stay at your place?'

2B: Iya, omae, kane go aai wake yna n da kara saa;.
   'Well, since it’s not the case that you don’t have money…'

3B: Tyanto heya karite dokurita siro yo;.
   'Rent a room and be independent.'

   (Hitonatu)

(17) Typical recommendation
1A: Biiru tyoodai.
   'Give me some beer.'

2B: Moo yametota hoo ga ii yo.
   'You’ve had enough.'

   (Hitonatu)

b. Setting a condition

Sometimes a refuser proposes conditions for performing the requested action. S/he implies that s/he may be able to help if the condition is accepted by the requester. In other words, the refuser will not do the favor for the requester unless the requester fulfills the stated condition. Insofar as the refuser shows that s/he has a will to grant the request under certain conditions, this type of response may be seen as a partial refusal. However, all the conditions set by requestees in my data are more or less unreasonable to the requester, so setting conditions on the requested action actually amount to a kind of refusal strategy.

In the following example (18), the two speakers work for the same company and the man is the woman’s boss. The man is married and has a family, but the woman is single. They are having an affair, but the man keeps it a secret from his family. The man
requests that the woman give him her apartment key. She replies that she will do so on the condition that the man give the key to his house to her in return, an impossible condition. What she really does, or intends to do, is to refuse the request, but by implying that she has a will to listen to his request under a certain condition, her refusal seems less straightforward if nevertheless clear.

  e.g. (18)  1A: Apatato no kagi, morusenai ka na?
             ‘Can I have a key to your apartment?’

     2B: Otaku no kagi o itadakere nara.
             ‘If I can have a key to your house.’

     (MD)

In most cases, when a refuser presents a condition as a response to a request, the condition is something out of the requester’s control, and the refuser knows this. By proposing something absurd as a condition, the refuser indicates his/her rejection of the request.

4.5.4 Expressions of apology

Apologetic expressions such as Moosiwake arimasen or Gomen ne are used in six conversational exchanges, and they usually follow some reason of refusal. Instead of mentioning impossibility or unwillingness, the refuser uses apologetic expressions to soften his/her refusal. In the data, five out of six such tokens use the word gomen16, and one token used moosiwake arimasen which is addressed by the manager of a bank to a visitor. The examples are shown below.

  e.g. (19) A and B have met for the first time at a konpa (student party), and A is giving B a ride home. A seems to like B, but B is not interested in A. B is about to get out of A’s car.

     1A: A, zya, denwabango, osiete.
             ‘Oh, then, give me your phone number.’

     2B: ....Uti, derwa, nai n desu yo.
               ‘We...don’t have a phone.’

16 They are either “Gomen ne?” or “Gomen nasai.”
A is a lawyer, and is investigating a case to help her business acquaintance Takaoka, who is also a lawyer and is falsely accused. A visits a bank where B is a manager, and asks him to show some documents to prove Takaoka’s innocence. A and B meet each other for the first time.

B: Kanren-yoru wa subete kensatu-tyoo no hoo ni teisyuta-site orimasu no de, koita de wo,...
   ‘Since we’ve submitted all the related documents to the Public Prosecutors Office, we... (cannot show you them) here...’

A: Utasi de kekko na n desu.
   ‘Duplicates of them are fine.’

B: Misete itadakenai n desu ka?
   ‘Can’t you please show them to me?’

A: Moosiwake arimasen. Sore mo subete....
   ‘I’m very sorry. They were all... (submitted to the PPO), too.’

B: Doo site mo, misete itaikenai n desu ka?
   ‘Isn’t there any way you can show them to me?’

B: [Looks down in silence.]
requester is in a position where s/he needs somebody’s help, s/he is in an weak position. The requester makes a request in order to materialize something by the addressee’s kindness. Therefore, the requester will always benefit from it, while an addressee usually will not. In other words, the requester becomes indebted to the addressee, but the addressee owes nothing to the requester. It is the requester who will become indebted, so s/he has to apologize for bothering the requestee with her request. As the acceptance of the request is entirely up to the addressee’s kindness, s/he does not owe anything to the requester, nor will s/he usually be in trouble, even refusing a request. His/her position, in terms of face, is more secure than that of the requester. S/he therefore has less need to apologize for his/her act of refusal, but s/he may feel sympathy (omoijari) for the requester, who is going to be inconvenienced, and in recognition of this, may utter the expression of Gomen nasai or the more casual Gomen.

As for the exceptional example (20), in which the refuser replies with very polite language, even though he was in a more face-secure position than the requester, he decided to speak politely to the requester. He probably thought that the requestee might be one of the bank’s customers or a potential customer. Japanese in business tend to pay a great amount of respect to their customers so much so that this kind of language might well be such an employee’s default response to any person from outside the bank making such a request.

4.5.5 Expressing empathy with the requester

According to previous studies of refusals in Japanese, both speaker and addressee sometimes say something aimed at not hurting the other’s feelings or avoiding conflict with others. In addition, Murakami (1993) mentions that a requester says things to reduce the refuser’s anxiety, and Raohaburanakitto (1995) suggests that when the requester perceives the refuser’s negative attitude s/he senses that the request is going to be refused.
Szatrowski (1993a) suggests that the requester even helps the refuser make the refusal. The requester says something that shows his/her empathy\(^7\) with the refuser’s position, and that makes the refuser feel it easier to refuse. These arguments imply that it is the requester who usually expresses empathy to the refuser.

Contrary to the findings of previous studies, however, most expressions of empathy in my data were used by the refuser\(^8\). The refuser usually expressed empathy after indicating refusal. According to Raohabarakanikitto’s argument, after the refuser indicates his/her negative attitude, the requester, in turn, is supposed to express his/her empathy with the refuser in order to make the situation less confrontational. However, the requesters in the present data persisted with the same request rather than giving up out of consideration for the refusers. Thus, the data do not quite support the position that the requester expresses empathy with a refuser. Rather, it supports the opposite. Furthermore, all the expressions of empathy used by the refusers in my data were apologetic expressions. In the case of refusals to requests, then, it seems that it is not necessary to separate the strategies of “expressions of apology” and “expressing empathy”. Moreover, since in the present study, it is specifically the refuser who uses this kind of expression, the maxim of “Express empathy with the addressee” should be modified to “Express empathy with the requester”.

4.5.6 Asking for more information

There are only three conversation samples in which the refuser seeks more information. According to Raohabarakanikitto’s study, the refuser does so when s/he needs

\(^7\) Empathy (omiyar or kikabara) refers to the ability and willingness to sympathize with others, to be sensitive toward another’s feelings, and to understand another’s situation.

\(^8\) There is only one conversation in which the requester expresses her empathy to the refuser. In this exchange, the requester shows her empathy after the refuser apologizes, by saying “It’s not something that you [the refuser] should apologize for.”
more information to measure the importance of the request and, possibly, to find a good reason, if any, to refuse the request.

In the first example shown below, the refuser (2B) wants to know the reason why the requester (1A) is making the request to him. At the same time, the refuser may be measuring the importance of the request, or possibly trying to find a good reason to refuse. However, since he indicates his refusal right after he asks for more information (3 & 4B), it is questionable if the refuser really wanted to have more information about the request. He probably just asked these questions to show that he was surprised to hear the request.

(21) 1A: Ano onna to kippori wakare, Oizumi ha ni kawaatte hosii da de da. ‘I just want you to break up with that woman, and join the Oizumi-party.’
2B: Doosite ore o? Doosite na n da, Kashimura? ‘Why me? Why is that, Kashimura?’
3B: Ore no kimovi wa kawaran. ‘I won’t change my mind.’
4B: Dono habatu ni kawaatte tumori mo nai. ‘I don’t have any intention of joining any party, either.’
5B: Konwa mon de kyoohaku sitatte muda da. ‘You’re wasting your time trying to intimidate me with such a thing.’

(SKS)

In the following example, the refuser asks the requester to clarify the request (2B).

(22) 1A: Haruka tyan, kono aida no koto, nakatta koto ni site hosii n da. ‘Haruka, I want you to forget about what happened between us last time.’
2B: Doo in iim? ‘What do you mean?’
3A: Nakatta koto ni.....site hosii n da. ‘I want you.....to forget it.’
4B: Doosite? ‘Why?’

(CN)
It seems that the request is not very clear to the refuser, but in the next exchange, even though the requester simply repeats the same request (3A), it seems that the refuser understands what the requester means this time, and asks the reason for the request (4B). Therefore, while the refuser has fully understood the request, she asks the requester to clarify it, as if it were something she cannot comprehend. In this example, it is less likely that the refuser measure the importance of the request. It is conceivable that she is looking for a good reason to refuse the request by asking for more information; however, it seems more to the point that since the request is something she clearly does not want to hear, she is shocked and would like to know what he has in mind, rather than how important the request is.

In examples (21) and (22), the content of the request is somewhat unexpected for the requestee and something which the refuser does not want to hear. Therefore, the refuser asks the requester to provide more information about his intention, or asks him why it has to be the requestee to be the one to undertake that task. It seems that if the content of the request is unfavorable to the refuser, s/he is not truly interested in the importance of the request. Rather, s/he is more interested in getting to know the intention behind the request.

The data do not have any samples which display a refuser asking for more information in order to find reason to refuse. One example shows that after she indicates her refusal, a young female refuser asks for more information from an older female requester, who is a customer to the refuser. Moreover, even after the refuser understands the requester’s situation and her reason for making the request, she refuses it after all by explaining that it is simply impossible to do the favor for her. In this conversation, the refuser does not ask for more information in order to find some good reason to refuse. She knows that she has no choice but to refuse, because what is

---

19 The content of the request is to take the requester to Burma the next day. Since Japanese need a visa to enter Burma, and it takes time to have the visa issued, the refuser believes it is impossible to help her.
requested is something beyond her power. Under these circumstances, she probably asked for more information to show her customer that she was concerned for her, even though she could not help.

4.6 Indirect refusal

It is commonly said that Japanese refuse indirectly. Since none of the six (or five, if expression of apology and expression of empathy are counted as one) strategies clearly express straightforward denials, it may be true that Japanese refuse indirectly. However, is this always true? Are there no circumstances at all in which Japanese refuse directly?

Words that directly express the speakers’ unwillingness, judgement of impossibility, and distaste, such as /verbal stem + tukanai/ ‘don’t want to’, mari ‘impossible’, dane ‘no good’, and iya ‘don’t like it’ are usually perceived as direct refusals, especially when they are used with no qualifier or hedge preceding them, which softens the statement (such as yotto). If the requestee provides a reason for the refusal between the initial request and these direct expressions, the refusal will sound less direct and straightforward, because stating one’s reason implies that except for that reason, the request might be honored. More importantly, however, giving one’s reason helps the requestee get ready to accept the refusal, even if it comes in a rather direct form. In contrast to this, a direct refusal can be defined as a refusal perceived as such by the requestee when the refuser uses a straightforward expression of refusal without any hedge before it, in immediate response to the request.

In Raohaburanakito’s four types of Japanese refusal, it will be recalled, there are the refusal type of IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY (e.g., Dekimasen) and IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON (e.g., Watasi...past! Watasi, kodomo te nigate da mo;:n!). Should these be considered “indirect refusals”? The criteria which distinguish directness and indirectness may be culture-independent, but to most Japanese, the first type sounds quite direct and
straightforward unless some statements of reason or a hedge precedes it. The second type probably does not sound as direct as the first type because some reason follows the expression of refusal, and softens the entire utterance. However, until the requester hears that part of the reason, s/he might perceive the refuser’s negation as a direct refusal.

In my data, there are fifteen conversation samples which take the type of IMPOSSIBILITY only and six samples of IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON. Interestingly, in the present data, the first type, which can be regarded as a direct refusal, is the second most commonly used type of the four possible types. Here are some examples of these two types.

(23) Imp only (Impimibility)

A and B are balloon artists and work for the same company. Since B has been working for the company longer than A, A uses a distal speech style.

1B: *Yaot, waku wa ore ga tukaru.*
   "Then, I’ll make the frame."

2A: *Dame desu... Ano, watashi hitori de yarasete kudasai.*
   "No! (lit. 'It won’t do') Um, please let me take care of it by myself."

3B: *Muri da.*
   "It’s too much (for you to handle alone)."  
   (Hitosatu)

(24) Imp only (Distaste)

A and B are close friends.

1A: *Ne, sono hanasi, ostete?*
   "Hey, tell me that story, will you?"

2B: *Ya da:.*
   "No! (lit. 'it's [too] unpleasant!'"
   (CN)

(25) Imp only (Unwillingness)

A and B are lovers and B has asked A to break up with him.

1A: *Syojin totte!*
   "Take a picture of me!"
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2A: "Owakare ni... "
   'For our farewell...'

3A: "Ina, kamera, motteru n desyo?"
   'You have your camera with you now, don’t you?'

4B: "Hi yo...[Leaves]"
   'It's OK (without doing so)' --- I don’t feel like it.  (Busu)

(26) Imp + Reason (Impossibility)

A and B are attending the same university. B is having a relationship with her professor, who is A’s father. A is asking B to break up with her father.

1A: "Moo nido to titi ni awanai de."
   'Never, ever see my father again.'

2A: "Yakusoku site."
   'Promise me.'

3B: "Dekimasen."
   <Impossibility>
   'I can’t.'

4B: "...Atasi, sinken na n desu."
   <Reason>
   'Because I’m dead serious.'
   [...]  

6B: "Sensee to issyo ni iru to....."
   'When I’m with the professor.....'

7B: "Siaiwa ne na n desu."
   <Reason>
   'It’s...I feel happy.'

(CN)

(27) Imp + Reason (Distract)

A is a young woman who lives in a gorgeous apartment which her rich fiancé bought for them. One day three male strangers come into her apartment saying they are her brothers who were separated when they were little. They have decided to stay at A’s place, but A wants them both to leave.

1A: "Issyo ni iru doke de, okasuku naru s."
   'Just being with you makes me feel cheerful,'
   [...]  

4A: "Sonkei sittayu wa."
   'I admire you.'

5B: "Sonnaa... Soo?"
   'No, no... do you?'
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6A: Da kara watasi no onegai mo kiete kursa wa yo nee...? 'So you will do me a favor foe me, am I right?'

B7: Iya ya tte. <Distaste>
'No, I tell you.'

B8: Sore wa tigau mon. <Reason>
'Because that's a different story.' (Mosimo)

(28) Imp + Reason (Unwillingness)

Four friends are discussing who is going to baby-sit their mutual friend's daughter.

1A: Ato wa, sigoto ga owatte, yuugata kara yoru ni kakete ka...
'Then, (we need somebody to take care of her) after work, from evening to night...'

2B: Itiban seekaku na zikan ni sigoto ga owaru no wa....
'The one who finishes her job at the precise time everyday is...'

3B: Marie... yo ne?
'Marie..., right?'

4C (Marie): Haa?
'What?'

5A & D: Saa da nee... 'Thaat's right.'

6C: Watasi... pasu! <Unwillingness>
'I... I pass on this!'

7C: Pasu! pasu! pasu! pasu! [waving her hand hard] <Unwillingness>
'Pass, pass, pass, pass!' 

8C: Watasi... kodomo tte nigate da mo...n! <Reason>
'I... don't get along with kids!' (Hitonatu)

Notice that all the conversation samples presented above are performed by speakers who have a close relationship with each other. In other words, these are conversations in which each side sees the other as in-group. There are also a few conversation samples of this type among the data that involve out-group people; however, there is no single conversational exchange of this type performed by two total strangers.
The data show many examples of direct refusals, and this suggests that Japanese also in fact refuse requests directly, especially when the participants at least recognize each other. This of course raises the question of what it is that leads the refuser to construct one kind of refusal (e.g., direct), and not another (e.g., indirect) in a certain situation?
CHAPTER 5

DATA ANALYSIS

In the preceding chapter, the characteristics of the seven types and the five strategies\(^1\) of Japanese refusals to requests were discussed. Although it is important to know what they are like, it is even more important to recognize which types and/or strategies of refusals is are appropriate to use in what kind of situation. The way people talk is greatly influenced by the speakers’ personal relationship, including social status and power relationships, and by age, gender and the topic of the conversation. By focusing on the personal relationship, age, and gender of the participants, and the content of the requests, this chapter seeks to describe the kind(s) of situations in which each type and strategy of refusal is likely to be used.

5.1 Types of Japanese refusals to requests

5.1.1 Statement of reason only

Although there are some conversational exchanges which are performed by people who have a close relationship, most samples which take this type are conversations in which each participant sees the other as out-group. This is especially clear when the speakers are strangers to each other, or they are, or used to be, doing business together (but their relationship is not as close as that of friends). Broadening one’s contacts and

\(^1\)Two strategies (i.e., apologetic expression and expression of empathy) are considered as one single strategy here.
maintaining a good relationship with several companies is particularly crucial in the world of business, and people in business are apt to be nice and polite to each other doing so serves these purposes. It being polite to others, it can help to avoid straightforward expressions of refusal, and prefer instead implied refusal, by stating their reason(s).

In Japan, an older person is generally treated respectfully simply because s/he is older than the other person, and the younger one talks politely to the older one. On the other hand, the older person usually talks casually to the younger, and generally takes a stronger stand on opinions expressed to that younger person. It might therefore be assumed that an older person will refuse directly to a younger person, since s/he is in a position of greater authority than the younger one. However, in the data, the opposite phenomenon is observed; older refusers tend to use the REASON refusal type. Actually, of all the conversational exchanges which took the REASON refusal type, the number of those performed by younger requesters and older refusers, are twice as many as those involving older requesters and younger refusers. Furthermore, older people state reasons more than twice as often as younger ones do.

At first glance, it seems that the older refusers are more polite than the younger refusers in my data, but if the speakers’ relationship is also taken into consideration, we note that these older refusers are the requesters’ business acquaintances, business customers, superiors, or strangers. As mentioned above, people tend to behave politely in a formal, business situation. Consequently, in this case, age difference is not a key factor. The older refusers may be polite because their business depends on the relationship they have with the requesters.

If the data are examined in the parameter of gender difference, conversations with the opposite sex use REASON refusal type more than those with the same sex. This type is employed more by a male refuser toward a female requester. From this, it can be inferred that men have a tendency to avoid using direct refusals if the requester is a woman.
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As there are thirty samples which include the REASON refusal type, it is difficult to devise a single description that applies equally to all these requests. The content of each request is different from the others. However, requests in these conversations that include the REASON refusal type three or more times, are inclined to have the following features.

1. The content of the request involves money. There is a possibility on the refuser’s side that s/he may lose money or suffer a serious loss if s/he agrees to the request.

2. In most cases, the requester has much to gain from acceptance of his/her request.

3. Requesters have usually selected the requestee because they believe that person is the only one able to handle the matter.

4. The content of the request oftentimes goes beyond the refuser’s capacity. The refusers simply cannot do what they are asked to do.

Ike (1982) argues that money is a factor that characterizes power relationships. A person who supplies money usually has power. Therefore, a customer has more power than a sales clerk when the two interact in a sales situation. This argument supports the first feature listed above.

5.1.2 Statement of REASON + IMPOSSIBILITY

Since there are only three samples in the data which take the REASON + IMPOSSIBILITY refusal type, it is hard to generalize about the kind of situation in which this type is likely to be used. When the refuser implies refusal by giving a reason, it is usually the requester’s responsibility to sense the impending refusal, and s/he should not persist in the request. However, if the requester either does not recognize the sign of impending refusal, or persists with the request, the refuser has to make a clearer statement of rejection. But such cases are rare, perhaps because requesters usually sense the imminent rejection, thus saving the refusers the need to make the impossibility explicit. Following are some relevant findings from my data, but more data of this type are needed if we are to define the circumstance of this type of refusal.
All three conversations are performed by people who stand in out-group positions in regard to each other; each treats the other as outside his/her own social locus. In two of these cases, the conversants are colleagues; in the other one they are business acquaintances from different companies. Here again the conversants may intentionally avoid direct refusals in the interests of maintaining their business relationship.

The refusers are either older or about the same age as the requesters. However, the refusers’ choice of this refusal type does not seem to be affected by age. Rather, it is influenced by personal relationship. Although the refusers are older, and would thus be allowed some self-important behavior, they are considerate and avoid direct refusals because their relationship with the requesters is based on their business. On the other hand, since they are in a position of greater power, they may feel less hesitant to clearly state when compliance with the request is impossible.

The refusers in all three samples are male, and in two of these, the requesters are also male. Although this sample is too small to draw any hard conclusions, it can be inferred that the refusers feel it is easier to say a straightforward “No” to someone of the same sex, and that male speakers are more frank with each other than with female speakers.

In the case of the reason refusal type, male refusers are usually considerably to female requesters; however, in these data, a male refuser states impossibility directly to the female requester. This may be because the power relationship is more important than gender difference in the selection of a refusal refusal type. In this conversation, the male refuser is senior in the same company to the female requester, so he has higher social status and has more power in that frame than she does.

The content of these requests varies. However, in all cases, the requesters are desperate for the refusers’ help. Although the refusers use expressions which indicate impossibility (e.g., the negative potential /verbal root + (ra)/re + ma/i)2 in two of the

---

2 The actual expressions used in the data are kasorema ‘can’t obtain (lit. buy)’ and irema ‘can’t say’.
conversations, the tasks themselves do not seem totally unmanageable for the refusers. The viewer is led to believe that they could do the tasks if they wanted to, and that the main reason for refusal is the refusers’ lack of willingness to undertake the requested tasks. However, this is not how they refuse. In both conversations, the refusers indicate that the request is something they cannot handle. Refusing because “I do not have ability to do the task” is regarded, in Japanese culture, as less egocentric than “I do not want to”, and serves to preserve the face of the requester.

5.1.3 Statement of IMPOSSIBILITY only

Unlike the above-mentioned two refusal types, this type is likely to be used by people in the same in-group. A straightforward refusal, with no hedges, is regarded as direct, especially if it is performed right after the request is made, and it also sounds blunt. Since both conversants speak from positions inside the same group, the relationship indexed here is close and steady, and they can be openhearted and frank with each other.

In some samples in the data, speakers for whom the addressee stands in the out-group also use this refusal type. There are no cases of IMPOSSIBILITY in which the conversants are strangers to each other. When IMPOSSIBILITY alone is used, then, the speakers are acquainted with each other in some way. Although there are two conversations between colleagues which show this refusal type, no conversations performed by business acquaintances, i.e., people whose relationship is established through business, are observed with IMPOSSIBILITY alone. In addition, in the two conversations between colleagues, the requester is subordinate in the organization to the refuser. In a formal, business situation, where politeness is necessary to some extent, then, a direct refusal tends to be avoided. It may be used only if a refuser has more power and higher social status.

---

One of them is not categorized as the out-group, for although they are colleagues, they are friends with each other at the same time.
The data show that the refusers tend to be either older or the same age as the requesters. This also follows the phenomenon that older people can be straightforward with those who are younger because they are widely and routinely deferred to. People the same age can do so, with each other too, but they will often do so from roughly equal position where politeness and reserve are not so expected. There is only one conversation with this type of refusal in which the refuser is younger than the requester; however, she is the daughter of the requester. In this case, the speakers’ personal relationship seems to have influenced the choice of refusal type more than the age difference.

In the data, male refusers use this refusal type more than female refusers, and this pattern is most likely to occur in conversations between a female requester and a male refuser. In the data, the requester is the refuser’s girlfriend, subordinate, or younger sister, in other words, in-group people with whom the refuser does not have to be very polite. Female refusers on the other hand, use this refusal type to a female requester or a male requester whom they do not care for very much. Since there are only three samples of female refusers in the data; however, there may be some other situations in which a female refuser uses this refusal type. More data are needed to clarify ways in which gender difference relates to the refusal type IMPOSSIBILITY.

In terms of their content, few of these requests concern a serious matter. The requests ask the refuser to stay overnight at the requester’s place, ask for the refuser’s opinion, and so on. In all but a few cases, anybody might be the requestee, in other words, it does not have to be that very person the requester asked; somebody else could also undertake the requested task. Even though the refusers decline the requests, it does not mean that the requesters suffer any serious consequences. This in fact may make

---

4 There is one conversation exception in which the requester is a mother of the refuser’s student (i.e., the refuser is the teacher). Although the requester is not younger nor subordinate to the refuser, their relationship is established through the student, who is less powerful than the refuser. In this case, the speakers may determine their position from the student’s viewpoint, so that the refuser can be direct to the requester as if he were talking to his student.
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refusers feel it is easier to use direct refusals: They sense that the request is not a very serious matter, and consequently do not feel very guilty about rejecting it. Here again, the true reason of refusal is that the refusers do not want to take on the requested task. Even though they sometimes use an expression that indicates impossibility, there is actually only one request which is clearly out of the refuser's control. Therefore, although the refusal expressions are blunt, the refusers try to be nice to the requesters by attributing their refusal to their inability to perform the task, not to their unwillingness.

5.1.4 Statement of IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON

There are only seven conversational exchanges which include this refusal type in the data. The discussion below is based on the findings in the data.

There are four conversations in which the speakers are of the same in-group, and three three conversations in which conversants regard each other as out-group. Of the four conversations in which conversants are mutually in-group, three of them are performed by family members. It can be assumed that family members tend to use this refusal type. As the number of conversations performed by mutually in-group and that of conversation performed by mutually out-group are almost the same, it can also be assumed that personal relationship does not control the refusers' selection of this refusal type very much. However, more data are necessary to verify these assumptions.

The number of conversations between the speakers of the same age slightly exceeds that of the conversations with the speakers of different ages. There are three conversations by the speakers of the same age. Since both speakers are the same age, the refusers may find it easy to use a clear, direct rejection.

---

5 The content of this request is to return money which the refuser borrowed from a money lending company by the requestor's name without her permission. The refuser borrowed this money to pay back his previous, cumulative loan; therefore, the amount is huge and he cannot pay off his debts immediately.
It does not seem that gender influences the refusers to select this refusal type, either. Although there is no conversation between two male speakers in the data, no significant difference is observed among the four possible combinations of gender. Compared with women’s speech, men talk directly and get right to the point. Therefore, they may not have to add the reason once they tell their intention of rejection.

Most requests are made specifically to the refusers. In other words, the requesters believe that nobody else but the refusers can handle the matter. The requesters desperately need the refusers’ cooperation. Some requests are too much to ask for the refusers, such as taking the requester to Burma the next day, breaking up with the refuser’s lover, or offering the requester a job with a very high salary. Therefore, the refusers know that a great amount of work will be required of them if they do not refuse. As they can foresee their loss which will be caused by their acceptance of the request, they put the brakes on the requesters’ further requests by indicating a clear denial. There are four samples in which the refusers use the expression of impossibility; however, only one applies to the case which the refuser does not have the ability to take care of the matter. As for the other three, the true reason of refusals comes from the refusers’ disfavor to the request. Since the refusers do not like the idea of the requests, they do not feel like doing them, and consequently they refuse the requests. It can be inferred that if the refusers know that the request will work unfavorably to them, they sometimes show their negative attitude by making a direct refusal. If the requesters do not give up, then refusers need to state the reason of rejection. Adding reason(s) after a direct refusal also softens their utterance and makes it less straightforward.

5.1.5 Ignore

The data do not show a clear difference depending on the personal relationship of the conversants. The number of conversations in which conversants regard each other as
out-group, or in which one speaker stands outside another (but in which the other sees that speaker as inside his/her achī, or vice versa) slightly exceeds that of the conversations in which conversants stand in the same in-group. However, the difference is not large enough to generalize that people who are mutually out-group tend to ignore requests. Within the conversations in which the conversants regard each other as out-group, the relationship of business acquaintances is less likely to take this refusal type. On the contrary, strangers use this refusal type to indicate refusal. Ignoring someone talking is regarded as impolite behavior; therefore, it hardly occurs in a formal, business setting. On the other hand, if both the speakers are strangers, depending on the situation, they do not have to be very polite to each other because they have not established any relationship which they need to maintain thereafter.

According to the data, refusers who are older than the requesters use this refusal type more often than refusers who are younger than the requesters. Most refusers in this pattern are the refusers' colleague, acquaintance, or just a stranger. If the speakers are colleagues, the requestor is either the refuser's subordinate or employee; therefore, in addition to the factor of age difference, the power relationship between the speakers also matters in the choice of strategy of refusal. Out of fourteen samples of this type in which the refuse is older than the requestor, few conversations are between business acquaintances. This finding also supports the idea that people avoid behaving very directly in a formal business situation.

This refusal type is used in the conversation between a female requester and a male refuser. For the most part the speakers are lovers or strangers. Costes (1993) points out that male speakers tend to dominate the conversation when they talk with female speakers. She also suggests that conversational dominance is realized through silence and grabbing
the floor. These arguments may apply to Japanese conversations between the speakers of
different gender. Japanese men sometimes take a somewhat arrogant attitude with their
girlfriend or wife, and ignoring is one such attitude. People can also be impolite to
strangers because they have not established any relationship yet. Therefore, these two
personal relationships allow people, specifically men in this case, to respond impolitely.
There are also a few samples of colleagues, but all female requesters are either subordinate
or employees to the refusers. Male refusers can be discourteous in order to show the
female addressees that they have more power and a higher social status than females in a
company.

The contents of the requests vary. It seems that the degree of the requester's gain
(i.e., what the requester hopes to gain from the refuser's approval, and how much it is
worth to him/her) and that of the refuser's loss (i.e., what the refuser suffers by doing the
favor, and how badly s/he needs to escape it) are about the same. When a requester cannot
ask anyone else but the refuser, and s/he also knows that the refuser's collaboration will be
quite helpful, it is usually the case that the refuser also knows how serious the request is,
and how and how much it will inconvenience him/her. In such a case, s/he is disinclined to
agree to perform the favor. The greater the degree (i.e., requesters gaining much, refusers
losing much), the more refusers use this refusal type in a conversation.

5.1.6 Ignore/Request

There are only nine samples of this refusal type in the data. In four of these
conversations, the speakers regard each other as in-group, and in five others, they regard
each other as out-group. However, it may be inappropriate to jump to the conclusion that

---

*There are several definitions of "floor", but I use Edelsky's (1993) definition of "floor" for this study
because the differentiates floor and turn. According to her, floor is "the acknowledged what's going on
within a psychological time/space" (209). Turn results from a transition from one speaker to the next
speaker, and it can hold a floor. For example, a client's turn in a therapy session holds the floor, but the
therapist's turn of "mmhm"'s or "You mean X?" do not.
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when speaking to someone whom speakers regard as his/her out-group, they tend to use this refusal type. In the case of the conversations in which the conversants are in the same in-group, the speakers are related as family or lovers. The speakers in the conversations in which conversants are mutually out-group are colleagues (the requester a subordinate), or acquaintances and strangers who usually do not have a very established or steady relationship.

It is not considered proper or agreeable of a refuser to ignore a request, and instead make his/her own request, thus chancing the topic. Such self-centered conduct may be acceptable among people who have a very close relationship because they can talk frankly to each other, or those who do not know each other very much because they do not have to keep up the relationship. In other words, people can be very frank and straightforward with each other if they know each other quite well, or if they scarcely know each other. Family and lovers fit in the first case, and strangers and acquaintances fail in the second situation. The relationship of colleagues is not as intimate as that of lovers and family, but it is not as weak as that of strangers, either. However, in these cases, the requester is subordinate to the refuser. Therefore, the refuser is in a stronger position and is able to respond in a blunt way. In this case, the power aspect of the relationship influences the speakers' linguistic behavior more than its personal aspect.

The number of conversations in which a refuser is older than a requester is about the same as that of conversations which include younger refusers. Furthermore, there is no sample in which the speakers are about the same age. One can infer that the speakers of the same age would use this refusal type more often than those who include a younger refuser because of their equal position; however, the data show no sign of this. As there is no significant difference between the other two patterns, speakers' age seemingly does not affect the choice of this refusal type very much.
On the other hand, this refusal type is likely to be used if the speakers are of a different gender. The data do not show any notable difference between the case of female refusers and that of male refusers; however, there are very few male-male and female-female examples that display this refusal type. Strangers and lovers use this type, and male refusers use this with strangers, and female refusers use this with their boyfriends. Both personal relationships allow people to behave impolitely. It seems that male refusers become blunt if no relationship exists between the speakers, and that female refusers’ unreserved attitude comes from an intimate relationship.

Contents of requests vary, but the requests of “leaving” (i.e. “Please leave.” or “Please leave me alone”), “meeting” (i.e., Please meet me at X), and of “hiring” (i.e., please hire me) are observed more than other requests. What these three have in common is that the requests cannot be handled by anyone else but the refusers, yet the refusers are not under any obligation to perform the requested act. In the degree of the refusers’ burden, the first two requests are low, but the third one is rather high. Therefore, this refusal type may appear when the request has minor or major consequences for the requestee. If a request is trivial to the refuser, s/he may ignore it effortlessly, and assert what s/he wants instead. If a request is burdensome and out of the question for a refuser, s/he simply disregards it, and starts talking to other people or changes the subject.

5.1.7 Counter-requests

Responding to a request by making a request is observed more in conversations performed by people who regard each other as out-group than by people in the same in-group. Among people from different out-groups, strangers, colleagues and business acquaintances tend to use this refusal type. Ritual expressions which imply refusal, such as, kono hanasi wa nakatta koto ni Site kudasai ‘Please forget about this matter’ (lit.
'Please treat this matter as if it didn't exist.') are also used in conversations between strangers and between people who are connected through business, and colleagues and people of business acquaintance set a condition. If the two speakers are strangers to each other, there need to be no reserve between them, and they may feel it is easier to be blunt. In such circumstances, they may not hesitate to go ahead and make their own request instead, by way of response. If the speakers' relationship is founded on business, the refuser usually consents to the request, under a certain condition. People who are dealing with business are sensitive about "who owes what to whom" because it greatly affects the results of their business, and they make an effort to balance social debts and credits between them. They try to make and keep them even in order to make it easier to do business smoothly. As there is some distance between strangers or between colleagues in the aspect of closeness, they also can behave formally to some extent. Their use of ritual expressions, for example, is a sign of this formality.

It seems that age does not influence the choice of this type of refusal. In all except one of the conversations that include the refuser's counter-request, there is a difference in age between the requester and the refuser. However, whether the refuser is younger or older than the requester does not correlate with anything obvious. The number of conversations in which the refusers are older than the requester slightly exceeds that of conversations between an older requester and a younger refuser. Business acquaintances appear in the first type (i.e., older refuser and younger requester) but do not in the second type. Older refusers may find it easier to make their own counter-requests and to control the topic, but in these cases, it may be the nature of the business relationship which influences the refusers to choose this type of refusal.

Gender is not a strong factor in deciding on this type of refusals, either. It seems that the speakers of different gender use this type more than the speakers of the same
gender, but the difference is not very significant.\footnote{Even male refusers make counter-requests while six female refusers do the same.} Male refusers make counter-requests more than female refusers do to male requesters. Whether the male refusers are older or younger than the female requesters does not appear to matter. Again, it may be the personal relationship that allows the refusers to make a request. My data show that two strangers of different gender or lovers tend to use this refusal type. People of the first type can be outspoken enough to make their own request because no reserve is required among them. People of the second type can be frank enough to make their own request because of their intimate relationship.

The requests are mostly refused because the refusers do not like the content of the request, not because the refusers do not have the time or ability to take on the requested task. Therefore, most counter-requests from refusers ask for a removal or reconsideration of the original request. The refusal type of ‘X-si nai de (kadasa)’ ‘don’t do X’ is used, and the X usually refers in some way to the requester’s original act. In addition, counter-requests which take an imperative form, such as /verbal stem + nuasi\footnote{For example, Soto de xirii\textsuperscript{a} ‘Do it outside.’, Tanaco buyo o tonuna‘Contact each section in charge.’} or /direct style imperative\footnote{For instance, Suro ‘Do [it]!’, Suna ‘Don’t do [it]!’, Hame ‘talk!’}, are used often. In this way, the refusers ask the requesters either not to make such a request, or they introduce something else that they want the requester to do. Some originally requested acts would impose a burden on the refusers, but others would not. All that the two have in common is that the refusers do not like the idea of the original request.

Now let us move on to strategies of refusals to see if personal relationship, age, gender, and content of the request influence what strategies are used.
5.2 Strategies of Japanese refusals to requests

5.2.1 Using incomplete sentences

My data show that people who regard their addressee as out-group use incomplete sentences, such as, "Boku no tiizon de wa..." 'I (cannot decide such a serious matter) by myself" more often than people in the same in-group. Colleagues and business acquaintances use this strategy. In these relationships, some level of formality is required. As previously mentioned, it is often more polite to leave sentences open-ended than to finish them. The use of incomplete sentences sometimes functions to show the speakers' politeness, and it softens the sentences. Some level of formality is usually required between people from different out-groups. Using incomplete sentences is one way to show a speaker's formality and politeness to the addressee because it leaves out the part that would state the impossibility, or the refuser's distaste, or unwillingness.

On the other hand, age does not have influence on the choice of this strategy. There are exactly the same number of conversation samples of each combination of age difference (i.e., the same age, older refuser, and younger refuser). As the data do not show any significant difference, it may be appropriate to assume that age is not a crucial factor for refusers using incomplete sentences.

Conversations between males and females use incomplete sentences more than those ones in which speakers are the same gender. It seems that when male refusers respond to female requesters, they do not complete their utterances as often as female refusers do to male requesters. However, the difference between the two patterns is not very noticeable. Therefore, whether a refuser is a man or a woman does not matter so much. On the other hand, whether the gender of the requester and the refuser are the same or different may count. Speakers may feel some distance if the gender of the addressee is different from their own, and become slightly more polite when speaking to people of the opposite sex.
The refusers tend to use incomplete sentences when the content of the request is something unexpected or when they hesitate to take on the requested task due to unwillingness or distaste. In the latter case, refusers also often use hesitation noises and/or hedges (i.e., *Iya*, *Maa*, *Udek=i, A...ie, Ato*, etc.), and the pace of the speech usually slows down. There are also two conversation samples in which the refusers turn down the requested action because it is out of their control. Refusing a request owing to inability is a good reason to refuse, and it may be easier than refusing due to unwillingness. In such a case, the refuser may reject the request with less hesitation and sense of guilt. S/he finishes his/her sentences completely. However, in the case of the two tokens in the data, the refusers decided to speak politely by leaving the sentences open-ended. This may be because the requester is their customer, or potential customer. Japanese people pay respect to their customers a great deal because they believe they owe their success in business entirely to their customers. They often say "The customer is always right", or "The customer is king". These two conversations clearly show the Japanese attitude toward their customers, and it also shows that personal relationships, including power relationships, are a strong factor affecting how people interact.

5.2.2 Gradual revelation of negative attitude

As mentioned in the previous chapter, very few conversation examples of this type are available in my data. There are only three conversations which take this pattern, and it is not appropriate to determine which factor(s) influences the refusers to use this strategy by looking at such a small number of examples. The following are the findings from these three conversations in my data.

There are two conversations performed by people who are mutually out-group, and one by people in the same in-group. Each conversation has a different pattern of the age.

---

10 The original Japanese phrase is *"Oyako-sama wa kami-sama desu"*. (The customer is God).
difference between the request and the refuser. The refuser is a man in two conversations, and a woman in the third one, but the requester of all three conversations is a woman. The content of the requests are rather heavy to the refuser. One of them is something unmanageable for the refuser, and the other two will give him/her some trouble.

Showing a negative attitude implies the refusers' rejection. The refuser does not clearly state his/her refusal; therefore, it is an indirect way to refuse. Japanese people often use circumlocution to avoid hurting others' feelings and to be polite. In the data, this strategy is used with a customer, a female friend and with a stranger. People speak politely to all of these people according to the situation. They are careful not to hurt others, especially their friends.

As far as the three samples in the data show, the content of the request is burdensome. Both speakers know that it is a big favor to ask. The refuser rejects it nicely by indicating his/her refusal, hoping that the requester perceives it as a rejection. However, as the requester is also desperate for the refuser's help, s/he will not give up that soon, and keeps asking the refuser to do a favor. The refuser, in turn, implies his/her rejection again, expecting that the requester will understand it and give up this time. If the requester does not, then the refuser has to do the same thing again. As they repeat this exchange, the refuser's expression of refusal becomes clearer in order to make the requester aware of the refuser's rejection. As a consequence, it seems that the refuser shows his/her negative attitude "gradually".

From the data, it can be inferred that personal relationships and the content of request have something to do with the refuser's choice of this strategy, but more data are necessary to confirm that idea.
3.2.3 Proposing alternatives

My data show that people who are mutually out-group use this strategy more often than people in the same in-group. Most speakers are related through business, and the refusers have a higher social status or are in a position of more power.

A refuser proposes an alternative when s/he cannot, or does not want to, do the requested task, but s/he has another idea to solve the problem. An alternative can be an offer (i.e., a refuser will do something else for a requester) or a suggestion (i.e., a refuser advises a requester to do something else). The second case is predominant in the data. By making a suggestion, refusers can avoid clearly stating their refusal and can take control of the topic of the conversation. They can take the floor of the conversation.

Some alternatives, especially those which are proposed by people who are mutually out-group, also bring the conversation to a conclusion. Expressions such as *Kinashi hanasi wa mata aratamete... ‘We can discuss it in detail some other time.’, Ato de miru yo. ‘I’ll look at it [your work] later.’, and Ue to mo soodan itsimasite go-renraku sasete itadakimasu ‘I’ll also talk with my supervisors about this and will contact you later.’ are rather conventionalized expressions which can, if framed so, imply the refuser’s rejection. In such cases, the refusers do not really intend to talk about it later (either with the requester or with their supervisors) or to look at it (the requester’s work), but, these sound nicer than a statement like *Iya, sumasen/dekimasen yo. ‘No, I won’t/can’t do [that].’ The refusers can also conclude the talk about the requested matter by indicating they will not do anything about it at this moment but maybe some time later.

Refusers can control a conversation by proposing alternatives; therefore, they are in a stronger position than the requester in a sense. The speakers’ age difference also follows this. In most such conversation tokens have the refuser is older than the requester. As mentioned above, older people are usually deferred to by younger people in Japan; this tends to give them greater freedom to take the initiative in a conversation with someone
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younger. Therefore, it is more likely that older refusers, who are in a position of more power, propose alternatives to younger requesters than younger refusers do that to older requester.

Male refusers' use of this strategy to female requesters stands out in the data. Moreover, most of the conventionalized expressions mentioned above are used by male refusers. This suggests that when refusing a female requester, older men have a tendency to do so by taking control of the conversation, specifically by using a conventionalized expressions to end present talk on that subject.

The contents of the requests here are generally trifling matters, such as providing some information, explaining the situation, or giving the requester another can of beer. The requesters can clearly ask somebody else for help and even if the request is refused, the requesters will not be in very serious trouble. The refusers will not lose very much by doing the requested task, but s/he simply does not feel like doing it. There are no refusals given because of the inability of the refuser. The refusers reject because of their unwillingness and distaste to the request.

On the other hand, there are also a few conversations in which the requester is desperate for the requestee's help. In such cases the context of the request is rather serious and will impose a burden. Accepting the request will mean s/he suffers some loss. In these situations, too, refusers either suggest what else the requester can do in this situation or conclude present talk on the matter with a conventionalized expression.

5.2.4 Expressing empathy with the requester

There are only six conversations which include apologetic expressions in my data. According to the data, it seems that people who are mutually out-group use this strategy more than mutually people in the same in-group do. These speakers do not know each other very well, i.e., they are acquaintances, strangers, or customers. There are two
conversations in which the refusers are talking to a customer or potential customer, and both refusers use apologetic expressions. In both cases, the refusers have no power or authority to do the requested task. Even though it is not their fault that they cannot help the requester, they apologize anyway to show their goodwill to the customers.

Lovers constitute the only cases of mutual in-group members in the conversations which include this strategy. Moreover, the content of the request is the same in all cases: the requester wants the refuser to stay overnight at his/her place. There is a saying in Japanese that even between friends, courtesies matter. However, in these cases, it is less likely that the refusers apologize out of mere courtesy or politeness. Rather, their apologies come from the heart. The refusers truly feel bad about rejecting the request. The requesters in these situations have simply shown their affection toward the requestee; they just want their lover to be at their side. Refusing this request, then, means refusing the requester’s love and affection, which will hurt the requester’s feelings a great deal. Japanese people usually try to avoid hurting their addressee’s feelings when they talk, and if they realize that they have hurt the addressee, they usually apologize. Two conversation tokens in my data follow this pattern of linguistic behavior. The refuser realizes that s/he has hurt the requester, and s/he apologizes about that.

Age does not seem to be related to the refuser’s use of apologetic expressions. The number of conversations with an older requester slightly exceeds the other two possible combinations, but the difference is not very significant.

Both male and female refusers use this strategy, but it seems, at least in my data sample, that male refusers apologize less than female refusers do. There is no conversation which includes apologetic expressions between two men. Since there are about the same number of conversations for each other possible combination of the speakers’ gender (i.e.,

11 Siaoki naka ni mo rege ari. According to Koji Kotowaza ziten (Syobunsha, 1980), one English saying similar to this is “A hedge between keeps friendship green” (p.111).
M-F, F-F, F-M), it appears that male refusers do not apologize as much as female refusers do, at least in my data sample. Apology is widely considered a polite behavior in Japan. It loosens tension caused by conflict, helps return the personal relationship back to a smooth and harmonious one, and helps solve problems that have arisen between speakers. Therefore, my data may support the argument that women speak more politely than men.12 However, in the case of apologies, it seems that the content of the request may be a stronger factor that affects the refuser’s speech.

With two exceptions13, all the contents of requests that evoke apologetic refusals have something to do with love and affection. In most cases, the requesters say something which expresses their affection to the requestees who do not respond as the requesters expect, or wish. The refusers in effect reject the requester’s friendly feeling or affection, and this usually hurts his/her feelings. There is one conversation in which the requester asks the requestee to break up with her lover, the requester’s father. If the requestee accepts this, then she has hurt herself; if she refuses, she knows that this will upset the requester a lot. The refuser does not want to upset the requester, yet she simply cannot give up her lover; therefore, she cannot help but refuse the request. In all cases, refusers who apologize are aware that they will hurt the requesters’ feelings by refusing the request. Kindaichi (1987) suggests that Japanese people apologize probably not for what they have done in itself, but for the fact that their behavior has destroyed or damaged their relationship. The refusers in my data may also have felt sorry about the disharmony introduced into the relationship by their rejection, and apologized for that. It seems that if people’s feelings may be hurt, refusers tend to use apologetic expressions when they reject.

12 This idea is discussed by several linguists such as Brown (1980). Shibamoto (1987) and Ide (1990) also argue that this claim applies to Japanese as well. Smith (1992) adds to this claim that Japanese women’s speech is powerless as well as polite.

13 These two exceptions are conversations in which the requester is a refuser’s customer.
5.2.5 Asking for more information

There are only three conversations which include this strategy. This is not a sufficient amount of data to form any conclusion about what affects the refusers' use of this strategy. Therefore, the following is just what is found in my data.

There are two conversations where the speakers regard each other as in-group (i.e., lovers and colleagues/friends), and one in which the speakers stand outside each other (refusal to a customer). The refusers are either younger than or about the same age as the requester. The gender of the speakers is the same in two cases (a male requester and male refuser; and a female requester and female refuser) and different (a male requester and female refuser) in the third. Therefore, female refusers use this strategy slightly more than male refusers. What all three of them have in common is that the content of the request has surprised the refusers. The requests are something the refusers did not expect, so they all ask *Doosite*? 'why?' in order to get more information about the request.

In some cases, a refuser asks for more information about the request so that s/he can find a good reason to refuse. On the other hand, asking for more information can be regarded as a considerate way to respond. The requestee is still on the same topic, and s/he has not ignored the request, so his/her asking further questions about the request can be perceived as asking an interest in the request. The requestee’s positive face is thus respected.

The conversations in which requestees ask for more information are observed between both mutually in-group people (such as lovers and friends) and mutually out-group people, especially (in the latter case) if a customer is involved in the conversation. Fishman (1983) and Coats (1993) point out that women (in the United States) make an effort to keep the conversation going by asking questions. My data seem to support these conclusions, so we may ask if the refusers in the data ask for more information in order to
show politeness to the requesters. However, since all the refusers in my data are surprised and ask “Why?”, it is more likely that they simply want to know the reason for the request.

5.3 Factors which affect the speaker’s choice of linguistic behavior

I have looked at each refusal type and strategy to figure out what influences speakers to select a certain refusal type and/or strategy of refusal. A brief summary of what has been discussed is presented in the next two pages.

5.3.1 Personal Relationship

Although some types and/or strategies need more data to describe their characteristics, my data show that on the whole, mutually out-group people tend to use refusal types and/or strategies which are considered as (a part of) indirect refusals. People who see each other as in-group, on the other hand, use the refusal types which are regarded as direct.

STATING IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY and STATING IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON are the only refusal types which are predominantly used by people who regard each other as in-group. These two types, especially the first one, are considered direct refusals. No reserve or hesitation is usually involved in the refusers’ rejection. The relationship of mutually in-group people is close and firmly established. When each sees the other as inside, the two are usually on equal footing, so that they can talk in a casual, direct speech style. Mutual trust among people who have a history of shared insides is not broken easily, and on many matters they do not feel a need to hold anything back from each other. Such a background facilitates the frank statement of straightforward refusal.

On the other hand, people who stand outside each other keep some distance between themselves. Their relationship is not as steady or grounded in shared experience as that of mutually in-group people. Standing outside each other means standing in a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refusal type</th>
<th>Mutual position</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Content of request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REASON</td>
<td>out-group: strangers bus. acquaint.</td>
<td>Older ref</td>
<td>M ref-F req</td>
<td>Business req’s loss: large req’s gain: large ref’s inability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REASON + IMP</td>
<td>out-group: bus. acquaint. colleagues</td>
<td>Older ref Same age</td>
<td>M ref Same (M-M)</td>
<td>ref: no will req: desperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>in-group: no strangers colleagues (sup to sub)</td>
<td>Older ref Same age</td>
<td>M ref F-F</td>
<td>not very serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP + REASON</td>
<td>in-group family out-group</td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>no M-M</td>
<td>ref’s loss: large req’s gain: large req: desperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore</td>
<td>out-group strangers no bus acquaint.</td>
<td>Older ref (+ power)</td>
<td>M ref-F req lovers strangers colleagues (F req=sub)</td>
<td>ref’s loss: large req’s gain: large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore/ Request</td>
<td>out-group colleagues (+ power to - power) strangers in-group lovers family</td>
<td>Older ref no same age</td>
<td>Different sex strangers lovers M ref to strangers F ref: to BF</td>
<td>Either light or heavy Only ref can perform Ref has no obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>out-group strangers in-group lovers</td>
<td>Different age Older ref (+bus.)</td>
<td>Different sex M ref to strangers to lovers</td>
<td>ref: no will some requests are heavy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: bus. acquaint. = business acquaintance, sub. = subordinate, sup. = supervisor, ref = refuser, req = requester, M = male, F = female (++power) = one who has more power, (-power) = one who has less power, (+bus) = business involved

(continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Mutual Position</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Content of request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete sentence</td>
<td>out-group colleagues bus. acquaint.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Different sex M ref - F req</td>
<td>unexpected ref: no will inability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitude</td>
<td>out-group: customers strangers in-group friend</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>M ref - F req F ref - F req</td>
<td>heavy ref: inability troublesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>out-group (+bus.) ref: (power -)</td>
<td>older ref</td>
<td>M ref - F req</td>
<td>light, sometimes desperate/serious ref: no will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>out-group: customer acquaintance stranger in-group lovers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>no M-M</td>
<td>love &amp; affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info.</td>
<td>in-group lovers out-group customer</td>
<td>same age younger ref</td>
<td>same sex M req - F ref</td>
<td>unexpected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

different position, often an unequal one. Since little is assumed, some reserve is a useful thing, and frankness can invite misunderstanding. These people need to make an effort to maintain a harmonious relationship, since they cannot just assume it. Therefore, politeness is useful, and people usually talk in a careful, distant speech style.

Among the refusal types and strategies used mostly by mutual outsiders, some can be regarded as polite ways to refuse and others, not. It seems that refusal types or strategies of the first type (such as REASON, REASON + IMP, INCOMPLETE SENTENCES, APOLOGY and so on) are used by people who have established their relationship through
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Figure 4. Three concentric circles which represent positions assumed in Japanese human relationship

From the self’s perspective, the *soto* and *yo-so* circles are both outside. The circle called *soto* is the world of acquaintances, where some reserve or modesty is needed. Japanese people pay special attention to other people in this circle and become watchful of their speech. People whose relationship with the self is established based on business are often seen by the self as in this circle. In the business world, as in public venues generally, evaluation from others matters a great deal for people to succeed. Therefore, people control their linguistic behavior in order to influence the others. As a result, they pursue a respectful avoidance, in formal attitude and behavior when mingling with outsiders, it is safer to express only views with wide socially acceptance.14

The strategies which are regarded as somewhat impolite (such as IGNORE, IGNORE-REQUEST, REQUEST, etc.) are mostly used by strangers, who from the speaker’s perspective are out-group. This finding contradicts the above argument that people who regard addressees as outside refuse politely. In order to make the difference between the

---

14 Yamada (1992) refers to such “socially accepted views” as “intermee” in Japanese.
two clear, we need to put strangers into a different category from that of colleagues, business acquaintances, and customers. It is appropriate to categorize strangers under the group called *yoso* which locates at the outer-most circle.

People who belong to the outer-most circle are referred to as *yosomeno* ‘outsider, stranger’ or *aka no tanin* ‘complete stranger’, and they are not very important to the self. One does not care much about how one looks from the *yosomeno*’s point of view. Moreover, people who regard themselves as outsiders to each other do not expect much in the way of politely attentive treatment from others because they do not know each other very well. Since there are no grounds to expect or motivate politeness with true strangers, one will not be disappointed in his/her expectation of others. Thus, as Ueda (1996) pointed out, true strangers can behave “impolitely” to others, i.e., in ways that would be impolite, were there an expectation of politeness. For example, some Japanese people push others away when they get on a train during rush hour. Furthermore, there is a Japanese proverb *Tan no haji wa kakizame*, which means one can cast off any sense of shame when one is away from home. However, there are cases where strangers behave politely as well. For example, people usually wait in line, and usually talk in a careful, distal speech style until they get to know each other better. In my data, there are also some conversation examples in which the strangers refuse by using some types or strategies which are considered as polite, such as the refusal type of REASON, or APOLOGY. Therefore, strangers can be polite as well.

Miyake (1994) states that one’s attitude toward people in the *yoso*-group varies due to lack of information about them. One has no choice but to decide what kind of linguistic behavior to take based on the little information s/he has about the others. Therefore, depending on the situation, one behaves excessively politely in some cases, and rudely in other cases. Miyake’s argument does not clearly show the factor which helps one to decide
whether to behave politely or not. However, Lebra (1976)’s notion of omote and ura may help elaborate Miyake’s suggestion.

Lebra points out that the uchi-soto distinction is not created by social structure, but by situations, which change constantly. The distinction may be inside vs. outside an individual person, a family, a company, etc. Lebra also argues that the uchi-soto dichotomy is not a totally sufficient criterion for defining a situation, and that a second dichotomy of omote and ura should characterize a situation as well. Omote refers to ‘front’ or ‘what is exposed to public attention’, and ura indicates ‘back’ or ‘what is hidden from the public’ (112). By combining these two with soto and uchi, three kinds of situations are created, as shown below. Lebra states that a situation which is created by the combination of uchi and omote is less likely to occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omote (front)</th>
<th>Ura (back)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uchi (in-group)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soto (out-group)</td>
<td>Ritual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. The three possible situations defined by Lebra (1976: 112).

In the intimate situation, one feels others are insiders, and reveals his/her natural self and takes off his/her social mask. Speakers and addressees are expected to be in an equal position, and the frankness often leads to stupidity and infantility.

On the other hand, one defines others or a third person as outsiders in the ritual situation and the anomic situation. In the ritual situation, one cares about others’ opinion. One makes an effort to maintain face, in other words, one tries to avoid behavior which may cause him/her shame. Therefore, one tries to follow conventional rules, manners, and etiquette with his/her social mask on. One does not express his/her wish but expects others to sense it (omoiyari). In the anomic situation on the other hand, others from the outside world are not present; therefore, one does not have to consider ritual codes or maintain a
“front”; therefore, his/her behavior need not be careful or solicitous. Unlike the ritual situation, *emochi* is not usually observed in this situation.

It seems that existence of a possible relationship is one of the factors which makes strangers decide how to behave correctly, according to the situation. In the ritual situation where they have to deal with each other again, they have to maintain face and behave politely. On the other hand, people can choose to behave in an asocial way (i.e., amonically) when they know that there is, and will be, no relationship established among them.

5.3.2 Age and gender

5.3.2.1 Age

In addition to the distinction between in-group and out-group, the speakers’ age and gender may also be components which create a human relationship. However, it does not seem that these two factors have a great influence on the speakers’ choice of their linguistic behavior. In my data, older refusers are a majority in each refusal type or strategy. This may suggest that the older refusers feel it is easier to refuse than younger refusers, but there is the possibility that the conversations I collected just happened to include a lot of older refusers. Therefore, it may be hasty to conclude that people who are older refuse more. However, there is a tendency for speakers of the same age to use refusal types which include stating impossibility (i.e., REASON + IMPOSSIBILITY, IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY, and IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON). This suggests that people of roughly the same age find it easier to use clear statements of rejection. As they are equal in terms of age, they are also roughly equal in position, and that allows them to be frank with each other.

Another distinctive finding is that conversations which include an older refuser are performed mostly in business settings. In a Japanese company, older people usually have
higher rank and therefore more power. Thus, it may be the speakers’ power relationship, rather than the age difference, that affects how the refuser rejects a request.

5.3.2.2 Gender

The speakers’ gender does not seem to influence very much how they refuse, either. In the data, there are more conversations performed by two speakers of different sex than by two speakers of the same sex. Moreover, the data show that male speakers refuse more than female speakers. These findings imply that people tend to refuse more if they are talking to someone of the opposite sex, and that men refuse more than women; however, it is more likely that it happened to turn out that way because of my data which were selected by the speakers’ mutual position, not by gender.

Although there are more male refusers than female refusers in the data, there is no male-to-male conversation taken which includes the refusal type of IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY. On the other hand, the refusal type of IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY which is considered a direct refusal, is primarily used by male refusers. Male speech is often described as blunt -- point-blank, brief, and impolite -- compared with female speech. Once a man indicates his refusal, it may be considered effeminate or unmanly to make an excuse in order to justify his rejection. Making an apology is regarded as polite behavior. Therefore, it is understandable that in referring a request, male refusers do not use IMPOSSIBILITY + REASON and APOLOGY, but the refusal type of IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY.

There are fewer samples of female refusers in my data, but it seems that female refusers use refusal type and/or strategy which is regarded as blunt or straightforward only to people who belong to the same group, i.e., fellow in-group people. In the data, female refusers use the refusal type of IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY to female requesters only, and use the strategy of IGNORE/REQUEST to someone in her in-group, such as her boyfriend. On the
other hand, the polite strategy of APOLOGY and of ASKING FOR MORE INFORMATION are used more often by female refusers than by male refusers.

These findings suggest if they refuse, people in these TV dramas tend to refuse a request when it is made by a person of the opposite sex. Male refusers use straightforward refusal type or strategy of refusals more often than female refusers. On the other hand, female refusers use a polite refusal type or strategy of refusal more often than male refusers. When women refuse in a direct, straightforward way, it is usually done to people presently in the same uchi. Men can be blunt when they refuse. They also take control of the topic of the conversation when they are refusing a request made by women. Women, on the other hand, refuse more carefully than men. They show their empathy to the requesters by apologizing or asking for more information about the request in order to demonstrate their participation in the conversation and to show their concern about the request.

If power plays a part in the conversants’ relationship, it probably is a stronger factor in influencing the speakers’ linguistic behavior. In a business setting in particular, although the situation is gradually changing these days, men usually have more power and higher status in companies than women. Therefore, most of the time, it may be easier for men to refuse a request from women, simply because women are more often their subordinates. On the contrary, if women do not feel it is easy to refuse a request from men at work, this is most often because men are their superiors. When they refuse, they do so in a polite manner in order to avoid conflict with their boss.

5.3.3 Content of requests

The content of a request also matters in determining how to refuse. It seems that the straightforward refusal type (such as IMPOSSIBILITY ONLY) and strategy (e.g., KNORE) are used for both small and big requests. If the request is a trifling matter for the refuser,
such as going home or leaving, the refuser does not hesitate very much in rejecting the request, and his/her rejection will not cause much trouble to the requester. If the request is serious and burdensome for the refuser, such as returning a large amount of money right away, s/he may reject it outright. In this case, judging from the typical situation in my data, both the requester and the refuser know that the content of the request is too much to ask. The refusers probably assume that even though the request is refused, the requester will understand why; therefore, they seldom hesitate to refuse the request in a straightforward manner.

On the other hand, indirect, circumlocutory refusals, such as stating a reason or the use of incomplete sentences, are used for a request to which refusers need to be careful about their speech in responding. These indirect refusals are observed with more frequently in conversations between colleagues, business acquaintances, and between clerks and customers, and money is involved in the requested matter. The requesters usually stand to gain some money while the refusers will lose some if the request is accepted. Money is essential in doing business; both gaining and losing money affects management and the operation of a business, and people are usually very careful about how to respond when they talk about something which involves money. Furthermore, it is often considered disgraceful or shameful to talk about money, so people tend to pretend that money is not their first matter of concern, and give something different as a reason for refusal.

Apologetic expressions are particularly used when the request comes from the requesters’ affection or liking for the requestee. Refusing this kind of request results in hurting the requestee’s feelings; therefore, refusers apologize, in effect, for hurting the requester.

Japanese people make an effort to maintain a harmonious human relationship with others, and pay special attention to their speech; what they say and how they say it, in order
not to hurt others’ feelings. If they hurt others’ feelings, their relationship will not be as friendly as it used to be. Therefore, when this happens, people apologize for what they did (i.e., hurting others), and/or for breaking the relationship by hurting others’ feelings.

5.4 Conclusion

It seems that the most effective factors in the speakers’ choice of refusals is the personal or human relationship and the power relationship between the speakers. Fellow in-group people can refuse each other directly, or in a straightforward way because of their equal position and trustworthy relationship. Refusers who see the requester as out-group, on the other hand, tend to refuse indirectly by using refusal types and/or strategies which are regarded as polite. If the requesters are the refusers’ business acquaintances or customers, their linguistic behavior becomes especially polite.

However, people who regard the addressee as out-group can be straightforward as well. If there is a power relation involved between the speakers, a person who has more power can be intimate. For example, a supervisor can refuse directly to a request made by his/her subordinate because from his/her perspective, there is no boundary of ichi and soto between s/he and his/her subordinate so that the subordinate is regarded as his/her in-group (even though from the subordinate’s point of view, s/he is regarded as out-group). Within the mutually out-group people, strangers can behave straightforwardly as well.

When the speakers realize that there is, or will be, a possible relationship between them, they usually try to behave politely because they do not want to damage the relationship with their speech and other behavior; however, once they realize that they do not have to deal with their addressees again, they sometimes dispense with the kind of careful behavior that would support such further dealings.

The speakers’ age and gender do not seem to be major factors which affect the speakers’ linguistic behavior. Rather, in these data at least, they are more like secondary
factors in the power relation. An older person usually has more power than a younger person, and s/he deserves respect from the younger one. It is acceptable for the older person to behave self-importantly. Therefore, older people can refuse directly to younger requesters.

In the data, there are more male refusers than female refusers, and this implies that men refuse more than women do. However, in Japanese society, particularly in the business world, men generally have a higher status, thus have more power than women. Therefore, because of the power they have, they can control the conversation, and can refuse in a less than careful way to female requesters.

The refusers occasionally reject directly both small and big requests. In the first case, the refusers seem to know the requester's burden from refusal is not serious, so they may feel it is easier to refuse in a direct way. In the second case, although the refuser knows the burden their refusal will impose on the requester is quite severe, they also realize that the burden taken on with acceptance of the request will be as severe him/her, too. The refusers tend to assume that requesters also understand their situation, and act as if they hope that their refusal will be perceived as reasonable even though it is done directly. Moreover, if the content of the request has something to do with money, refusers tend to imply their refusals by using roundabout expressions. If a request comes from the requester's affection toward the refuser, the refuser tends to use apologetic expressions together with the refusal.

The linguistic behavior of Japanese people is closely related to perceived human relationships and social norms. People do their best to maintain harmonious relationships with others. They worry if they hurt others' feelings, and are concerned about what others might think about them. They gauge their position in each situation, and behave in a way that indexes that position in ways acceptable to social norms in order to maintain a good relationship with others. They try to keep conflict to a minimum, and therefore, they tend
to be polite to each other and avoid expressing their thoughts straightforwardly, unless they are quite sure about the closeness or non-existence of their relationship.
CHAPTER 6

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Introduction

As the focus of foreign language instruction has moved toward a communicative approach, the question of how to expand the learners’ communicative ability in Japanese has received much attention among Japanese language specialists. Along with this, the field of research has been expanding to the level of semantics or pragmatics. Recently, much research has been done on the level of pragmatics: how the learners perform the speech acts of request, apology, gratitude, or refusal in a second language, and how they are different from that of a native speaker of that language. By comparing the learners’ and the native speakers’ speech acts, it has been thought possible to determine what kind of misunderstandings might occur between them in what situations. Research on Japanese language in terms of interlanguage pragmatics\(^1\) contributes to research on Japanese L2 pedagogy.

\(^{1}\)This term is used in Blum-Kulka, House et al. (1989). This is a study of interlanguage (i.e., a language system which learners of a foreign language construct as they acquire more knowledge of the L2. It is not equivalent to either the L1 or the L2) focusing on the learners’ pragmatic and discourse knowledge.
6.2 Research on interlanguage pragmatics between Japanese and English

6.2.1 Research on pragmatic transfer from English to Japanese

Although some research on pragmatic transfer\(^2\) from Japanese to English has been done by Beebe, Takahashi & Ulissi-Weltz (1990) and by Robinson (1991), very little research has been done on pragmatic transfer from English (or other foreign languages) to Japanese. The following is one example of the research on pragmatic transfer from English to Japanese.

Ikoma and Shimura (1993) asked thirty people (ten native speakers of Japanese (JI), ten native speakers of American English (AE), and ten American students of advanced Japanese (AJ)) to do a discourse completion test (hereafter, DCT). AE took the test in English, and JI took the test in Japanese. For AJ, the explanations of the situations were given in English, but the conversations were written in Japanese with romanization and English translations of the conversation also provided. There were twelve situations in which the subjects needed to make a refusal, and the subjects were asked to write down how they would respond in each situation. There were four types of refusal, (a refusal to a request, to an invitation, to a suggestion and to an offer), and each type of refusal included situations in which the addressee’s social status was higher or lower than, or the same as the subject’s. In all cases, the addressee makes a request, invites, makes suggestions, or offers something.

The results of their experiment show that the American subjects, (native speakers of English (AE), and students of Advanced Japanese (AJ)), used direct refusals more often than the native speakers of Japanese (JI) when they refused a request. Moreover, JJ presented alternatives more than AE and AJ did. When JJ refused a supervisor’s request to work overtime, they used pause fillers less than AE and AJ did; however, when the roles

\(^2\) A transfer of communicative ability in order to perform a speech act and/or a transfer of knowledge to speech.
were reversed, and they refused their employees' request for a raise in salary, they used
pause fillers more than AE and AJ did.

Ikoma & Shimura point out that three kinds of harmful transfer\(^2\) were observed in
their experiment, and two of them are related to refusals to a request. First, when JJ
refused a request from someone of a higher or the same social status, they presented
alternatives more often than AE and AJ did. This implies that just stating the reasons of
refusal, the most common strategy for AE and AJ, may be considered evidence of a lack of
sincerity in Japanese. Another kind of harmful pragmatic transfer was that the AE and AJ
used direct refusal more than JJ. JJ used incomplete sentences, especially to people of a
higher social status than themselves, so that they avoided using the expressions of direct
refusal such as *dekimasen* ‘can’t do [it]’ (lit. It cannot be done)’. Ikoma and Shimura
suggest that the AE and AJ’s use of direct refusal was described by their tendency to use
complete sentences. However, there is a possibility that the AJ were instructed to use full
sentences, in order to focus on Japanese structural patterns. It is probably inappropriate to
guard their tendency of using complete sentences as pragmatic transfer from English to
Japanese.

AE and AJ did not show any difference according to the addressee’s social status
when they used incomplete sentences. Ikoma and Shimura state that the use of incomplete
sentences is regarded as indirect refusal because refusers can imply their refusal without
saying the latter part of the refusal sentence, which if uttered would be a direct refusal
expression, such as *dekimasen*. Although JJ used incomplete sentences in order to avoid
direct refusal and were careful not to be impolite to addressees of higher status, the
learners of Japanese (AJ) did not show that tendency. These findings suggest that there is

---

\(^2\) Ikoma & Shimura argue that there are two kinds of pragmatic transfer: harmless transfer and harmful transfer. According to their experiment, AJ and AE used expressions of gratitude more than JJ did when they refused an invitation. This will not be regarded as impolite by JJ; therefore, this type of pragmatic transfer is considered a harmless transfer. A harmful transfer, on the other hand, is one which causes some mistaken impressions of impoliteness between the two speakers.
a possibility that AJ would be considered impolite when dealing with their superiors in social situations.

Ikoma and Shimura conclude that the results of their experiment will be useful for teaching learners of Japanese how to refuse without offending Japanese people. They also suggest that the use of incomplete sentences for refusal is a helpful skill for the learners of Japanese to learn. However, they do not mention how or in what way, the skill can be taught.

6.2.2 Research on pragmatic transfer from Japanese to English

6.2.2.1 Beebe, Takahashi & Uliess-Weltz’s study

Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz (1990) did an experiment to see if there was any pragmatic transfer from L1 (the learners’ native language) to L2 (the second, or target language) in performing the speech act of refusal. They asked twenty Japanese speaking Japanese (JJ), twenty Japanese speaking English (JE) and twenty Americans speaking English (AE) to fill out a DCT.¹ The DCT was a written role-play questionnaire which included twelve situations where only a refusal would fit. An interlocutor’s lines are written out, following the description of a situation, in the DCT. The subjects are asked to fill out the blank which follows the interlocutor’s lines. Even though the word “refusal” was not used in the test, in order to avoid biasing the subjects’ choice of response, the rejoinder that followed the blank made it hard for the subject to respond with anything but a refusal.

There were four stimulus types: three requests, three invitations, three offers and three suggestions. One stimulus from each group required a refusal to someone of higher status, someone of lower status than the subject, and someone of the equal status. The authors examined the order of semantic formulas and their frequency, and described the

¹ The test was written in English, and the subjects were instructed to write their answers in English.
result for each stimulus type. They focused only on situations where the difference between JE and AE was likely to be caused by the influence of the native Japanese discourse patterns.\(^3\)

The result shows that when the subjects were refusing a request made by somebody of lower status, JJ and JE opened with an apology, which was put second by AE, following an expression of positive opinion such as “I’d love to”. JJ and JE followed the apology with an excuse, while AE left the excuse till last.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Apology / Regret</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Regret</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Positive opinion</td>
<td>Regret</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Typical order of semantic formulas in refusals of requests from a person of lower status

When the subjects refused a request from somebody of higher status, they all started by stating a positive opinion. However, while AE only stated positive opinions, JJ and JE also expressed empathy for the requester. Another notable point is that JJ and JE did not use Apology/Regret while AE still kept it in the second position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Positive opinion / empathy</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Positive opinion / empathy</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Positive opinion</td>
<td>Regret</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Typical order of semantic formulas in refusals of requests from a person of higher status

---

\(^3\) Beebe, Takahashi, Uliss-Weltz (1990) refer to this type of transfer as “negative transfer”.
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The results also show that when JJ and JE refused a request, they said "I'm sorry" more frequently than AE did. Ninety five percent of the JJ responses and eighty five percent of the JE responses contained an apology, while only forty percent of the AE responses contained one. Furthermore, JJ and JE showed marked code-switching in frequency of Apology/Regret formulas between a higher and a lower status requester, while AE did not.

Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz's study displayed some examples of pragmatic transfer from Japanese to English in performing the speech act of refusal to a request. This suggests that the reverse (i.e., pragmatic transfer from English to Japanese) may occur when American learners of Japanese refuse a request from a native Japanese. If it does, Japanese addressees may perceive the American learners' refusal as impolite due to an insufficient amount of expression of apology and/or empathy, and to "insensitiveness" (from a native Japanese viewpoint) toward difference in status.

6.2.2.2 Robinson's study

Robinson (1991) asked twelve female native speakers of Japanese to do a DCT in English. There were six situations, and the subjects were instructed to refuse in each situation. In five out of six situations, the subjects were asked to refuse a request made by an American female classmate. The subjects were asked to give concurrent verbal reports on what they were thinking while they worked on the DCT. Right after the subjects finished the DCT, the researcher interviewed them for 20-30 minutes about the content of their utterances in the concurrent verbal reports (i.e. they were asked to make a retrospective report).

The following comments were made by the subjects either in a concurrent report or a retrospective report:

- I never refuse because it is very hard for me.
- I have to think of some good reasons to refuse.
- The best way is just avoid giving a straight answer to the addressee.
- Not saying "no" is very good for Japanese women. If we don't say "no", we can keep our harmony with many people.
- I'm not accustomed to saying "no".
- At first I answered "I am not sure whether I can go" (to an offer of a ride by an unsafe driver). This is almost a direct translation from Japanese, and in the case of Japanese, people won't ask any further, but I thought this is not clear enough (for American people) and I should refuse more straightforwardly.

These comments imply that native Japanese speakers avoid saying a straightforward "no" in order to maintain harmony in their relationship with the requester. The last comment also implies that Japanese people tend to have a stereotypical image of American people. The Japanese think that Americans talk directly so that one has to speak clearly or straightforwardly when speaking to them.

This tendency is also observed in the experiment conducted by Yokoyama (1993). She asked eighty native Japanese speakers to refuse a request and an invitation in a role play. Each subject was asked to do the same task twice: once to a native Japanese speaker, and are to an American who speaks Japanese. The results show that when the Japanese responded to American interlocutors, they used direct refusals more often than when they responded to Japanese interlocutors. They also used fewer indirect refusals, hesitation, or hedging to American interlocutors. The researcher also asked the subjects to state their thoughts about the experiment. Japanese subjects commented, “I refuse straightforwardly to foreigners, but I think I will negotiate more with a Japanese interlocutor”, “I don’t think foreigners will understand subtle euphemistic expressions of Japanese”, “As Americans talk directly, I believe I have to talk in the same way”.

6.3 Rethinking the popular belief that “Japanese refuse indirectly”

Japanese refusals are generally considered indirect, and when people say that "Japanese people refuse indirectly" they often mean it in comparison with American refusals. Does this mean that Japanese refusals are always indirect and American refusals
are more direct? The results of my study show clearly that there are some circumstances when Japanese also refuse directly. A person who has more power and/or higher social status, a total stranger, a close friend can refuse directly to a request. Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz (1990)'s study also showed that compared with Americans, Japanese refuse directly, especially when the refuser is older than the initiator (i.e., a person who requests, invites, etc.).

As the following conversational exchange shows, American refusals are not always direct, either.

Donny (D): Guess what.hh
Marcia (M): What.
D: hh My egr is stg:iled.
(0.2)
D: (*n) I'm up here in the Glen?
M: Oh::
(0.4)
D: (.hh)
M: And hh
(0.2)
D: I don' know if it's possible, but (.hhh/(0.2)) see l haveta open up the hy:nk.hh
(0.3)
D: a't uh: (.) in Brentwood?hh=
(0.4)
M: =Yeah:- en I know you want- (.) en I whoa- (.) en I would, but- except I've gotta leave in about five min:hutes. (hhheh)
D: [=Okay then I gotta call somebody else. right away.

(Shegloff, handout; cited in Geis,1995: 75)

In this conversation, the refuser Marcia does not clearly state "No, I can't.", but just explains her situation, that she has a time conflict, and thus implies her refusal. In other words, Marcia is refusing indirectly.

Furthermore, one of the American subjects in Yokoyama (1993)'s study on refusals made a comment that the Japanese speak directly and are rude when they speak to Americans (or foreigners). This comment suggests that Japanese refusals can also be taken as a direct refusal by the American.
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The notion of directness, which is to say, the criteria for judging it, seem to be culture-specific. A popular notion among Japanese is that Americans speak directly, but Americans also regard Japanese refusals as rude and straightforward in some situations, especially when the Japanese speaking in English. Although Japanese refusals are generally considered indirect, Okazaki (1995)'s study shows that Japanese refusals are more “direct” than Korean refusals. The results of the studies discussed above suggest that the criterion of directness varies in each culture. Therefore, it does not seem appropriate to generalize that Japanese refusals are uniformly indirect. It is more accurate to say that the way Japanese people refuse varies depending on the situation. They refuse in the appropriate way for each situation, either indirectly or directly, after considering several factors such as personal and/or power relationship and public attention.

6.4 Pedagogical implication

Refusals are difficult things to perform even in one’s native language. They may be even more difficult in a foreign language. In order to keep misunderstandings between native Japanese and learners of Japanese to a minimum, it is very important to teach the learners how to refuse appropriately in a variety settings. However, it seems that the importance of social appropriateness has not been emphasized much in most Japanese language learning materials and teaching methods. What is necessary for better language learning is language instruction which incorporates a performative emphasis on sociolinguistic and pragmatic knowledge of Japanese, that is, which develops reliable intuitions about social appropriateness.

6 Okazaki (1995) asked sixty people to do DCT. Out of sixty subjects, twenty are native speakers of Japanese who refuse in Japanese to a Japanese addressee (JJ), twenty are native speakers of Korean who refuse in Korean to a Korean addressee (KK), and another twenty are native speakers of Korean who refuse in Japanese to a Japanese addressee (KJ). There were four settings (refusals to a request, to an invitation, to an offer and to a suggestion), and there were two types of addressee in each situation: one who took care of the subject, and another who did not. The result shows that JJ used more direct refusal than KK or KJ did. JJ did not use incomplete sentences as much as KK did.
6.4.1 Teaching “when”, “to whom” and “how” to refuse

It is not appropriate to teach only the stereotype that the Japanese refuse indirectly. Stereotypes can be wrong sometimes; therefore, the stereotype of Japanese indirectness may plant false preconceived ideas about Japanese refusals into the learners’ mind, and as a result, some misunderstandings between learners and native speakers of Japanese may occur. As indirect refusals are considered polite, it will not cause any trouble to the learners if they refuse indirectly all the time. In other words, it may be safe for the learners to refuse indirectly in any situation because they have less chance of offending the Japanese. However, it is also helpful for the learners to know that the Japanese also refuse directly in some situations.

As Yokoyama (1993)’s study shows, the Japanese are influenced by the stereotypical view that American speak directly, and because of that, they tend to speak directly to an American interlocutor. An American learner of Japanese may have a greater chance to be refused directly by Japanese simply because s/he is American, in addition to factors of social status, etc. If the learner has only learned that Japanese refuse indirectly, s/he may have difficulty figuring out how to deal with such direct refusals by the Japanese. S/he may be offended more than necessary, and miscommunication or misunderstanding with the Japanese interlocutor may occur.

It seems that the indirectness of Japanese refusals is mentioned in Japanese learning materials, but how to refuse indirectly is not explained or modeled sufficiently. Learners of Japanese may know that Japanese refuse indirectly, but they may not know what kind of linguistic behavior is considered indirect in Japanese. Since strategies of Japanese refusals have been discussed in the study on Japanese refusals, the results of those studies should be utilized in language instruction. If the learners do not learn how to refuse indirectly in Japanese, pragmatic transfer may occur when they perform the speech act of refusal. The
learners may use some strategies which are regarded as indirect in their native language but not quite so in Japanese.

Teaching strategies of Japanese refusals is very important; however, merely teaching strategies is not enough. The learners also need to know when and in what situation they are supposed to use these strategies because a single strategy cannot be used for every situation. For example, an expression of gratitude can be used as a refusal to an invitation (e.g., arigatoo gozaimasu, demo... “Thank you so much, but...”), but usually it is not used as a refusal to a request.

One of the essential factors which define a situation is the speakers’ personal and power relationship. One cannot always refuse in the same way to anyone. Refusing a close friend’s request and refusing to a colleague’s request are two different situations; therefore, the manner of refusing in each situation will be different. Furthermore, if a requester has more power and higher social status, sometimes the act of refusing itself will not be considered appropriate. One has to comply with the request no matter what it is.

Most studies on Japanese refusals point out that Japanese refuse indirectly by using strategies such as incomplete sentences, proposing alternatives, and conclude that it is important to teach these strategies to the learners of Japanese. However, very few studies discuss further on how to teach these strategies in class. A simple instruction of “refuse indirectly in Japanese” is not sufficient for the learners to perform a smooth communication with the Japanese. The learners also need to learn what strategies are considered indirect in Japanese, and when and to whom they should use these strategies. However, very few Japanese textbooks and other kinds of learning material consider the importance of teaching these things.
6.4.2 Refusals in Japanese textbooks

Usually students learn the language by using a textbook. As the trend of foreign language instruction has been moving toward the communicative approach these days, textbooks also should be designed in a way which promotes the improvement of the learners’ communicative ability in the target language. In order to communicate smoothly in a foreign language, the students need to learn language which is authentic and socially appropriate in the target culture. However, it seems that very few Japanese textbooks are designed with consideration of the authenticity and social appropriateness of the language.

6.4.2.1 Problems in Japanese textbooks

Raohaburanakitto (1995) examined ten Japanese textbooks to see how often refusals are observed in them. Five of them focus on structural patterns, and the other five focus on communicative ability.7 The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammar oriented</th>
<th>Communication oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refusal to a request</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal to an invitation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of personal relationship</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Refusals in Japanese textbooks: based on Raohaburanakitto’s study

7 The textbooks which Raohaburanakitto examined are:
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The results show that not many examples of refusals are introduced in Japanese textbooks. If they are, they are mainly refusals to an invitation, and rarely refusals to a request. Although there are twenty five examples of refusals, only two of them have a brief explanation of the speakers’ personal relationship. Therefore, the learners cannot get any information from the textbooks to figure out how they should refuse depending on the personal relationship, even though this is what the native speakers of Japanese usually do when they refuse.

Most examples of refusal are caused by the refuser’s time conflict or inability. Such reasons are regarded as a good reason to refuse, so the refuser does not feel especially bad about refusing. On the other hand, if the refuser has no good reasons to refuse, in other words, if the refuser actually has the ability or time to accept a request, an invitation, etc., s/he usually finds it is difficult to refuse and feels bad about rejecting. This type of refusal is quite difficult to perform without offending the interlocutor. Learners need to learn this type of refusal as well because this happens quite often in real life. Most of the true reason for refusal in my data are the refusers’ unwillingness to do the favor for the interlocutor. Since such refusals do not have a specific reason, some misunderstandings may occur between the speakers if the refuser does not refuse in an appropriate way which avoids hurting the interlocutor’s feelings. This is a very complex skill, yet very few Japanese textbooks deal with this type of refusal.

Raohaburanakito found that there were only two conversations in which the refuser refuses without having a good reason to do so. Both are refusals to an invitation. The following is one of them:

A: *Nagai-san, rokku no konsaato no kippu o ni-nai, tomodan ni moratta n da kedo, issyo ni doo? Boku, kono konsaato no koto o kiiie kara, sute ittakaatten da.*

‘Ms. Nagai, my friend gave me two tickets to the rock concert, but would you like to come with me? Since I heard about this concert, I’ve been wanting to go.’
B: Warui kedo, rokku ni wa kyōomi ga nai no. Kikitai to omowanai no.
'Sorry, but I'm not interested in rock music. I don't feel like listening to
(such music).'

A: Ongaku ga kirai na no?
'You don't like music?'

B: Soo yuu wake zya nai wa. Suki na ongaku mo kirai na ongaku me aru wa.
'That's not what I mean. There are some music which I like, but there are
some which I hate, too.'

A: Demo, kono gurupu wa uta ga zyoozo da si, totemo ninki ga aru n da yo. Ikoo
yo.
'But (the vocal of) this group sings well, and is very popular. Let's go.'

B: Zitu wa watasi wa rokku wa daikirai na no yo. Hoka no hito o sasotte ite
kudasai. Sumimasen.
'Actually, I really hate rock music. Please ask somebody else to go with
you. I'm sorry.'

English translation is added by the author).

The refuser B's talk does not sound as if she cares about the inviter A's feelings and
maintaining a good personal relationship with the inviter A. In a real conversation, such a
strong refusal as B's rarely occurs.

Although it is probably mostly the learners' pragmatic transfer that makes their
speech sound impolite or inappropriate, textbooks may also have some influence on the
learners' speech. If the learners are assigned to memorize and/or perform the dialog above,
there is a possibility that they will conclude that this is how Japanese usually refuse an
invitation. Therefore, textbooks also should be carefully designed. They should introduce
several types of refusals: A refusal to a request, to an invitation, a refusal with and without
a good reason, a refusal to a close friend, to a supervisor, etc. In any case, some
explanation about the situation must be attached.
6.4.2.2 Textbooks which introduce good examples of refusal

Refusals are complex. They often involve a long negation between the speakers, and there is a great possibility to offend the interlocutor (Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990). It is difficult to refuse nicely even in one’s native language; therefore, it must be much more difficult for the learners of the language. They may offend native speakers when they refuse even though they do not intend to do so. This happens simply because they do not learn strategies of Japanese refusals and how to use them. Therefore, Japanese textbooks or other learning materials should introduce some examples of refusals which include several strategies to perform refusal successfully. However, at present, very few learning materials take this matter into consideration seriously.

As Raohabunranakito’s study shows, very few Japanese textbooks consider the importance of teaching sociolinguistic aspects of Japanese language. Formal Expressions for Japanese Interaction: Taigyu Hyoogen (Tatematsu, et. al., 1991) and Japanese: The Spoken Language Part 1 -3 (Jorden with Noda, 1988) are among the few textbooks which incorporate sociolinguistic aspects of Japanese language.

The first book provides the unit called “Refusing a request”. The goals of this unit are: (1) refuse requests without offending the listener, and (2) accept and refuse offers. As the goals indicate, there are two dialogs of refusal to a request and one dialog of refusal to an offer. Very brief explanation about the setting of the conversation is provided: the situation of the dialog (e.g., refusing a request), the characters in a conversation, and the place where the conversation takes place. The following is an example of the conversation in this textbook:

**Setting: Refusing a request**

The characters: Smith, Tanaka (the receptionist of the Center)

Place: At the receptionist’s desk

Tanaka (1T): *Sumisu-san, anoo, tootto onegaisi koto ga aru n desu kedo.*

"Mr. Smith, um, I have a favor that I would like to ask of you, but... (may I?)"
   ‘What is it? You are welcome to ask me anything.’

3T: *Anoo, watasi no tomodati ga eikaiwa o naritagattemu n desu kedo, osiete yatte moraemasenka?*
   ‘Well, my friend wants to learn English conversation, and I wonder if you could teach him/her.’

4S: *E;;, eikaiwa desu ka?*
   ‘Uh...m, English conversation, you said?’

5T: *(Ee)*
   ‘(Yeah)’

6S: *Mainiti kekkoo syukudai de isogasii si, eigo wa amari tukaitaku nai si ...... Taihen moosiwake nai n desu ga....*
   ‘I am pretty busy with my homework everyday, and I don’t want to use English very much......so, I’m very sorry, but....(I cannot do that for him/her.)’

7T: *Soo desu ka. Uu;;n, zannen da nara....*
   ‘Is that so. Hmm, I’m sorry to hear that.’

8S: *Oyaku ni tatenakute sumimasen.*
   ‘I’m sorry that I cannot help you.’

9T: *Iie, kanzin no benkyoo ga orusu ni nattemo ikenai si ne. Zya, tomodati ni wa kotowatte okimasu kara.*
   ‘No, it is not a good that you neglect your study which is important for you. Well, then, I will tell your refusal to my friend.’

10S: *Hontoo ni sumimasen.*
   ‘I’m really sorry.’

11T: *(Ie le.)*
   ‘(No, no).’

*(Tatematsu, et.al., 1991: 70)*

(Numbers, bold-face font and translation were added by the author.)

The way Smith refuses in the conversation above seems natural. It does not offend the requester Tanaka. First Smith shows a negative attitude to the request by using verbal avoidance (i.e., hedging *Ee*; and repetition of part of request *Eikaiwa desu ka?*) (4S).

Then he starts stating some excuses for not being able to teach English conversation followed by a statement of regret (i.e., *Taihen moosiwake nai n desu ga...*) without completing the statement of excuse (6S). He does not clearly state his inability (e.g., Dekimasen ‘I can’t’) at all. He attributes his refusal to time conflict, which is usually
considered a good reason to refuse. He also adds an apologetic expression which softens
the refusal (68, 88, & 108). The requester shows her empathy toward the refuser Smith
(97). Her statement of empathy helps justifying Smith’s refusal and it makes Smith feel
relieved about his refusal.

The textbook also provides a section called Application Exercises where the learners
need to decide how to refuse requests in a certain situation. The learners need to take
Smith’s part and interact with three different people (i.e., a landlord, a professor at a
university, a senpai [senior]); therefore, there are some varieties in the activities.

However, the purpose of this textbook is to teach how to interact with the Japanese in the
formal setting; therefore, there is no example of a conversation between close friends.
Furthermore, the reason of refusal is time conflict in both two conversations of refusal to a
request. Therefore, not so many variety of refusal type is introduced in this textbook.

The second textbook, *Japanese: The Spoken Language part 1.3* (JSI, hereafter)
does not provide any section which focuses on refusal; however, some refusals are
observed in the conversations which are presented in the textbook. A brief explanation of
each conversation is provided at the section called *Miscellaneous Notes* where the learners
can get some information about the characters, their relationship, situation, and some
explanations about the words which are being used in a conversation.

Although most of refusals appear in the latter half of the books (Lesson 15 - 30),
JSI introduces a refusal to an invitation in the very first lesson. The conversation is as
follows:

(J): Simasen ka?
*Wont’ you do it (or play)?*

(N): Tyotto....
*I’m afraid not.*

(Jorden with Noda, 1988: 29)

A brief explanation of the conversation is provided in Miscellaneous Notes. For this
conversation it says:

109
[...] (N) is invited to join a game of go during an office break. 1...]

**Tyotto**, often with slowed-down articulation, is commonly used as a polite refusal. The literal meaning of the word is "a bit", "a small amount." Here it implies 'a bit impossible, inconvenient, out of the question, etc.' By saying no more than **tyotto**, the speaker is less precise and more polite, thereby softening the refusal.

(Jorden with Noda, 1988: 31)

From these notes, the learners can visualize the situation, and can learn that their utterance has to be less precise in order to refuse politely. As one of the major points of this lesson is to learn verbal negative forms, the learners might respond *lie, simasen.* ‘No, I won’t’ to the invitation of *Simasen ka?*. Although this response is grammatically correct, it is not socially appropriate. It sounds very straightforward, and there is a great possibility that it will offend native speakers of Japanese. By introducing a proper way to refuse, this textbook aims to prevent learners from offending native speakers.

It is very important to teach or warn the learners from the beginning that grammaticality is not the only thing that they have to be careful about. They need to know that they also have to consider whether their speech is appropriate or acceptable in the target culture where the language they are learning (i.e., the target language) is spoken, especially if the target language and the learners' native language have very few things in common.

Native speakers of the target language usually will not get upset if the learners of that language make mistakes in grammar; however, even though they understand that their interlocutors are non-native speakers of the language, they may be offended to some extent if the learners' speech is not appropriate in a certain situation. Speech acts are realized differently from culture to culture, and these differences may cause communication difficulties between the target native speakers and the learners (Gass, 1995). In order to prevent such incidents from occurring, it is necessary to develop Japanese textbooks and other learning materials (such as computer-assisted self-learning materials) which consider culturally authentic and socially appropriate use of the Japanese language, and which offer guidance in performing FTA, such as refusals or requests, in Japanese, because FTAs are

Japanese learning materials or instruction, however, must be careful not to focus solely on the speech act of refusal. It is not useful or practical to teach only “how to perform refusals.” As mentioned in Chapter 2, refusals are always embedded in discourse with another speech act, such as a request or an invitation. In other words, refusals are not recognized by themselves. Refusers must recognize that they have been requested (or invited, offered, suggested) by their interlocutor before they perform refusals. Likewise, a performance of refusal ends when the initiator (i.e., interlocutor) recognizes that his/her request was refused. In order for learners to learn how to perform refusals in ways that work, they need to learn not only strategies of refusals themselves, but also ways to recognize the actualization of a request and of a refusal.

6.5 Teaching methods

Several scholars in Japanese, such as Jones (1993), and Szasrowski (1986a,b, 1987), have declared the importance of teaching the sociolinguistic or pragmatic aspects of the Japanese language, (i.e., how to do things with Japanese words), through classroom activities. They state that the Japanese value harmonious relationships with others, and that learners of Japanese need to learn how to talk with native Japanese without offending them or breaking the human relations. If the learners learn only Japanese vocabulary and grammar, they may apply these words and rules to the discourse strategies of their native language, and this may offend the native Japanese speakers or cause misunderstandings between the learners and the native Japanese speakers. However, very few scholars actually discuss how the language teacher can teach the sociolinguistic/pragmatic aspects of the Japanese language. The importance of teaching sociolinguistic aspects of Japanese has
been widely recognized these days. Now it is time for us to move further than that, and to discuss how we can teach them.

As mentioned earlier, one way to teach sociolinguistic aspects of Japanese language is to design and use Japanese textbooks which consider the importance of these aspects and incorporate them in the materials they present. However, however informative the textbooks or other learning materials may be, there is a limit to how much the learners can learn from them. For optimal learning, the learners need to have enough opportunities to practice what they learn (National Foreign Language Center, 1993). They need to practice the appropriate way of using the language within a certain situation in order to have a real knowledge of the language (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992). The classroom is one of the places where the learners can practice what they learn; therefore, the instructors have to design their teaching plans carefully in order to have the learners practice appropriate use of the language in context.

Activities such as listening to tapes to memorize key conversations, and working on mechanical and/or substitution drills, are helpful for the learners to learn the structural patterns of the Japanese language. These activities themselves mean to develop authenticity, in other words, they model authentic activities and they help the learners to build the skills which are essential in carry out authentic activities. The learners need to learn socio-culturally authentic behavior. In other words, they learn to be "able to take part in a story while intentionally playing a role according to the context" (Noda, 1994: 162) in which they find themselves. In order to participate in a story, or to be authentic, learners must "have a full knowledge of the context and have established the schema" (Noda, 1994: 163) of the context. What the learners do not know, or cannot figure out by themselves is when to say what to whom when they speak in a foreign language. In other words, they have no idea in what context the language they are learning can be used. The
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learners have to learn when and to whom it is appropriate to use a particular form (Rubin, 1983). The teachers’ responsibility is to help the learners formulate the schema which the stories represent and practice participating in new stories. If a teacher uses a textbook or other kind of learning material which presents only the building-block type of activities, it is the teacher’s job to create authentic activities in the classroom.

Social context plays a major role in Japanese in interacting with each other (Takahashi & Beebe, 1993). Jorden (1992) points out that the big problem for the learners is to figure out how the target language is used within its social contexts. She also mentions that cultural context plays a major part in determining generally approved behavior. As my study shows, the speech act of refusal to a request is related to context. The way one refuses is determined by the factors such as personal relationship, power relationship, and the content of the request. In order for the learners to perform this FTA without offending native Japanese speakers, they need to learn how to do it appropriately in various settings where refusal is required or likely to occur. In order to learn a skill, a learner must practice it (NFLC, 1993). Therefore, the instructors’ role and responsibility is to provide as many different social contexts as possible for the learners to practice speech acts (e.g., of refusal) in various situations by performing it in the target language.

Walker & McGinnis (1995) point out that “all language use is made meaningful by cultural and social contexts” (4), thus, the learners should learn language within a cultural context. The native Japanese teacher’s responsibility is to present the learners with models of behavior which is culturally appropriate in Japan. For instance, if a native Japanese instructor teaches the speech act of refusal, first s/he needs to identify the most appropriate behavior and the skills which are essential to perform the speech act of refusal. Since the act of refusal is influenced by the speakers’ personal and power relationship, the teacher needs to take that into consideration, and comes up with several settings in which refusal occurs. Moreover, the teacher has to make the presentation of the model, including
behavior and skills, comprehensible to the learners (i.e., the presentation has to be match the levels of instruction).

Japanese is one of the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs), and is a "truly foreign language" (Jorden, 1992: 142) to English speakers. There is a considerable cultural distance between American learners of Japanese and the native speakers of Japanese. The learners will not be native speakers of Japanese no matter how hard they study. Walker and McGinnis (1995) argue that "the goal of all LCTL study is to enable learners to interact in and with the culture being studied" (3). The learners need to learn to behave in a culturally appropriate manner in the target culture in order to function in that culture. They need to learn to be "a successful foreign participant" (Walker and McGinnis, 1995: 3) who makes native speakers feel comfortable about interacting with him/her. The teachers need to understand this goal, and to assist learners in understanding the strategies of interaction in and with the culture which the learners are studying.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

7.1 Conclusion

The purpose of my study is to see if Japanese refuse indirectly all the time, and if they do, how they refuse. As refusals usually follow a request, an invitation, an offer or a suggestion, I put my focus on refusals to a request to examine them based on the two points I presented above.

The results of my study show that although indirect refusals are used for the most part of Japanese refusals to a request, direct refusals are occasionally used as well. The notion of directness is culture specific. Therefore, it may not be appropriate to make a general conclusion that the Japanese refuse indirectly at all times. Rather, the Japanese consider several factors before they perform a speech act of refusal, and refuse in the way which is appropriate or acceptable in a particular situation.

The Japanese regard a harmonious human relationship with others as important. They are very sensitive to social status, power relationship, and to whether they regard the interlocutor as in-group or out-group, and adjust their speech accordingly.

The Japanese can be frank, straightforward, and even blunt with others when:
- Both speakers stand on an equal footing (i.e., insignificant difference in social status and power relationship).
- One of the speakers has higher social status or more power, and can therefore be straightforward.
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Thus, speakers' social status, their power relationship, the existence and closeness of relationship between them, and the group they belong to matter considerably when deciding how to talk, or which words to choose.

Refusals are a FTA (face threatening act), and there is a possibility of offending the interlocutor by performing this speech act if the speaker does not do it in an appropriate way. Learners of Japanese sometimes offend native Japanese when they refuse even though they do not intend to do so. This may be because they have not learned appropriate and acceptable ways to refuse in Japanese culture. Therefore, they just apply how they refuse in their native culture, and this attempt result in inadvertently offending native Japanese speakers.

As the goal of the learners of Japanese is to be able to function well in Japanese society, they need to learn to be able to communicate with native Japanese people in a way which makes Japanese feel comfortable. Therefore, it is very important to teach sociolinguistic and/or pragmatic aspects of Japanese language in addition to teaching its vocabulary and grammar. However, very few Japanese textbooks or other learning materials place emphasis on these aspects. Very few of them incorporate a speech act of refusals, and it seems that only the popular phrase of “The Japanese refuse indirectly” is introduced without any concrete examples. Teaching this kind of stereotype may be dangerous because stereotypes can be misleading. Learners of Japanese need to learn how to refuse appropriately according to circumstances for better and smoother communication with native Japanese. Japanese textbooks, learning materials and teaching methods should be improved and designed to meet the learners' need of learning sociolinguistic and/or pragmatic aspects of Japanese language.
7.2 Suggestions for further study

7.2.1 Research method

Due to some drawbacks of the DCT, I decided to examine two or more speakers’ interaction to analyze how the Japanese refuse to a request. I used some videotapes of Japanese TV dramas for collecting data, but some improvement should be made for further study of Japanese refusals.

First of all, more data are needed. Some strategies of refusals could not be collected, or observed in the dramas; therefore, it may not be appropriate to generalize under what circumstances these strategies are likely to occur.

Secondly, the nature of TV dramas may be problematic. Although the settings of each drama vary, most of them are usually considered as situation comedies. Thus, considering my data in terms of genre, there is not much variety among them. In order to understand how Japanese refusals are performed correctly, data should be taken from several different kinds of genre.

TV dramas may be a good source to collect some conversational exchanges because the speakers (i.e., actors) in the dramas are not biased against the research. They are not talking for the sake of research nor they are informed that their utterances are going to be recorded and used for a research on Japanese refusals. Therefore, in a sense, all conversations occur “naturally”, but as all TV dramas are fictional, these conversations are not quite “real”. There is a time constraint in making a TV drama; therefore, there may be a possibility that the producer of the drama decided not to spare too much time for a scene of refusal although it may take longer than that in a real life situation.

Thus, ethnographic data collection, i.e., collecting data in a naturally occurring situation, is probably the most reliable way to study the social and linguistic constraints on a particular speech act. With this method, the social setting, location and the participants can also be recorded precisely; therefore, information about the linguistic and social
constraints on the use of an given speech act is also provided (Houck and Gass, 1995). The subjects’ usually “talk” much more and longer than the ones in DCT (Beebe and Cumming, 1995). The difficulty of this method is that it is hard to control contextual variables and also is difficult to predict when a particular speech act will occur (Houck and Gass, 1995), the data are collected unsystematically (Beebe and Cumming, 1995), and it takes great amount of time (Rubin, 1983).

Conversation is an interactional phenomenon. According to Psathas (1990), an interactional phenomenon has the following characteristics:

1) It has a visual and/or auditory and/or tactile and/or kinesthetic appearance of the participants in the actual course of their interaction.

2) It has a spatio-temporal appearance of speech, utterances, silences and movements of the body. (Psathas, 1990, 10)

It seems that body movement is also an important factor in analyzing conversation. However, very few studies with ethnographic data collection pay attention to non-verbal resources. Kendon (1992) argues that body movements are considered “vehicles of explicitly intended messages” (328) and are directly related to the conversation. Houck and Gass (1995) point out that raising eyebrows conveys the speaker’s uncertainty and functions as a question or request for further clarification.

Audio tape recording mainly collects utterances and their correlates, such as silence, turns, overlap. However, videotape recordings can also obtain non-verbal interactional phenomena including hand, head, and body movements. As Beebe, Takahashi and Ulissi-Weltz did, it is probably better to videotape the speakers’ performance so that all the essential factors are taken into consideration in analyzing the conversation.

There are several methods for conversational analysis. Each method has its own advantages and disadvantages. It is probably better to collect data through multiple approaches, i.e., incorporating all possible data gathering methods in order to obtain more reliable explanations on Japanese refusal.
7.2.2 Other points to consider

There are two reasons why I decided to study Japanese refusals specifically to a request: 1) to narrow down the topic of the research; and 2) as a native speaker of Japanese, I intuitively feel refusals to a request are not quite the same as refusals to other speech acts such as an invitation, a suggestion, and so on. I did not investigate whether they are actually different from each other or not, but it may be worth doing some research on refusals of each type of speech act, and see how they are similar or different from each other as a further study.

There is also another type of refusals: "active non-cooperation". The refuser accepts a request without intention to comply. Therefore, apparently it does not seem that a request is refused, and the requested task is going to be done by the refuser; however, it turns out that the refuser does not do the task. How and when do the requester realize that his/her request is refused? Under what circumstances does this type of refusal mostly occur? These questions would be also interesting to study, and such studies will contribute to better and more precise understanding of refusals in Japanese.
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APPENDIX A

TITLES OF THE MOVIE AND THE DRAMAS WHICH WERE USED FOR DATA ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese Original Title</th>
<th>English Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katyoo Shima Kohsaku</td>
<td>Section Manager, Kosaku Shima</td>
<td>(KSK: 2)1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Dramas&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD Bugi</td>
<td>AD Boogie</td>
<td>(AD: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asita ga aru kara</td>
<td>There’s always tomorrow</td>
<td>(Asita: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besuto Furendo</td>
<td>Best Friend</td>
<td>(BF: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gakkoo ga abunai</td>
<td>The school is in danger</td>
<td>(GK: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitonatu no puropoozu</td>
<td>A summer’s marriage proposal</td>
<td>(Hitonatu: 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyampasu Nooto</td>
<td>Campus Note</td>
<td>(CN: 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misu Daimondo</td>
<td>Miss Diamond</td>
<td>(MD: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosimo negai ga kanau nara</td>
<td>If my wishes can come true</td>
<td>(Mosimo: 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongu Bakeesyon</td>
<td>Long Vacation</td>
<td>(LV: 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seigi wa katu</td>
<td>Justice for All²</td>
<td>(J for A: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetteeteki ni ai wa</td>
<td>Love is completely....</td>
<td>(Ai: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watasi te busu datta no?</td>
<td>Was I that homely?</td>
<td>(Busu: 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The movie is about two hours long, and each drama has about 10 to 12 episodes, each of which lasts for one hour.

1 In parenthesis, the abbreviation of each title and the number of hours used for data collection are shown.

² The literal English translation of the title should be “Justice will Prevail”, but as the drama also shows an English title of “Justice for All”, I will used this as the English translation for my study.
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APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MOVIE AND DRAMAS
QUOTED IN THE TEXT

# 1 <CN>
A: はるか（女子大生；18歳）
B: 桑田の義理の母（40代後半）

A: お願いします、大一さんと広大君が一緒に暮らすことをお願いしました。
   お願いします。大一さんのことを、分かってあげてください。大一さんはすごく真剣に生き
   いる人だし、真面目だし、その……、……心よさしい人なんですね。
   ですから……。
B: 広大のことで、
   他人のあなたに、口をはさんでもらいたくないの。
   ＜Reason＞
   お引っ越しください。
   ＜Counter-request＞
A: 待ってください！
   ＜Counter-request＞
   私も広大君の面倒なら少し位見れます。
   だから……、あたしに何かお手伝いさせてほしいんです。私も、どんなことでもやりま
   す！お願いします！
   ＜Counter-request＞
B: （無言で立ち去る）
   Ignore

# 2 <BF>
A: 銀（職場の部下；20代前半；女性）
B: 須田（上司；30代前半；男性）

A: おはようございます、須田さん。
B: 何だ？
A: （聞き取り不可能）のプランに沿って、ホッチキスのデザインを作ってみたのですが、
   須田さんにもご意見を伺いたいと思いますので、……そこでお願いします！
B: （見えて、箇所隠れる）
   Ignore
A: あの、……ご意見は…………？
B: （無言）
   Ignore
A: ……失礼します……… （去る）
   ---数時間後---
A: あの、須田さん、先程のデザインの件なんですが……。
B: デザイン？
A: ご意見、聞かせてください。
B: ないよ。
A: どういうことですか？
B: デザインになってないものに、意見を言いえないよ。
   ＜Reason + Imp＞
——第三者が伝言を伝えに割り込む——
A: どこがどうダメなのか、ちゃんと説明してください！
B: 君はあれを描くのに、いくつかのホッチキスを触った？
A: (無言)
B: 頭の中ででっち上げただけのものをデザインなんて呼んではしくない！Counter-request
——敬語下降——
A: 失礼します。…もう一度作り直しました。お願いします。
B: (受け取って) 後で見るよ。 Ignore, Negative attitude

#1 <Hitosato>
A: まりえ (20代前半；女性) B: あきこ (20代前半；女性) ＊友人同士
A: じゅあ、あきこが隠れてよ。
B: そういう問題じゃない！ Criticism
A: じゅあ、どういう問題？

4 <CN>
A: はるかの父 (大学教授；51歳) B: はるか (女子大生；18歳)
C: まゆみ (はるかの妹；中学 3年)
A: 年が明けたら……,aの一、…一度、みどり君と会ってくれないかね？
   …まゆみ、にかく～会ってくれれば、どういう人か、分かってもらえると思うんだ。
B: …まゆみ、あの、…煮物の火、弱くして。
   Ignore
C: うん。
A: どうかな？ はるか。
B: もう、いい加減にしてよ！ Criticism
   バック、あの青島みどりとどこで会ったの？
——中略——
A: おまえ達が考えているような人じゃないんだ。…ときに……一度うちに来てもらって…
C: いやよ！ ＜Imp＞
   うちには入られないとね！ ＜Reason＞
   バックなんて、大ラク！ (二階へ上がる)
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#5 <Busu>
A: 懐掛けのうちのAの名前を教えてください。
B: 懐掛けさん
A: これから、これ、練習します。
B: え？
A: レッスン、たいさく
B: たけ火
A: この袋の中に髪の毛の毛を私、全部 Skylarしました！恐らく清掃として
取っとくつもりだったんですけれど、それはやめました。手伝ってくださいませね？
B: は、あん... 私、そろそろこれで失礼いたします。
A: おいでないで！一人にしないでください！髪の毛の毛を取ったの、協力してください。
B: お願い！あなた、その髪に来なってでしょう？私、私... あの毛を取ったの
で、お願いです、私の味方してください！

#6/12 <J for A>
A: 高岡介護士（男、29歳）
B: 水沼（30中、女）

（Bの友人側で）
B: どちら様でしょうか？
A: セントラルホールオフィスの高岡清平といいます。
B: はいー...。
A: ビッグストーンインターナショナルの彼氏を恐れていています。
B: お手伝いください。
A: 亡くなった彼氏のことでお困りですねが、ご冥福をお祈りいたします。
B: 会社の方とはどんなにも会わないように、無理のあることからも言われておりますので。
(Reason) Incomplete
A: 分かりています。そのまんの介護士の了解も得ないでこうやってお会いすることは
	倫理違反です。
B: だったら、おおらかー... お引き取りください。
A: ご主人の存の本当の理由を知りたいんです！

#7 <J for A>
A: 石田介護士（男、39歳）
B: 受付の女性（29前）

B: すみません、大内先生はまだ今会議中なんです。
A: こちらは利用だ。
B: すみません、困ります！
A: 大内先生！
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#8 <CN>  
A: はるか（女子大生；18歳）  B: 三浦（大学4年；男性：サークルの先輩） ＊恋人同士

（電話で）
A: 帰ったら...... あ、はるかです...あのー...もう一度、お話ししたいんです。
      今考えてる事とか、色々、全部、話してお話ししたいんです。
B: あの......考えたいって、言ったよね？ ＜Reason＞
A: そうだね...そうなんですかけど......
B: 長く言い、待ってくれない？ ＜Counter-request>
A: はい......
B: じゃあ...（切る）

#9 <Busu>  
A: 増田里子（女；30, コピーライター） B: 速也（20中, カメラマン） ＊恋人同士

A: 今夜、行くわ、いい？
B: いいんじゃないですか？あの部屋は俺のものじゃないんですから。
A: どうしてそんな言い方しかできないの？
B: （無言）
A: ゆっくり話がしたいのよ。あたし達、この雰囲気、こんなにじゃ、話しすぎてるね。
B: いるかいいか？いかなないよ。 Negative attitude
A: お、あの部屋に戻るの？
B: わからないよね。じゃ。
A: 違う！怒ってて！いいのね？
B: 命命令なよう、俺はあなたのオモチャじゃねーぞ。 ＜Reason＞ Order

#10 <Busu>  
A: 増田里子（女；30, コピーライター） B: 濃尾裕之（30中） C: 取引先社長（男；40後）

（Cの会社の男子トイレで、Aはトイレの中で描れて待っている。）
（Cが入ってきたのでトイレから出てきた）
A: 社長、お久しぶりでございます。
（心中）
C: しかし...君はここで何をしているの？
A: 社長をお待ちしておりました。
C: え？
A: 秘書の方に聞いても、ちらがあいのものですから...。
B: いや、失礼をお許しください。一刻も早く社長にお目にかかれる場所はここしかないと判断
      いたしました。
A: お願いがあります。クリスマスキャンペーンのパブリシティをもう一度濃尾と私にやらせ
      てください。
B: プランも持ってております。是非一度、お話を聞かせていただけないでしょうか？
A&B: 宜しくお願いします！
C: 仕事の事なら、それぞれの担当部署を通しなさい。 ＜Reason＞ Alternatives, Order
A: 福山タケシュ（30，コーピーライター） B: 八百屋の主人（40代）
A: パーカーのチラシのコピーをやらせていただけませんでしょうか？
B: コピーして何？ Negative attitude
A: 宣伝の言葉です。
B: ああ、宣伝文句？ああ、いや、宣伝文句だったね、僕が考えているんだよ。＜Reason＞Negative attitude
A: え？ほん、これ、見なよ。僕が考えたの。おうまいもんでしょう？イヤー、こんな文句にねー、何方ものかわれないのよ、あてがなくて。うちあたりの店じゃぎー。ね？＜Reason＞Negative attitude
A: 一度、やらせてみていたけませんか？驚くようなものを見せますから！
B: あんた...困ってるの？あのえ、いやー、困ってるなんだったさー、どうだろう。うちのレジで働いてくれないか奈ー？
A: コピーの仕事がしたいんです。 Counter-request
B: いや、いや、レジだからね、明日からでもすぐ始めいただけるよね。 Counter-request, Negative attitude
A: コピーですか！私の仕事はレジじゃないで、コピー！実は、ああもこれも...（店内に貼ってあるポスターを指差しながら）僕考えたんですが。コーピー、宣伝文句！
B: 何か、ああた、事情がありそうだね。
A: この道ではあたり、一流なんですね。 Negative attitude
B: 笑
A: だからお宅に限ってありません！
B: あのね、自分で一流と信じる人間はなかなかいないよ。僕がお仕めいか、本物か、どっちかだね。 Negative attitude
A: 私も、おかしくありません。
B: いや、どっちにしたってさー、一流に払う金はどうにやこうおい！＜Reason＞Negative attitude
A: 採用一例、10万円でどうでしょうか？不採用の場合は保証はいりませんから。
B: 冥滅でしょうか？ Negative attitude
A: そうですか？
B: あのね、ああた、あの、どーすー仕事が知らないので、ああたの、いっしょ、その、何でも何役という仕事ばっかりしてるから、顔がその、ずれてるのだろう？ Negative attitude
うちあたりのスーパーマンね、東さん達が、100グラム、500円の牛丼を買うのだって話
話しててねのん。だから、そーいて感覚を忘れちゃね、ああた、触れ売にならないの！
ね？分かる？＜Reason＞
A: 分かりました。じつは、その準備をもっと早くせせるような、そんなコピーを考えています。
B: で、どううちにしたってね、うちにそんな金ないから！ね？うん。＜Reason＞Negative attitude
A: ええと、ごめえします。失礼します。
# 13 <Bushu>
A: 布村サトシ（30、コービーライター） B: 男（40代）
A: 如何でしょうか。...これ、例のしゃべるやחんのコピーなんですけど...コピーだけ採用していただけませんでしょうか？コピーの入力はパブリシティーで作業しております。私の個人のコピーだけ採用していただけますか。
B: あり、しかし、このキャンペーンについてはパブリシティー東京さんとすでに契約済みですのです...会社をお詫びになったと言うのが一...（上目遣いに見る）【Reason】

# 15<CN>
A: はるか（女子大生；18歳） B: 桑田（大学4年；20代半ば；男性）*恋人同士
B: 悪いんだけと、帰ってくるがないかな？
A: ちょっと、私に出来る事ない？何でもするから。Ignore, Offer (counter-request)
B: いや、いや、いんだけと、帰ってくるがないかな？
A: 本当に、帰ってくるがないかな？
B: いや、いんだけと、帰ってくるがないかな？
A: 本当に、帰ってくるがないかな？
B: いえ、帰ってくるがないかな？

# 16 <Hitonatsu>
A: ひろみ（男；30代） B: 青木（男；20代）
A: ああ、青木。
B: え？
A: 俺を保険料に書いてくんぬえかんあ。
B: いや、お客、金が少ない訳じゃないんだからさー。ちゃんと部屋借りて独立しろよー。Alternative, Order
A: でもない。一人葬は寂しいもんだよー。
#17 <Hitonatu>
A. あきこ (20代半男；女性)  B. 青木 (20代半男；男性)
A: ビール、ちょうだい。
B: もう、やめといた方がいいよ。

Alternatives (suggestion)

#18 <MD>
A. 職場の上司 (40代後半；男性)  B. 部下 (30代前半；女性)  AとBは不倫関係
A: アパートの鍵、もらえるかな？
B: お宅の鍵を頂けるなら。

Condition, Incomplete

#19 <CN>
A. 沢田 (東大4年；男性)  B. はるか (女子大生；18歳)
B: あ、あの、ここで結婚です。失礼します。
A: あの、は、申し訳ありません。
B: いえ、違います。
A: すみません、電話番号、教えて。
B: うーん、電話、ないんですよ。

＜Reason＞
A: え？
B: それに...... 私、彼がいるんです。

＜Reason＞
A: ごめんなさい、失礼します。

apology

#20 <J for A>
A. 郷野弁護士 (女, 20代)  B. 銀行の支店長 (40代後；男)
B: お手伝いいたしました。支店長の新島です。
A: 何で手伝っていただけませんか？
B: 関連書類は全て検証係の方に提出しておりますので、こちらでは......

＜Reason＞
Incomplete

A: 申し訳ありません。見せていただけませんか？
B: 申し訳ありません。それも全て......

＜Reason＞ Apology, Incomplete

A: どうして見せていただけないんですか？
B: (隠蔽：顔をうつむかせ、顔を相手からそらす)
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#21 <KSK>
A: 鳥 副業 (30代後半；男；会社員)    B: 坂村 (30代後半；男；Aの同僚)
B: あの女性きっぱり別れ。大笑いに加わってほしいだけだ。
A: どうしてオレを？どうしてなんんだ、坂村？
オレの気持ちは変わらん。この進捗に加わるつもりもない。  ＜Reason＋Imp＞
こんなもんで脅迫したてて無駄だ。

#22 <CN>
A: はるか (女子大生；18歳)    B: 桑田大一 (大学4年；男性) *恋人同士
B: はるかちゃん、...この間のこと、なかったことにしてほしいんだ。
A: どういう意味？
B: なかったことに...してほしいんだ。
A: どうして？
B: 俺はまず、会話を送って、それから広大を引き取ろうと思う。
A: それをあたしも手伝いたいの。
B: はるかちゃんには、聴かない。
A: どうして？あなたがいるひとよく子さんが言いだから？
B: あの子、そんなこと、言ってないだろ？
A: あなたがいること、あなたと広大の力になりたいの。
B: ちょっと頭を冷やしなよ。
君だって、自分の子供でもない3歳の子供の母親になるために、わざわざ大学に来たら寂しくないだろ？

#23 <Hitoeatu>
A: 恵 (30代前半；女性；バレーボールアーティスト)    B: 三上 (30代前半；男性；Aの上司)
B: じゃあ、俺は俺が作る。
A: ダメですよ！あの、私一人でやらせてください。
B: 難容だ。
A: この時のオブジェだって、ちゃんと出来たじゃないですか！  ＜Imp＞
B: 練習と仕事は違う。納期期限があるし、プレッシャーだってかかる。
A: 大丈夫です。プレッシャーなんか心配ありません。だから、お願いします...あの、今、少しでも気、抜きましょうやっぱり私なんか、なんて思っちゃうから、だから、一人で頑張りたいんです。お願いします。

#24 <CN>
A: はるか (女子大生；18歳)    B: やよい (女子大生；18歳) *友人同士
A: ね、その話、教えて？
B: やだよ。  ＜Imp＞
#25 <Basu>
A: 達也（20）カメラマン B: 女、20中 ＊彼女同士（？）
A: 一人になりたいんだ。
B: うそ。...あの人と一緒に暮らすわけ？
A: 別れたいよ、夕子とも。
B: え？
A: 何もしていられないの。もういやなんだ。
B: 私、達也を除いだらさせたりなんかしてない！
A: 前例なんだよ。あのマンションに来ても、俺、いないから。
B: 何処行くの？
A: （無言）
B: よやだ。そんなの、何処へ行くの？教えて？
A: じゃあな、元気で。
B: 大丈夫だって！お別れに…今、カメラ、持ってんでしょ？
A: いえよ。（No thanksの意味）（去る）

#26 <CN>
A: はるか（女子大生・18歳） B: みどり（女子大生・19歳）
A: もう二度と父に会わないので、...約束して。
B: できません。...<Imp + Reason>
...UpdatedAt, 真剣なんです。先生に、色々相談するうちに、自分がすごく楽になって、...。
A: 許せない。...まさか、いくら真剣でも、許せない。
許せないから、許せるの？
B: ...ごめんなさい……。私にはそれしかいえません。
A: 待って！父と…父と結婚したいの？
B: （無言）
A: 許して。
B: それは...分かりません・・・。
A: じゃあ、ただの遊びじゃない！...どこが真剣なのよ？
B: じゃあ、はるかさんを、私が先生と結婚を考えたら、許してくれるんですか？
A: （無言）
B: ただし、どうしていいのか、分からないのよ...だから、苦しんでるんじゃない！

#27 <Mosimo>
A: 女（20） B: 男（20） AとBは義理の兄弟（血つながりはない）
（Aがお酒をBに勧める）
B: うれしいなー。妹のお酒ー？
A: ねーえ？
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B: うん？
A: お騒がしいんだけけどー。
B: なんでもええから、ゆーとみてね。
A: 本当？
B: うん。
A: あの二人に誹言してほしいんだ。
B: それはできへんね、うん。
A: 私の辛い立場、分かるでしょう？
B: いや、分かるよ。そら、分かるけど。
A: 一緒にいるだけで、パーっと明るくなるし、心も和むし、すごいじゃない。
B: 尊敬しもうね。
A: そんなあるー。そう？
B: だから私のお願いも聞いてくれるよねー？
A: いややって、それは違うもん。
B: どう考えても、それは違うもん。
A: （拗り言で）ちくしよー。しぶとい奴だ。
A: （拗り言 Negotiation）
B: うそ泊ましながら本当の兄妹だったら、妹の動景を開いてくれてもいいんじゃない。
B: （うそ泊ましながら）分かる、分かるで、そやけど、21年ぶりにおとうさんやんか、親しい
B: やんか、兄妹としては、ずっと一緒にいたやんか、おいたやんか、でもそれがあか
B: ゆうんやったら、せめて3ヶ月は一緒におらしてー。
A: （拗り言で）だめだ、こいつ。
A: 何？

#28 <Hiccup>
A: 男（30歳後） B: 女（20中） C: まりえ（女、20中） D: 男（20後） ＊親しい
A: 友人同士
B: 仕事が終わって、夕方から夜にかけてかー。
B: 一番正確な時間に仕事が終わるのは……まりえ、……よね？
C: はい。
A: えー。。。
C: 私……、バス！……バス、バス、バス、バス！（手を横に振りながら）
A: 私、手抜って音手もーん！

#29 <MD>
A: 嫁さん（30代；ツアーのお客） B: にな（女性；30代前半；ツアー・コンサート）
A: あの、あなたにお願いがあるんですけれどもね？ビルマへ連れて行っていただけませんか？
B: お騒がしいんです、あ、今、ミャンマーっていたらでしたよね？……ほら、ね？
B: こんばんは近くまで来てますから、なんとか連れてってくださいねー。
A: 突然そんなこと言われても……
A: そんなこと、お願いします。
B: おばあちゃん、それは無理ですよ。明日なんて...... ＜Imp＋Reason＞ Incomplete
A: あの...... 年配の飼い主、聞いてください（チップを渡す）ね？
B: おばあちゃん、本当に無理なんですよ。マンションにいにくにはピザが必要なんです。 ＜Imp＋Reason＞
A: （え？）
B: 明日ピザの申請をしても、すぐにピザは発行されないんです。 ＜Reason＞
A: 本当ですか......そうですか......ダメなんですか......無理なんですよよねえ......
B: ごめんなね、おばあちゃん。 ＜apology＞
A: そうですね、仕方ありませんねえ...... 理由を聞く。マンションに住むためには、すべての手続きを確認しているのに、見落としがありました。了解しました。
B: 力になれなくて、ごめんなね、おばあちゃん。 ＜apology＞
A: 論争を起こすことはありません。 ＜empathy＞

#33 ＜J for A＞
A: 高岡介護士（男、29歳） B: 岸野介護士 （20中、女）
A: どうだった？
B: お目です...... 高岡先生は？
A: ようね。
B: 高岡、分かったんだですか？ 譲渡期限を明らかにする必要です。
A: 明日の夜話のお楽しみ。 ＜Ignore, Alternative＞

#34 ＜Hitonatsu＞
A: 娘（20歳） B: 母親（40中）
A: へー、ママ、私の気持ちがわかるかうんなんだ。
B: うち前じゃないの。 製造元だからね。
A: そーかさ、生鮮い食物か、やめてくれると、導き答えられるよさげって。 って、つまり、お茶を頼むのですね。
B: そんなことは、どうでもよろし！ ＜Ignore, Concede＞
A: あなたの気持ちが不快だって言ってんの！ あんたさー、自分の失恋の手-cancel の、埋め合わせようと、青木君と付き合いとしてんでしょう。
B: もちろね。
B: へー、青木君のこと、どう思ってるか、言ってみた。
A: いやです。 ＜Imp＞
B: 自分の進歩を押し付けないでくれる？ ＜Counter-request＞
# 35 <CN>
A: 桑田（大学4年生；20代前半；男性） B: 取引先の担当者（40代前；男性）
B: 今週中に300人連絡しない限り、この企画は打ち切ると念を押したはずだ。<Reason>
A: しかし、勝負はこれからです。
B: 桑田君、最低限の人間を確保して初めて、ツアーや原稿にできるんだ。そのまま終了して、万が一、人が集まらなければ、原稿を下げる事は出来ない。我々は許しを働く事になるんだよ。……この期はなかったことにしてくれ。
<Reason> Counter-request

#36 <Hitonatsu>
A: あきこ（20代後半；女性） B: 川島（20代半ば；男性） ＊恋人同士
B: さて、帰るかな？
A: どうして？……どうして忍まていないの？……どうして？
B: 自分でもよくわからないんだけどさ、……わからないけど……、今日は帰るね。
<Imp>
A: （うなずく）
B: （頬にキスして）ごめんな。
A: 様子ないでま。
B: おやすみ。

#37 <Busu>
A: 通也（20中、カメラマン） B: 遠尾（20中、男、コピーライター）
A: タコとは異なる仕事仲間なんでね？
B: そういうこと、君に説かれて答える気はないよ。
<Imp>
A: タコを張り詰めたい気持ちじゃないんですか？
B: ここでの一、君に一、僕の気持ちを張ってくれたようによいよ。
Ignore
A: タコは……仕事以外では付き合わないと約束してください。
B: ははは……それは無理だ。
<Imp>
A: どうしてですか？
B: 小さな会社だ。仕事とプライベートと区切りがつにくい。
<Reason>

#38 <Beau>
A: 達也（20中、カメラマン） B: 塚山（30、コピーライター） ＊恋人同士
A: 湘南江のモカビしてるじゃない。タコが社長だろう？
B: （無言）
A: 出来ないなら、俺がりく。
B: ひく？
A: いやなんだ、あっちもこっちも大事だから、それで納得しろなんて、絶対にいやだ。
B: 『フロムサザー』は私だけのものじゃないわ。私と従属さん...
A: その理由は、聞いてたくないよ。俺の言うとおり出来ないんだったら、別れよう。
B: (無言)
A: どうする。
B: (無言)
A: どうするんだよ。
B: 好きよ、遠慮が、別れるなんて考えたこともないわ。
A: だったらあいつと手を切れ、できるだろう。
B: (無言)
A: 無理言うなで。
B: 無理しろよ。
A: 分からず理！
B: 分からず。
A: 妹、もう家のベースにはまらない。決めたんだ。（去る）
B: 待って！後で話ししよう。前のティールームで待ってて！
A: (無言で去る)
#45  <LV>
A: 女（女、モデル）、30  B: 碌名（男、20中）
A: あの、私、ちょっと思いついたんですけれど…。
B: はい。
A: 30分ったら、あなたも覚悟て、シャワー浴びて寝備えにすると思うでしょう。ですから、
ここは一つ。
B: ここは一つ、何ですか？
A: 私と結婚してください。
B: （沈黙）
…か、勘弁してくださいよ（笑）
Conventional expression, Negative attitude
すみません、あの、はっきり言いますけど、あの、あなたが、パニックって、取り乱してい
ると思うんですよ。（感情）それに、あの、僕、花柄の代わりなんて出来ないし、
あの、ホラー、関係者の人だって沢山来てるでしょう。
Reason
A: …あ、…
B: …う…
A: そうか…
B: だから、あの、ここは一つ、式場に早く戻って、事後策を考えたほうがいいですよ。
Alternative, Suggestion
ほら、花柄だって戻って来るかもしれないし…。
A: そうでしょうね。

#48  <BF>
A: 20代前半；男性  B: ゆうこ；20代半ば；女性
A: ドライブ、しませんか？
B: え？
A: 僕、…好きなです。ゆうこさんのこと、…最初にあったときから、何となく。
…一緒に、付き合ってください。
B: …ほかにしないで。
…そんな、…簡単なこと？簡単に…好きになったなんて言わないで。
Criticism
A: そんな、…簡単なこと？簡単に…好きになったなんて言わないで！
Counter-request

#51  <CN>
A: 田中大一（大学4年；男性） B: 相川教授（51歳；男性） C: 相川はるか（大学1年；女
性；18歳） A-B: 学生→教授  A-C: 友人、B-C: 夫婦→娘
A: ところがある程度資金が溜まったところで、後に半を出して…、かえって借金を増やし
てしまって…。
B: 何を考えていたんだ。
Negative attitude
C: で、広大さんは？
B: 妻の両親が背ってます。…もう少しです。もう少しで資金を全部返して、こいつと
一緒に暮らせるんです。そうしたら、ここを出て、ちゃんと就職します。
もう少しも、待っていただけませんか？（顔を下げて）お願いします！
A: 君の言い分は、そうかもしれない。しかし大学というところは、学問をする神聖な場所だ。君のような人間がいては、迷惑だ。それでも売ったら、外でやることだ。

B: 教授、この大学に、学問を喰っている学生が、はたして何いるんでしょうか？
A: 何事かと語論するつもりはない。

# 52 <Busa>
A: 増山ちず (30, コピーライター)  B: 男 (30後)

A: なるべく早く、自分の会社を持ちたいと思っていますんですけど…。
B: でも、まー、その場合も、代理店さんの下請けになる訳でしょう？…それが社からの直接の見注は
doかなあー？

A: でも、会社を持つ場合、デザイナーの推薦依頼も一緒ですから、制作金銭をうるわし、
B: じゃ、その際、又、直接連絡くださいよ！
A: ごろーさまでした！ （去る）
A: お忙しいところをどうも。

# 56 <Hitonatu>
A: 川島 (20代半ば; 男性)  B: 取引先の社長 (50代半ば; 男性)

B: そんなに、無茶言われても困りますわ、あんな人気ない、さばけない、僕けいやね、
A: そんな、ないないつうしぇのパソコン、よう買い取りまへんわ、そんなん。
B: いや、あの、すみません、ちょっと…すみません！（脅威顔）
A: いや、次、あんねやー。

B: すみません、あの、うー、ちょっとだけ、あの、すみません！
A: 何ですか、あきまへんやって！（無理やり差し返される）
B: ちょっとだけで結構ですから。
A: 何かあつてぬや、（立ち上がろうとする）
B: あ、あの、お願いします！（階下げる）お願いします！
A: いや、あの、うー、わ、分かりました。こんな、あの、男らしさとかしますわ。

その返り altijd、あの、新シリーズ、10台、まわしてください。
A: 10台に？
B: はい。
A: あ、…いえ、…それは、あの、…うちにも販売のスケジュールがありますので…。
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