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ABSTRACT

Studies that compare speech-act realization across languages (including native speakers vs. learners) are many. However, in most cases, they look only at single sentences, not sequences in which those acts are produced. Also, they often fail to address the influence of instruction when discussing learners' performances.

This study examines request sequences produced by Japanese learners, and compares them with those produced by native speakers of Japanese. Then, it discusses selected links between the learners' performance and the instruction. Specifically, request sequences produced by native and non-native speakers of Japanese, prompted by six role-play tasks, were collected and analyzed. Participants reflected on their performances after accomplishing the tasks; these reflections were also collected.

Naturally occurring request sequences, separately collected at two settings, are consistent with some features of the role-play data, e.g. native speakers' frequent use of a variety of apologies and mitigating expressions in setting up requests.
Another result from the role-play data is that a majority of learners had difficulty in using direct style final predicates even when the task called for their use. Learners themselves indicated this difficulty in their reflections.

As a first step toward understanding this problem, an account of how the direct/distal style distinction is introduced and developed in the learning materials used in the students' courses is given. It was clear from this account that the materials provide ample examples of direct style in Japanese conversations, detailed grammatical and pragmatic explanations, in a systematic presentation.

It is a very complex process to train learners to be able to handle requests in ways that fit contextual particulars. Even with materials that provide sufficient models and information, learners still experience the difficulty. They need to accumulate the experience of decision making on what linguistic items to use, in what form, in what style, to whom, with what conversation topics and so on, until they reach the level of automaticity. Opportunities for such decision making should be increased, and the need to be on the lookout for more such opportunities has to be communicated to learners.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation for the present study

As a language instructor, it is the most intriguing experience to observe changes in learners. Because Japanese is very different from English linguistically and culturally, American learners need to develop new ways of interacting in order to communicate appropriately with Japanese people. Assisting learners in this process is challenging but rewarding.

At the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures at The Ohio State University, I engaged in teaching Japanese for seven years. The program has very strong teaching principles and teaching materials, which provide detailed grammatical and sociolinguistic explanations of the Japanese language; systematic presentation of the materials and well-trained teaching assistants and instructors are other features of the program. However, I did not know for sure how skilfully our learners were able to interact in Japanese with Japanese people outside of class hours. Because I did not have many opportunities to observe them interacting with native Japanese speakers besides their instructors, I was
ignorant of how they would interact and how similar or different the students' interactions would be compared with those involving only native Japanese speakers.

Because the performance of learners reflects what they have learned through instruction, some kind of controlled examination of the learners' interaction with native Japanese speakers should provide a way to evaluate our instruction. If the learners can interact in a culturally appropriate manner, other things equal, we may assume that the instruction contributed to this. If they cannot, chances are that the instruction could have provided more to assist them. I was motivated to investigate the achievement of learners and its relation to the programmatic instruction that they have received.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Much research has been conducted to compare speech acts performed by native and non-native speakers of various languages. Data have been collected for specific speech acts, such as apologies, compliments, invitations and requests (for example, Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989). Existing studies describe how speech act production differs between the two groups, but do not seem to address how the instruction of the non-native speakers might have contributed to this difference. This is an unfortunate tendency, since it in effect fails even to consider a major parameter of such skills as the learners have developed. I think it is necessary to design comparative speech act studies so that they are more informed by the perspective of the actual training engaged in by language
learners and instructors. A language instructor who knows her learners and the
details of the instruction is better equipped to analyze how performative
differences are the products of instructional variables.

1.3 Purposes of the study

This study has two purposes. The first is to examine the performance of a
subset of the learners of Japanese at The Ohio State University. For this, I used
role-play to elicit performance of speech acts, and thus collected data produced
by these learners, in order to compare their performances with those of native
speakers of Japanese. The speech act focused on in this study is requests. In the
process of data collection from role-plays, both learners and native speakers were
asked to reflect on each role-play, in recall protocol interviews conducted
immediately following the interaction. This was done to gain some insight into
thinking processes that accompanied the performance, insofar as participants
were able to recall and articulate them, for light these recollections might shed on
why the subjects performed in certain ways in certain situations. Based on these
two kinds of data, I discuss how the interaction performances of people in the
two groups differed. If there are common features in learners’ performances that
turn out to be problematic in communicating with native Japanese speakers, they
need to be understood and addressed, so they may be corrected (or better,
prevented from arising). And, it has to start with some account of the instruction
that these learners received. This leads to the second purpose of this research.
The second purpose is to discuss links between the learners’ performance and the instruction. I will describe principles behind the instruction, information the learners received and activities the learners engaged in during class hours. Based on this description, I will consider how the instruction might have contributed to the learners’ performance.

1.4 Strengths and weaknesses of the study

One of the strengths of this study is that it is a speech act comparative study of Japanese language. As mentioned in 1.2, comparative studies on speech acts between native and non-native speakers are numerous. However, the number of studies on Japanese is still limited. In this regard, this study may be able to make a unique contribution to the field.

Another strength is that a language instructor who engaged in the instruction of the non-native participants conducted the study. As the instructor, I know how much material these learners have covered, have some understanding of their study habits, and so on. This knowledge was of help when I attempted to relate the learners’ performances to the instruction.

The recall protocol interview is a special feature of this study. Its data should reveal at least part of the aims, options considered, and other thoughts of the participants and help us to understand why a participant chose a particular linguistic item in a particular form in a speech act, for instance. When the speech act data produced by participants are analyzed, the analysis is more or less objective. When the contents of the instruction are described, again it is a
descriptive, relatively objective picture that we obtain. The data obtained through the recall protocol interview add a subjective picture, from the participants' side. These data constitute valuable insights when examining the relationship between non-native speakers' production and the instruction.

One of the weaknesses of this study is that the results of the speech-act data analysis may not be generalizable. Because the participants were not selected by random sampling, what they have produced may not be representative of the general population of Japanese learners at Ohio State.

1.5 Organization of this study

In Chapter 2, basic concepts of this study is reviewed. Concepts such as speech act, conversation analysis, and the notion of face are discussed. Previous studies on speech act realization across cultures are also be reviewed here. Chapter 3 first describes this study's data collection procedure and the background of the participants. Then, data obtained by the role-plays generated by six tasks will be analyzed. Chapter 4 examines naturally occurring data at two settings for the purpose of comparison. Chapter 5 examines differences that emerged in the speech act data between native and non-native participants. In considering one of the differences, namely, the use of direct style, the contents of relevant features in the instruction will be described in some detail. Finally, pedagogical implications will be discussed. Chapter 6 presents the conclusion, of this study and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Basic concepts

In this section, I review basic and important concepts on which this study is based: speech acts, conversation analysis and the concept of face. I also discuss the basic units of analysis in my study.

2.1.1 Speech acts

Austin (1962) differentiate ‘performative’ utterances from ‘constative’ utterances, which are true or false statements. Using such examples as ‘I do’ uttered in the marriage ceremony, or ‘I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth’ uttered in the action of christening a ship, he claims that uttering of the ‘performative’ utterance “is, or is a part of, the doing of an action.” He states “to say something is to do something; or in which by saying or in saying something we are doing something” (1962:12).

Searle (1969:16) introduce the idea of speech acts, and he states that the unit of linguistic communication is “the production or issuance of the symbol or
word or sentence in the performance of the speech act." Searle classifies illocutionary acts\(^1\) into six categories: 1) assertives, 2) directives, 3) commisives, 4) expressives, and 5) declarations. Assertives commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. With directives the speaker attempts "to get the hearer to do something" (1969:13). Commisives commit the speaker "to some future course of action," and expressives "express the psychological state" (1969:14-15). Finally, a declaration "brings about some alteration in the status or condition of the referred to object or objects solely in virtue of the fact that the declaration has been successfully performed" (1969:17).

When attempts are made to apply speech act theory to actual discourse, difficulties become apparent. Early speech act theory assume a direct mapping of primary speech acts onto linguistic forms, and this assumption constitute its major limitation.

Levinson (1981) is one of several critiques that question the validity of speech act theory by challenging its basic assumptions. First, by citing examples like *Would you like another drink?*, in which a question and an offer are made in one utterance, he points out that one utterance unit may involve more than one speech act. This shows how simple it is to challenge the claim that speech acts correspond to utterance units. Second, by observing that utterance units are very variable, including sets of sentences, sentence fragments, non-verbal actions, and even silence, he questions the assumption that all utterances are segmentable into unit parts. Given the difficulty of identifying utterance units and mapping

\(^1\) Illocutionary acts are the acts performed in saying something, such as betting or promising.
speech acts onto utterance units, the third assumption of speech act theory, namely, the existence of procedures that assign speech acts to utterance units, becomes questionable. Levinson (1981:487) maintains the importance of looking at more data, for he believes that "we need to have a lot more systematic information about the basic nature of conversation before abstract theorizing is likely to be profitable."

Levinson is among a number of scholars who have criticized speech act theory from a perspective that views language acts as social acts, performed in social contexts. Geis (1995), for example, calls actions like making requests, offers and promises "communicative actions" and states that these are social acts, as opposed to linguistic acts. His argument is based on three facts. First, many such communicative actions can be performed nonverbally. Second, the differentia of different communicative actions "involve particular factual states, psychological states – beliefs, desires, attitudes, and feelings, and social relations among participants" (1995: 15). For instance, for a promise to be felicitously carried out, the person to whom a promise is made has to have certain need. If a speaker is not certain about this need, an offer is made instead. In this sense, communicative acts are social: they depend on other people and our understanding of them. Third, context plays a critical role in the interpretation of an utterance. The utterance *It's going to rain today* can be a warning to a person who has planned a picnic. It can be interpreted as a complaint when uttered by the person who has planned a picnic. With these three points, Geis (1995:32)
concludes that communicative actions are social acts, and that we should not simply associate them “with the uttering of individual sentences or utterances.”

Levinson (1992) also considers language use in a sequence. Using empirical materials, he attempts to document that speech acts and speech activities are inseparably interconnected. The basis of Levinson’s discussion is Wittgenstein’s (1958a; 1958b) idea of “language games.” Because the idea of “language games” includes a wide range of activities and because Wittgenstein does not think it profitable to try to find a single common essence of “language games,” their definition is not all that clear. One of the explanations Wittgenstein (1958a:5) gives is as follows:

And the processes of naming the stones and of repeating words after someone might also be called language-games. Think of much of the use of words in games like ring-a-ring-a-roses.

I shall also call the whole, consisting of language and the actions into which it is woven, the “language-game”.

Levinson (1992:69) agrees with Wittgenstein’s suggestion that understanding a language “involves knowing the nature of the activity in which the utterances play a role.” He then introduces the notion of “activity type” which refers to “any culturally recognized activity” (1992:69).

Taking the speech act “question” as an example, Levinson (1992:81) demonstrates how “the discourse properties involved in the definition of a question are subject to the nature of the activities in which questions are used.” In actual language use, a question can play a different role. For example, in the cross-examination of a rape victim, the defendant’s lawyer skilfully uses
questions to establish something that works against the victim. In that particular context, the point of asking questions is not to obtain new information, but to get the victim to answer. Also, in classroom interaction, a teacher’s questions sometimes function as “requests to follow a procedure” (1992:89), as shown in the following sequence:

T: OK, Ivy, do you see a name on that page you know?
I: Ann.
T: That’s the one that Jane just named. How do you spell Ann?
I: A, N, N.
T: How do we say A?
I: (no response).
T: Jane, do you want to help her?
C: I know.
J: The letter capital A.
T: Capital A, N, N. Why do we say ‘capital’, Ivy?
I: (no response).
T: Why should we put a capital A on Ann, Esme?
E: Because it’s someone’s name.
T: It’s the name of someone, Ivy. So we make it special.
E: A girl, the name of a girl.
T: Would you see any other name, Ivy, that you know?
C: I see a name, a Ben.
T: (to Ivy): …any other name? Let Ivy find one. D’you see a name you know there?
I: (pause) Ken?
T: All right, Ken. That’s right. How do you spell Ken?
(Gumperz and Herasimchuk (1975:109ff) quoted in Levinson (1992:88))

In this sequence, the point of the teacher’s questions is to guide the children through a procedure, namely, identifying a name, spelling it, and indicating that the first letter in the name should be capitalized. As the questions used in cross-examination and the classroom indicate, the role and function of an utterance is defined by in what kind of “activity type” it is used. This standpoint is very
different from the speech act theory that Levinson is critiquing, where the meaning of a “speech act” is defined independent of the “activity type”.

2.1.2 Conversation analysis

Another approach to linguistic communication relevant to the present study is conversation analysis. Coming from the tradition of ethnomethodology, conversation analysts avoid “invented sentences” (Stubbs 1983:485) devoid of contexts, but focused on naturally occurring social action and interaction as the subjects of their study. The goal of conversation analysis expressed by Atkinson and Heritage (1984:1) is “the description and explication of the competences that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organized interaction.” Many proponents of conversation analysis claim a need to avoid premature theorizing, and worked to put the emphasis on the data themselves.

Early conversation analysts, for example, have made attempts to describe patterned rules that govern conversational interactions. One of their basic findings is that turn-taking is fundamental to conversation and that adjacency pairs – paired utterances such as question-answer, offer-acceptance, etc. -- are typical in conversation. Schegloff (1972:379) characterizes conversation as “a ‘minimally two-party’ activity” where a speaker and a hearer negotiate in cooperation. With this understanding, the problem of multiple speech acts being realized in a single utterance is avoided. As Edmondson (1981:26) states, for
conversational analysts, speech acts are the result of "a negotiation, a co-operative achievement, or a conversational outcome between two speakers."

In the present study, I base the analysis of my data on this idea, that speech acts develop in interaction. In conducting the analyses, I focus not on single utterances, but on sequences in which participants realize speech acts.

2.1.3 Face

While the metaphor's roots run deep in several Asian traditions (at least), Brown and Levinson (1987) propose using a concept of 'face' in analyzing interaction. They assume that all competent adult members of a society have "'face', the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (1987:61), and that it consists of two parts: negative face and positive face. They treat these two faces as two basic needs, and describe them as follows:

negative face: the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others.
positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others. (1987: 62)

Although people generally try to maintain one another's face, Brown and Levinson admit that there are acts which are contrary to "face wants." When these acts are expressed in interaction, the face of the speaker or the addressee can be threatened.

Speech act theorists like Searle does not pick up on the concept of 'face', but Geis (1995) incorporate it in his Dynamic Speech Act Theory. He recognizes two effects in interactions: a transactional effect and an interactional effect. The
transactional effect is the "usual ostensible goal of an act" (1995:3), while the interactional effect includes threats to the addressee's negative or positive face.

2.1.4 Basic unit of analysis

Atkinson and Heritage (1984) state that "sequences and turns within sequences, rather than isolated sentences or utterances" (1984:5) have become the primary units for conversation analysts. Geis (1995:xii) also argues that "the focus of our research should be less on how we might make a request or issue an invitation in uttering a single sentence, and more on how we do requesting and inviting in multiturn conversational interactions." In total agreement with these statements, I take the sequence as a basic unit of analysis.

In actual analysis, a multiturn sequence has to be broken up into smaller units. I will use the term "move," following Goffman's (1976) definition. Working in the framework of conversation analysis, Goffman notes that the concepts of sentence and talk during a turn are "responsive to linguistic, not interactional, analysis" (1976:271), and maintains a need for new unit. He defines this unit as "any full stretch of talk or of its substitutes which has a distinctive unitary bearing on some set or other of the circumstances in which the participants find themselves" (1976:272).

A move differs from a turn or an utterance, and a turn may contain more than one move. Using the example below, Coulthard (1977:8) makes this point, stating that "moves can be co-extensive with utterances, but some utterances, like A's second, contain two moves":

13
A: Can you tell me why do you eat all that food?
B: To keep you strong.
A: To keep you strong, yes, to keep you strong. Why do you want to be strong?

In my data, speakers use a number of moves to make their requests, and do so in sequences. Among such moves, I will call those focal requests in which a speaker specifically makes mention of desired things or actions in a way that can be interpreted as assuming that the desired action would be achieved by the addressee. These focal requests will be analyzed in detail in Chapter 3.

2.2 Competencies needed for learners by foreign languages

One of the purposes of the study has been to determine how appropriately a certain group of non-native learners of Japanese are able to make requests in Japanese. In order for the learners to do so, they must have developed certain competencies. In this section, I review the varieties of competencies needed for learners of foreign languages, assuming that their goal in doing so is successful communication with natives of the language.

Reacting against what he saw as an overly narrow notion of linguistic competence, Hymes (1972) proposes the idea of communicative competence. In explaining this notion, he writes that “a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences, not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate” (1972:278) He elaborates on it as follows:
He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others.

Applying this concept of communicative competence to second-language acquisition, Wolfson (1989) states that second-language acquisition, like first-language acquisition, is the acquisition of communicative competence. According to her, “becoming an effective speaker of a new language not only involves learning new vocabulary in addition to rules of pronunciation and grammar, but must also include the ability to use these linguistic resources in ways that are socially appropriate among speakers of the target language” (1989:219).

This view has been shared by a number of researchers, and different researchers have referred to this competence with different terms. Like Wolfson (1989), Thomas (1983) recognizes two aspects of a speaker’s ‘linguistic competence’. One is “grammatical competence (‘abstract’ or decontextualized knowledge of intonation, phonology, syntax, semantics, etc.),” and another is “pragmatic competence (the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context)” (1983:92).

Harlow (1990) uses the term “sociopragmatic competence” which she defines as a speaker’s knowledge of “how to vary speech-act strategies according to the situational or social variables present in the act of communication” (1990:328).
"Sociocultural competence" is another such term. Cohen and Olshtain (1981:113) use it to refer to "the ability to use target language knowledge in communicative situations." They point out, as an important aspect of this competence, "the ability to use the appropriate sociocultural rules of speaking (also referred to as "sociolinguistic" rules), i.e., the ability to react in a culturally acceptable way in that context and to choose stylistically appropriate forms for the context" (1981:113).

These researchers recognize social contexts in which a language is used, and they state that a language learner needs to develop certain competencies in order to communicate with a target native speaker, by following certain rules and in appropriate ways. Thomas (1983:96) states that "it is the teacher's job to equip the student to express her/himself in exactly the way s/he chooses to do so – rudely, tactfully, or in an elaborately polite manner." She also gives a reason why teachers should do so, stating, "while grammatical error may reveal a speaker to be a less than proficient language-user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on him/her as a person" (1983:97).

Gumperz makes the same point in considerable detail in his 1982 study, where he introduces the idea of contextualization cues. He defines these as "the means by which speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows" (1982:131). In other words, they are "any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signalling of contextual presuppositions"
(1982:131). He makes an interesting comment on what happens when people involved in interaction misinterpret these contextualization cues:

> It is important to note that when this happens and when a difference in interpretation is brought to a participant’s attention, it tends to be seen in attitudinal terms. A speaker is said to be unfriendly, impertinent, rude, uncooperative, or to fail to understand. Interactants do not ordinarily notice that the listener may have failed to perceive a shift in rhythm or a change in pronunciation. Miscommunication of this type, in other words, is regarded as a social faux pas and leads to misjudgements of the speaker’s intent; it is not likely to be identified as a mere linguistic error. (1982: 132)

From these comments by Thomas and Gumperz, we are reminded that learners of foreign languages, who are prone to make errors in communication with target native speakers, face a real danger of being judged negatively in attitudinal terms. In order to avoid this, it is important, in the instruction of foreign languages, to consider ways to equip learners with the kind of competencies that enable them to act in contextually effective ways in the target language.

2.3 Speech act realization across cultures: Previous studies

Researchers have noted for some time now how language is used to perform certain speech acts across languages. Since the early 1980’s, researchers in second language acquisition have been investigating how non-native speakers of certain languages accomplish certain speech acts in their target language. There are a number of cross-cultural speech act realization studies, for example, on requests (Blum-Kulka 1982; Tanaka and Kawade 1982; Blum-Kulka and
Olshtain 1986); apologies (Cohen and Olshtain 1981; Olshtain 1983; Blum-Kulka and Olshtain 1984); refusals (Takahashi and Beebe 1987; Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz 1990); corrections (Takahashi and Beebe 1993); the expression of gratitude (Eisenstein and Bodman 1986; 1993); chastisement and disagreement (Beebe and Takahashi 1989); compliments (Wolfson 1989) and complaints (Olshtain and Weinbach 1986). Some of this research uses the so-called Discourse Completion Task (DCT) as its means of data collection, while others employ different means. As a project that uses the DCT, the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) is often cited in the literature. In the following section I will describe the CCSARP and some studies of requests which also use the DCT.

2.3.1 The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP)

The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) is conducted to investigate inter- and intralingual variability in speech act performance. Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989:22) state that its goal is “to establish patterns of speech act realization under different social constraints across a number of languages and cultures, including both native and non-native varieties.” Using subjects of seven different language varieties, they collected data on two speech acts: requests and apologies. Because they were interested in collecting a large sample with a manageable level of variables, they used the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) as their instrument. While regarding data coming from
“natural” conditions as ideal, Blum-Kulka et al. ruled out the use of ethnographic methods, because they wanted to compare speech acts produced by native and non-native speakers of the same language, and that concluded that the DCT was a more suitable instrument.

In the DCT, a subject is presented with a written representation of a dialogue with a missing line. She is required to fill in that line with a request or an apology to complete the dialogue. The dialogue is preceded by a description of its context of situation, its setting and the social relationship between the participants and their status difference. One such example is shown in (1):

(1) at the University
Ann missed a lecture yesterday and would like to borrow Judith’s notes.
Ann: ________________________________
Judith: Sure, but let me have them back before the lecture next week. (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989: 14)

After being collected, each “utterance” is analyzed according to the project’s coding scheme, for variables such as “alerters”, “supportive moves” and “head acts”. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) explicate this process showing the example in (2):

(2) Judith, I missed class yesterday, do you think I could borrow your notes? I promise to return them by tomorrow.

As this example illustrates, the request sequence may include: alerters, such as address terms (‘Judith’), proposed supportive moves (‘I missed class yesterday’), the request proper, or Head Act (’could I borrow your notes?’), optionally elaborated with downgrades (‘do you think’) or upgraders and postponed supportive moves (‘I promise to return them by tomorrow’) (1989: 17)
The CCSARP generated much research that compares the realization of a particular kind of speech act across two languages or between native speakers and non-native speakers of one language. Several such studies are discussed in the following section.

2.3.2 Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Studies Using the DCT

This section reviews studies that use the DCT as a means of data collection. Some of them were done even before the CCSARP, while others use data from the CCSARP.

Blum-Kulka (1982) compares "request realization" in Hebrew and English between native speakers and second language learners. Using the DCT, she elicited request forms from Hebrew native speakers, Hebrew learners, and English native speakers. All of her Hebrew learners were native speakers of English enrolled in an American university. As a result of her data analysis, Blum-Kulka notes that there are cases where Hebrew learners used a less direct strategy for requesting, compared to native speakers. She interprets this as a transfer of social norms from the learners' first language.

Blum-Kulka explains that since they do not know the rules of usage in a new language, learners go back to strategies familiar to them, namely, their first language's strategies. This observation may be accurate, but she does not discuss this matter in terms of how language teachers should formulate policy or take action to deal with the problem. Her conclusion seems pessimistic, since, in her words, "once he acquires a certain level of linguistic competence, the learner will
presumably try to activate some kind of functional competence in achieving his communicative ends” (Blum-Kulka 1982:53). Again, she fails to address the potential role of language instruction in creating functional competence, i.e. new behaviors, in learners from the very beginning, as part of their instruction. Her statement almost sounds as if language learners must discover the relevant conventions of language use by themselves, and then only after they have reached a certain level of proficiency. Her view conflicts with a view expressed by Thomas (1983), as follows:

I would suggest that we do a grave disservice, even to those who are studying in the country of the target language, if we expect students simply to ‘absorb’ pragmatic norms without explicit formalization. Nor can we afford to regard the teaching of pragmatic appropriateness as the icing on the ginger-bread – something best left until complete grammatical competence has been attained.

(1983:111)

Blum-Kulka (1983) provides a more elaborate comparison between request forms produced by Hebrew native speakers and by Hebrew learners. She notes the learners’ less direct way of requesting. She also points out that certain forms of request, such as Ata yaxol? "Could you?" questions in Hebrew, for example, which were often used by Hebrew learners, “do not carry the illocutionary force of” (Blum-Kulka 1983:51) the equivalent form in English.

Based on these findings, she argues against Fraser (1978), who assumes the universality of speech-acts across cultures, and who claims that “second language learners do not have to learn ‘how to code their intentions’ in the target language” (1978:34). On the contrary, Blum-Kulka believes that it is necessary for second language learners to go through the process of learning “how to
mean” in another language. Her (1983:38) position is “the way in which the
interrelationship among pragmatic, linguistic, and social factors is manifested in
language varies considerably from one language and culture to another.”

Up to this point, her argument is well taken. However, when it comes to
actual instruction in “how to mean” in another language, she does not have
much to offer. She seems to believe that we first have to know more about how
speech acts are realized in any particular language before we start talking about
how to teach them in that language, but does not venture beyond that.

In a later study, Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985) focuses on the receptive
aspect of communication. They maintain that “appropriate reaction to speech act
behavior rather than linguistic output is a good indication of the internalization
of [sociocultural] rules, regardless of grammar errors which that output may
contain”² (1985:304). They administered a judgement test regarding the
appropriateness of request and apology realization to three groups: Hebrew
native speakers and Hebrew learners in Israel took the Hebrew version of the
test, and English native speakers did the English version. Subjects were asked to
choose from among three assessments: “most appropriate,” “more or less
appropriate,” and “not appropriate.” One example of a request situation in the
judgement test is shown in (3):

² In a note, they elaborate on this point, as follows: “People who live in a country other than their
original homeland may often exhibit fossilized grammatical forms yet be viewed by their
environment as acting socially and culturally in an appropriate manner. We suggest that they
have acquired the receptive sociolinguistic rules of speaking although their productive
competence is not fully nativelike” (Olshtain and Blum-Kulka 1985:322).
(3) Situation 1. *Asking for a Loan*

Ruth, a friend of yours at the university, comes up to you after class and tells you that she has finally found an apartment to rent. The only problem is that she has to pay $200 immediately and at present she only has $100. She turns to you and says:

(1) How about lending me some money? (P)
(2) So, do me a favor and lend me the money. (P)
(3) Do you want to lend me the money? (distractor)
(4) I’d appreciate it if you could lend me the money. (N)
(5) Could you possibly lend me the money? (N)
(6) Lend me the money, please. (D)

(Olshtain and Blum-Kulka 1985:310)

Olshtain and Blum-Kulka observed that American English speakers preferred indirect negative politeness strategies, indicated as (N) in the above examples, while Hebrew speakers preferred direct positive politeness strategies, indicated as (D). Based on this observation, they conclude that Hebrew learners in Israel “will have to learn, as part of their process of acculturation, to accept the use of direct and positive politeness strategies” (1985:314). This conclusion leads them to a further question: what is the relationship between the learners’ level of acculturation and their length of stay in the community where the target language is spoken? By comparing the preference of request strategies between learners and native speakers, they found that for the learners they studied, preferences become similar to those of native speakers as the learners’ stay in the target language community increases in duration.

---

3 Using the concept of politeness, following Brown and Levinson (1987), each of the choices is labelled with politeness strategies: (P), (N) and (D). (P) indicates positive politeness strategy; (N) negative politeness strategy; (D) direct-bald on record.
In the beginning of their paper, Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985:303) state that, as researchers, they are “urged by practitioners to find out more about the acquisition process of sociocultural rules by learners participating in different learning situations.” However, as they present it, what they found in this study is not likely to be of much use for practitioners. If all that this research tells us is that learners acculturate to the pragmatic norm as they stay longer in the target language community, the only thing practitioners can do would seem to be to dispatch their learners to the target language community immediately and make them stay there for a long time. We need to address the complex and challenging question of how to help learners learn new pragmatic norms from the beginning of their classroom training, well before we see them off to target language communities. The data produced in these studies suggest as much, so it is odd that the authors fail to propose any such remedies.

Using data from the CCSARP, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) compare the request realizations of native speakers and non-native speakers\(^4\) of Hebrew in terms of utterance length. They found that non-native speakers used significantly longer utterances for request realizations, specifically that non-native speakers provided more modification, such as justification or precommitment for the request than native speakers did. According to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, the level of verbosity rose in proportion to the level of linguistic proficiency of the non-native, and the non-native speaker who had spent a number of years in the target community demonstrated native-like

\(^4\) Their native languages varied, but included English.
behavior. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain draw attention to this verbosity, because they believe it could cause pragmatic failure.

Their study clearly presents one difference found in the performance of native and non-native speakers, yet the authors fail to suggest any means whereby this possible cause of pragmatic failure might actively be avoided. Their observation of non-native speakers’ gradual accommodation toward a native norm seems to indicate that they believe that the only way that non-native speakers can learn to behave like native speakers is to stay in the target language community until that happens.

Examining the data of Hebrew natives and Hebrew foreign learners, and also English native and non-native speakers, Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1987) analyze learner’s deviations from native use. The differences they note are one of perspective⁵ and one of internal modification⁶. Specifically, they observe that Hebrew learners are reluctant to refer to the performer of the requested act. They also observe of English that native speakers use down-toners⁷ more often than English learners.

⁵ ‘Perspective’ is one of the CCSARP’s analytical parameters for requests. “Each pattern was classified as belonging to one of four mutually exclusive perspectives: hearer oriented (Can you do it); speaker oriented (Can I borrow your notes); speaker and hearer inclusive (Can we clean the kitchen); impersonal (The kitchen needs cleaning)” (Blum-Kulka and Levenston 1987:156).

⁶ Internal modification is another parameter of the CCSARP analytical framework. “Each pattern was classified according to the presence (and type) or absence of elements mitigating the speech act (Please clean the kitchen) or aggravating it (Clean up that bloody mess)” (1987:156).

⁷ A downtoner is “some modest quantifier to downplay the extent of the request” (1987:166), such as a little in Could you please clean up a little? .
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So far, we have reviewed some of the cross-cultural speech-act realization studies that use the DCT as a means for data collection. Each study notes differences in request realization, and points out the possibility of pragmatic failure. However, they all seem to lack any perspective informed by pedagogical concerns, that is, what their findings mean for language instruction. These researchers, all of whom work in the tradition of second language acquisition, seem to believe that sociocultural rules can be acquired by learners only “naturally” in situ.

2.3.3 Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Studies using means other than the DCT

Koike (1989) expands Blum-Kulka’s (1982) study, and claims that foreign language learners develop pragmatic competence in interlanguage. In her study, she attempts to answer two questions: whether learners recognize speech acts while listening to them in the target language (L2), and whether their native language (L1)’s pragmatic competence transfers in the production of L2 speech acts.

Using English native speakers who are learners of Spanish in second semester beginning Spanish, Koike conducted listening comprehension and production experiments. In the first experiment, after listening to different messages which involved three speech acts, learners were asked to identify two

---

8 “Interlanguage is the term given to an interim series of stages of language learning between the first (L1) and second language (L2) grammars through which all L2 learners must pass on their way to attaining fluency in the target language” (Koike 1989: 280). For the detail, see Selinker 1974.
things: 1) what type of speech act was involved in the message and 2) elements which helped them understand the message. The results of the listening comprehension experiment reveal that with a knowledge of familiar expressions such as *por favor* ‘please’ and *lo siento* ‘I’m sorry,’ even learners at the end of their second semester of Spanish learning can identify speech acts in Spanish as L2.

In a production experiment reported in the same research, learners at the end of their first semester of Spanish instruction were provided with descriptions of situations that require a request, and were asked to write down what they would say in these situations. One example of such a situation is shown in (4):

(4) Situation B: I (the instructor) am in your house and have just sat down in your father’s favorite chair. You know your father will be upset if he finds me sitting there when he returns home in five minutes. What will you say to me? (Koike 1989: 284)

Many of the learners used commands and command-like strategies, which Koike says are less polite. Koike attributes this inappropriate strategy to the complexity of the situations. The example in (4) requires a learner to explain to his/her instructor several things: 1) the chair that she is sitting in is the father’s favorite chair, 2) the father will be upset if someone else sits in it, and 3) the father will return home in five minutes. Explaining these things may well be difficult for beginning learners to handle. Koike (1989:279) poses a question in the beginning of her paper: “what pragmatics result when speakers are pushed beyond their L2 competence to conform to the perceived demands of both the production of a more polite form and a conceptually complex speech act?” If the
learners have only studied Spanish for one semester and are not equipped with the necessary tools to produce polite requests, it seems only natural that they would revert to simpler means or means from their base culture and language, unless more complex means have been a focus in their instruction. This can be easily predicted without any experiments.

Koike (1989) conducts another experiment in which she asks English speakers to perform similar tasks in English, as a point of comparison. Predictably, the strategies used were very different from those produced by the beginning students of Spanish. She states that Spanish equivalents to these polite forms produced by the English native speakers “do not always carry over to the L2 situation” (1989:285). If the students are not equipped with enough conversational moves, and the grammatical structures and vocabulary that constitute them, it is hard to expect appropriate forms to be carried over. It is impossible to expect students to perform using appropriate forms before they are taught how to do it. Yet, in her conclusion, Koike (1989:286) claims that the results of the experiments confirm the idea that “adults readily recognize speech acts and try to communicate within them.” Such a conclusion contradicts what her data indicate, that learners of Spanish used less polite and inappropriate strategies. The learners were able to identify speech acts in the listening comprehension experiment, but were not successful in producing appropriate speech acts.

From this gap between what the learners can identify and what they can produce, Koike (1989:286) infers that “pragmatic rules are applied only after
many learners feel they can successfully communicate the basic proposition of the speech act in grammatical terms.” Here, as with Blum-Kulka above, pragmatic rules and grammatical rules are treated as totally independent entities, and there seems to be no idea that instruction might attempt to somehow integrate these two and teach learners pragmatically and grammatically appropriate ways of expressing themselves.

Koike (1989:287) does, however, add a pedagogical suggestion, stating that “textbook authors and classroom teachers need to make corresponding changes in approaches to L2 teaching, since the limitations imposed by the textbook and the classroom on pragmatically appropriate input hinder the learner from becoming truly proficient in communicating in the target language.” However, she does not say how textbooks and classroom teaching impose limitations, nor does she suggest how these changes should be made. As with the research of Blum-Kulka, we are left with a problem demonstrated (pragmatic failure by learners), but no specific causes or solutions identified.

Using French native speakers and English learners of French as subjects, Harlow (1990) investigates how social variables of sex, age, and familiarity influence speech-act realization patterns in French. Three kinds of speech-act -- requesting, thanking, and apologizing -- were represented. One of her purposes was to compare how learners’ performances differ from those of native speakers, and to arrive at implications for language teaching.

Data collected through a written role-play questionnaire shows that the native speakers preferred indirect requests, using pourriez-vous 'Could you' or
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savez-vous ‘Do you know’, making their utterances longer as a result. The age of the addressee influenced the realization of requests among the natives, who tended to use a title of respect (monsieur, madame, mademoiselle) with older strangers, while foreign learners chose not to do so.

In the speech-act of thanking, it is observed that older addressees invites longer formulas of thanking from native speakers. Harlow suggests that this could be inferred as a reflection of the respect for age that is general in French society. Familiarity also affects the realization of the request. When a native speaker is not familiar with the addressee, his utterance tends to become longer, and referring to the addressee’s ability (peux-tu, pourriez-vous ouvrir ‘Can/Could you open?’) was preferred, possibly attempting to minimize the effects of imposition.

With these results, Harlow suggests that information pertinent to social variables that affect speech-act strategies should be presented in textbooks “from beginning level on” (1990: 348). Classroom activities, she adds, should “be expanded to include practice in performing speech acts with addressees of different ages, sexes, and social status, so as to give learners practice in selecting language strategies according to these variables” (1990: 348).

In conclusion to her, Harlow emphasizes the importance of communicating to learners that “language is composed of not just linguistic and lexical elements; rather, language reflects also the social context, taking into account situational and social factors present in the act of communication” (1990: 348). Harlow’s research not only investigates the differences that obtain between
native and non-native speakers' performances, but also addresses the implications for pedagogical practice of those differences. In this regard, her work goes further than the CCSARP. However, students' learning the facts about differences between their performances and native speakers' performances is one step among several that would seem to be needed. Here, too, more needs to be said. It is necessary, for example, to show learners models of how native speakers perform in particular circumstances in a variety of social roles and have them practice, with similar variation, following and extending the model.

Edmondson, House, Kasper and Stemmer (1984) compare the performance of native speakers with learners, and identify some pedagogical implications of their findings. This study is different from the others reviewed so far, in that the data was collected through oral role-plays by three groups of subjects (English native speakers, German native speakers, and German native speakers studying English). After the role-play, subjects were asked to listen to the recording of their performance, and to comment on it. According to Edmondson et al., the learners had a small range of linguistic means to realize speech-acts, preferred structurally simple ways to realize speech acts, and used routine formulae inappropriately. Edmondson et al. (1984:122) link these behaviors of the learners to the instruction that they had received, and state, “learners who have received structurally orientated foreign language instruction and little exposure to the foreign language in non-educational contexts are not
capable of realizing a variety of pragmatic and discourse functions in an 
interactionally appropriate way.”

As we have seen so far, the link between learners’ performance and the 
content of instruction has not been discussed much in L2 acquisition research. In 
this regard, Edmondson et al., differ from Koike (1989), who immediately 
associated learners’ pragmatic failures to the use of L1 strategies. The former, by 
contrast, take instruction into consideration, by scrutinizing classroom discourse. 
In this, their work provides a new perspective on the investigation of L2 speech 
act strategies. Based on their analysis of classroom discourse, they emphasize 
that “the minimal unit for communicative target language practice should be the 
Exchange, and not the utterance or speech act” (1984:124).

There is other research, too, which focuses more on how to teach foreign 
language. Holmes and Brown (1980) discuss practical aspects of teaching 
English to foreigners. They state that a teacher who is willing to assist learners 
acquire rules for using English appropriately “need[s] to discover ways of 
facilitating and accelerating this acquisition process” (1980:79). One such way, 
according to Holmes and Brown, is to have discussion with learners on their 
performance. They state that the adult learners “bring to second language 
learning an ability to introspect which can be extremely valuable” (1980: 80). 
Since adult learners have acquired rules for speaking at least in their native 
language, they state that “the teacher can make use of this sociolinguistic 
competence to facilitate contrastive analysis of sociolinguistic systems in the 
classroom” (1980:80).
Their suggested activities include an exercise of choosing appropriate forms from many choices given for situations that require certain speech acts, such as requests, apologies and refusals, an exercise of thinking about the situation given a question sentence that includes ‘or’, and an exercise in which learners are to label the question sentence with its function. In some of these activities, learners are actively involved in producing utterances. In others, they simply choose the correct item from among several or label the utterance. It is certain that these activities raise the learners’ awareness of conventions for speaking. While this awareness is meaningful and valuable for the learners, it still does not deal with the issue of how to ingrain those rules for speaking as reliable intuitions in learners. The issue that needs addressing is how to help learners come up with an appropriate utterance spontaneously every time they attempt to accomplish something in the target language, and to extend their working “model bank” as they do so. Holmes and Brown offer very practical and interesting ideas to raise learners’ awareness, but they do not discuss how the instruction can forge active links between this awareness on the part of learners and their proclivity for actual actions.

George (1981) makes another suggestion. She introduces an idea of “a course based on authentic video materials which will provide both the input for cross cultural observation and for varieties of spoken language” (1981:82). She insists on the use of genuine materials “to give students access to the flavour of cultural specificity and of language” (1981:83). Specifically, she recommends the
use of films and plays, since videotaping naturally occurring communicative events is extremely difficult.

Among the cross-cultural speech act realization studies that do not use the DCT as data collection means, we note in conclusion that several of these refer to the relationship between learners' performance and the instruction that they are receiving. Some of the studies even include suggestions for instruction. However, the majority of them merely suggest that instructors address in discussion the fact of differences in speech act realization, with the expectation that this will raise the awareness of the learners. That probably will, but awareness is still not performance. Oddly enough, there seems to be no discussion about how to actually teach learners to actually communicate in appropriate ways in real time.

2.4 Previous studies on requesting in Japanese

In this section, I review previous studies on request-making in Japanese. As stated in the Introduction, one of the purposes of this study is to investigate differences and similarities in request-making between native speakers and non-native learners of Japanese. The ultimate purpose of this comparison is to understand the differences between the two groups and to draw some pedagogical implications for instructors so that learners can be better equipped with pragmatic competence that supports effective social action. There are several studies on request-making in Japanese.
Nakamichi and Doi (1995) review teaching materials for elementary Japanese which they consider representative\(^9\), and note that most of these materials present ~*te kudasai* 'Please do ~.' as a "typical request expression." Upon defining 'request' as "an action which calls for addressee's voluntary action for the sake of speaker's benefit" (1995:85), they maintain, in the light of their definition, that ~*te kudasai*\(^{10}\) 'Please do ~.' is an expression of instruction rather than of request.

They point out that many of the teaching materials present the "original" meaning of ~*te kudasai*, which is "asking, with some deference, for a certain action" (Nakamichi and Doi 1995:87). A request with ~*te kudasai* can become appropriate only when there is a context in which the speaker has the power to request that action or in which the requested action can benefit the addressee. They point out that presenting the original meaning without discussing the necessary contexts is not very helpful for learners who need to make requests in real-life situations. Nakamichi and Doi (1995:89) believe that it is important for learners "to analyze structures of request discourse into units and learn expressions which appear in these units which make up the discourse."

---

\(^9\) Those materials are: 1) *Terebi nihongo kooza syokuuu 1 Sukitto Yan-san to nihon no hitobito* TV Japanese elementary course 1 Skit: Mr. Yan and Japanese people; 2) *Terebi Nihongo kooza Syokyuu 2 Zoku Yan-san to Nihon no hitobito* TV Japanese elementary course 2 Skit: Mr. Yan and Japanese people part 2; 3) *Nihongo Syoko* 'First steps in Japanese'; 4) *Situational Functional Japanese volume 1*; 3) *Talking Business in Japanese*; 6) *Bunka Syokyuu Nihongo I-II* 'Bunka elementary Japanese I-II'; 6) *Tyuugoku kara no kikoku-sya no tame no seekatu nihongo* I 'Living Japanese for returnees from China'.

\(^{10}\) A construction based on the verbal gerund (-te in this and the formulae below).
As examples of request expressions more frequently used, they mention expressions such as ~te kudasaimasen ka? 'Would [you] give me the action of ~?', ~te itadakemasen ka 'Could [I] have [you] ~?', ~te itadakitai n desu ga.. 'I'd like to receive the action of ~, but [will that be all right?]'. According to their observation, the presentation of these expressions in the reviewed materials was rather sporadic, which made it difficult for learners to have systematic practice in using these expressions.

Nakamichi and Doi's (1995) study limits itself to request expressions that appeared in teaching materials, and their view of request-making is rather static. On the other hand, Kumagai (1995) introduces a more dynamic view of request-making, by investigating strategies used in requests as they were made in role-play data. By showing a simple picture to native Japanese subjects, she presents a situation, in which they were directed to get a doctor for a neighbor who has suddenly become ill, and asked the subjects what they would say in that situation.

In the data she has collected, she notes many different kinds of moves, but finds that most of the discourses (more than 95 %) consisted of three moves: "information provision," "request," and "something else." In addition to these basic moves, she observes many strategies, which she divides into two major categories: (1) strategies that increase the feeling of urgency of the request, and (2) strategies that indicate consideration toward the addressee. She classifies specific examples in each category as follows:
(1) Indicating urgency
   b) repeated request
   c) seriousness of the situation
   d) offer to navigate
      eg) Miti o otemasu. ‘I will give you directions.’
          Watasi to issyo ni kite kudasai. ‘Please come with me.’

(2) Consideration for the addressee
   a) apology: sumimasen ‘I am sorry.’, osore irimasu ‘I am sorry’,
      nooshiwake nai/arimasen ‘I have no excuse.’, warui ‘(I feel) bad about it.’
   b) emphasis on the apologetic expression
      makoto ni nooshiwake arimasen
      ‘I am extremely sorry.’
   c) hesitation
   d) hesitation expressions: tyotto ‘a bit’, dekimisata ra ‘if you can’,
      ippen ‘just once’
   e) express the feelings of trust and closeness: address doctor with sensee
      (Kumagai 1995:24)

In her conclusion, she states that the manner in which a request is made differs according to who makes the request. The choice of strategies depends on each subject’s personality and her experiences in the past. This study is successful in demonstrating the diversity of actual request-making obtained through a role-play.

Using naturally occurring data, Kashiwazaki (1993) compares the hanasikake-koodoo ‘discourse initiating behavior’ of native and non-native speakers. Their approaches may be different, but Kashiwazaki shares the same concern with Nakamichi and Doi, that is, if smooth communication is the aim, it is not sufficient to teach only sentential patterns such as site itadakemasen ka?
‘Could [I] have [you] ~?’
She defines 'discourse initiating behavior' as a series of moves at the beginning of a discourse which includes: (1) getting the attention of the hearer, (2) conveying the speaker's message\textsuperscript{11}, and (3) a response from the hearer. She tape-recorded conversations which took place at a study-abroad counsellor's office at a Japanese university. Her data include conversations between Japanese native speakers and university employees and also those between non-Japanese learners of the Japanese language and university employees.

Regarding request-making, she notes that Japanese native speakers avoid direct request expressions, explain their situations, and leave it to their addressees to deduce what is desired. According to her, when the request is complex, Japanese native speakers introduce their topics with the phrase, \textit{xx no koto na n desu ga}... '(It is that) it is regarding xx ...'. She also observes that many of the Japanese native speakers do not finish their request sentences, and leave off instead with \textit{xx-tai n desu kedo.../desu ga}... '(It is that) [I]’d like to xx, but...'.

Compared to the Japanese native speakers, 90\% of whom make some kind of apologetic remarks before their requests (such as \textit{Sumimasen ga} .. ‘I’m sorry but ...’), fewer Japanese learners do the same. According to Kashiwazaki, while the Japanese native speakers share a tendency to avoid direct request-making and a preference for explaining their situation first, Japanese learners have a tendency not to spend enough time on pre-request moves, but to move on to their requests quickly, which gives their addressees an impression of being dealt with abruptly. But a clear difference, she notes, is that the learners tend to use

\textsuperscript{11} In these messages, Kashiwazaki focuses on requests and demands from speakers.
full-sentences in their requests. Some of them do not know how much information to verbalize, and as a result give bad impressions to the addressees, Kashiwazaki observes. The pedagogical implications of this, as she sees it, are that Japanese learners need to be taught explicitly some of the characteristic ways of request-making exhibited by native speakers. This study is significant in that it uses naturally occurring data. Kashiwazaki’s analysis gives a clear presentation of the differences between the request-making of Japanese speakers and non-native speakers. However, she does not offer many specific ideas on how to bridge the gap between the two groups.

Kumai (1992) compares the request-making performance of Japanese native speakers and Japanese learners using role-play activities. The role-play task requires a subject to ask to borrow a book from three different people: Instructor I who is about sixty years old, Instructor II who is about thirty years old, and "Yamada-san," a student.

Analyzing the collected data, Kumai notes that Japanese learners’ performances differed from those of the Japanese native speakers from the start. Upon entering the instructor’s office, all of the Japanese native speakers said Situree-simasu ‘Excuse me,’ while the number of Japanese learners who uttered any kind of greeting at all was only about half. Some of them used Gomen-kudasai12 ‘Excuse me,’ Ozyama-simasu13 ‘Excuse me (for intruding).’, Haitte mo ii

12 This is a greeting uttered upon entering stores, or the entryway of people’s residences.
13 This expression is used for actually entering the interior of people’s residences and rooms.
desu ka? ‘May I come in?’), which are considered inappropriate as overtures when entering someone’s office. Kumai observes that both the Japanese native speakers and the Japanese learners felt a need to provide information as to why this book is needed, and why they are asking the addressee for it, etc. The Japanese native speakers showed a tendency to provide more information when speaking to the instructors than when speaking to Yamada-san.

In this role-play task, the script was designed so that subjects’ addressees would reject their request first time around. Having their requests rejected, the Japanese native speakers provided more background information in order to effectively support the legitimacy of their request, while the learners just repeated their original request. This behavior could be interpreted to mean that they were asserting their request as their right, so, Kumai thinks that it could create negative impressions in their addressees. In their request the second time around, a number of Japanese native speakers specified the period of borrowing as ni-san niti ‘two three days’ or tyotto ‘for a short period of time’. They also used expressions, such as doo site mo ‘no matter what’ or nantoka ‘somehow’ for an effect of pleading. As for request expressions, more Japanese native speakers used kasu ‘lend’ than kariru ‘borrow.’ Most of these expressions (e.g. kasu) ended with some form of no da (such as ~n da/~n desu) plus ke(re) do mo, and for Japanese native speakers, karitai ‘want to borrow’ occurred in 22% of the request expressions. Kumai observes that there were numerous errors in the use of the
extended predicate ... no da ⁴⁴ among the Japanese learners. She voices concern that the expression ~tai desu ‘want to ~’--without an extended predicate, which was frequently used by the learners, openly expresses the speaker’s desire and thus gives an abrupt impression. She feels that the combination of n(o) da + kedo, .. is an indispensable unit for request-making, and that this should be taught.

After their request was accepted, most of the Japanese native speakers added, by way of ending the interaction, utterances like Is-syuukan de kanarazu kaesimasu. ‘[I] will make sure that [I] will return the book in one week’ or Zyaa, okari-simasu. ‘Well then, [I] will borrow the book’. The learners did not venture to use this kind of utterance at all.

Kumai notes that some of the Japanese learners had a problem shifting speech levels according to their addressees and the situations. Those learners kept using a distal style no matter who they were talking to. Another stylistic difference is that Japanese learners had a tendency to use direct style without any sentence particles such as ne, sa, or yo. Kumai states that this phenomenon is prevalent among the elementary and intermediate level foreign learners in her subject pool. Kumai also reports a problem in the foreign learners’ performances in that they lack stylistic coherence as a whole. According to her, in their speech, formal expressions and casual expressions are used in a mixed fashion and these sometimes unintentionally created a humorous impression.

---

⁴⁴ According to Jordan with Noda (1987), the pattern /predicate + no da/ "relates what precedes n(o) to something in the real world which is known or assumed to be known by the person addressed, as well as being known by the speaker" (1987:179). They also state that, when appropriately used, the extended predicate “can create a feeling of closeness, empathy, understanding, and warmth” (1987: 243).
She concludes that Japanese learners cannot learn to perform requests successfully by practicing "request expressions" alone. It is important for them to understand the structures of Japanese discourse behavior and to learn how to realize their request in a discourse. The learners may profit from being told these things as information, as Kumai recommends. However, this does not mean that they will therefore become able to realize their requests in a fashion similar to the Japanese native speakers. Kumai does not elaborate on how she would do this.

Among studies on Japanese request-making, the number of comparative studies on how Japanese native speakers and Japanese learners realize their requests is limited. Kumai (1992) discusses in detail the differences in requests produced by the two groups in her study. Although she notes differences, she does not offer specific ideas on how to help learners to make requests as Japanese native speakers do.

2.5 Methodologies for data collection

As we saw in the second section above, there are a number of speech act comparative studies that use the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) as their means of collecting data. At the same time, there are other studies that question the validity of data collected by DCT and that use alternative means. In this section, I review some of the discussion regarding data collection methods.
The unified opinion that supports the use of the DCT is its efficiency. Wolfson, Marmor and Jones (1989) quote a list of the DCT's advantages from Beebe (1985) as follows:

The Discourse Completion Tests are effective means of:
(1) gathering a large amount of data quickly
(2) creating an initial classification of semantic formulas and strategies that will occur in natural speech
(3) studying the stereotypical perceived requirements for a socially appropriate (though not always polite) response
(4) gaining insight into social and psychological factors that are likely to affect speech and performance
(5) ascertaining the canonical shape of refusals, apologies, partings, etc. in the minds of the speakers of that language. However, they are not natural speech and they do not accurately reflect natural speech. (1989: 183)

As we can see in (5) above, even in a list supposedly listing its advantages, the difference between natural speech and the DCT data is noted. This difference should be the greatest weakness of this method. Rose (1992) notes some concerns expressed by the researchers who use the DCT in their research. For example, Wolfson et al. (1989) “question the assumption that short, decontextualized written segments are comparable to the longer stretches of discourse typical of actual interaction” (Rose 1992: 52). In the DCT, speakers are asked to produce one utterance in which one particular speech act is realized. In natural speech situations, it might take multiple exchanges for a speaker to set up and realize one speech act, but in the DCT, this possibility cannot be reflected in the data.

Wolfson et al. (1989) express a similar distrust toward data obtained with the DCT. As they put it,
with regard to the comparison of data yielded by questionnaires versus those collected through an ethnographic approach, a fundamental question has to do with the validity of written responses to short dialogues which, by their very nature, lack the context of an ongoing verbal interaction. (1989:182)

Beebe et al. (1990), who study pragmatic transfer of English by Japanese speakers, offer a caveat in their conclusion that their study’s results should be considered preliminary because the DCT is “limiting and may bias the results” (1990:67). As we can tell from those comments, the very researchers who have done comparative speech-act studies using the DCT have few illusions about the DCT.

This feeling of doubt is not caused only by the other-than-natural nature of the obtained data. It is also caused by the belief that human cognition differs when writing and when speaking. Cohen and Olshtain (1994:148) point out that “as for discourse completion, it is a projective measure of speaking and so the cognitive processes involved in producing utterances in response to this elicitation device may not truly reflect those used when having to speak relatively naturally.”

Some of these doubts also seem to be based on the inadequacy of native speakers’ intuitions in reflecting on their behavior. The DCT is designed on the assumption that native speakers are capable of providing accurate descriptions of what they would say. However, as Wolfson et al. (1989:181) point out, “when native speakers are asked to report what they or others would say in a given speech situation, their responses are often very different from the speech behavior which is actually observed.” From the discussion so far, it is clear that
despite its wide use, the validity of the DCT as a data collection method is questioned by many researchers.

As alternatives to the DCT, there are several other ways to go. Open role-play is one such alternative. In an open role-play, participants realize speech acts orally, instead of writing them down, but do so following written cues provided prior to their interaction.

Kasper and Dahl (1991) discuss its advantage over the DCT stating that open role-play provides “a much richer data source” (1991: 229). According to them, data collected through open role-play “represent oral production, full operation of the turn-taking mechanism, impromptu planning decisions contingent on interlocutor input, and hence, negotiation of global and local goals” (1991:229). These data allow the researchers “to observe how speech act performance is sequentially organized (e.g., in terms of strategy choice and politeness investment), what kinds of interlocutor responses are elicited by specific strategic choices, and how such responses in turn determine the speaker’s next move” (Kasper and Dahl 1991:229). While the data obtained from open role-play is not exactly the same as naturally occurring data, the speech act realization in sequence that it enables may present a more realistic picture than the one-line data that the DCT demands.

One disadvantage that open role-plays “share with authentic conversational data,” report Kasper and Dahl, is “that they need transcribing” (1991:229). Because open role-play is not a writing task, researchers have to transcribe tape-recorded data. Multi-sequenced speech acts, compared to one-
line speech acts, produce a larger quantity of data, and the transcription process requires more time and effort of the researchers. This process can be a burden.

Another kind of data collection method is the verbal report. In this method, participants are provided with some tasks to accomplish, such as translating, reading or realizing speech acts. While performing the tasks, they are asked to report what they are doing or thinking. Cohen (1991:135) states that verbal report measures are “intended to provide mentalistic data regarding cognitive processing.” He introduces several different verbal reports as follows:

Such verbal reports include data that reflect self-report (learners’ descriptions of what they do, characterized by generalized statements about learning behavior), self-observation (the inspection of specific, not generalized, language behavior, introspectively or retrospectively), self-revelation (think-aloud, stream-of-consciousness disclosure of thought processes while the information is being attended to), or some combination of these (Cohen, 1987b; Cohen & Hosenfeld, 1981; Radford, 1974).

(1991:135)

An advantage of verbal reports, Cohen and Olshtain (1994:153) point out that “verbal report interviews provide feedback from respondents regarding aspects of their behavior that would otherwise be left to the intuitions and speculations of the investigator.” While the DCT and open role-play methods are concerned with simply collecting speech samples, the verbal report method is concerned with the participants’ inner cognitive processes not directly observable. In this sense, data provided by this method may offer useful insights.

While the verbal report method may have some advantages over other methods, it is not perfect. According to Cohen (1991), some critics are skeptical
that the verbal report can capture the cognitive processing of the participants, because they believe that the processing is unconscious. Other critics are concerned about the verbal report’s "potentially intrusive effect" (Cohen 1991:136). They fear that retrospection process for the verbal report might distort the actual task performance. According to Cohen (1991), critics would suggest that the problems with the verbal report "seriously limit the generalizability of the findings and might even preclude their use" (1991:137).

As we have observed, all three data collection methods, namely, the DCT, open role-plays, and the verbal report have both strengths and weaknesses. This makes it difficult to select a single best data collection method. Beebe and Cummings (1996) note this difficulty. After a short review of relevant research, they state that "this brief review of the literature to date indicates that the debate continues over the reliability and validity of Discourse Completion Test data and that oral role-plays, closed or open, do not solve all the problems inherent in the collection of speech act data" (1996:67).

On the other hand, several researchers share a similar view on the selection of data collection methodology. Taking potential strengths and weaknesses of each method into consideration, Cohen (1991) locates the use of verbal report not as "a replacement for other means of research," but as "a complement to them" (1991:138). Cohen and Olshtain (1994:155) also conclude that "the safest way to proceed is to use multiple measures, in order to triangulate the measurement of the speech act phenomenon question." They do
not discuss which method complements which other one, but they do recommend the use of a mixture of data collection methods.

Kasper and Dahl (1991) agree with others, and particularly promote the combination of production and metapragmatic assessment\(^{15}\) data. The rationale they offer is as follows:

The combination of production and metapragmatic assessment data provides an empirical basis for explaining observed patterns of speech act realization and politeness in terms of perceived contextual constraints, and of the pragmatic force and politeness value language users attribute to different linguistic means and strategies. Metapragmatic assessments of contextual factors can provide an important corrective, or confirmation, of the values and weights of contextual factors built into the instrument by the researcher. Such controls are particularly important in cross-cultural studies where the researcher is not a member of one or more of the implied cultures. (1991:238)

Taking these suggestions into consideration, the present investigation uses partially cued role-plays for data collection and recall protocol interviews as a start in understanding the sociopragmatic intuitions of native Japanese speakers and Japanese learners, as revealed in regard to requests.

\(^{15}\) Metapragmatic assessments are "techniques to complement primary (production) data" (1991:232). Kasper and Dahl note two kinds of such assessment data: 1) assessments of contextual factors, 2) assessments of the linguistic realization modes themselves.
CHAPTER 3

PROMPTED NATIVE/NON-NATIVE REQUEST SEQUENCES

3.1 Data collection procedure

Data were collected through the use of role-play tasks. Participants met with the researcher individually in a quiet conference room, and they were asked to perform six role-play tasks prompted by situations described\(^1\) on separate index cards, after having first read an instruction card. To reduce the anxiety of the non-native participants, the instruction card for them made it clear that the purpose of the role-play was not to evaluate their Japanese, and urged them to relax and do their best. Such comment was not provided for native participants. At this time, all participants were encouraged to ask questions if they had any. The researcher then told the participants that she would ask them what went through their minds after each task, for the purpose of recall protocol. She also

---

\(^1\) English was used for the non-native participants' instruction card, and Japanese was used for the native participants' ones.
informed them that the performed tasks and recall protocol would be recorded with an audio tape-recorder.

3.2 Role-play tasks

Each role-play assumed two roles: one played by a participant who would make requests, and another, called ‘partner’, performed by the researcher. Each task on an index card described a situation, including the participant’s role, the partner’s role, and a problem in that situation. Participants were prompted to resolve the problems by interacting in Japanese with the ‘partner’.

Six role-play tasks were created:

(1) Business: less face-threatening task
(2) Business: more face-threatening task
(3) Casual: less face-threatening task
(4) Casual: more face-threatening task
(5) Formal: less face-threatening task
(6) Formal: more face-threatening task

In order to give the participants freedom in choosing how they would resolve the problems described, directives such as “make a request of X to do Y” were avoided. The task presents a “situation & problem” and a “relevant fact.” The six tasks and their elicitation aims follow as below:

1. situation & problem

At the company office, you need a large envelope to put some report in. You looked everywhere, but you couldn’t find any.
relevant fact

A part-time student worker is assisting you at the office. There is a stationery store nearby.

In this task, a participant plays the role of the person in need of an envelope, and the researcher plays the part-time student worker’s role. It is an interaction between the roles of a company employee and his/her subordinate. Because running errands would be considered within a part-time student worker’s duties, this action should not be face-threatening to him or her. The intended interaction is for the superordinate to ask the subordinate to buy some envelopes at the nearby stationery store.

2. situation & problem

You are very busy today at the office. Yamada-san at the Bank of Tokyo just called and said that he has completed the report you need.

relevant fact

Suzuki-butyoo² is going to the Bank of Tokyo for a meeting this morning.

Here, a participant plays the role of a company employee in need of a report that Yamada has completed. The researcher plays the role of Suzuki-butyoo. The intended interaction is for the company employee to ask Suzuki-butyoo, who is scheduled to go to the Bank of Tokyo, to pick up the report that s/he needs. This task is considered more face-threatening than Task 1 because, in this case, the

---

² Butyoo means ‘division manager’. A division manager belongs to the middle management of the company that is just below the top management to which C.E.O., president and vice president belong.
company employee makes a request of Suzuki-butyoo, whose social status is higher.

3. situation & problem

You and your friend plan to go to Cincinnati this coming weekend. You were planning to drive your car. However, you’ve just learned that your car insurance doesn’t take effect till next week.

relevant fact

Your friend has a car, a driver’s license, and insurance.

This task is designed to elicit a casual interaction between friends. The intended interaction is for a friend, played by a participant, to ask, in a casual manner, another friend played by the researcher to drive to Cincinnati this weekend. Cincinnati is a two-hour drive from where the role-play took place. Given the circumstance, this request seems legitimate, and it is not particularly face-threatening.

4. situation & problem

It’s dinner time. You’ve just remembered that you have to watch a video for your Japanese film class tomorrow. Class starts at 8:30 am. You have the videotape, but no VCR. You’ve heard that the boyfriend of your Japanese friend has recently bought a VCR.

relevant fact

You don’t know the boyfriend well, but you’ve heard his name is Takashi.

This task also elicits casual interaction between friends. The participant plays the role of the person in need of VCR, and the researcher plays the role of the Japanese friend. The task is more likely to pose a threat to the face of the
recipient of the request, because the person in need of the VCR has to ask for something which does not belong to the addressee, and because it is dinner-time and this does not give enough time for the addressee to resolve this problem at his/her convenience.

5. situation & problem

Yesterday you asked your Japanese teacher/professor\(^3\) to write a recommendation letter for you to Tsukuba University in Japan/ New York University in the U.S.A.\(^4\) Today, you realized that the deadline is tomorrow.

relevant fact

Your teacher has a fax machine.

This is a formal interaction between a student and a teacher. The participant plays the role of the student who asks for the recommendation letter to be written. The researcher plays the role of the teacher. The intended interaction for this task is for the student to ask the teacher to fax the recommendation letter to Tsukuba/New York University. Insofar as writing recommendation letters is a part of a faculty member’s responsibilities, this action would be considered to have relatively low face-threatening potential, but the fact that the student has left little time for the letter to be written adds a face-threatening element to the situation.

\(^3\) ‘Your Japanese teacher’ was used for the non-native participants; ‘your professor’ for the native participants.

\(^4\) ‘Tsukuba University in Japan’ is used for the non-native participants; ‘New York University in the U.S.A.’ for the native participants.
6. situation & problem

Today you lent some computer software to your Japanese teacher/professor\(^5\). It belongs to your older brother, but you thought he won’t need it for a while. But your older brother has just called to say he wants it back tomorrow morning.

relevant fact

You have Japanese class/that professor’s class\(^6\) tomorrow from 8:30 am.

This is designed to elicit formal interaction between the student and the teacher. The participant plays the student who lent the software to the teacher. Because the student must ask for the object, which he has just lent to the professor, without giving the professor enough time to use it, this task is considered more face-threatening than Task (5).

To summarize, tasks (1), (3), and (5) were less face-threatening than (2), (4), (6) respectively. For tasks (1) and (2) the relative face-threat level came primarily from the nature of the speaker-addressee relationship. For tasks (3) through (6), however, the face-threat level was considered higher primarily because of the nature of the perlocutionary act, or the resultant action expected of the person of whom the request would be made, given the social expectations involved.

\(^5\) ‘Your Japanese teacher’ is used for the non-native participants; ‘your professor’ for the native participants.

\(^6\) ‘Japanese class’ was used for the non-native participants; ‘that professor’s class’ for the native participants.
3.3 Participants

3.3.1 Native speakers of Japanese

Eighteen native speakers of Japanese participated in the role-plays. Seven of them were female, and eleven male. Their ages ranged from eighteen to twenty eight. There were only three people who had worked full-time, yet all of them had part-time work experiences. Six participants were from western Japan (the Kansai area), and their dialect was occasionally reflected in the data. Others were from eastern Japan (Kanto) and other areas, and they used “a more or less standard, Tokyo-based language” in the role-plays. The length of the entire group’s stay in the U.S. ranged from two months to six years. However, twelve of the participants had been in the U.S. less than a year\(^7\). Their background is shown in the table below:

\(^7\) In an attempt to avoid or lessen influence from English, the researcher sought people who were relatively new to American society and culture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Birth place</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Length of stay in the US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM¹⁷</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Part-time job</td>
<td>3 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kanagawa</td>
<td>Part-time job (1 yr. 6 mo.)</td>
<td>1 yr. 6 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF³</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ibaraki</td>
<td>Bank (7 yrs.)</td>
<td>10 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Part-time job (4 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Part-time job (3wks.)</td>
<td>10 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>Part-time job (5 yrs.)</td>
<td>10 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Niigata</td>
<td>Part-time job (2 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Shiga</td>
<td>Part-time job (3 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>Part-time job (2 yrs.)</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hiroshima</td>
<td>Translation (6 mo.)</td>
<td>6 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Part-time job (5 mo.)</td>
<td>1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>High school teacher (4 yrs. 6 mo.)</td>
<td>4 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>University research assistant (1 yr. 6 mo.)</td>
<td>1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Part-time job (7 yrs.)</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Research institute (6 mo.)</td>
<td>2 yrs. 2 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Saitama</td>
<td>Research institute (5 yrs.)</td>
<td>4 yrs. 3 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kobe</td>
<td>Part-time job (1 yr.)</td>
<td>1 yr. 3 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Part-time job (1 yr.)</td>
<td>2 mo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Backgrounds of Native Participants

ªMeaning 'native male'

³Meaning 'native female'

### 3.3.2 Non-native learners of Japanese

All of the eighteen non-native learners of Japanese who participated in the role-play were enrolled in Japanese language classes at The Ohio State University (OSU) at the time of their participation. Of the eighteen learners,
thirteen were at the end of 450 hours of instruction, and five were at the end of 600 hours of instruction. Four were female, and fifteen male. All of them except for one were undergraduate students, either juniors or seniors. For two participants, English was not their first language. About half of these participants had studied some Japanese outside OSU. Four had taken Japanese classes at their high schools. One participant took Japanese class at a Japanese college as an exchange student for nine months while enrolled at OSU. Another participant had enrolled in an intensive summer program held at another American college. One participant had taken three years of Japanese at another American college. One other participant studied Japanese on his own for three years while he was stationed in Japan on military duty. All but two of the non-native participants had the experience of learning one or more foreign languages besides Japanese. All of the participants had been in Japanese classes taught by the researcher, and knew her.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years of study</th>
<th>OSU (Qtrs.)</th>
<th>Outside OSU</th>
<th>Other foreign languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNM1</td>
<td>6 yrs. 5 mo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High school (4 yrs.)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM2</td>
<td>1 yr. 8 mo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>German, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM3</td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High school (3 yrs.)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM4</td>
<td>4 yrs. 6 mo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High school (3 yrs.)</td>
<td>English, Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM5</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM6</td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High school (3 yrs.)</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM7</td>
<td>2 yrs. 11 mo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tsukuba University (11 mo.)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM8</td>
<td>1 yr. 6 mo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Spanish, Chinese, German, Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM9</td>
<td>1 yr. 6 mo.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM10</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM11</td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>On his own (3 yrs. 6 mo.)</td>
<td>Spanish, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM12</td>
<td>1 yr. 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM13</td>
<td>4 yrs. 2 mo.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Chinese, Korean, French, Spanish, German, Russian, Modern Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNF14</td>
<td>2 yrs. 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>English, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNF15</td>
<td>2-3 yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Middlebury College (9 weeks)</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM16</td>
<td>6 yrs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>German, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNF17</td>
<td>3 yrs. 9 mo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hobart &amp; William Smith College (3 yrs.)</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNF18</td>
<td>4 yrs.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Backgrounds of Non-Native Participants

* Meaning 'non-native male'

* This participant's native language is Korean.

* Meaning 'non-native female'

* This participant's native language is Korean.
3.4 Comparison of data

As Heritage & Atkinson (1984:5) state, “for conversation analysts, … it is sequences and turns within sequences, rather than isolated sentences or utterances, that have become the primary units of analysis.” As indicated in the previous chapter, this focus on analyzing request sequences as wholes is a welcome development. As a language instructor, I am also interested in specific linguistic forms that native and non-native Japanese speakers use for actual individual "request" predicates. In order to distinguish the two, a sequence in which a speaker demonstrates a request-making will be called a request sequence, and an actual request predicate will be called a focal request. The smallest unit of analysis for the present purpose is called a move. Goffman’s (1976:272) definition for the move, “any full stretch of talk or of its substitutes which has a distinctive unitary bearing on some set or other of the circumstances in which the participants find themselves” is used.

The collected data varied; a typical native request sequence or a typical non-native sequence did not exist. Nevertheless, some comparisons are possible between the two groups. Participants expressed their focal requests using combinations of (a) a verbal gerund (the so-called "te form") and (b) a verb of giving or receiving. The verbal gerund expresses the substance of what is being requested, and the giving or receiving verb that governs it indicates the direction of the exchange, while also being marked for social deixis. Therefore, comparisons will be made in terms of (1) verbal nuclei used in the focal request,

---

8 Most of them are verbal gerunds.
(2) a verb of giving and receiving, and (3) how subjects structured moves in a request sequence, i.e., what moves were involved in formulating the request sequence, and how these moves were organized within a sequence.

3.4.1 Business: less face-threatening task (Task 1)

In this task, participants were asked to solve the following problem: “At the company office, you need a large envelope to put a report in. You looked everywhere, but you couldn’t find any.” Relevant facts were that “A part-time student worker is assisting you at the office” and “There is a stationery store nearby.” Because instructions for these role-play tasks to the participants did not overtly direct the participants to perform certain requestive acts, each participant was free to choose his or her means to resolve the problem. As a result, the specific contents of the focal request varied among participants.

In this section, we first look at what the participants requested. The following table shows the verbal nuclei used in the focal requests by the native and non-native participants in Task 1, a less face-threatening task in a business setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katte kite... (11) 'buy [it] and come back'</td>
<td>Katte kite... (7) 'buy [it] and come back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itte katte kite... (3) 'go, buy and come back'</td>
<td>katte... (2) 'buy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(kai ni) itte kite... (2) 'go (to buy [it]) and come back'</td>
<td>itte... (2) 'go'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itadakemasu ka? (1) 'Could [I] receive (them)?'</td>
<td>itte katte... (1) 'go and buy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zibun de kai ni ikimasu. (1) 'I will go myself.'</td>
<td>itte kitte... (1) 'go and come back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kai ni itte... (1) 'go to buy (them)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>osiete... (1) 'teach [me]'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>error (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Verbal Nuclei Used in Focal Requests from Task 1

The two most common focal requests for the native participants were *katte kite* 'buy [it] and come back' and *itte katte kite* ‘go, buy and come back’. Fourteen out of eighteen participants used one or the other of these requests. Two participants used *itte kite* ‘go (to the stationery store) and come back’. As we can see, all the native participants’ focal requests mention the act of ‘coming back.’

These same focal requests were also common among non-native participants. Seven out of eighteen non-native participants used *katte kite* ‘buy [it] and come back’. However, some of the non-native participants made their requests without mentioning the act of ‘coming back.’ They simply requested
that the addressee *katte* ‘buy’, *itte* ‘go’ or *osiete*9 ‘inform/teach’. Requesting that the addressee perform some action (in this case, go to the stationery store and buy a large envelope) without mentioning the action of coming back sounds rather odd to a native’s ears. Thus, in terms of the choice for gerunds of the focal request, there were no major differences between the two groups.

Next, let us look at the verb of giving or receiving used in the focal request by the two groups in Task 1. They are shown in Table 4. All of these verbal predicates govern other, non-finite verbs, which express the acts being requested.

---

9 This particular participant wanted the addressee to tell (/ teach) him the location of the stationery store.
Table 4: Verbs of Giving and Receiving Used in Focal Requests from Task 1

In examining each form, we will use the most commonly requested action, namely *katte kire*, which requests that the addressee buy something and come back. Native participants used the following forms:

(1-1) Katte kire kure/kun nai ka na?
      buy    come    give-NEG Q
      '(I wonder) if [you] do not buy [it] and come back for me?'

(1-2) Katte kire moraeru ka na?
      buy    come    receive-POT Q
      '(I wonder) if [I] can have you buy [it] and come back.'
(1-3) Katte kite kureru\textsuperscript{10}?
    buy come give
    ‘Will [you] buy [it] and come back for me?’
    (lit. ‘give [me] (the action of) buying and coming back?’)

(1-4) Katte kite kureru ka na?
    buy come give Q
    (I wonder) if [you] would buy [it] and come back for me?

(1-5) Katte kite kudasai\textsuperscript{11}.
    buy come give \_\textsuperscript{12}-IMP
    ‘Please give me (the action of) buying and coming back.’

(1-6) Katte kite itadakemasu ka?
    buy come receive \_\textsuperscript{13}-POT-DIS Q
    ‘Could [I] have [you] buy [it] and come back?’

(1-7) Katte kite kuremasu ka?
    buy come give-DIS\textsuperscript{14} Q
    ‘Will [you] give [me] (the action of) buying and coming back?’

(1-8) Katte kite moraemasen?
    buy come receive-POT-DIS-NEG
    ‘Can’t [I] have [you] ...?’

Because the participants knew that their role involved speaking to an office
assistant who is ranked lower than themselves, many of them used direct style as

\textsuperscript{10} Kureru ‘give’ is to the speaker’s in-group, which is often (as here) as small as the individual speaker.

\textsuperscript{11} This is the imperative of an honorific verb, conventionally used in direct style. The distal-style imperative Kudasaimase is so polite as to be rather restricted in use.

\textsuperscript{12} This symbol indicates honorific politeness, which “marks forms which exalt the person to whom they refer.”

\textsuperscript{13} This symbol indicates humble politeness, which “marks forms which humble the person to whom they refer.”

\textsuperscript{14} Japanese predicates have two styles: distal and direct. According to Jorden with Noda (1987:32), the distal style “indicates that the speaker is showing solicitude toward, and
maintaining some linguistic distance from, the addressee, i.e., s/he is being less direct and more
formal as a sign of deference to the person addressed (and/or the topic of discussion), rather than
talking directly, intimately, familiarly, abruptly, or carelessly.” The direct style, in contrast,
indicates that the speaker is not showing solicitude toward the addressee. Only the distal style
will be indicated in the English gloss. A verb is in a direct style when it is not indicated as distal.
in (1-1) through (1-4). There were others who preferred to use distal style as observed in (1-5) through (1-8). One of the native participants who uttered (1-6) commented in the recall protocol interview as follows:

- ".. amari zibun ga see-syain da kara tte meeree-suru yoo na katati zya nakute, kibun yoku itte itadakeru yoo ni (laugh) kotoba-zukai ni ki o tukeyoo tte koto o kangaete masita." (NF8)

'I did not want to give the impression of giving orders to the part-time student worker simply because I am a full-time worker. I paid attention to the language I used, so that the part-time student would help [me] without any bad feelings.'

Compared with the forms used by native speakers, those used by non-native speakers were limited in number. They are:

(1-9) Katte kite kudasaimasen ka?
    buy come give ↑-NEG Q
    ‘Won’t [you] give me (the action of) buying [it] and coming back?’

(1-10) Katte kite kuremasen ka?
       buy come give-DIS-NEG Q
       ‘Won’t [you] buy [it] and come back for me?’
       (lit. ‘give [me] (the action of) buying and coming back’)

(1-11) Katte kite moraitai n desu kedo.
       buy come receive-DES Nom Cop-DIS but
       ‘(It is that) [I]’d like to receive (the action of) buying [it] and coming back, but...’

(1-12) ... kurenai?
       give-NEG
       ‘Won’t [you] give ...?’

Only two non-native participants used direct style ... kurenai? ‘Won’t you...?’

The non-native participants used distal style for the rest of their interactions in this task, and switched to direct style in their focal requests. Even though the materials (textbook, video, audiotapes) used by the non-native participants had
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introduced the direct style at the introductory level, thus giving them considerable experience using this style in rehearsal with videos and audiotapes, not to mention in-class role-plays, sixteen out of eighteen participants did not use this style for this task. In the recall protocol interview, some of these participants said they were hesitant to use the direct style in talking to a part-time worker. The following is a list of what the non-native participants said in their recall protocol interview regarding predicate style:

- "First thing I was thinking of was what style of speech to use. It’s still hard for me to think of whether to use polite distal or direct style even with even though I was a superior." (NNM1)

- "I was kind of a little fuzzy on the language to use? ...Even though the other person was | ah | part-time worker, I wasn’t very comfortable talking down to them, and using just one direct style.” (NNM8)

- "then I also considered what language I should use, you know, how, ah, polite I should be or how polite I could be.” (NNM12)

- "I was kind of hesitant without,...I can’t actually ask her to buy it for me, although she is a part-time student and I am over her. Not necessarily. I can, like, order her around, so I was kind of,...hesitated at first.” (NNF14)

- "I was thinking about how to be polite. Even though I am the manager, how to be polite to this um part-time worker. And ask her nicely, so she won’t think she is like a flunky or doing errors, you know, because I say ‘you do this, you do that’, but try to be nice to her. ... unless you are really close to the part-time worker, and she might not mind, but you are not close to her, she may think that you are too bossy or pushing [?] her around or him around too much.” (NNF15)

It is clear that the non-natives were very conscious about the style of predicates. Some of them seemed to equate the use of direct style with ‘talking down’ and ‘being bossy,’ and they consciously chose not to use the direct style in order to ‘be nice.’
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In this section, I now describe how request sequences are structured in each interaction. All of the native participants' request sequences start with one of the following three moves:

(1-a) addressing the need for a large envelope
(1-b) addressing the desire for an envelope
(1-c) addressing the absence of an envelope

All the request sequences ended in a focal request that the addressee purchase the envelope. Different participants used different moves in between, namely:

(1-d) checking the addressee's knowledge about envelopes,
(1-e) addressing the absence of envelopes,
(1-f) checking the addressee's knowledge of the stationery store's location,
(1-g) inquiring about the availability of the addressee.

Theoretically, it is possible for participants to come up with any combination of the above moves. Actually, the longest sequence produced by a native participant involved a few discrete moves, identified in bold face in brackets, as in [1-I] below:

[1-I] X = a native participant (NM15) playing the role of a full-time worker. Y = the researcher playing the role of a part-time worker.

X: 1 Sono: I huutoo ga hituyoo na n desu ga .. [addressing the need]
    ‘Well, (it is that) [I] need an envelope, but ..’

Y: Ee.
    ‘Yes.’

X: Doko ni aru no ka, sirimasen ka?
    [checking the addressee's knowledge of envelopes]
    ‘Do [you] know where [they] are?’
Y:  | Eeto | ookii huutoo, tyotto kirasiteru to omou n desu yo nee.
   'Le't see, [I] think [we] are out of large envelopes.'

X:  A, soo.
    'I see.'

Y:  Ee.
    'Yes.'

X:  So sitaraba: ..
    'Then, ..'

Y:  Hai.
    'Yes.'

X:  .. kono kaisya no soba ni aru bunbooguya-san sitte masu?
    [checking on the addressee's knowledge of the stationery store]
    '.. do [you] know the stationery store near this company?'

Y:  Hai hai.
    'Yes. Yes.'

X:  A, zyaa, soko ni itte: ..
    'Then, going there, ..'

Y:  Ee.
    'Yes.'

X:  | Eeto: | wan-setto, hito hito-tabata tte iu no ka na?
    'well, one set, (I guess) [we] should call them one-bundle?'

Y:  Hai.
    'Yes.'

X:  Katte kite kudasai. [requesting the purchase errand]
    'Please buy [them] and come back.'

However, the most common kind of sequence (produced by six out of the
eighteen native participants) was much simpler. It consisted of two moves: (1)
addressing the need and suggesting a source, and (2) requesting the purchase.

One such sequence was the following [1-II]:

[1-II] X = a native participant (NM14) playing the role of a full-time worker
      Y = the researcher playing the role of a part-time student worker

X:  Hai, | lee | huutoo ga hituyoo na no de, | eeto | kaisya no soba ni
    bunbooguya ga aru no de .. [addressing the need]
‘Yes. Because [I] need a large envelope, well, because there is a stationery store near the company...’

Y: Ee.
‘Yes.’

X: .. | context | itte katte kite kudasai. [requesting the purchase errand] ‘let’s see, please go [there] and buy [it] and come back.’

While the structures of the natives’ request sequences varied, the most common one consisted of two moves: addressing the need and requesting the purchase errand. We examine structures of the non-natives’ request sequences in the following section.

Like their native counterparts, eleven out of eighteen non-native participants mentioned the need of an envelope as the first move in their request sequences. Following that move, seven of the participants mentioned their inability to find an envelope or the absence of the envelope as in boku wa motto ookii huutoo ga irimasu kara15 ano mitukete inai n desu ‘[I] need a larger envelope, but well, [I] haven’t found one.’ or as in ookii huutoo irimasu kedo | ano: | koko ni wa zenzen arimasen. ‘[I] need a large envelope, but, well, there aren’t any here.’.

There were in fact some native participants who made reference to their own inability to find an envelope; however, in their cases it was a response to the student worker’s negative question, Arimasen ka? (‘Aren’t there any envelopes?’), by way of confirming the absence of the envelopes. Another move particular to the non-natives’ data was ‘expressing a reason why the envelope is needed’ (used by eight participants), as in ookii huutoo ni | ano: | repooto o ireru hituyoo ga arimasu kedo (‘It’s necessary to put the report in a large envelope,

15 Probably be a mistake for kedo.
but,'). Most of the native participants who expressed the content identical to this
did not present it as an independent clause, but as a modifying clause instead, as
in repoot o ireru ooki na huutoo ga hituyoo na n de ('as it's that there's need for a
large envelope to put a report in, ..').

The request sequences produced by native speakers are, over all, more
uniform. Native participants seemed to weigh the importance of the information
expressed in the task instruction card, and to differentiate core information from
information more peripheral to the task. In order to come up with simple
sequences, they sometimes omitted certain information (which they judged not
so important for solving the problem), or put the more peripheral information in
subordinate clauses. Expressing in a subordinate clause the reason an envelope
being needed is one such example. Non-native participants, on the other hand,
did not practice such fine-tuning. They seemed to be trying to express all the
information given in the instructions with more or less equal attention to each bit
of it. In the recall protocol interview, ten of them mentioned that they were
thinking about particular linguistic items such as words and particles, as, for
example, here:

- "Then, when I first looked [?] at this, I couldn't remember huutoo. .. So I was
trying to think of a way to explain huutoo in Japanese. (NNM1)
- "What was I thinking? Well, how to say "stationery store"? (laugh)' (NNM5)
- "Ahhh, how to say which particle for sirabemasu. (NNM6)
- "I forgot bunbooguya." (NNM8)
• “Mostly, I didn’t know the word for ‘directions’, so I was trying to guess if that was it.” (NNM9)

• “And finally the pronunciation for bunboogu.” (NNM12)

• “The only part was like | ah | I couldn’t find.. I can’t find something and I looked everywhere trying to think ...trying to remember how to say ‘somewhere’ (laugh).” (NNM13)

• “I forgot the word for stationery store, something bunboo.” (NNF14)

• “Mmm, it was hard, like ‘to put some report in’. Couldn’t remember that one.” (NNF15)

• “Couldn’t remember the | ah | potential for mitukeru.” (NNF18)

In contrast to this response from non-native participants, native participants mentioned questions they had considered about how to realize the request or about the realism of the task:

• “Kyoka o totte, (inhales) | nan desu ka | kaisya no syahi de toru ka, sore to mo zibun no are to toru ka, sore o kangaetemasita.”
  ‘[I] was thinking whether [I] should use company’s money, with permission, or use my own.’ (NM1)

• “.. watashi izen ni hataraitte ita n desu ga, bunguhin bungu-rui ga nakatta kara to itte, bunbooguya san ni kai ni iku to iu koto wa nakatta no de, hutuu tatoeba syomu-bu toka ni ippai arimasu yo ne.”
  ‘From my previous work experience, there were no occasions when we went to a stationery store to buy envelopes when we were out of them. Usually, there are plenty stocked in, for example, the Commercial Division, aren’t there?’ (NF3)

• “.. boku anmari hito ni tanomi-narete nai n de, zibun de ikoo ka doo ka, mayotta n desu kedo.”
  ‘[I] am not used to making requests to others, so [I] was wondering whether [I] should go myself or not.’ (NM7)

• “Huutoo wa nan-may hituyoo ka.”
  ‘How many envelopes are needed.’ (NF11)

---

16 Inhaling through one’s teeth is a common index of being hesitant to proceed.
There was one more native participant who expressed a concern similar to NF3’s. While the non-native participants expressed questions about language use or particular linguistic items, there were no native participants who mentioned concerns about linguistic forms. Instead, they expressed questions about how this request should be realized in actuality or expressed doubt about the realism of the task itself.

In this Business: less face-threatening task (Task 1), not much difference was observed at the level of verbal gerunds used in the focal requests between native and non-native participants’ data. For both groups, katte kite ‘buy [it] and come back’ was the most common choice. As for the verb of giving and receiving used in the focal requests, the native participants’ data showed more variety, with eight different ways of asking (about half of them in direct style). Almost all of the non-native participants’ focal requests were in distal style. The structure of the request sequences demonstrated variety even among the natives’ data. However, the natives’ sequences were simpler than those of the non-native; they consisted of minimal number of moves focused on solving the problem.

3.4.2 Business: more face-threatening task (Task 2)

In this task, participants were asked to solve the following problem: “You are very busy today at the office. Yamada-san at the Bank of Tokyo just called and said that he has completed the report you need.” The relevant fact was “Suzuki-butyoo is going to the Bank of Tokyo for a meeting this morning.”
Participants played the role of the person who needed the report, and the researcher played the role of Suzuki-butyoo.

First, we observe what specific actions the participants requested focally. The following table presents verbal nuclei used in the focal requests by the native and non-native participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uketotte (kite)...</td>
<td>motte irasite...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'obtain and (come back)'</td>
<td>'take hold of [it] and come back (↓)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totte kite...</td>
<td>motte kite...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'take and come back'</td>
<td>'take hold of [it] and come back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>azukatte (kite)...</td>
<td>motte kaette...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'take [it] in to your keeping and come back'</td>
<td>'take hold of [it] and return'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moratte kite...</td>
<td>motte modotte...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'receive [from someone] and come back'</td>
<td>'take hold of [it] and return'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yotte...</td>
<td>motte kaette kite...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'drop by'</td>
<td>'take hold of [it] and come back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tori ni itte...</td>
<td>motte...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'go take [it]'</td>
<td>'put [it] out'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itadaite kite...</td>
<td>dasite...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'receive (↓) and come back'</td>
<td>'put [it] out'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moratte kite... ...</td>
<td>motte...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motte kite</td>
<td>'take hold of [it]'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'receive/take hold of and come back'</td>
<td>faltered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Verbal Nuclei Used in Focal Requests from Task 2

---

17 Both motte and totte in these tokens would in English be rendered more naturally, if less literally, as 'get'.
Among the native participants, requesting that the butyoo obtain the report and come back (uketotte kite...) was most common; five out of eighteen native participants chose this action. The rest of the choices were: moratte kite ... ‘receive [from someone] and come back’ or totte kite ... ‘take and come back’, yotte kite ... ‘drop by and come back’, and azukatte kite... ‘take [it] into your keeping and come back’. Non-native participants used the verb motu ‘take hold of [it]’, in expressions like motte kaette ... or motte modotte ... or motte kaette kite... ‘take hold of [it] and return’, and motte kite ... ‘take hold of [it] and come’. The form most often used by them was motte ‘take hold of [it]’ followed by the honorific-polite gerund of an equivalent for ‘come’, irasite...: motte irasite.

Twelve of the non-native participants said in the recall protocol interview that they were thinking that they should use polite language because they were speaking to their butyoo. Here are some examples of what they said:

- “... because you were my butyoo ah I was set um trying to be as polite as possible and as easy as possible to not to be rough or something like that with my style of speech.” (NNM1)

- “Even though I was too busy in the office, because I was subordinate, I didn’t want to say ‘you go get it.’ (NNM2)

- “I was thinking how would I ask the butyoo to go over there and bring this report back to me and still be polite.” (NNM5)

- “I was trying to remember to use I guess the honorific not honorific but ah maybe respect respect language or something because it’s a butyoo ” (NNM13)

- “Honorific. Had to think about honorific.” (NNF18)

These examples clearly show that these participants paid attention to the fact that they were making a request of a butyoo, and tried to make their request very
polite. This probably influenced their frequent choice of the honorific-polite gerund *irasite*, which did not appear at all in native participants' requests.

Next, we will observe the verbs of giving and receiving used in the focal requests. A summary is given in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ...itadakenai desyoo ka? (4) | ...kudasaimasen ka? (10) | 'I wonder if [I] cannot have [you]...' | 'Wouldn't you give...?'
| ... itadakitai n desu ga (yorosii desyoo ka?) (3) | ...kuremasen ka? (2) | 'I’d like to have [you]..., but (is it all right?)' | 'Won’t you give...?'
| ...moraenai desyoo ka? (2) | ... irasite mo yorosii desu ka? (1) | ‘I wonder if [I] cannot have [you]...?’ | 'Is it all right if [you] come having...?'
| ...moraemasen ka? (2) | ... itadakemasen ka? (1) | ‘Can’t [I] have [you]...?’ | 'Could [I] have [you]...?’
| ...itadakemasu ka? (1) | ... moraitai n desu kedo .. (1) | 'Could [I] have [you]...?' | '[I]d like to have [you]..., but ..'
| ...itadakemasu desyoo ka? (1) | error (1) | 'I wonder if [I] could have [you]...' | error (1)
| ... itadakemasen desyoo ka? (1) | ...itadakeru to taihen tasukaru n desu ga.. (1) | 'I wonder if [I] could not have [you]...' | 'I will be relieved if [I] can have [you]...'
| ... itadaketara to omoimasite... (1) | ...itadaketara to omoimasite... (1) | '[I] thought if [it] is possible to have [you]...' | '[I] thought if [it] is possible to have [you]...' |
| ... hosii. (1) | ...hosii. (1) | '[I] want to have [you]...' | '[I] want to have [you]...'
| error (1) | error (1) | |

Table 6: Verbs of Giving and Receiving Used in Focal Requests from Task 2

Here, the native participants demonstrated more uniformity. All of them used the verb *morau* 'receive' or *itadaku* (the humble-polite equivalent of the verb...
(2-1) .. itadakenai desyoo ka?
Receive↓-POT-NEG Cop-DIS-TENT Q
'[I] wonder if [I] cannot have [you] ...'

(2-2) .. itadakitai n desu ga (yorosii desyoo ka?)
receive↓-DES Nom Cop but all right Cop-DIS-TENT Q
'[I]'d like to have [you] ..., but (is it all right?)'

(2-3) .. moraenai desyoo ka?
Receive-POT-NEG Cop-DIS-TENT Q
'[I] wonder if [I] cannot have [you] ...'

(2-4) .. moraemasen ka?
Receive-POT-DIS-NEG Q
'Can't [I] have [you] ..?'

(2-5) .. itadakemasu ka?
Receive↓-POT-DIS Q
'Could [I] have [you] ...?'

(2-6) .. itadakemasu desyoo ka?
Receive↓-POT-DIS Cop-DIS-TENT Q
'[I] wonder if [I] could have [you] ...'

(2-7) .. itadakemasen desyoo ka?
Receive↓-POT-DIS-NEG Cop-DIS-TENT Q
'[I] wonder if [I] could not have [you] ...'

(2-8) .. itadakeru to taihen tasukaru n desu ga..
receive↓-POT with great deal be helped/rescued Nom Cop but
'[I] will be relieved if [I] can have [you] ..., but ..'

In contrast to this preference of the native participants, the majority of the
non-native participants chose the honorific-polite equivalent of kureru 'give (to
in-group)', kudasaru (the honorific-polite equivalent of the verb kureru) Ten of the

eighteen non-native participants finished the request sequence with the predicate given in (2-10).

(2-10) .. kudasaimasen ka?
give↑-DIS-NEG Q
'Wouldn’t [you] give (the action of) ..?'

Two of the eighteen used (2-11):

(2-11) .. kuremasen ka?
give-DIS-NEG Q
'Won’t [you] give (the action of) ..?'

The expression in (2-10) was introduced in the early stage\(^\text{18}\) of the program at Ohio State, and it was repeatedly used in practice with taped drills and in more open-ended classroom activities. Thus, the non-native participants probably preferred it because it was a familiar form for them, and they knew that it was a ‘safe’ form to use to a person whose social status is higher. Geis (1995:) points out that, in general, in request-making, it is less face-threatening, hence more polite for the speaker, to refer to his/her own action rather than to an action of the addressee. In this case, therefore, referring to the act of receiving that the speaker (who is subject of the verb morau or itadaku) hopes for is more polite than referring to the hoped-for act of giving by the addressee (who is subject of the verb kureru or kudasaru). In this regard, it is interesting to note that native participants unanimously chose morau ‘receive’ or itadaku ‘humble equivalent of morau’. In addition, in the recall protocol interview, twelve of them expressed a feeling of resistance to this particular task. For them, asking their division chief, whose social status is much higher than their own, to get something was not a

\(^{18}\) At about one hundredth hours of class time (48 minutes each).
realistic scenario. One female participant who actually had the experience of working at a bank expressed an aversion to making this request, and declared that she would not do so in reality. One male participant pointed out that making a request of a person of higher social status was something one would not dare to do. Some relevant comments from the recall interviews are listed below:

- “Boku ga syain de butyoo ni iu tte iu no wa mazu dekinai to omoimasu yo, ippan kigyou de”
  ‘As a company employee, [I] think it is impossible to ask this of a butyoo in a normal company.’ (NM1)

- “Ue no hito ni wa mono wa tanomi-nikui desu. ... Totemo.”
  ‘It is difficult to make a request of a person whose status is above your own. ... Very much so.’ (NF6)

- “Nihonzin dattara tanomanai ka naa.”
  ‘If [you] are a Japanese, [you] wouldn’t make the request; I wonder.’ (NF11)

- “Butyoo ni wa tanomanai ken desu ne, kore wa.”
  ‘This is the kind of thing [you] don’t request of your butyoo.’

As we can see from these responses, this task was perceived as loaded with the danger of committing a serious faux pas. It would be a natural consequence of this perception, if the participants attempt the task at all, to put their focal request as carefully as possible, using morau or itadaku to minimize the perceived face-threat. Non-native participants, on the other hand, were not all aware of the subtle difference between morau/itadaku and kureru/kudasaru, and simply chose what they felt comfortable with as the safest way of requesting.
The native participants' uncomfortable feelings about making a request of a socially higher person is also manifested in the frequent use of mitigating expressions in their request sequences. This contrasts sharply with the way they handled the Business: less face-threatening task. Examples of such mitigating expressions are apologies, such as Taihen moosiwake nai n desu., Honto ni moosiwake nai n desu keredo mo .. 'There's really no excuse for this, but..', or Taihen kyoosyuku na n desu ga .. '[I] am awfully sorry, but..', or Oisogasii tokoro taihen moosiwake gozaimasen. '[I] am awfully sorry to impose when [you] are busy.'

Conditionals were used by six native participants, as in yorosikattara .. 'if it is all right (with you),..' or mosi zikan ga arimasitara.. 'if [you] have time,..'. To express a similar feeling, four participants also used a provisional expression such as mosi yorosikereba.. 'if it is all right (with you),..' Conventional expressions such as Otesuu desu ga,.. 'it would be a trouble (for you), but,..' or Tuide ni 'In addition to (what you will be doing)' are also observed.

In marked contrast, the non-natives' data clearly lacked these mitigating expressions. For most of them, conditional and provisional expressions were not available, since these forms had not yet been introduced in their program of study; there were four who had just learned conditionals. The only mitigating expressions used by non-natives were Su(m)imasen kedo.. 'I am sorry, but,..' and Warui (desu) kedo.. 'It's bad [of me], but,..' Actually, the latter is grossly inappropriate, because it is usually used from a person of higher status to a person of lower status. The non-native participants depend almost entirely on Japanese introduced in their program of study, so expressions like Kyoosyuku
desu ga,.. and Otetsuu desu ga,.., which do not occur in their materials, were simply unavailable to them. It was interesting to observe that even though both Su(m)imasen. 'I am sorry.' and Moosiwake arimasen/gozaimasen '.I am very sorry.' were introduced at the very beginning of their training, none of the non-native participants used Moosiwake arimasen/gozaimasen here. In other words, for the non-native participants, both expressions were available for use. It seems likely that lack of experience in using Moosiwake arimasen/gozaimasen. in similar situations and perhaps little modeling of its use in such situations, were behind this non-use. I also suspect that non-native participants were not aware of the fact that there were situations in which Moosiwake arimasen/gozaimasen. would be preferred to Su(m)imasen. Native speakers, on the other hand, perceived this task as a very face-threatening task and chose expressions most suited for reducing the face-threat. This strategy was not only demonstrated by their choice of individual expressions, but also by the ways in which they structured the request sequence, to which we now turn.

All the request sequences, native or not, contain some of the following moves:

(2-a) reference to the speaker's being busy
(2-b) reporting the call from Yamada-san
(2-c) confirming section chief's schedule today
(2-d) confirming that the speaker will make an arrangement for the section chief
(2-e) apology
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(2-f) mentioning that the speaker has a favor to ask
(2-g) asking when the section chief will leave
(2-h) asking when the section chief will return
(2-i) requesting that the section chief obtain the report

Among these, the most essential moves seem to be (2-b), (2-c), and (2-i). Three native participants structured their request sequences using only these three moves. The rest of them, except for one, used the same three moves, but also added others and changed the order in which they employed them.

Move (2-c) serves to weaken the anticipated face-threatening effect. If the participants requested out of the blue that the section chief go over to the Bank of Tokyo and pick up the report, this would be quite presumptuous (and thus rude), because it implies that doing so is part of the section chief’s responsibilities. If the requester indicates that s/he knows that the section chief is going to be at the bank on his own business, the request will not sound as rude, other things equal. Expressing this knowledge therefore was very likely intended to soften the face-threatening effect.

Apologies were used effectively for the same purpose. Several native participants, especially female speakers, used apologies more than once in their request sequences. One such example sequence is shown below:

[2-I]  X = NF8 playing the role of a company employee
       Y = the researcher playing the role of the butyoo

X: | Eeto | Suzuki-butyoo.
   ‘Uh, Suzuki-butyoo.’

Y: Hai.
   ‘Yes.’
X: Anoo | taiken kyoosyuku na n desu ga ..
   'I am awfully sorry, but..' 

Y: Ee. 
   'Yes.' 

X: Tyotto onegai ga aru n desu keredo mo ..
   'It is that) [I] have a small favor to ask, but ..'

Y: Hai hai. 
   'Yes. Yes.'

X: .. kiite itadakemasu desyoo ka.
   '.. would [you] listen to [me]?'

Y: Ee. Ee. 
   'Okay.'

X: Anoo | (inhales) Suzuku-butyoo, kyoo Tookyoo Ginkoo ni kaigi de
   irasshyaru tte huu ni ukagatta n desu keredo mo ..
   'Um, Suzuki-butyoo, (it is that) [I] heard something to the effect that [you] are
   going to the Bank of Tokyo for a meeting, but ..'

Y: Ee, Ianoo | gozen-tyuu tyotto kaigi ga aru n de ..
   'Yes, because there is a meeting in the morning'

X: Hai. Anoo | sono toki ni tyotto onegai-sitai n desu ga ..
   'Yes. Well, (it is that) [I]'d like to ask you a favor then, but ..'

Y: Hai. 
   'Okay.'

X: .. (inhales) Ianoo | eeto | tatta ima Tookyoo Ginkoo no Yamada-san kara
   watasi ga zutto hituyoo to site ita repooto ga dekiagatta tte iu renraku o
   itadaita no de ..
   '..um, uh, since [I] have just received a call from Yamada-san at the
   Bank of Tokyo, saying that [he] had completed a report which [I]
   needed, so ..'

Y: Hai. 
   'Yes.'

X: Honto ni moosiwake nai n desu keredo mo, Ianoo ..
   'There is no excuse for this, but um ..'

Y: Ee. 
   'Yes.'

X: .. Suzuki-butyoo ga eeto Tookyoo Ginkoo ni ikareta sai ni..
   '.. when [you] go to the Bank of Tokyo, ..'

Y: Ee. 
   'Yes.'
X: .. sore o uketotte kite itadakenai desyoo ka.
   ‘.. (I wonder if) [you] could receive [it from them] (for me).’

This participant apologizes before she presents her request, and apologizes
again immediately before she mentions the action that she desires the section
chief to perform. She uses very formal apologies such as Taihen kyoosyuku na n
desu ga .. ‘[I] am awfully sorry, but..' and Honto ni moosiwake nai n desu keredo mo
.. ‘There is no excuse for this, but..’, and reinforces these by extending the
predicates with n(o). Another native participant used apologetic remarks and
mitigation moves19 in order to minimize the face-threatening effect. Her whole
sequence is presented below.

[2-II] X = NF3 playing the role of a company employee
       Y = the researcher playing the role of butyoo

X: Situree-simasu.
   ‘Excuse me.’

Y: Hai.
   ‘Yes.’

X: | Eeto | Suzuki-butyoo, kyoo no: gozen-tyuu ni Tookyoo Ginkoo ni
      irassyaru to ukagatta n desu ga ..
      ‘Well, Suzuki-butyoo, (it is that) [I] heard that [you] are going to the
      Bank of Tokyo this morning, but ..’

Y: Ee, lano l kaigi ga aru kara, lano l gozen-tyuu dekakeru n desu.
   ‘Yes. Well, because there is a meeting, well, [I] will go out there in the
   morning.’

X: Soo desu ka. (1) Honto ni atukamasii onegai de, moo honto ni
      moosiwake nai n desu ga ..
      ‘[I] see. (1) This is really an impudent favor to ask, and there is really no
      excuse for this, but ..’

Y: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

19 Both apologetic remarks and mitigation moves are written in bold face and numbered.
X: .. Ianoo | Tookyoo Ginkoo no Yamada-san to iu kata, eeto, uti no sekusyon de osigoto issyo ni sasete itadaiteru Yamada-san to iu kata kara denwa ga haitte ..
   ‘.. um, [I] have received a call from a person by the name of Yamada with whom [I] am doing a business in my section, and ..’

Y: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

X: .. izen kara | sonoo | kanozyo ni onegai-site ita repooto ga ..
   ‘.. the report which [I].. er .. had asked her to complete ..’

Y: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

X: .. kyoo dekiagatta to iu koto datta n desu.
   ‘.. has been completed, she said.’

Y: Aa, soo desu ka.
   ‘Is that so.’

X: Ee. Sore de, Ianoor honto ni dekiru dake hayaku sono repooto o tukaitai mono desu kara ..
   ‘Yes. Then, well, er.. because it’s a matter where [I] really would like to use that report soon, ..’

Y: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

X: .. sugu ni hituyoo na n desu ne.
   ‘.. (it is that) it’s needed immediately, actually.’

Y: Aa, soo desu ka.
   ‘Is that so.’

X: Sore de (2) watakusi ga | sono | .. tori ni iku no ga, toozen na n desu. Honto ni toozen na n desu ga ..
   ‘So, (2) It really is my responsibility to go and pick it up. I know that it is really my responsibility, but ..’

Y: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

X: .. tyotto tatekonde ite, kyoo no gozen-tyuu, iki soti Tookyoo Ginkoo no hoo ni ..
   ‘.. being a little hectic, this morning, to the Bank of Tokyo, ..’

Y: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

X: .. ikesoo ni nai n desu ne.
   ‘.. it does not seem that [I] can go.’
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Y: A, soo desu ka.
   ‘Is that so.’

X: Sore de | ano | (3) mosi sasitukaе nakereba ..
   ‘so, well, (3) if it is all right (with you) ..’

Y: Ee, ee.
   ‘Yes. Yes.’

X: (4) kotira no hoo kara Yamada-san ni denwa-site ..
   ‘(4) [I] will call Yamada-san, and ..’

Y: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

X: .. sono repooto o tatoeba uketuke no kata ka nani ka ni azukete oite ..
   ‘.. er .. and ask him to leave the report at the reception desk or somewhere
   like that, and ..’

Y: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

X: ano butyoo ga itte itadakereba sugu | anoo | uketoreru yoo ni site okimasu
   no de ..
   ‘.. and if you go there, I will arrange so that you can pick it up right away,
   so ..’

Y: Hai hai.
   ‘Yes. Yes.’

X: .. uketotte kite itadakeru to, taihen tasukaru n desu ga ..
   ‘.. [I]’d greatly appreciate [it], if [you] could pick it up (for me), but ..’

Y: A, soo desu ka. Wakarimasita. Zyaa,..
   ‘Is that so. [I]’ll do that. (lit. [I]’ve understood. Then, ..’

X: Sore de ..
   ‘Then, ..’

Y: Ano, Yamada-san ni wa renraku-site moraeru n desu ne.
   ‘Let’s see, it is that [you] can contact Yamada-san for me, right?’

X: Motiron desu.
   ‘Of course.’

Y: Hai.
   ‘Okay.’

X: De, (5) butyoo omodori ni nari sidai, mosi | anoo | .. odenwa kotira no hoo
   ni itadakereba,..
   ‘Then, (5) as soon as [you] come back, if [I] could receive a call from [you], ..’
Y: Ee.
   'Yes.'

X: .. sugu ni lanoo | ukagaimasu.
   '.. [I] will .. er .. come (to your office) right away.'

Y: Hai.
   'Okay.'

X: Kotira no hoo ni ukagatte, | ano | tori ni mairimasu no de ..
   'I will be here immediately. I will come here and pick it up, so ..'

Y: Aa, soo desu ka.
   'Is that so.'

X: Yorosii desyoo ka.
   'Will [that] be all right?'

Y: Hai, a, | lanoo | doo se sotti e iku kara, ii desu yo.
   'Yes. Um, er.. [I] am going overthere anyway, so that's fine.'

X: Honto ni arigato gozaimasu.
   'Thank you very much.'

Y: Iie, ii desu yo.
   'No, it's all right.'

X: (6) Katte itte moosiiwake arimasen ga..
   'There is no excuse for being selfish, but ..'

Y: Ieie.
   'Not at all.'

X: .. doozo yorosiku onegaisimasu.
   '.. would you please.' (lit. '[I] make a request of you. ')

Y: Hai.
   'Yes.'

X: (7) Ima sugu Yamada-san no hoo ni wa..
   'Right now, with Yamada ..'

Y: Hai.
   'Yes.'

X: .. renraku-site okimasu no de ..
   '.. [I] will make a contact, so ..'

Y: Hai. Hai. Atasi, ato zyuugo-hun gura; de deru no de ..
   'Yes, yes. [I] will leave (here) within 15 minutes, so ..'

   '[I] am rescued. Thank you. Excuse me.'
In (1), the speaker repeats *honto(o) ni* ‘really’, and expresses how sorry she feels about the request. In (2), she emphasizes the fact that she understands that she is the one who is supposed to go. After explaining the reason why she cannot go, she checks on the addressee’s feelings. This move (3) signals that she values the willingness of the addressee and that she wants to make a request only if the addressee is willing to comply. The next move (4) assures the *butyoo* of the ease of the task. Even after she expresses the request, she continues to explain the procedure of how she will come to his office to pick up the report in (5). With another apologetic remark in (6), she concludes the request sequence. However, by mentioning her intention to call Yamada, she further makes an effort to make the addressee know that she will do what she can to make the task easy, and as a result, mitigates the face-threat. As this example demonstrates, request sequences can contain many mitigation moves. This particular request sequence was in fact performed by the aforementioned female native speaker who expressed strong reluctance, in the recall protocol interview, to make this kind of request of a division head. Because it was almost impossible for her to even imagine doing this in real life, she felt if she were to try, she needed to make the request sequence as cautious as possible. Among the native participants, there were others who produced simpler request sequences. A sequence at the simpler end went as follows:

[2-Ⅲ] X = MN16 playing the role of the company employee
Y = the researcher playing the role of the *butyoo*

   ‘Excuse me, Suzuki-butyoo.’
Y: Hai.
  ‘Yes.’

X: | Anoo | Tookyoo Ginkoo no Yamada-san ga, | anoo | repooto ga dekiagatta
    tte iu renraku ga haitte, mosi yorosikereba | anoo | Tookyoo Ginkoo ni iku
    tuide ni ..
  ‘Well, [I] have received a call from Yamada-san at the Tokyo Bank,
  saying that the report has been completed. If [it] is all right (with you),
  um, when you go to the Bank of Tokyo, ..’

Y: Ee.
  ‘Yes.’

X: .. | sono | repooto o totte kite itadakita ni desu keredo mo ..
  ‘. (It is that) [I]’d like [you] to pick up that report, but ..’

This simple sequence is not necessarily rude. In this example, the speaker seems
to assume that the section chief already knows who Yamada is, because of the
non-use of Yamada-san to iu kata ‘a person by the name of Yamada’. He does not
elaborate on the nature of the report. It could be because he assumes that the
section chief also knows about this matter. In role-plays, participants have the
freedom to make such assumptions. As the above three sequences indicate, the
sequence reflects the beliefs and values of each participant. The more complex
the task becomes, the more difficult it becomes to determine a ‘typical’ native
sequence.

Next, we examine the structures of non-native participants’ request
sequences. Determining a typical structure for the non-native request sequence
is also a difficult task. The moves that constitute their request sequences, are
very similar to those observed in natives’ sequences. The ordering of the several
moves is also as varied as that for the native request sequences. Three essential
moves that show up in the native’s sequences--- (2-b) reporting the call from
Yamada-san, (2-c) confirming section chief’s schedule today, and (2-i) requesting
that the section chief receive the report on behalf of the speaker----are used by fourteen out of eighteen non-native participants. However, when we compare the native and the non-native sequences that have identical structures, the overall impressions that we receive are very different between the two. In the above section, I introduced a female native participant’s request sequence that contained two apologies. Below is a non-native example that also has three apologetic expressions in its structure.

[2-IV] \( X = \text{NNF17 playing the role of the company employee} \)
\( Y = \text{the researcher playing the role of the butyoo} \)

\( X: \text{Suzuki-butyoo.} \)
\( \quad \text{‘Suzuki-butyoo.’} \)

\( Y: \text{Hai.} \)
\( \quad \text{‘Hai.’} \)

\( X: | \text{Anoo| tyotto warui desu kedo ..} \)
\( \quad \text{‘Um, [it]’s a little bad [of me], but ..’} \)

\( Y: \text{Ee.} \)
\( \quad \text{‘Yes.’} \)

\( X: | \text{anoo| Yamada-sensee |a: \_ Tookyoo Ginkoo no Yamada-san kara denwa} \)
\( \quad \text{ga arimasita.} \)
\( \quad \text{‘.. um, [I] have received a call from teacher Yamada (error), ah, Yamada at the Bank of Tokyo.’} \)

\( Y: \text{N.} \)
\( \quad \text{‘Yes.’} \)

\( X: | \text{Anoo| n: \_ watasi no repooto o e: | n: \_ dekimasa\_ |a: \_ dekita to itte imasita.} \)
\( \quad \text{‘Um, er.. my report er.. had been completed, er.. [he] was saying.’} \)

\( Y: \text{A, soo.} \)
\( \quad \text{‘Is [that] so?’} \)

\( X: | \text{Anoo| la: \_ sumimasen kesa Tookyoo Ginkoo de \_ anoo| oa matiawase ga arimasu.} \)
\( \quad \text{‘Um, er.. excuse me, [you] are planning to meet with someone at the Bank of Tokyo, this morning.’} \)
Y: Ee, ano kaigi ga aru n desu yo, gozen-tyuu ni.  
‘Yes. Well, (it is that) [I] have a meeting in the morning.’

X: | Anoo | warui kedo | anoo | la: | Yamada-san kara repooto o l n: l (pause) dasite moraitai n desu kedo ..
‘Well, [it] is bad [of me], but, (it is that) [I] would like to have Yamada-san submit (error) a report, but ..’

Y: Aa, soo desu ka. Zya, | anoo | Tookyoo Ginkoo de moratte kuru n desu ne.
‘Is that so? Then, well, (it is that) [I] would receive [it] at the Bank of Tokyo, right?’

X: Hai. | anoo | ii desu ka?
‘Yes. Well, is [it] all right?’

‘It’s okay. Then, [I] will go (there) and come back having received [it].’

X: Hai, arigatoo gozaimasu.
‘Yes. Thank you.’

Y: Doo itasimasite.
‘You are welcome.’

Sequence [2-IV], compared with sequence [2-I], is blunt and presumptuous.

This difference was caused by the lack of appropriate apologies and honorific/humble forms. The following sequence [2-V] is by a native participant, and [2-VI] is by a non-native participant. Both [2-V] and [2-VI] have almost identical structures.

[2-V] X = NM17 playing the role of the company employee  
Y = the researcher playing the role of the butyoo

T1 X: Suzuki-butyoo!
‘Suzuki-butyoo!’

T2 Y: Ee.
‘Yes.’

T3 X: | Eeto | taihen moosiwake nai n desu keredo mo ..
‘Well, there is really no excuse for this, but ..’
T3 is an apology. T5 confirms the section chief’s schedule today. The interaction continued as follows.

T4  Y: Hai. 
    ‘Yes.’

T5  X: .. leeto: | kyoo | anoo | Suzuki-butyoo wa Tookyoo Ginkoo no hoo ni ikaremasu yo ne.
    ‘.. well, today, [you] are going in the direction of the Bank of Tokyo, aren’t you?’

T6  Y: Ee, kaigi ga aru n de ..
    ‘Yes. (It is that) [I] have a meeting, so ..’

T7  X: Hai. A, soo desu ka. | Anoo | desu ne | ano | tuide tte tuide to itte wa nan nan na n desu keredo mo ..
    ‘Yes. I see. Well, I don’t quite want to put this as anything like “while you’re there,” but ..’

T8  Y: Hai. 
    ‘Yes.’

T9  X: Tookyoo Ginkoo no Yamada-san tte iu kata ga irassyaru n desu ga ..
    ‘Actually (it is that), there is a person by the name of Yamada at the Bank of Tokyo, and ..’

T10 Y: Ee. 
    ‘Yes.’

T11 X: .. sono kata ga | desu nee | leeto: | watakusi no hituyoo to siteru repooto o, le: | ma: | le: | dekiagatta tte iu koto de renraku haitta n desu ne.
    ‘.. that person, let’s see, called me and told me that the report, er.., ah.. er.. which I needed has been completed.’

T12 Y: Hai. 
    ‘Yes.’

T13 X: .. sore de | anoo | Suzuki-butyoo, | ano | moosiwake nai n desu keredo mo sono Yamada-san kara sono repooto o mo | le: | moratte kite | desu ne | koti no hoo ni motte kite itadakemasen desyoo ka.
    ‘.. then, well, Suzuki-butyoo, well, (it is that) there is no excuse for this, but could [you] receive that report from Yamada-san and bring [it] back?’

From T9 to T11 reports the telephone call from Yamada-san. In T13, the participant apologizes again, and requests the addressee to pick up the report.
T14 Y: A, soo desu ka.
   ‘Is that what it is.’

T15 X: Watakushi, tyotto ‘anoo l asa kara totemo: isogasiku site orimasu n de..
   ‘Since [I] have been tied up all morning, ..’

T16 Y: Ee ee.
   ‘Yes. Yes.’

T17 X: .. Tookyoo Ginkoo no hoo ni made tyotto ikenai n de..
   ‘.. (it is that) [I] cannot get over to the Bank of Tokyo’

T18 Y: Aa.
   ‘Oh.’

T19 X: .. taihen moosiwake nai n desu keredo mo..
   ‘.. [I] am awfully sorry, but ..’

T20 Y: Aa, soo desu ka. Anoo, zyaa, eeto, X-san no hoo kara
   Yamada-san ni renraku-sitoite moraemasu ka?
   ‘Is that so? Well, then, ah, would [you] call Yamada-san
   beforehand?’

T21 X: Hai, wakarimasita. Sore wa wakarimasita.
   ‘Yes, [I] will do that (lit. ‘understood’). That, [I] will do.’

T22 Y: Hai, wakarimasita.
   ‘Yes, okay.’

T23 X: Yorosiku onegai-simasu.
   ‘I would very much appreciate it.’ (lit. ‘I make a request of you.’)

T24 Y: Hai.
   ‘Okay.’

This order of elements is repeated in the non-native’s following sequence:

[2-VI] X = NNM6 playing the role of the company employee
   Y = the researcher playing the role of the butyoo

T1’ X: Butyoo-san?
   ‘Butyoo-san?’

T2’ Y: Hai.
   ‘Yes.’

T3’ X: ! Ano ! warui desu kedo ..
   ‘Well, [it] is bad [of me], but ..’

T4’ Y: Hai hai.
   ‘Yes. Yes.’
T5' X: .. i ano i kyoo i ano i Tookyoo no Ginkoo ni kaigi ga arimasu ne. 
'.. well, today, well [you] have a meeting at the Bank of Tokyo, 
right?'

T3' is intended as an apology, but as noted earlier, is not the sort of thing to say 
to one's division chief. T5' confirms the section chief's schedule for today.

T6' Y: Ee, gozen-tyuu kaigi arimasu yo. 
'Yes, in the morning, [I] have a meeting.'

T7' X: i Anoo i situree desu kedo, watasi ni a Tookyoo no Ginkoo no 
Yamada-san o watasi ni ano, repooto o dekite kudasaimasita kedo .. 
'Um, [it] is rude, but, to me, oh, Yamada-san at the Bank of Tokyo 
completed a report for me, but ..'

T8' Y: Hai. 
'Yes.'

T9' X: .. i ano i tyotto ginkoo kara motte irasite mo yorosii desu ka? 
'.. um, is it all right for you to bring [it] from the bank?'

T7' contains a second apology and a report of Yamada's phone call. T9' is a 
request that Suzuki pick up the report.

T10' Y: II to omoimasu kedo. i Ano i X-san wa dame na n desu ka, 
kyoo wa? 
'[I] think [it] is all right, but, well, is [it] bad for you, today?'

T11' X: Zitu wa i anoo i kyoo wa tottemo isogasii desu kedo .. 
'Actually, [I] am very busy, today, but ..'

T12' Y: Aa, soo na n desu ka. 
'Oh, is that so?'

T13' X: N, yorosiku onegai-simasu. 
'I make a request of you.'

'Okay, I will do that. (lit. [I]ve understood.) Then, [I] will bring 
[that] back.'

T15' X: Arigatoo gozaimasita. 
'Thank you.'

T16' Y: Hai. 
'Okay.'
As we can see, the sequences [2-V] and [2-VI] share almost identical structures, in terms of gross sequencing. However, there are some differences. The first difference is the level of politeness in the apology. As mentioned before, the non-native participant in [2-VI] does not use the expression *Mooshiwake arimasen*. ‘There is no justifying it’. Another difference is observed in the section where Yamada’s telephone call is reported. In the native participant’s sequence [2-V], this part is more elaborated. First, the speaker introduces Yamada into the sequence in [2-V] T9. The speaker at this point apparently does not know whether Suzuki knows Yamada or not, and with *Yamada-san to iu kata* ‘a person by the name of Yamada’, the speaker makes sure that Suzuki will know the name of the person the speaker is referring to. In the non-native participant’s sequence [2-VI], this step is omitted. Without any consideration of whether Suzuki knows Yamada or not, the participant reports the call from Yamada.

For this Business: more face-threatening task (Task 2), the verbal nuclei used in the focal requests by both groups were rather different. Non-native participants did not have access to *uketotte (kite)* ‘receive and (come back),’ the most common choice of the native participants. The most common choice for the non-natives was *motte irasite* ‘get/take hold of and bring [it]’, which was not used at all by the native participants. As for the verbs of giving and receiving with which they made their focal requests, we noted that native participants preferred to use a receiving verb i.e., to refer to their own action, while non-native participants used a giving verb, i.e., made reference to the *butyoo’s action*. I suspect that non-native participants were not aware of the fact that expressions
referring to their own actions would be less face-threatening than expressions referring to their addressee’s actions.

We also noted that native speakers have access to a greater variety of apologetic and mitigating expressions. Native participants used mitigating expressions skillfully, and made active efforts to lessen the face-threatening effect. Non-native participants, on the other hand, were conscious of the possibility of a face-threatening effect, and made efforts to avoid it, using the very general apology *Sumimasen*. ‘I am sorry’ or, erroneously, the blunt and overly familiar *warui kedo* .. ‘[It]’s bad [of me], but ..’. Despite their efforts, owing to the highly face-threatening nature of the task, and a lack of appropriate expressions in their lexicons and deficiencies in skills at using what they had studied, the non-native participants’ request sequences tended to sound blunt, even crude. Among the native and non-native participants, the structure of their request sequences varied widely, and it was hard to find regular differences owing to structure alone.

3.4.3 Casual: less face-threatening task (Task 3)

In this task, participants were asked to solve the following problem: "You and your friend plan to go to Cincinnati this coming weekend. You were planning to drive your car. However, you’ve just learned that your car insurance doesn’t take effect till next week.” The relevant fact was that "Your friend has a car, a driver’s license, and insurance.” Each participant was asked to play the
role of the person whose insurance was not in effect. The researcher played the role of that person’s friend.

First, we look at what the participants requested in their focal requests. A summary is given in Table 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unten-site ... ‘drive’</td>
<td>unten-site ... ‘drive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unten-site itte ... ‘go by driving’</td>
<td>tukatte ... ‘use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dasite ... ‘(make the car) available’</td>
<td>itte ... ‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tukawasite ... ‘let [me] use (the car)’</td>
<td>Kore de iku no wa doo? ‘How about going by this?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itte ... ‘go’</td>
<td>Unten-dekimasen ka? ‘Can’t [you] drive?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onegai-site mo ii ka na? ‘(I wonder) if it is all right to ask [you]’</td>
<td>error (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotti no kuruma de onegai. ‘[I ask [you] to use your car.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Verbal Nuclei Used in Focal Requests from Task 3

Native participants requested that their friend (1) ‘drive’ (unten-site...), (2) ‘let them use the car’ (tukawasite...), (3) ‘make the car available’ (dasite...), or simply (4) ‘go’ (itte ...). Among these four actions, the third request, to make the car available (kuruma o dasite) is, I suspect, used generally among young people,
and it is a new extension for the verb *dasu* 'get out, contribute'. Not surprisingly, there were no non-native participants who requested this action, although the verb *dasu* was familiar to them in other uses. Except for this expression, non-native participants used means similar to the natives' for making requests.

Next we observe what kind of verbs of giving and receiving participants used in their focal requests in this task. A summary is given in Table 8:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...kunna?/kurenai?  'Won't [you] give ...?'</td>
<td>...kurenai?  'Won't [you] give ...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...hosii n da kedo ii ka na?  '[I] want to have [you] ... but is it okay?'</td>
<td>...mo ii?  'Is it okay to...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...kureru?  'Will [you] give ...?'</td>
<td>...mo ii ka na?  '[I] wonder if it is okay to ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...kurenai ka na?  '[I] wonder if [you] don't give ...'</td>
<td>...mo ii desu ka?  'Is it all right to ...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...kuresen ka?  'Won't [you] give ...?'</td>
<td>...kureru?  'Will [you] give ...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...moraitai n da.  '(It is that) [I]d like to have [you] ...'</td>
<td>...kudasaimasen ka?  'Wouldn't [you] give ...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...moraemasu ka?  'Can [I] have [you]...?'</td>
<td>X wa doo desu ka?  'How about X?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...moraemasen?  'Can't [I] have [you]...?'</td>
<td>... dekimasa?  'Can't you ...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...itadakemasu ka?  'Could [I] have [you]...?'</td>
<td>... sureba ii kedo ..  'If [you] ..., that would be good, but ..'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...site.  'Please...''</td>
<td>... moraitai n da kedo ..  '[I]'d like to have [you] ... , but..'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X de itte ii ka na?  '[I] wonder if it is all right to go by X.'</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X wa doo ka na?  'How about X, [I] wonder.'</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Verbs of Giving and Receiving Used in Focal Requests from Task 3

Native participants used four variations with the verb kureru ‘give’ in their requests:
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(3-1) Unten-site kunnai/kurenai?
    drive       give-NEG
    ‘Won’t [you] drive (for me)?’ *(lit. ‘give driving’)*

(3-2) Unten-site kureru?
    drive       give
    ‘Will [you] drive (for me)?’

(3-3) Unten-site tte kurenai ka na?
    drive       go       give-NEG     DEL
    ‘Won’t [you] drive (for me)?’

(3-4) Unten-site itte kuremasen ka?
    drive       go       give-DIS-NEG     Q
    ‘Won’t [you] drive (for me)?’

Of these, the non-native participants used (3-1), (3-2) and (3-4). One of the non-native participants used a rather polite form, considering that he was asking a friend (3-5):

(3-5) Unten-site kudasaimasen ka?
    drive       give↑-DIS-NEG     Q
    ‘Won’t you please drive (for me)?’

Native participants also used four variations of the verb *morau* ‘receive’ in their focal requests:

(3-6) Unten-site moraitai n da.
    drive       receive-DES     Nom Cop
    ‘(It is that) I’d like to have you drive.’ *(lit. ‘to receive driving’)*

(3-7) Dasite moraemasu ka?
    offer      receive-POT-DIS     Q
    ‘Can [I] have you provide your car?’

(3-8) Unten-site moraemasen?
    drive       receive-POT-DIS-NEG
    ‘Can’t [I] receive the action of driving?’

(3-9) Dasite itadakemasu ka?
    offer      receive↓-POT-DIS     Q
    ‘Could [I] have you provide your car?’
In the non-native participants' request sequences, only one person used *morau* as in (3-6). Requests (3-7), (3-8) and (3-9) sound to me inappropriately polite for talking to a friend. I believe it is the norm in most natural contexts for most college students to speak in direct style when speaking to a friend. So why should examples like (3-7), (3-8) and (3-9) have occurred? In the role-play tasks, both native and non-native participants were adjusting back and forth, acting the role of a friend or like a company employee, depending on the task. I observed that some of the native participants were unable to switch easily to several different roles. The above three might be such instances. The use of direct style by native participants, however, is prevalent. Twelve out of eighteen native participants conducted their interactions in direct style, while only five non-native counterparts used direct-style throughout the interaction for Task 3.

Another way of requesting observed among the native participants was to ask for permission, as in (3-10):

(3-10) Kuruma no unten, onegai-site mo ii  *ka na*?
car Con driving asking favor good DEL
'As for driving, I wonder if it is OK to ask [you].'

There were three native participants who used this pattern. The underlined deliberative marker *ka na* was used by six native participants in their focal requests in this task. According to Jorden with Noda (Part 3, 1990: 29), *ka sira*/*ka naa* "marks deliberation addressed to oneself, requiring no particular answer from anyone within hearing." The meaning of *ka na* (with its shorter final vowel and rising intonation) may differ slightly from *ka sira*/*ka naa*; however, judging from the meaning of *ka sira*/*ka naa*, it seems unlikely that *ka na* would be very
confrontational. Thus, *ka na* seems to be perhaps another way of mitigating face-threat, even as it is markedly casual. By phrasing the question as if it were a self-directed question and thus making it non-confrontational, the natives who used this may have been making an effort to reduce the face-threatening effect their focal request potentially has.

Requests introduced by asking for permission to request were also common among non-native participants. Six out of eighteen participants used this strategy illustrated in (3-11):

(3-11) Kuruma o tukatte mo ii?
car Obj use too ok
‘Is [it] okay to use (your) car?’

The deliberative marker *ka na* had not been introduced to the non-native participants, so they probably did not have access to it. There were rather direct requests among native participants’ data as in (3-12) and (3-13).

(3-12) UnTen-site.
drive
‘(Please) drive.’

(3-13) Sotti no kuruma de onegai.
(addressee’s side) of car Cop please
‘With your car, please.’

Sentence (3-12) is a very clear-cut direct request. This participant seems not concerned about the face-threatening effect. Sentence (3-13), compared with (3-12) is slightly indirect, because the requested action is not clearly mentioned but inferred by *onegai*.

As illustrated in these examples, the data demonstrate a range of requests for one task. Even among native-speakers, there was a person who made a
request in polite, distal style forms like (3-9), and there are people who use
direct forms such as (3-12) and (3-13). When given a role-play task, a participant
presupposes a world in which s/he acts the role as s/he imagines it. This world
seems to differ in some regards from person to person, within the general
constraints imposed by the ways the roles and task have been defined. For one
person and the world she imagines, a request like (3-12) may sound
inappropriate, while for others, it may be acceptable. The variety of requests
above suggests the existence of such differing worlds in the participants’ minds.
In data from the non-native participants, direct requests like (3-12) and (3-13) are
not observed. Also, some requests made by non-native participants are a little
off the mark, and sound as if they were suggestions:

(3-14) Kore de iku no wa doo desu ka?
       this by go Nom Top how Cop-DIS Q
       ‘How about going by this (car)?’

(3-15) Sinsinati ni kuruma unten-suru, doo?
       Cincinnati to car drive how
       ‘To Cincinnati, drive a car, how is?’

Sentence (3-14) is more suited for the role of someone with a friend who known
to be able to offer the use of her car. Sentence (3-15) is grammatically
problematic, and it might be understood as a suggestion.

As we observed earlier in regard to this task, the verbs of giving and
receiving used in the focal requests by native participants and non-native
participants had some overlaps in terms of the use of kureru ‘give (to in-group)’
expressions and expressions asking for permission as in X-site mo ii? ‘Is [it] all
right to X?’ The use of expressions morau ‘receive’ was mostly limited to the
native participants. In the native’s data, rather direct request expressions as in (3-12) and (3-13) were found, while non-native’s data included problematic focal requests found in (3-14) and (3-15).

Next, let us look at how the structures of request sequences differ between native participants and non-native participants. Moves contained in the native’s request sequences are:

(3-a) topic introduction (reminding the addressee of the trip to Cincinnati)

(3-b) apology

(3-c) mention of the unavailability of the car insurance

(3-d) checking on the addressee’s ability to drive

(3-e) checking on the availability of the addressee’s car

(3-f) checking on the addressee’s car insurance

(3-g) requesting that the addressee offer his/her car

The simplest sequence is structured with (3-c) and (3-g), as in [3-I]:

[3-I] X = NM1 playing the role of a person whose car insurance expiring
     Y = the researcher playing the role of X’s friend

T1 X: Raisyuu kuruma no hoken ga kiretyau kara..
     ‘Because [my] car insurance will be expired next week, ..’
     [mention of the unavailability of the car insurance]

T2 Y: N.
     ‘Yeah.’

T3 X: .. raisyuu Sinsinati iku toki ni unten-site kureru?
     ‘.. will [you] drive (for me) when we go to Cincinnati next week?’
     [requesting that Y drive]

T4 Y: A, watasi ga?
     ‘Oh, who, me?’

T5 X: Hai hai.
     ‘Yes, yes.’
This particular sequence presents the topic as a part of the 'request that Y drive' move (T3). Except for this one case, all the native participants performed moves (3-a) topic introduction and (3-c) mention of the unavailability of the car insurance. An explanation of why the speaker needs the addressee’s favor seems an indispensable move. Half of the native participants (nine out of eighteen) had elements (3-a) topic introduction, (3-b) apology, (3-c) mention of the unavailability of the car insurance and (3-g) requesting that the addressee offer his/her car in their sequences, but in different orders. One such example is [3-II].

[3-II] X = NF10 playing the role of a person whose car insurance is expiring
Y = the researcher playing the role of X’s friend

X: | Nto | konsyuu-matu no Sinsinati ni iku hanasi na n da kedo: ..
   ‘Um, [it is] about our plan to go to Cincinnati this weekend, but ..’
   [topic introduction]

Y: N.
   ‘Yeah.’

X: .. kuruma unten-suru tte itta n da kedo sa ..
   ‘(it is that) I said that I would drive, but ..’

Y: N.
   ‘Yeah.’

N: .. kuruma no hoken ga raisyuu made kikanakatta n da.
   ‘(It is that) it turned out the car insurance won’t be effective next week.’
   [mention of the unavailability of the car insurance]

Y: A, hontoo.
   ‘Oh, really.’

X: Sore de warui n da kedo, .. [casual apology]
   ‘[I] am sorry, but’

Y: N.
   ‘Yeah.’

X: .. kuruma dasite hosii n da kedo, ii ka na?
   ‘(It is that) [I] want [you] to provide [your] car, but I wonder if it’s okay.’
   [requesting that the addressee provide his/her car]
The rest of the conversations have topic introduction and mention of the unavailability of the car insurance as their base and then go on to confirm some of the conditions which would make it possible for the addressee to drive i.e., moves (3-d) checking on the addressee's ability to drive, (3-e) checking on the availability of the addressee's car and (3-f) checking on the addressee's car insurance. One example that illustrates such a sequence is [3-III].

[3-III] X = NM14 playing the role of a person whose car insurance is expiring
Y = the researcher playing the role of X's friend

X: Ano sa:. ..
   'Well, ..'

Y: N.
   'Yeah.'

X: .. kondo Sinsinati iku yo ne. [topic introduction]
   '.. [we're] gonna to be going to Cincinnati, now, aren't we?'

Y: N.
   'Yeah.'

X: De, ore ga unten-suru hazu datta kedo ..
   'And, [I] was supposed to drive, but ..'

Y: N.
   'Yeah.'

X: .. zitu wa hoken ga raisyuu made kikanai n de ..
   '.. actually, (it is that) the car insurance won't cover into next week, so..' [mention of the unavailability of the car insurance]

Y: A, honto ni:
   'Oh, really.'

X: .. de, kuruma motte ta yo ne.
   '.. and, [you] have a car, right?'
   [checking on the availability of the addressee's car]

Y: N, motte ru yo.
   'Yeah. [I] do.'
The structures of the request sequences produced by native participants in this task were rather uniform. Fifteen out of eighteen made moves of (3a) 'topic introduction' and (3c) 'mention of car insurance unavailability' as their base, and then added more moves like (3b) 'apology' and (3e) 'checking on the addressee's ability' to perform the requested act.

It turns out that the structures of non-native participants' request sequences were quite similar to those of native participants. The only element not included among the non-native participants' moves is (3e) checking on the addressee's ability to drive. Just like the native participants' sequences, all the non-native participants' request sequences contain a topic introduction and mention of the car insurance unavailability. The most common structure consisted of moves (3-a) topic introduction, (3-c) mention of the unavailability of the car insurance, and (3-g) requesting that Y drive/offer his/her car in this order. More than half of the non-native participants (eleven out of eighteen) had this structure in their sequences. The next most frequent sequence (three out of eighteen) had the move (3-e) checking on the availability of the addressee's car. The rest of the participants' request structures consisted of the same basic structure of (3-a), (3-c) and (3-g) and one or more moves other than (3-e) added to it. As far as this Casual: less face-threatening task (Task 3) is concerned, then, both native participants and non-native participants had very similar structures in their request sequences.
The major difference between the two was the frequency of apologies. Native participants clearly included apologies and mitigating expressions more frequently than non-natives did. The apologetic moves made by six native participants were the simple Gomen nasai. 'Beg pardon', and Warui kedo .. 'It's bad [of me], but ..'. Other mitigating expressions such as onegai dekiru to uresii n da kedo .. 'I'd feel happy, if I could ask of you, but..' or dekireba/dekitara .. 'if you could, ..' were also used. Nine out of eighteen native participants said, in their recall protocol interview, that this task was easy because they were making the request of a friend. The following remarks are some of those they made:

- "Kore wa hizyoo ni yari-yasui desu." (NM1)
  'This is extremely easy to do.'

- "Betu ni kore wa hutuu no koto zya nai desyoo ka?" (NM16)
  'Wouldn't this be an ordinary kind of thing?'

- "Tomodati na no de, tyotto gurai muri-kiite kureru ka na tte iu kanzi de anmari kangaenai de, hai" (NF8)
  'Because (the addressee) is my friend, [I] had a impression that [s/he] would consent to something a little difficult, and [I] did not think too much'

Even so, the same people used apologetic expressions.

In the non-native participants' request sequences for this task, on the other hand, such apologetic expressions were rarely observed, in spite of the fact that expressions like Sumimasen ga .. and Warui kedo .. are familiar to them, and that they used these apologetic expressions in other role-play tasks. At the least, criteria for the use of apologetic expressions thus seemed to differ between native and non-native participants. Native participants will use apologetic expressions rather freely even when they do not feel they have imposed unduly.
For the natives, apologetic expressions may occur naturally with request-making as a precaution not to offend the addressee. Non-natives, on the other hand, do not use apologetic expressions unless they are concerned about the difference of social status between themselves and their addressees or the task itself is very face-threatening. One possible reason for this is differing cultural assumptions about other people’s cars. One native participant, for example, mentioned his impression about car use among American young people. He commented from his experience that American people lend and/or borrow their cars in a more casual manner than Japanese do. If this observation is accurate, differing beliefs about other people’s cars, borrowing them, and so on, may be a significant factor behind the presence and the absence of apologetic expressions.

In both native and non-native’s request sequences, most participants had a topic introduction move. Here, I want to compare how these moves differed. In the native’s topic introductions, we find roughly two types. One type starts with reference to a mutually known fact. Such examples are shown below:

(3-A)  Syuumatu no Sinsinati no doraibu na n da kedo ..
‘As for the drive to Cincinnati this weekend, ..’

(3-B)  Sinsinati ni iku hanasi na n da kedo ..
‘As for our plan to go to Cincinnati, ..’

Another type uses sentence final yo ne or zyan? (contracted form of tag question zya nai?) to remind the addressee of what they had discussed.

(3-C)  Konsyuuumatu issyo ni Sinsinati ni iku koto ni site masita yo ne.
‘We’d decided to go to Cincinnati together this weekend, hadn’t we?’

(3-D)  Syuumatu Sinsinati ni iku koto ni natte ta zyan?
‘It was set that we would go to Cincinnati this weekend, wasn’t it?’
Among the non-native participants, there were some who introduced the topic as in (3-A) and (3-B) above. The noun *koto* was used by four participants, as in (3-E) and (3-F):

(3-E) Syuumatu no Sinsinati no ryokoo no koto na n desu kedo ne, ..
'It's about the trip to Cincinnati this weekend, but ..'

(3-F) Sinsinati torippu no koto desu ga, ..
'It's about the Cincinnati trip, but ..'

There were two non-native participants who used the nominalizer *no* for *koto*, as in *Sinsinati e iku no da kedo ..* which sounds like an extended predicate meaning ‘(It is that) [I] am going to Cincinnati, but ..’. It is not clear if they intended to use an extended predicate there or they simply thought they could create a pronominal phrase with *no*, to refer to this mutually known matter. There were others who introduced the topic by reminding the addressee of it as something they had discussed previously, as in (3-C) and (3-D). However, the multiple-particle sequence *yo ne* and contraction *zyan?* were apparently not known to these non-native participants, and they used *ne?* instead:

(3-G) Konsyuu no syuumatu Sinsinati ni iku ne.
'[You]'re going to Cincinnati this weekend, aren't you?'

(3-H) Konsyuu matu wa Sinsinati ni iku tumori desu ne.
'[You]'re intending to go to Cincinnati this weekend, aren't you?'

The particle *yo* "indicates that the speaker assumes s/he is providing the addressee with new information”, and the particle *ne* is “a confirmation seeker” (Jorden with Noda, Part 1, 1987:33). Therefore, with the particle sequence *yo ne(?)* a speaker can introduce something as new at *that point in the conversation*
(with yo), and then confirm it as previously known (with ne). Unlike this, the particle ne? seems to confirm only the clause’s account of the addressee’s intention, unless the speaker overtly mentions the subject ‘we’. In (3-C) and (3-D), the speaker successfully confirms the intention of both speaker and the addressee, however in the case of (3-G) and (3-H) only the speaker’s belief about the plans of the addressee is confirmed, and it sounds as if the speaker is detached, even somewhat cold. Introducing sentence particle sequence yo ne? and modeling its use in a variety of contexts could, with rehearsal and repeated opportunities for voluntary use in live interaction, add a good tool for confirmation that would be of benefit to non-native speakers.

In this Casual: less face-threatening task (Task 3), the verbal gerunds used in the focal requests by native and non-native participants were similar. In order to express their focal requests, native participants used expressions with both kureru–kudasaru ‘give–honorific give (to in-group)’ and merau–itadaku ‘receive–humbly receive’. By contrast, non-natives used mainly expressions referring to ‘giving’ by the addressee (i.e., kureru–kudasaru). Expressions asking for permission as in X-site mo ii? ‘Is [it] all right to X?’ were used in the focal requests of both groups. In the previous Business: less face-threatening task (Task 1), the native participants rarely used mitigating expressions, but in this Casual: less face-threatening task (Task 3), mitigating expressions were observed in the native’s data. As for the structures of the request sequence in this Casual: less face-threatening task (Task 3), they were similar across the two groups.
3.4.4 Casual: more face-threatening task (Task 4)

In this task, participants were asked to solve the following problem: “It’s dinner time. You’ve just remembered that you have to watch a video for your Japanese film class tomorrow. Class starts at 8:30 am. You have the videotape, but no VCR. You’ve heard that the boyfriend of your Japanese friend has recently bought a VCR.” The relevant fact was “You don’t know the boyfriend well, but you’ve heard his name is Takashi.” Each participant was asked to play the role of the person who needed a VCR. The researcher played the role of the friend whose boyfriend owned a VCR.

First, we will look at what the role-players requested. A summary is given in Table 9, mostly in the form of verbal gerunds used in larger structures to be illustrated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kasite … ‘lend [it]’</td>
<td>karite … ‘borrow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misite/misasete …</td>
<td>kasite … ‘lend’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘show [it]’</td>
<td>tukatte … ‘use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denwa-site … ‘call [someone].’</td>
<td>mite … ‘watch’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari reru? ‘Can [I] borrow?’</td>
<td>tanonde… ‘ask’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanonde… ‘ask’</td>
<td>San-nin de issyo ni mimasyoo ka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renraku toremasu ka ne. ‘I wonder if you can contact [him]’</td>
<td>Kasite moratte. ‘Please have [it] borrowed.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onegai-sitai. ‘[I]’d like to ask’</td>
<td>Tukaitai n desu kara, ii desu ka? ‘[I]’d like to use [it], but is it all right?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined predicates</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Verbal Nuclei Used in Focal Requests from Task 4

Five out of eighteen of the natives made some use of the gerund of *kasu, kasite … ‘lending’*. Four out of eighteen made use of gerund *misete … ‘showing’*. Other choices were *kari reru* ‘be able to borrow,’ and *tanonde … ‘asking’*. In addition, native participants used combined request predicates and embedded predicates. An example of combined predicates is shown in (4-1):
(4-1) Misete itadaki-tai n desu ga, tanonde moraeru showing receive[−DES N Cop-DIS but requesting receive-POT ka naa? 
DEL
‘(It is that) [I]’d like to receive the action of (Takashi’s) showing [it].\(^{30}\)
I wonder if I can have you request it [of him].’

In this example, the misete itadakita predicate itself can qualify as an appropriate request. However, this participant chose to make the request more explicit with tanonde moraeru ka naa?. An example of embedded predicate is shown in (4-2):

(4-2) Kasite kureru yoo ni tanonde kunnai ka naa?
lending give manner asking give-NEG DEL
‘I wonder if (the addressee) could not ask (Takashi), so that
(Takashi) gives the action of lending.’

In example (4-2), the participant apparently requested ‘asking,’ but the content of the request is ‘lending (the VCR),’ which part is embedded under yoo ni ‘so as to/so that’. Among non-native participants, the most common choice (six out of eighteen) was karite ‘borrowing’. Following this choice, kasite ‘lending’ was common (four out of eighteen). Other choices were tukatte ‘using’ and mite ‘watching’. All of these verbal gerunds were used under an auxiliary of some kind, as above. There was only one non-native participant who used a predicate embedded under yoo ni in the request.

We note a major difference between the choices of native participants and those of non-native participants in this task. While six native participants used kasite morau ‘receive (i.e. have someone) lend’ (a combination of the gerund of the verb kasu ‘lend’ and the plain (not humble) receiving verb), the same number of

\(^{30}\) That is, ‘would like to have Takashi show (it).’
non-native participants used expressions with the verb kariru ‘borrow.’ For non-native participants, to say karitai ‘[I]d like to borrow’ or karite mo ii? ‘Is [it] all right to borrow?’ is apparently easier than kasite moraitai ‘I’d like to receive (your action of) lending.’ Also, almost none of the non-native participants used predicates embedded under .. yoo ni as in the above example (4-2). This happened simply because many of the non-native participants had not learned this structure (V-u yoo ni tanomu) yet.

When we observe the participants’ requests more closely, we note still more differences between the two groups. When native participants request that something be shown, with either of two gerunds misete/misite ‘show’, they are requesting that they be ‘given’ a viewing of the video at Takashi’s place, with Takashi and the addressee. Six native participants requested this action. One of the participants actually asked his addressee during the role-play to come along with him to Takashi’s. Later in the recall protocol interview, he explained that he could not go to Takashi’s place alone, because he and Takashi would not have anything in common and could not carry on a conversation unless their mutual friend were present. Another participant explained, again in the recall protocol interview, that moving the VCR was problematic. The same person mentioned that he would later treat Takashi to a dinner to return the favor.

In this way, native participants were concerned about the details of how to realize their requests, even including how to return the favor. The majority of non-native participants requested permission to borrow the VCR from Takashi.
Some of them were aware of the fact that viewing the video at Takashi's place was another option, but did not request that action. In the U.S., most people drive, and with a car handy, it is easy physically to lend and borrow things, even things as large as a video deck. In contrast, in Japan, using one's car is not as common as in the U.S., especially among students. This cultural difference may have influenced the choice made by the participants, so that native participants requested that they be given a viewing of the video as well as, in other cases, a loan of the VCR from Takashi. The non-native participants, in contrast, only requested that they borrow the VCR.

In the recall protocol interview of the non-native participants, no one expressed concern for repaying the debt to Takashi. Most of them were concerned about whether to use distal style or direct style, or how to express that they had to watch a video. They indicated that this task was difficult because they were making a request of somebody that they didn’t know. They were concerned about how not to sound rude or too pushy, yet these concerns mainly for the sake of linguistic choices. Here are some samples of what they said:

- "I didn't know how what the end of the structure was, where, even though you may be different from talking about your boyfriend if I should have used more honorifics talking since he is in more your in-group than mine. He's definitely my out group." (NNM2)

- "I know I ah stayed in distal style, because I kind of | ah \ kind of get the rest of it out .. saying it in direct style would have been a lot more difficult.” (NNM8)

- ".. and then I thought how am I going to ask YOU to ask boyfriend if I could borrow VCR. Ah, and so I tried to put together the pattern that should point to that. Um, and then I wasn't sure how close of friends we were, so I, I tried to stick with the more distal form of communication rather than really
familiar form. .. Ah, especially since I was also making such a very odd request, I didn’t want to be too pushy.” (NNM12)

Native participants were thinking more in detail, as mentioned above, in terms of actions to remedy the social awkwardness caused by making this request.

Let us now examine the verbs of giving and receiving used in focal requests. A summary is given in Table 10:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... moraenai ka na(a) (to omotte...) (4)</td>
<td>... kudasaimasen ka? (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| '[I] wonder if [I] cannot have [you] ...,' (I thought ...)' | 'Wouldn't you give ...?'
| ...moraitai n da kedo .. (2) | ...site mo ii desu ka? (2) |
| '[I]d like to have [you] ...' | 'Is it all right to ...'
| ... moraeru ka naa? (1) | ... mo ii daroo ka? (2) |
| '[I] wonder if [I] can have [you] ...' | '[I] wonder if it is all right to ...'
| .. moraenai ka? (1) | ... mo ii? (2) |
| 'Can't [I] have [you] ...?' | 'Is it all right to ...' |
| ...itadakenai desyoo ka. (1) | ... kurenai? (2) |
| '[I] wonder) if [I] could not have [you] ...' | 'Won't [you] give ...?' |
| ... kurenai? (1) | ... kureru? (1) |
| 'Won't [you] give ...?' | 'Will [you] give ...?' |
| ... kurenai ka na(a)? (1) | ... tai n desu kedo.. (1) |
| '[I] wonder if [you] won't give ...' | '(It is that) [I]'d like to ..., but ..'
| ... hosii n da yo. (1) | ... moraitai n desu kedo.. (1) |
| '[I] want [you] ...' | '(It is that) [I]'d like to have [you] ..., but ..'
| X, dekinai ka naa? (1) | ... itadaite mo ii desu ka? (1) |
| '[I] wonder if [you] can X.' | 'Is it all right to have [you] ...?' |
| ... wake ni ikanai ka naa? (1) | |
| '[I] wonder if [I] can ...' | |
| ... wake ni wa ikanai yo ne. (1) | |
| '[We] can't really ..., can we?' | |

Table 10: Verbs of Giving and Receiving Used in Focal Requests from Task 4

In the native participants’ data, the combination of a verbal gerund and a

‘receiving’ verb was common, as in (4-3) and (4-4):

(4-3) Misite moraenai ka na?

show receive-NEG DEL

'I wonder if [I] cannot have [you] let me watch it.' (lit. receive the addressee’s action of showing’ )
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(4-4) VCR o kasite itadakenai desyoo ka?
    Obj lending receive¬NEG Cop-DIS-CON Q
    ‘I wonder if [I] could not receive (the addressee’s action of) lending the VCR.’

As we observed in the Business: more face-threatening task (Task 2), native participants preferred using ‘receiving’ verbs morau/itadaku over ‘giving (to ingroup)’ verbs kureru/kudasaru when indicating actions they wished to request. In this task, twelve of the native participants used morau/itadaku but not kureru/kudasaru. In the case of combined predicate, morau/itadaku choice is often used as in the following examples:

(4-5) Kasite itadakenai ka naa to iu koto o hanasite lending receive¬POT-NEG DEL Quote say thing Obj speaking
    moraenai ka na to...
    receive-POT-NEG DEL Quote
    ‘I was wondering if [I] could not have [you] speak to him and ask him.’

(4-6) Tyotto dake kasite moraenai ka naa to omotte,
    a little only lending receive-POT-NEG DEL Quote thinking
    sore de Okutsu-san itte moraenai ka na, Takashi-san ni.
    then say receive-POT-NEG DEL to
    ‘I was wondering if [I] could not have [Takashi] lend [me] [the VCR] only for a short time, then can I have [you] request Takashi?’

This task was rated as more face-threatening, because the speaker cannot simply put the request directly to his addressee, but has to ask his addressee to request something of Takashi, whom the speaker does not know very well. In example (4-5), the first underlined receiving verb itadakenai refers to the speaker’s receiving from Takashi, and the receiver of the underlined moraenai is the speaker as recipient in relation to the addressee. The same is true of the two moraenai’s of example (4-6). In the Casual: less face-threatening task (Task 3), we
noted frequent use of deliberative *ka na(a)*. In this Casual: more face-threatening task (Task 4) also, its use\(^{21}\) is common. This use of *ka na(a)* is the one seen earlier, which makes the speaker’s utterance sound as if it were a self-directed question and non-confrontational. As a result, it works to weaken the face-threatening effect, while also making it sound more relaxed.

Among the non-native participants, the most frequently observed expression (eight out of eighteen) was *X-site mo ii desu ka?* ‘is it all right to do X?’ In the previous Casual: less face-threatening task (Task 3), six of them used the combination of a verb and a giving verb like *X-site kurenai/kuremasen ka?*, but in this task, only three participants used the pattern with *kureru*. This may have been owing to the fact that they were not making a request directly of the addressee. In the recall interview, five of the non-native participants mentioned that they were conscious of this fact and that it made this task a little more difficult for them. Here are some examples:

- “since it was the boyfriend’s VCR and not yours I was thinking about whether to use, um, ah, something like, ah ‘could you check with your boyfriend to see if I could um, use his VCR or just say ‘do you think I could use borrow his VCR.’” (NNM1)

- “Well, this one this situation seems to be more complex than any of the ones that we have in the class. Because I’m going through ah, an additional interaction not just asking a friend for a VCR but asking a friend to ask her boyfriend for a VCR.” (NNM 8)

- “plus I think ah, because you are asking somebody to ask somebody to do something um, .. I still have trouble with that.” (NNM13)

---

\(^{21}\) In the above examples ((4-1), (4-2), (4-3), (4-4), (4-5) and (4-6)), deliveratives are in bold face.
Because they had to involve an unfamiliar person in their request, they might have become hesitant and thus chosen what they knew to be a less direct expression. Thus, the general tendency of natives to prefer the receiving verb *morau* or its humble equivalent *itadaku* remained the same in this task, and the non-natives often used expressions requesting permission.

Differences in the use of direct/distal style are also observed in this task. While the majority (fourteen out of eighteen) of native participants used direct style throughout their interactions, the number of non-native participants who used direct style here was only five.

In the following section, we look at how the participants structured their request sequences in carrying out Task 4. In this task, twelve out of eighteen of the native participants’ sequencing had a surprisingly uniform structure, which consisted of the following moves in the following order:

(4-a) explanation of the situation regarding the ‘Japanese Film’ class
(4-b) mention of the unavailability of a VCR
(4-c) confirming that Takashi owns a VCR
(4-d) requesting that a meeting be arranged with Takashi so that the speaker can watch the video/or ask to borrow the VCR

One example of this typical structure is shown in [4-I].

[4-I]  X = NM7 playing the role of a person in need of a VCR  
Y = the researcher playing the role of X’s friend

X: A, mosimosi.  
‘Hello?’

Y: A, mosimosi?  
‘Hello?’
X: | Ano sa: | ..
    'Um, ...'

Y: N.
    'Yeah.'

X: .. | eeto | asita no zyugyoo no tame ni sa: ..
    '.. um, for tomorrow's class, ..'
    [explanation of the situation regarding the 'Japanese Film' class]

Y: N.
    'Yeah.'

X: .. | bideo o mitokanakya ikenakatta n da kedo: ..
    '.. (it is that) [I] had to watch a video, but ..'

Y: N.
    'Yeah.'

X: .. | nan ka, uti, bideo nai n da: ..
    [mention of the unavailability of a VCR]
    '.. somehow, [I] don't own a video deck!'

Y: N. N. N. Bideo-teepu wa aru wake?
    'Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. (Is it that) you have a videotape (at least),'

X: Ee.
    'Yes.'

Y: N.
    'Yeah.'

X: (inhaltes) Sore de: sa ..
    'So, ..'

Y: N.
    'Yeah.'

X: .. | are desyo, karesi tasika bideo-deikki katta to ka itte ta yo ne.
    '.. [you] were saying something like that [your] boyfriend had bought a
    video deck or something, right?'
    [confirming that Takashi owns a VCR]

Y: N, | ano nee | 2-syuukan mae ni katta n no, katta no.
    'Yeah, um, [he] bought [one] two weeks ago.'

X: A.: Sore dee, mosi dekiru n nara sa: ..
    'Ah, then, if [it] is possible, ..'

Y: N.
    'Yeah.'
Eight of these native participants exchanged a routine telephone greeting with the addressee at the beginning of the sequence. Three others had apologies or apologetic expressions between these four elements. These apologies were for the request itself or for calling at mealtime. There were three participants who started the sequence by stating that they had a favor to ask. At various points in their sequences, the majority of the participants mentioned, the fact that their addressee’s boyfriend Takashi had bought a VCR. However, some participants intentionally avoided mentioning it. Instead, they asked the addressee one of the following questions, for which they in fact knew the answers:

(4-e) if she knew anyone who owns a VCR
(4-f) if there were any good way (to solve the problem)
(4-g) if the addressee had a VCR
(4-h) if she could ask someone who owns a VCR

The native participant who asked (4-e) had a very strong negative reaction to the idea of visiting someone whom he did not know very well to watch a video together. In the recall interview, he remarked

- “Situree desu ne... Da tte siranai hito no ie ni kari ni iku tuu no wa yappari atta koto no nai hito no ie ni iku tuu no wa yappari situree da to onioimasu.”

‘[It] is rude, you know? .. Going to the house of someone you don’t know to borrow something is, when you come down to it—going to the house of someone you’ve never met—is rude, I think.’ (NM5)
He therefore tried to avoid the action by first asking (4-g) and then asking (4-e). Another participant, who asked (4-f), revealed in the recall interview a similar experience she had actually had: she had asked a friend if she owned a sleeping-bag, even when she knew that it was her friend’s friend who owned one. By asking this question (to which she already knew the answer), she hoped to prompt her friend to make an offer. The participant who asked (4-h) explained in the recall interview that he had done so because his purpose was to borrow a VCR from anyone who owned one, and it did not have to be Takashi. He also added:

• ”Tatoeba kono Takashi-kun tte iu hito ga takai bideo-dekkī o katte, dare ni mo kasitakunai tte iu zyookyoo dattara hoka no hito o syookai-suru ka mo sirenai si .. Ato anmari nan ka dare ka ga katta kara sore kara kariyoo to ka tte omou no anmari suki zya nai.”

‘For example, if the situation is one where the person called Takashi had bought an expensive VCR and he didn’t want to lend [it] to anyone, then [my addressee] might introduce somebody else, and .. And [I] really don’t like to be thinking [I] want to go borrow something because somebody bought it.’ (NM16)

The native participants who felt uncomfortable about asking for things from someone whom they did not know very well, even when done through a friend, devised strategies to avoid making this request. Even among those who made this request, there were eight participants who expressed uneasiness about this task, in the recall protocol interview, as follows:

• ”Kore nan to iu ka tomodati no tomodati mitai na kanzi de, tyotto sono hizyoo ni tanomi-zurai naa to iu ki wa site ..”

 ‘This is, what shall [I] say, being like a friend’s friend, my impression is [it] is very difficult to make a request.’ (NM4)
• “Yappari koo siranai hito ni mono tanomu toki tte sugoku e: tanomi-zurai desu nee.” (NM7)
  ‘When you think about it, [it] is extremely difficult when you make a request of an unfamiliar person like this, isn’t it.’ (NM7)

• “Yappari tomodati tyokusetu no tomodati ni kariru no zya nai n de, sono hito no karesi toka na n de, (inhalas) sugoi warui naa? to omoinagara, ..”
  ‘Because it is not borrowing from your friend, and it is from your friend’s boyfriend, (inhale) [I] made the request feeling bad about [it]’ (NF8)

Next, let us look at the structures of non-natives’ request sequences for

Task 4. Roughly, they divide into two categories. The more common type (eight out of eighteen) was quite similar to the one used by native participants, and involved the following moves in this order:

(4-a) explanation of the situation regarding the class ‘Japanese Film’

(4-b) mention of the unavailability of a VCR

(4-c) confirming that Takashi owns a VCR

(4-d’) requesting that Takashi lend the VCR/ask for permission to borrow the VCR/express the desire to use the VCR

There were several participants who presented greetings and apologies between these moves. Five others had sequences almost identical to the above, but had some additional moves in their sequence. Another five of the non-native participants sequenced things differently. Following the initial greetings, instead of starting the sequence with the explanation of why the VCR is needed, they began with confirmation of relevant facts about the addressee’s boyfriend (his name, whether he has a VCR or not, etc.). It is not clear why these participants decided to ask about the boyfriend first, and no one offered any explanation about this choice in the recall interview.
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For this Casual: more face-threatening task (Task 4), what the two groups requested were rather different. Native participants asked to borrow the VCR, but also for an opportunity to view the video, whereas non-native participants only asked for the VCR itself. This is another difference that may reflect cultural differences. As for the verbs of giving and receiving used in the focal requests, the tendency to prefer a receiving verb remained strong in this task for the native participants. A permission-seeking question was the most common expression for the non-native counterparts. As for the structure of the request sequence, both groups tended to show a similar structure. However, native participants employed more strategies for avoiding the potential face-threat in their interaction, compared to the non-native group.

3.4.5 Formal: less face-threatening task (Task 5)

In this task, participants were asked to solve the following problem:

"Yesterday you asked your Japanese teacher/professor to write a recommendation letter for you to New York University in the U.S. (for native participants)/Tsukuba University in Japan (for non-native participants). Today, you realized that the deadline is tomorrow." The relevant fact was "Your teacher has a fax machine." Each participant was asked to play the role of the student who had this urgent need. The researcher played the role of the teacher.

The following table presents verbal nuclei used in the focal requests by the both groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h(u)akkusu (ka nani ka) de okutte ...</td>
<td>h(u)akkusu-site ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de okutte ...</td>
<td>'fax'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'send by fax (or something)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h(u)akkusu okutte ...</td>
<td>H(u) akkusu de dasimasen ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'send a fax'</td>
<td>'Won't you send by fax?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soosin-site .. 'transmit'</td>
<td>h(u)akkusu de okutte ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'send by fax'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h(u)akkusu site ... 'fax'</td>
<td>h(u)akkusu ni irete ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'put in a fax'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaite ... 'write'</td>
<td>H(u)akkusu de dekimasen ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'I make a request of you,'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tukawasete ... 'let [me] use'</td>
<td>Doozo onegaisimasu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'error'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onegai-site ... 'request'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tukutte ... 'make'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zibun de okuru 'send by myself'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Verbal Nuclei Used in Focal Requests from Task 5

The most common choices of verbal gerunds in the focal requests among the native participants were h(u)akkusu-site...~h(u)akkusu de okutte...~soosin-site... ~(to ask the teacher) to fax the recommendation letter. Eight out of eighteen participants chose to focus on this action. The second most common choice (five

---

22 Although the researcher expected that the participants would ask the instructor to send the fax directly to New York University, two participants asked that the recommendation letter be faxed to them.
out of eighteen) was to ask for the ‘writing’ (kaite ... 23) of a letter. Two
participants requested that the teacher write and fax the letter. Another two
requested that the teacher let them use the fax machine. Non-native participants’
choices were more uniform. Fourteen out of eighteen of them asked that the
teacher send the fax ʰ(h)akkusu-site-ʰ(h)akkusu de okutte-ʰ(h)akkusu de dasite.
Two asked the teacher to write the letter and send it. One asked the teacher to let
her use the fax machine. Another individual asked for general assistance, saying
Onegai-simasu. ‘I make a request of you’. Although the percentage of non-native
participants who asked the teacher to send the letter by fax was higher, both
natives and non-natives selected similar requestive acts for this task, which can
be summarized as asking the teacher to ʰ(h)akkusu-site-ʰ(h)akkusu de okutte
‘fax/send by fax the recommendation letter’.

Verbs of giving and receiving used by the both groups are presented in
the following table:

---

23 One participant used tukutte instead of kaite. However, from the context, it is clear that the
intended meaning was to write the recommendation letter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...itadakitai n desu kedo/ga.</td>
<td>...kudasaimasen ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(It is that) [I]'d like to have [you] ..., but ..'</td>
<td>ʻWouldn't [you] give ...?ʼ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... itadakenai desyoo ka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ[I] wonder if [I] cannot have [you] ...ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... kuremasen ka?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻWon't you ...?ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... moraitai n desu keredo mo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(It is that) [I]'d like to have [you] ..., but ..'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... moraeru to uresii n desu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keredo mo ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(It is that) [I]'d be happy if [I] can have [you] ..., but ʻ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... itadakemasu desyoo ka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(I wonder) if [I] could have [you] ...ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... itadakemasen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻCouldn't [I] have [you] ...?ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... itadakemasen desyoo ka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(I wonder) if it might be possible to have [you].ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... itadakereba to omoimasite ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(I was wondering) if [I] could have [you] ... /but ..ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... itadakereba arigatai n desu kedo ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(It is that) [I] will be grateful if [I] could have [you] ..., but ..ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... o onegai-sitai n desu ga ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(It is that) [I]'d like to make a request of [you], but ..ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... to oomotteru n desu keredo mo ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ(It is that) [I]'d like to ..., but ..ʼ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Verbs of Giving and Receiving Used in Focal Requests from Task 5
Expressions used in native participants’ focal requests were as follows:

(5-1) ... itadakitai n desu kedo/ga ...
     receive↓-DES Nom Cop-DIS but
     ’(It is that) [I]’d like to have [you] ..., but ..’

(5-2) ... itadakenai desyoo ka.
     receive↓-POT-NEG Cop-DIS-TENT Q
     ’[I] wonder if [I] cannot have [you] ..’

(5-3) ... kuremasen ka?
     give-DIS-NEG Q
     ’Won’t you give the action of ..?’

(5-4) ... moraitai n desu keredo mo..
     receive-DES Nom Cop-DIS but
     ’(It is that) [I]’d like to have [you] ..., but ..’

(5-5) ... moraeru to uresii n desu keredo mo
     receive-POT happy Nom Cop-DIS but
     ’(It is that) [I]’d be happy if [I] can have [you] ..., but ..’

(5-6) .. itadakemasen?
     receive↓-POT-DIS-NEG
     ’Can’t [I] have [you] ..?’

(5-7) .. itadakemasu desyoo ka?
     receive↓-POT-DIS Cop-DIS-TENT Q
     ’(I wonder) if [I] can have [you] ..’

(5-8) .. itadakemasen desyoo ka?
     receive↓-POT-DIS-NEG Cop-DIS-TENT Q
     ’(I wonder) if it might be possible to have [you] ..’

(5-9) .. itadakereba to omoimasite..
     receive↓-POT-PROV Quote think-DIS
     ’(I was wondering) if [I] could have [you] ..., so ..’

(5-10) .. itadakereba arigatai n desu keredo mo
     receive↓-POT-PROV grateful Nom Cop-DIS but
     ’(It is that) [I] will be grateful if [I] could have [you] ..., but ..’
(5-11) .. o onegai-sitai n desu ga...
   Obj make request-DES Nom Cop-DIS but
   '(It is that) [I]‘d like to make a request of [you], but ..'

(5-12) ... to omotte ru n  desu keredo mo ..
   Quote think Nom Cop-DIS but
   '(It is that) [I] am thinking to ..., but ..'

Except for the participant who used the negative form of the giving verb *kureru*
(5-3), and another who used the general request expression *onegai-suru* (5-11), all
the native participants used some variation on the receiving verb *morau* or its
humble equivalent *itadaku*. The non-natives’ choices showed sharp contrast to
this. While there was one individual who used (5-11), ten of them used the
following expression:

(5-13) .. kudasaimasen ka?
   give†-DIS-NEG Q
   'Won’t you give the action of ..?'

Other focal requests expressed by the rest of the non-native participants were
somewhat inappropriate:

(5-14) H(u)akkusu suru no wa ii desu ka?
   fax do Nom Top good Cop-DIS Q
   'Is it all right to send [it]?'

(5-15) H(u)akkusu o simasen/nasaimasen ka?
   fax Obj do-NEG/do†-NEG Q
   'Won’t [you] fax [it]?'

(5-16) Kore o tukaimasen ka, h(u)akkusu masiin?
   this Obj use-DIS-NEG Q fax machine
   'Won’t [you] use this, a fax machine?'

The permission seeking expression of (5-14) can be used when the speaker is the
agent. In this task, however, it is the addressee who is expected to take action, so
(5-14) is inappropriate. (And, in the U.S., it is socially inappropriate for the
student to handle an open letter about him/herself.) The expression used in (5-15) is a negative question, and was no doubt intended as an invitation. But an invitation like this is usually an invitation to something that will benefit the addressee (e.g. Suwarimasen ka. 'Won’t you sit down?'). Writing a recommendation letter does not benefit the teacher directly, however, so it is inappropriate to use (5-15) here. With the same reason, (5-16) is not appropriate, either.

In this task, the expected action was for the student to ask the teacher to fax a recommendation letter from her office. However, there were several native participants who did not request this action. In the recall protocol interview, those people explained their reasons for not doing so as follows.

- “Suisen-zyoo o’n(u)akkusu de okutte mo, tyanto sita riaru na yatu zya nai zya nai desu ka. .. H(u)akkusu tte iu no wa nan kannetu-si to ka iu kami zya nai desu ka.
  ‘Even if you send a recommendation letter by fax, it’s not a proper one, right? With faxes, it’s a sheet of that “heat sensitized” paper, right?’
  (NM1)

This person thought that a faxed recommendation letter would not be considered proper at the receiving end, i.e., New York University.

- “Kaitte moratta mono, itido te ni site, de, tukatte mo ji desu ka de zibun de okuru to omoimasu. .. sensee ni okutte oite kudasai tte iu no wa tyottoo aa (laugh) situree ka na to omoimasu ne.
  ‘I think [I will receive what [the teacher] had written, and (ask her) if [I] may use (the fax machine), and then transmit it myself. I think it might be a little rude to ask the teacher to have it sent.’ (NF6)

- “Ittoo kiite mite:, sensee ga nan te iu ka, yuugata toka ni wa dekinai de zikan ga kakaru iu n yattara moo onegai-suru sika nai kedo mo:, hayai zikan ni dekiru tte iiharu n yattara moo zibun de tori ni kite yaroo.”
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‘[I]’d ask first, (it depends on) what the teacher will say. If she says that (the letter) can’t be finished by the evening and it takes longer, I would ask her (to transmit it), but if she says that (the letter) will be finished at an earlier hour, I will come and transmit it myself.’ (NF12)

This person even refused the teacher’s offer to fax the letter, insisting that she would come to the office again to get it and then fax it herself. Some of the participants who asked the teacher to send a fax in the role-play said they felt uncomfortable doing it.

- “Kore wa, kinoo tanonde asita simekiri to iu no wa sugoku situree da na to. Kyoozyu desu kara kyoozyu ni hutuka inai de zibun no puraibeeto na suisenzyoo o onegai-site, sikamo kyoozyu no office no h(u)akkusu de okure to iu no wa iya desu ne. Kanari. Sugoku uwa:, zibun dattara kore iu no, sugoku iya da wa to omou to omoimasu.”

‘(I think) that it is very rude to ask (a recommendation letter) of a teacher two days before its deadline. I don’t like (the idea of) asking a teacher for a personal recommendation letter, and, on top of that, asking her to send it with her own fax machine. I really don’t like that. If [I] were this person, I would really hate to say this.’ (NF3)

- “Simekiri teka tyan to itte okanakatta no wa zibun na n de, tyotto moosiwake nai na tte iu huu na no wa, tabun kono zyookyoo dattara omou to omoimasu.”

‘Because [it] is I who failed to inform (the teacher) about the deadline, [I] would probably feel bad (lit. there’s no excuse) about this in this situation.’ (NF9)

Judging from the native participants’ reluctance to do so, asking one’s teacher to send a fax seems to have had considerable face-threatening potential. In order to lessen this effect, they used mitigating expressions, including apologies. In the following section, we will compare the mitigating expressions used by the two groups. Those used by the native participants were many and varied, and the majority of them used apologies immediately preceding their focal requests. The most common apology (used by eight out of eighteen participants) was
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Moosiwake arimasen. 'I am sorry. (lit. There is no justifying it.)' Sometimes, this
was intensified with taihen/hizyou ni 'very much/extremely' or hontoo ni/makoto ni
'really/truly'. Moosiwake arimasen was also used with oisogasii tokoro 'at a time
when you are busy'. Another apology was Kyosyuuki desu ga ... 'I am afraid I am
troubling you, but ...'. Beside these apologies, native participants used the
following mitigating expressions.

(5-A) Dekireba kyoo uti ni h(u)akkusu-okutte be possible-PROV today home to sending a fax
kuremasen ka? give-DIS-NEG Q
'(If it is) possible, won't [you] fax it to my house (for me),
today?' (lit. 'give the action of sending a fax')

(5-B) H(u)akkusu ka nani ka de, suisen-zyoo o fax or something by recommendation letter Obj
onegai-sitai n desu ga .. request-DES Nom Cop-DIS but
'(It is that) [I] would like to request (of you) a recommendation letter
by fax or something, but ..'

(5-C) Nan toka kaite itadakenai desyoo ka? somehow writing receive-POT-NEG Cop-TENT Q
'Can't [I] somehow receive (your writing of a recommendation letter)'

(5-D) Watasi no tetigai na n desu ga .. I of mistake Cop Nom Cop-DIS but
'(It is that) [it]'s my mistake, but ..'

In (5-A), by adding the condition dekireba 'if/provided it's possible', the speaker
is being considerate to the addressee. In (5-B), the speaker avoids limiting the
addressee's options of action, by suggesting that there are other ways besides the
faxing that he mentions. Considering the fact that the student and the teacher
are in the same room facing the fax machine, it seems clear that the student probably intends for the teacher to use that fax machine. The speaker adds *ka nani ka* ‘or something’ because not specifying the means in terms of a single option grants the addressee some freedom. In (5-C), the speaker alludes to the extreme difficulty of what he is requesting by using *nan toka* ‘somehow or other’ to modify adverbially the requested action. The mitigating expression (5-D) simply admits that the speaker is entirely responsible for what happened. All these mitigating expressions seem to be intended to lessen the threat of negative face for the addressee.

In contrast with the variety of mitigating expressions used by native participants, those used by non-native participants were quite limited:

(5-E) *Warui n desu kedo ..*  
bad Nom Cop-DIS but  
‘(It is that) [it] is bad [of me], but ..’

(5-F) *Sumimasen.*  
excuse me  
‘Excuse me.’

As explained in the previous sections, (5-E) is not appropriate for use toward someone outside one’s *uti* (e.g. someone not well known to the speaker or of higher social status). The apology of (5-F) is not so clearly wrong here as (5-E), but it seems too general. For example, it might also be used to stop someone on a street to ask for directions. In its sense, its remedial effect for face-threat seems rather small. Although the non-native participants had learned apologies like *Moosiwake arimasen* as a way to apologize for serious offences, they did not use this kind of apology in this task. There are two possible reasons for this. One is
that they simply forgot or did not know *Moosiwake arimasen* well enough to use it given the opportunity. Another is that they did not recognize this situation as face-threatening despite the fact that in the recall protocol interview, many of them said that they were very concerned to use ‘polite language.’ The following are some responses to the question, ‘What were you thinking while you were doing the task?’:

- “Using the polite form and then thank the teacher” (NNM3)
- “Trying to be polite.” (NNM5)
- “Since it is a teacher, and I’m making a request, I have to use more polite language, and that makes it more difficult to do.” (NNM8)
- “Ah, the first thing I thought about was the fact that you being a teacher, I should try to be polite and very deferential.” (NNM12)
- “Um, I didn’t I kind of knew all mo most of the vocabulary, the the hardest part is that it’s teacher’s I have to use just honoring form, I wasn’t sure whether I could do that or ..” (NNF14)
- “Plus in this case you have to keep in mind like ah honorific or polite levels, so it was harder.” (NNF18)

To judge from their actual utterances, many of the non-native learners seem to interpret using .. *site kudasaimasen ka?* ‘Won’t you do ..? (lit. give me/mine the action of ..)’ as the most polite possible way to make requests. They did not use apologies and mitigating expressions nearly as much as the natives did.

In the following section, we will examine how participants structured their request sequences in carrying out Task 5. Among the native participants,
the most basic pattern (found in thirteen participants’ request sequences) consisted of the following moves in this order:

(5-a) topic introduction
(5-b) mention of the deadline
(5-c) requesting that the recommendation letter be faxed

These participants started the sequence with a topic introduction such as Kinoo suisen-zyoo o onegai-sita n desu kedo .. ‘(It is that) [I] asked for a recommendation letter yesterday, but ..’, Senzitu moosigemasita suisen-zyoo no koto na n desu ga.. ‘[It] is about the recommendation letter that I mentioned to you the other day, but ..’, Kinoo onegai-sita suisen-zyoo no ken na n desu ga .. ‘([It] is the matter of the recommendation letter that [I] requested of [you] yesterday, but ..’). One person checked on the availability of the letter, while another asked about the availability of the fax machine, in addition to the above three moves. Ten out of eighteen participants used mitigating expressions at some point between these moves. The most often used apology, Moosiwake arimasen ga .. ‘There is no excuse [for my behavior] but ..’ was usually used directly preceding the focal request. A couple of people presented their requests very cautiously, and wrapped them with many mitigating expressions. The following sequence is part of one such example (mitigating expressions underlined):

[5-I]  X = NF6 playing the role of the student
      Y = the researcher playing the role of the professor

X: Sore de, tanoo | oisogasii tokoro, makoto ni moosiwake nai n desu ga ..
   ‘Then, er, (it is that) [I] am truly sorry when [you] are busy, but ..’

Y: Ee, ee.
   ‘Yes. Yes.’
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X: .. dekireba kyoo-zyuu ni ano kaki-agete itadakitai n desu keredo mo .. 
  '.. [if it is] possible, (it is that) [I] would like [you] to finish writing [the 
  recommendation letter] today, but ..'

Y: A, soo. Demo doo simasyoo ne. Sokutatu de okutte mo tyotto ma ni 
  awanai desyoo.
  'Oh, is [that] so? But what should [we] do? [It] won’t make it, even if 
  [I] send [it] by express mail.'

X: |Eeto | huakkusu da to (inhales) itiniti de tuku n desu ga: ..
  'Let’s see, (it is that) [it] will arrive [there] within a day with a fax, but ..'

Y: Ee.
  'Yes.'

X: .. | anoo | sore mo dekireba tyotto kyoozyu no ohuisu no h(u)akkusu o 
  tukawasete itadakitai n desu ga ..
  '.. um, (it is that) [I]d like [you] to let me use a fax machine in [your] 
  office, if it is possible, but ..'

Y: A, soo desu ka.
  'Oh, is [that] so?'

X: .. yorosii desyoo ka.
  '.. would [that] be all right?’

Y: A, wakarimasita.
  'Yes, okay. (lit.' [I]'ve understood.')'

X: Suimasen.
  '[I] am sorry.'

Y: Hai.
  'Okay.'

X: Onegai simasu.
  'Please. (lit. 'I make a request of you.‘)'

Y: Hai.
  'Okay.'

This participant said in the recall protocol interview that the kind of request she 
would make depended on what kind of relationship she had with the addressee. 
She thinks she would have made the request even more careful if she imagined a 
more distant relationship with the addressee. The following sequence is another 
example of a request sequence worked out with multiple mitigating expressions:
[5-II] X = NF3 playing the role of the student
   Y = the researcher playing the role of the professor

X: Kinoo onegai-sita Nyuuuyoku Daigaku e no suiSen-zynn o ken nan desu ga..
   '[It] is about the recommendation letter to New York University that [I] requested [from you] yesterday, but ..'

Y: Hai.
   'Yes.'

X: .. taihen moosiwake nai n desu ga..
   '.. there is really no excuse for this, but ..'

Y: Ee.
   'Yes.'

X: .. watasi, ukkari asita ga simekiri da tte koto, miotosite masite..
   '.. [I] overlooked that tomorrow would be the deadline.'

Y: A, asita ga simekiri na n desu ka!?
   'Oh, (is it that) tomorrow will be the deadline?'

X: Hai. Oisogasii to wa omou n desu ga..
   'Yes. [I]'m afraid that [you] are busy, but ..'

Y: Ee.
   'Yes.'

X: .. dekireba kyoo asu-zynn ni nan toka kaite itadakenai desyoo ka?
   '.. if [it] is possible, would [you] write [it] by tomorrow?'

Y: Tyotto mada kaite nai n da kedo, !aa! kore kara kakimasu kedo..
   '(It is that) [I] haven't written [it], yet, but ah, [I] am going to write [it],
   but ..'

X: Hai.
   'Yes.'

Y: .. doo simasyoo nee.
   '.. what shall [we] do, you know?'

X: !Anoo! sasituikae nakereba, huakkusu de okutte itadakeru to..
   'Well, if [it] is not a problem, if [you] could send [it] by fax, then ..'

Y: A, ano Nyuuuyoku Daigaku no hoo ni?
   'Oh, um, to New York University?'

X: Hai.
   'Yes.'

   'Okay. (lit. '[I]ve understood.') Then, [I] will do so.'
X: Arigatoo gozaimasu. Moosiwake arimasen.
‘Thank you. [I am sorry.’

In examples [5-I] and [5-II], speakers establish an apologetic tone in their first or second utterance and follow up throughout with mitigating expressions considerate of the addressee, e.g. Oisogasii to wa omou ‘[I]’m afraid that you are busy’ or Dekireba .. ‘If [it] is possible, ..’. At the end of the sequence, in [5-I], the speaker ends with an apology and a general request, Onegai simasu ‘I make a request of you.’ In [5-II], the speaker ends with a word of thanks and a repeated apology, Moosiwake arimasen ‘[I]’m sorry’. This ending part is common to all the native participants, and all of them finished the sequence with some expression of deference, such as Yorosiku onegai-simasu. ‘[I] request your consideration.’ or Arigatoo gozaimasu. ‘Thank you’.

The non-native participants’ sequences show basically the same structure as those of the native participants, but some important pieces are again sometimes missing. Twelve out of eighteen participants have a topic introduction referring to their action, such as Tegami onegai-simasita kedo .. ‘[I] asked you for a letter, but, ..’ or using a topic introduction set phrase, Suisen-zyoo no koto na n desu kedo .. ‘It’s a matter concerning the recommendation letter I asked for, but ..’. The following sequence by non-native participants has the above-mentioned three moves in order: (5-a) topic introduction, (5-b) mention of the deadline, and (5-c) requesting that the recommendation letter be faxed.

[5-III] X = NM1 playing the role of the student
       Y = the researcher, playing the role of the professor
X: ｜Anoo｜sumimasen.
   'Er, excuse me.'

Y: Hai.
   'Yes.'

X: Warui n desu kedo..
   '(It is that) [it] is bad [of me], but ..'

Y: Hai.
   'Yes.'

X: ｜anoo｜Tsukuba no tegami no koto na n desu kedo..
    '.. well, (it is that) [it]'s about the (recommendation) letter to Tsukuba
    (University), but ..'

[topic introduction]

Y: Hai hai.
   'Yes. Yes.'

X: ｜Anoo｜zitu wa, ｜anoo｜kyoo wa ｜anoo｜a, sumimasen ｜anoo｜kyoo wa
    ｜anoo｜dasu iya sumimasen kyoo wa sone tegami o dasanakereba ikenai to
    omoimasu kedo..
    'Um, actually, um, today, um, oh excuse me, today, um, submit, no, [I]'m
    sorry, [I] think [I] must submit that letter today, but ..'

[mention of the deadline]

Y: Kyoo, kyoo dasanakyaa ikenai n desu ka?
   '(Is it that) [you] must submit [it], today?'

X: Hai. Hai. Demo, ｜anoo｜huakkusu de okurete 24 mo i desu ka?
    'Yes. Yes. But, um, is it all right to send it by fax?'

[requesting that the recommendation letter be faxed]

Y: Huakkusu de okuru n desu ka?
   '(You mean that) [you] will send [it] by fax?'

X: Hai.
   'Yes.'

Y: Hai, aa, daizyoobu da to omoimas yo.
   'Yes. Ah, [I] think [that] should be fine.'

X: A, arigatoo gozaimasita.
   'Oh, thank you.'

When the speaker shifts from the topic introduction to the mention of the
deadline, he uses zitu wa ('the fact is') 25. This use is successful in making the

---

24 The speaker meant okutte.
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sequence sound more natural. There are five non-native participants who used this particular phrase, which six of the native participants also used. In the recall protocol interview, the speaker of [5-III] said that he was trying to come up with Japanese words for ‘recommendation letter’ or ‘deadline’. This uncertainty may have been the cause of his hesitation and several false starts. Another non-native example is shown in [5-IV].

[5-IV]  \( X = \text{NNM5 playing the role of the student} \)
\( Y = \text{the researcher, playing the role of the professor} \)

X: Ano, sensee, sumimasen.
   ‘Well, teacher, excuse me.’

Y: Hai.
   ‘Yes.’

X: Ano, kinoo Tsukuba-daigaku no tegami o sensee sense ga [sic] kaite
   moratta n desu kedo..
   ‘.. um, yesterday, [I] received [your] writing of a (recommendation) letter
   to Tsukuba University, but ..’

Y: Hai hai.
   ‘Yes. Yes.’

X: Ano, deddorain wa asita made desu.
   ‘Um, the deadline will be tomorrow.’

Y: Hai?
   ‘Yes?’

X: Anoo huakkusu-site kudasaimasen ka?
   ‘Um, won’t [you] fax [it] (for me)?’

Y: A, asita made na n desu ka?
   ‘Oh, (is it that) [it] will be by tomorrow?’

X: Hai.
   ‘Yes.’

25 In Jorden with Noda (1988:18), its use is explained as signalling “a particularly meaningful part of a conversation.”
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Y: Aa, soo desu ka. Ji desu yo. Zyaa, huakkusu-simasu. Hai, wakarimasita. 'Oh, is that so? [That] will be fine. Then, [I] will fax [it]. Yes, [I]’ll do that. (lit. I’ve understood.)' 

A significant difference is that while the majority of the native participants used some form of mitigating expression right before their focal requests, the non-natives did not, as we have just seen in [5-III] and [5-IV]. While it is possible for the non-native participants to get their intentions across without those mitigating expressions, one cannot deny the feeling of abruptness this lack creates. When we discussed the request sequences of the native participants, we observed that those sequences ended with a word of thanks or a general request, such as *Onegai simasu*. 

In a similar fashion, fourteen of eighteen non-native participants put a clear-cut coda at the end of their sequences. It is interesting that six of them predicated these closures in the perfective, that is, they used *Arigatoo gozaimasita*. ‘Thank you (in perfective)’ rather than *Arigatoo gozaimasu*. ‘Thank you (in imperfective)’, in striking contrast to the native’s imperfective predication of the same phrase. Since the action they have requested has not yet been performed, their expression of thanks should be in the imperfective, *Arigatoo gozaimasu*. On the other hand, non-native participants seem to perceive the whole process from the perspective of their request being accepted. Once their request is accepted, they consider the favor granted and finished. It is an interesting difference between the two groups, and certainly one that warrants careful and repeated pedagogical attention for the learners.
For this Formal: less face-threatening task (Task 5), the verbal nuclei used in the focal requests by both groups were rather similar. As for the verbs of giving and receiving in those focal requests, there are several differences. Native participants expressed their focal requests using many different forms of receiving verbs, while non-natives unanimously used kudasaimasen ka? ‘Would you do ~ (for me)? (lit. ‘give me/mine the action of ~’). As for the structure of the request sequence, both groups shared a similar pattern that consisted of the following three moves: (1) topic introduction, (2) mention of the deadline, and (3) request that the recommendation letter be faxed. However, native participants were versatile in the use of apologies and mitigating expressions to mitigate the potential face-threatening effect. They presented the focal requests with varieties of mitigating expressions in their request sequences. Non-natives were quite limited in this capacity.

3.4.6 Formal: more face-threatening task (Task 6)

In this task, participants were asked to solve the following problem:

“Today you lent computer software to your Japanese teacher/professor. It belongs to your older brother, but you thought he won’t need it for a while. But your older brother has just called to say he wants it back tomorrow morning.”

The relevant fact was “You have Japanese class/that professor’s class tomorrow from 8:30 am.” Each participant was asked to play the role of the student who lent his/her older brother’s software. The researcher played the role of the teacher.
First, we will examine what the participants requested, in the interests of accomplishing this task. Table 13 below presents the contents of focal requests, in the form of verbal gerunds variously governed by the higher predicates illustrated in the particular examples, that follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kaesite ... (13)</td>
<td>motte kite ... (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘return’</td>
<td>‘bring’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motte kite ... (2)</td>
<td>motte itte ... (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bring’</td>
<td>‘take’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watasite ... (1)</td>
<td>watasite ... (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hand [it] over’</td>
<td>‘hand [it] over’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modosite ... (1)</td>
<td>kasite ... (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘return’</td>
<td>‘lend’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tori ni ikitai. (1)</td>
<td>tori ni kite ... (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[I]’d like to go to get [it]’</td>
<td>‘come to get [it]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudasai. (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Give [me].’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onegai-simasu. (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I make a request of you.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faltered (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Verbal Nuclei Used in Focal Requests from Task 6

Among the native participants, thirteen out of eighteen used *kaesite* (the gerund ("-te form") of the verb *kaesu* ‘returning’). Besides that choice, there were gerunds of other verbs, such as *motte kite*... ‘bringing’, *tori ni itte* ... ‘going to pick up’, *watasite*... ‘handing over’, and *modosite*... ‘returning’. As for the non-
native participants, the verb *kaesu* 'return' had not been introduced to them and was not available. Six of them used *motte kite*... 'bringing'. Other choices were *motte itte...* 'taking', *kasite...* 'lending', *wasite...* 'handing over', *tori ni kite ...* 'coming to pick up', *Kudasai* 'give [me]', and a general request *Onegai-simasu* 'I make a request of you'. The most appropriate choice, *kaesite...* 'returning', was not available to the non-native participants, and many of them seemed to struggle a little to come up with an appropriate word. Although the choices *kudasai* and *Onegai-simasu* were not observed in the native participants' focal requests, the rest of the choices occurred in the language of the two groups.

Next, we will observe how the participants phrased their focal request. The native participants used a variety of predicates, each of which governed a gerund of one of the verbs mentioned in the last paragraph. Table 14 below shows the verbs of giving and receiving used in the focal requests by the both groups:

---

26 The verbal *iku* indicates the meaning of 'away from both the speaker and the addressee.' But in the case where the student is asking the teacher to bring the software to the classroom, this use of *motte itte* is not appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It is that) [I]d like to have [you] ...&quot; (3)</td>
<td>&quot;Wouldn't you give ...?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...itadakemasu desyoo ka.</td>
<td>...(mo) ii desu ka? (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'(I wonder) if [I] could not have [you] ...'</td>
<td>'Is it all right to ...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...moraemasen ka?</td>
<td>...kuremasen ka? (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Can't [I] have [you] ...?'</td>
<td>'Won't you give ...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...moraereba....</td>
<td>...(mo) ii desyoo ka. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'If [I] could have [you] ...'</td>
<td>'(I wonder) if it is all right to ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...kudasai.</td>
<td>... kudasaimasu ka? (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Please give...'</td>
<td>'Would [you] give ...?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...itadakemasen ka?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Couldn't [I] have [you] ...?'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...itadakenai desyoo ka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'(I wonder) if [I] could not have [you]...'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...itadakereba to omotte...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'[I] thought [I] might be able to have [you] ...,'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...itadakero to arigatai /sugoku tasukaru (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'[I] would be grateful/really saved if [I] could have [you] ...'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...itadaku koto, dekuru desyoo ka. (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'(I wonder) if it is possible to have [you] ...'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Verbs of Giving and Receiving Used in Focal Requests from Task 6

The native participants used a variety of predicates as follows:

(6-1) .. itadakitai no/n desu
receive↓-DES Nom Cop-DIS
'(It is that) [I]d like to have [you] ...'

(6-2) .. itadakemasu desyoo ka?
receive↓-POT-DIS-NEG Cop-DIS-TENT Q
'(I wonder) if [I] could not have [you] ...'
(6-3) .. moraemasen ka?
    receive-POT-DIS-NEG Q
    ‘Can’t [I] have [you] ..?’

(6-4) .. moraereba...
    receive-POT-PROV
    ‘If [I] could have [you] ..’

(6-5) .. kudasai.
    give
    ‘Please give [me] (the action of) ..’

(6-6) .. itadakemasen ka?
    receive-DIS-NEG Q
    ‘Could’t [I] have [you] ..?’

(6-7) .. itadakenai desyoo ka.
    receive-POT-NEG Cop-DIS-TENT Q
    ‘(I wonder) if it is possible to have [you] ..’

(6-8) .. itadakereba to omotte
    able to receive-POT-PROV Quote think
    ‘Thinking [I] might be able to have [you] ..’

(6-9) .. itadakero to arigai/sugoku tasukaru
    receive-POT Quote grateful extremely rescued
    ‘[I] would be grateful/really saved if [I] could have [you] ..’

(6-10) .. (itadaku koto, dekiri desyoo ka.
    receive-POT thing be able Cop-DIS-TENT Q
    ‘(I wonder) if it is possible to have [you] ..’

The non-native participants’ choices were again limited in number:

(6-11) .. kudasaimasen ka?
    give-DIS-NEG Q
    ‘Won’t [you] give (the action of) ..?’

(6-12) .. (mo)\(^{27}\) ii desu ka?
    too good Cop-DIS Q
    ‘Is it all right to (do) ..?’

\(^{27}\) The pattern /gerund X + ii/ means ‘it will be all right for X to have been actualized’. ‘The use of mo emphasizes the fact that the option mentioned is not the only possibility. It is therefore softer and more polite.’ (Jorden with Noda, part 2, 1988:246)
(6-13) kuremasen ka?
give-DIS-NEG Q
‘Won’t [you] give (the action of) ..?’

(6-14) (mo) ii desyoo ka?
too good Cop-DIS-TENT Q
‘(I wonder) if [it] is all right to ..’

(6-15) kudasaimasu ka?
give†-DIS Q
‘Would [you] give ..?’

Eight out of eighteen non-native participants used the form in (6-11). As in the
previous role-play data for formal: less face-threatening task (Task 5), we see the
same sharp contrast between the native and non-native participants in the
manner in which focal requests are performed. Sixteen of the native participants
used a ‘receive’ verb (morau or itadaku †), while eleven of the non-natives used a
‘give’ verb (kureru or kudasaru †). Furthermore, expressions (6-12) and (6-14)
above were not observed in the native participants’ data. In the recall protocol
interview, four of the non-native participants said that they were concerned
about how to say ‘return something’ in Japanese, as follows:

- “I was thinking about ‘returning’. I wasn’t quite sure of the form for using
  ‘returning’ and in order to do it in a way that was still polite to a sensee,”
  (NNM1)

- “I always get confused of kasu and kariru. I always have to remember which
  one it is by remembering which one I say to my friends 5-doru kasite kudasai.
28 So I remember it’s kasite is to lend. But that probably.. I don’t know. You
  probably can’t use that for a return. I was asking you to return it to me kasite
  probably sounds strange?” (NNM6)

- “I just momentarily forgot how to ask um ‘to bring it’.” (NNM8)

28 ‘Please lend me five dollars.’
• “I wasn’t sure if I wanted to have the tea [??] I wasn’t sure [??] want you…to say, ah or how I wanted to word it like ‘could you please give it back to me?’ or ‘I would like to be receiving it from you’. Sometimes I get confused as to which one I should use or which one is better. Um, and it’s usually determined by which particle I throw out first, ‘cuz if I throw out ni first, I’m gonna use kudasaimasen. I throw out ga, it’s gonna be moritai pattern, well for that it will be ni itadakimasen ka. That would be that that that structure, but ah, so, I’m still working on those.” (NNM16)

There were two others, who were concerned about the use of kinship terms (which one of them referred to as “family names”).

• “I was a little nervous. Where you use ani or oniisan, because of its relationship to me ah, so, I ended up messing up there.” (NNM7)

• “I still think one of my biggest weaknesses is using family names, I guess I’m still confused on ani and aine.”

From these comments, we see that yet again the non-native participants are concerned with language itself.

Next, we will examine how participants structured their request sequences. The most common request sequence among the native participants was as follows:

(6-a) topic introduction
(6-b) disclosing the ownership of the software
(6-c) explanation of the reason for getting the software back
(6-d) expressing a desire to get the software back

Eight out of eighteen native participants had a request sequence consisting of these four moves. There were four others whose sequences did not have the second move (6-b). All others had the above first three moves in that order, and some of them added other moves, such as:
(6-e) checking on the addressee’s schedule

(6-f) checking on the availability of the software

(6-g) assuring the addressee that she can borrow the software again

The non-natives’ data showed a sequence pattern that was very similar to that of the natives. The most common sequence, consisting of the four moves cited above, was shared by eight of non-native participants. Except for one individual, all the participants started the sequence with a topic introduction.

In this Formal: more face-threatening task (Task 6), for the contents of the focal request, non-native participants did not have access to the verb kaesu ‘return (something),’ the action most commonly referred to by the native participants. However, except for this choice, there were not too many differences between the specific actions that two groups requested. The greatest difference was observed in the manner in which they made their requests. As we observed in the other tasks, the native participants displayed control of a variety of ways to make their focal requests, mainly by means of a ‘receiving’ verb. The non-natives, by comparison, were rather limited in the range of expressions used for the focal requests. As for the structure of the request sequence, both groups showed similar patterns.

3.5 Conclusion

In this section we examined request sequences performed by native and non-native participants. This examination was made in terms of: (1) the verbal nuclei used in the focal requests, (2) the verbs of giving and receiving used in the
focal requests, and (3) structures of the request sequences. The verbal nuclei of focal requests varied. For Tasks 1, 3 and 5, both groups chose similar actions, but for Tasks 2, 4, and 6, their choices were rather different, mainly owing to the lack of availability of appropriate lexical items on the part of the non-native participants. As for the verbs of giving and receiving used in the focal requests, native participants used morau/itadaku 'receive'/"id.↑ as well as kureru/kudasaru 'give to me & mine'/"id.↓ in their focal requests in five out of six tasks. Non-native participants, on the other hand, showed a strong tendency to use kureru/kudasaru. For Task 1 (Business: less face-threatening task), Task 3 (Casual: less face-threatening task) and Task 4 (Casual: more face-threatening task), the researcher expected the use of direct style. Native participants indeed used direct style here, as expected, but the number of non-natives who used direct style was rather limited (two for Task 1, five each for Task 3 and 4). In the structures of the request sequences, a common difference was observed, which was the use of apologies and mitigating expressions. Native participants used these frequently, while non-natives’ use of them was limited.
CHAPTER 4

NATURALLY OCCURRING NATIVE REQUEST SEQUENCES

4.1 Request sequences between students

In the previous section, I compared request sequences produced by native and non-native speakers of Japanese. Because they were all prompted data, we now take a look at naturally occurring request sequences, for the purpose of comparison. Request sequences produced by native speakers in two settings, University and business have been collected. The first settings was an American university where the researcher is affiliated. Telephone conversations of the author\(^1\) with other students were recorded using a telephone pick-up device in Columbus, Ohio in 1996. Recordings of five ninety-minute tapes and four sixty-minute tapes were made. Thirteen request sequences were identified and transcribed. From this corpus, four types of interaction in which speakers use different request-making strategies will be analyzed in this section.

\(^1\) Due to the difficulty of finding someone who does not mind his/her private telephone being constantly tapped, the researcher's conversation had been recorded. Although there is a concern that the researcher is not naive on the subject, one advantage of such recording setting is that the researcher knows information about the person at the other end of the line.
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4.1.1 Referring to conditions

In the following request sequence, the speaker wants to obtain a piece of information. She does not directly ask for it, but taps into a related condition, which she knows to obtain, and which makes it possible for the addressee to meet her need. In (1), Okutsu is a graduate student who is assisting at a small Japanese student meeting off campus. Terada is an undergraduate student who knows Kojima, another student, better than Okutsu does.

(1) 1Okutsu: Ianoo! Kojima-san wa koreru no ka na?
    'Um, [I] wonder if Ms. Kojima will be able to come.'

2Terada: Kojima-san mo, Ianoo! Sasottara kuru to omoimasu yo.
    '[I] think [she] will come, uh, if [we] invite [her].'

3O: A, honto ni?
    'Really?'

4T: Moo, honto ni, iroiro, ima mo sakkii Kojima-san to hanasite owatta
toki sugu ni Yuko-san ni denwa sita n desu.
    '[She] really has various (problems), and [I] just now finished talking
    with her. Fact is, [I] called you right after that.'

5O: A:. !Anoi! denwa-bangoo, wakaru?: Mosi are dattara denwa si,
sasotte miyoo ka naa?
    'Oh. Er, do [you] know her phone number? If it's all right, [I]
wonder if I should call and invite [her].'

6T: Soo desu ne. Tyotto sita ni itte, sita ni itte ii desu ka?
    'That should be all right. Is it all right if [I] go down[stairs]?'

    'Yes. [I] am sorry (to have bothered you).'

In turn 1, Okutsu wonders if Kojima will be able to come to the upcoming meeting. She asks Terada, in turn 5, if she knows Kojima's telephone number. In the same turn, she also indicates the possibility of inviting Kojima. Learning that

---

2 Such parts will be in boldface.

3 Except for myself, pseudonyms are used for all the names of individuals and companies in
Okutsu is interested in inviting Kojima and that she does not have her telephone number, Terada interprets Okutsu's utterance in turn 5 as a request, and she indicates that she will go down stairs to get the phone number. In this sequence, Okutsu desired to obtain Kojima's phone number from Terada. One of the conditions that enables this action is that Terada has Kojima's phone number. Okutsu taps into this condition without using any focused request expression, and she obtains the information she desired. From her utterance and the context in which it was made, Terada understood what action was required of her.

In the prompted data, all the tasks required actions from the addressees, but not information. All the focal requests in the prompted data produced by native speakers refer to the actions they desire to bring about, and not the conditions that made those actions possible. However, participant imagined the conditions ("world") which were all a little different. They started out from those conditions as they saw them, making linguistic choices on the basis of them. So, the conditions existed, even though they were not specifically referred to. What they did may be somewhere between strictly following the Task instructions (with conservative interpretations) and what it is described here.

4.1.2 Requests expressed as desires or needs

In the following example, the request-maker expresses her request by stating her desire for an action to be performed by the addressee. In (2), Okutsu and Sato are teaching Japanese class together. Sato is senior to Okutsu in
graduate school, but she usually uses distal style speech, because Okutsu is a principal instructor in the teaching situation.

(2) 1Okutsu: Suimasen, nan da ka, maiban no yoo ni ..
    'Sorry, almost like every night ..'

2Sato: Iie.
    'No.'

3O: .. odenwa-site.
    '.. for calling [you].'

4S: Iie.
    'No, that's okay.'

5O: | Ano nee | asita na n desu kedo ..
    'Um, it's about tomorrow, but ..'

6S: Hai.
    'Yes.'

7O: Moo hitotu onegai sitai koto ga aru n da wa.
    '[I] have one more thing [I] want to ask of you.'

8S: Hai. (laugh)
    'Yes.'

9O: | Ano nee |
    'Um,'

10S: Ee.
    'Yes.'

11O: Kono gakki no ..
    'This term, ..'

12S: Hai.
    'Yes.'

13O: .. itiban owari no koro, soo da naa, Zi-ssyuume gurai ni naru naru
    naru to omou n da kede ..
    '.. at the end of this term, let's see, [I] think it will be around tenth
    week, but ..'

14S: Hai.
    'Yes.'

15O: .. bukku tuu no hoo ni hairssoo na n desu yo.
    '.. it appears that [we]'ll start using book II.'

16S: Hai.
    'Yes.'
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170: Sore de, hon o tyuumon sinakutya ikenai n da kedo..
'So, [we] need to place an order for the textbooks, but ..'

180: Hai.
'Yes.'

190: .. I anoo! moo kono ato toranai hito tte iu no mo takusan iru
desyyoo.
'.. um, there are probably many who will not take Japanese beyond
this class.'

200: Hai.
'Yes.'

210: Dakara, I anoo! kono ato tuzukeru ka doo ka tte iu koto o kakunin-
site moraitai n desu.
'So, um, [I] would like [you] to confirm how many people will
continue after this class.'

220: Hai, wakarimasita.
'Okay, [I]'ll do that.' (lit. 'I've understood.')

230: Suimasen ga, ...
'I am sorry [for the trouble], but ..'

240: Hai. De, zya, tuzukeru hito no ninzuu dake kiitokeba ii desu ka?
'Okay. Then, is it all right to just ask how many people are
continuing?'

250: Haihai.
'Yes.'

260: Wakarimasita.
'[I've] got it.'

In turns 1 and 3, Okutsu apologizes for her frequent calls. She introduces her
topic in turns 5 and 7, and tells Sato that she has a favor to ask. Following that,
Okutsu presents background information in turns 11, 13, 15, and 17, before she
describes her request. By this point, Sato understands that Okutsu has a request
to make and that she needs to place an order for new Japanese textbooks by the
end of the current quarter. When Okutsu expresses her desire in turn 21 to have
the number of continuing students confirmed, Sato immediately interprets it as a
request to her. Of course, the stage has been set for this: Onegai sitai koto ga aru
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'have a favor to ask' in turn 7 and the verb *morau* ‘receive’ in *kakunin site moraitai* ‘(lit. I) want to receive the action of having (the number) confirmed’ in turn 21 suggest very clearly that the agent of the requested action will be Sato. In this sequence, instead of referring to the addressee’s action, as in a question like *Kakunin-site kuremasu ka?* ‘Will you confirm (the number) for me? (lit. Will you give me (the action of) confirming (the number)?’ Okutsu expresses it as a desire, or need, that she has in regard to the work they are doing together.

In the prompted data, in all the tasks except for Task 1, we observed three or four cases where such indirect requests were made. The gerund-attached verbs *moraitai/iitadakitai* ‘want to receive’ /’id.↓’ and adjectival *hosii* ‘is desired’ were used.

4.1.3 Requests expressed as self-directed inquiry

In the interactions between close friends and with acquaintances, some requests are expressed as self-directed inquiry with sentence endings *ka na(a)/ka sira*, as already observed in records from Tasks 3 and 4. The following three examples from live interaction illustrate this same strategy.

In (3), an undergraduate student, Kojima, is calling Okutsu, in the latter’s capacity as one of those assisting at a Japanese student meeting off campus. Because Kojima knows Okutsu within this framework, and is younger than she, she uses distal style predicates throughout the conversation. They had already talked about the meeting and Kojima showed her interest in going. They had decided that Okutsu would pick her up at home at three forty-five. Because
Kojima changed her mind and decided to come to campus, she calls Okutsu,
wanting to change the place to meet.

(3) 1Kojima: Yuuko-san desu ka?
    'Is this Yuko?'

2Okutsu: Hai, mosimosi.
    'Yes. Hello?'

3K: A, Kozima desu.
   'This is Kojima.'

4O: Hai.
   'Yes.'

5K: lanoo, watasi lanoo ima kara lanoo Buraun Hooru ni ikoo to omotte n desu yo.
   'Well, I'm thinking about going to Brown Hall from now.'

6O: Hai hai.
   'Yes.'

7K: De, san-zi yonzyuugo-hun desita yo nee.
   'The (pick-up) time was three forty-five, wasn’t it?'

8K: Sco soo soo.
   'Right, right, right.'

9K: De, lanoo dekkagakkoo de aemasen ka ne, gakkoo de pikku appusite itadakeru no ga ii nna to omotte ...
   'Is it possible to see [you] somewhere on campus? [I] thought the possibility of being picked-up (lit. receiving (the action of) being picked up) on campus would be nice.'

10O: Haa, haa haa.
   'Oh, I see.'

11K: Doo se Buraun Hooru iku n da si ..
   '[I]‘m going to Brown Hall anyway, so ..'

   'In that case, hmm, how should [we] do this .. [I] wonder if [you] know East Tower. [I] wonder if it is too much to ask [you] to walk to East Tower.'

13K: .. Issuto Tawaa desu ka, tyotto hanarete masu yo nee.
   '.. East Tower? It's a little far, isn’t it?'
14O: Ano nee, sore dattara; tosyokan, mein raiburarii no tokoro made kite moraeru ka naa?
‘Well, then, I wonder if [you] could come (lit. [I] could receive (the action of your) coming) to the Main Library.’

15K: A, mein raiburarii made ikimasu yo, zyaa.
‘Okay, then [I] will come to the Main Library.’

In turn 5, Kojima tells Okutsu that she is coming to campus. She confirms their meeting time by referring to it in turn 7. Then, in turn 9, she inquires into the possibility of meeting Okutsu somewhere on campus. She also expresses her desire to be picked up on campus. However, she does this in a somewhat indirect way, saying Gakkoo de pikku appu-site itadakeru no ga ii naa to omotte .. ‘I thought the possibility of being picked-up (lit. receiving (the action of) being picked up) on campus would be nice ..’ Saying, for example, Gakkoo de pikku-appu site moraitai n desu kedo .. ‘I would like to be picked up (lit. receive (the action of) being picked up) on campus, but (would that be ok, etc.) ..’ would have been more direct. She speaks with reserve and waits for her addressee’s reaction.

In response to this, Okutsu asks her if she knows East Tower, the building where Okutsu lives, and raises the possibility of Kojima coming there to meet her. It is obvious that this question is addressed to Kojima, but it, also, takes the form of a self-addressed ‘I wonder’ question, with ka naa at the end of the sentence. Jorden with Noda (1990:29) explain the form ka naa as a marker of “deliberation addressed to oneself, requiring no particular answer from anyone within hearing.” In this sense, ka naa makes the question indirect and non-committal. Receiving the unwilling answer from Kojima in line 13, Okutsu proposes the alternative idea of meeting at the Main Library in turn 14. This
alternative idea is also presented in non-committal question form: *Mein raiburarii no tokoro made kite moraeru ka naa?* ‘I wonder if [you] could come (lit. [I] could receive (the action of your) coming) to the main library.’ These frequent uses of non-committal ‘I wonder if ~ is possible’ questions may reflect the relationship between Okutsu and Kojima. Kojima is much younger than Okutsu, and they do not know each other very well. Because they have not established a close relationship, they may be hesitant to use more direct ways of making requests.

Another example in which *ka naa* is used is shown in (4), below. In (4), Okutsu calls another graduate student, Kato, to ask about the means of transportation for the following day’s event. Okutsu, Kato, and other female graduate students have decided to go to an outlet mall that is about one hour’s drive away on the interstate. Originally, Okutsu was supposed to do the driving, in her car. However, she wants to change that arrangement.

(4) 1Okutsu: Mosimosi?
     ‘Hello?’

2Kato: Mosimosi.
     ‘Hello?’

3O: A, Okutsu desu.
     ‘This is Okutsu.’

4K: A, konban wa.
     ‘Good evening.’

5O: Osoku ni suimasen.
     ‘Sorry for calling late.’

6K: Ieie.
    ‘That’s okay.’

7O: |Ano saa | asita no koto na n da kedo ne ..
    ‘Um actually, it’s about tomorrow, but ..’

8K: N.
    ‘Yeah.’
9O: .. | anoo | Kato-san no kuruma de itte mo ii ka naa. Unten-site moratte mo ii?
    '.. um, [I] wonder if it is all right to go by your car. Is it okay for [you] to drive?'

10K: Tyotto matte ne.
    'Hold on a second.'

    (pause)

11O: N.
    'Yeah.'

12K: Daizyobu da to omou.
    '[I] think that should be okay.'

13O: A, honto ni. Moosiwake nai. Mosi | anoo | .. dame dattara ii n da kedo..
    'Really. (I am) extremely sorry. If um, it is inconvenient, that is okay, but, ..'

14K: N.
    'Yeah.

15O: Zitu wa | anoo | .. watasi, kuruma no hoken o saa, kaeta no nee.
    'Actually, [I] changed my car insurance.'

16K: N.
    'Uh huh.'

17O: Mae ano are-site ta tokoro to. Sore de ima nan te iu no toranzitto
    piriido na no ne.
    'It is, what's it called? - transit period, is what it is, right?'

18K: N.
    'Uh huh.'

19O: De, moo keeyaku wa | anoo | sensyuu no kinyoobi ni site ru kara,
    tetuzuki-zyoo nani mo mondai nai to omeu n da kedo, nan te iu no,
    soo iu syoosyo toka nani ka soo iu mono o zenzen moratte nai no yo.
    'The contract itself was made last Friday, so [I] think there shouldn't be any problem, but.. What's it called?--[I] haven't received any document at all.'

20K: N.
    'Uh huh.'

21O: De, mosi ziko ga atte, mosi man ga iti, nani ka atta toki ni sono
    tantoo no hito wa sono hito ni denwa o kakete kurereba ii tte iu
    huu ni itte ru n da kedo, zikan toka ga zikan ga zikan dattari sitara,
    zibun ga sono hoken o motte ru tte iu syoomee ni naru mono ga
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temoto ni nani mo nai kara, dakara komaru n zya nai ka na to omotte iyotto nan ka lanoo! .. sinpai da naa to omotta no ne.

'So, if accident occurs, if something happens, the person in charge said that [I] can just call him. But, if (something happens) at odd hours, [I] thought [I] might be in trouble, since [I] don't have anything to prove that [I] have that insurance. So, [I] was a little concerned.'

22K: N, lanoo! ii yo.
'Uh huh, um, sure, that's okay.'

After the formulaic greeting exchanges of turns 1 to 4, Okutsu apologizes for her call at a late hour in turn 5. Although Okutsu and Kato are friends and usually use direct style speech, Okutsu uses distal style in her apology, a typical adjustment on predicates that acknowledge impositions. In turn 7, Okutsu introduces her topic, using ~ no koto na n da kedo .. '(this is) regarding ~ ..'

Following this, she presents her request in the form of soliciting permission with, again, the 'I wonder if ..' ka naa at the end, as in Kato-san no kuruma de itte mo ii ka naa. '[I] wonder if it is okay to go by your car'. Kato checks with her husband about the use of their car and consents in turn 12. In turn 13, Okutsu apologizes in a formal way, and adds that she can still drive, if it is inconvenient for Kato. These actions of Okutsu’s in turn 13 may have been aimed at reducing the face-threatening potential vis-à-vis Kato. In turn 15, Zitu wa ‘actually’ marks the beginning of Okutsu’s explanation of why she has to ask Kato to drive. Her explanation continues in turns 17, 19 and 21. Okutsu chose to put this explanation after her request. Because the event is scheduled on the following day and Okutsu urgently needed an alternative driver, and because the reason was a little complicated, she constructed the request sequence in this order.
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So far, in this section, two request sequences have been analyzed. In both, a focal request was indirectly phrased in the language of a self-directed inquiry using *ka na(a)*. In the following sequence, the gentle-style equivalent of *ka na(a)*, *ka sira*, is used. In (5), Okutsu and Egami are two instructors teaching a Japanese course together. In this course, several characters (*kanzi*) are assigned as homework for each reading class. Students are supposed to come to class having studied and practiced reading and/or writing these characters on their own. Egami found that several characters had, by mistake, not been assigned for the following day's reading class. She calls Okutsu, who will be teaching the following day, and informs her about this mistake.

(5) 1Okutsu: Hai. *Ieeto* tyoito matte ne. *Ieeto* haihai, san-byaku nizyuu n. san-byaku nizyuu nana.
   'Yes. Um, hold on a second. Well, yes, three hundred twenty..' three hundred twenty seven.'

   2Egami: N. Soko kara san-byaku sanzyuu san made tyoodo nukete te
   'M hm. From that number to three thirty three, (they) are all missing.'

   3O: N.
   'M hm.'

   4E: Sore de, honto ni moosiwake nai n da kedo, saisyo no go-hun gurai
de, sono, hitotoori sorezore no kanzi ga haita yoo na reebun o pa tto
misete..
   'So, [I] am extremely sorry, but using first five minutes or so, briefly
show example sentences that contain each one of the characters, and
'..

   5O: N.
   'M hm.'

   6E: .. sore de, I anoo ma, kuwasii koto wa dekinai to omou n da kedo ..
*toriaezu kanzi dake o osaeru tte iu huu ni site moratte mo ii ka sira?*
'.. then, well, [I] don't think that [you] can go into details, but.. [I]
 wonder if [you] could at least present those characters.'
70: Hai hai, wakarimasita.
  ‘Yes yes. [I]’ll take care of it.’ (lit. ‘I’ve understood.’)

8E: Onegai-simasu.
  ‘If [you] would.’ (lit. ‘I make a request of you.’)

From turns 1 to 3, Egami is telling Okatsu the numbers⁴ of missing characters. In
turns 4 and 6, Egami raises the possibility of introducing these characters in the
following day’s class. It is extra work for Okatsu, because she must teach what is
already supposed to be done by the students. Knowing this situation, Egami is
very careful in asking this favor. In turn 4, she apologizes in a humble way,
using .. honto ni moosiwake nai .. ‘.. there is really no excuse ..’ (= ‘(I am truly
sorry’), although Egami and Okatsu are friends. She also suggests that Okatsu
keep the amount of extra work to a minimum, by saying go-hun gurai de ‘for
about five minutes’, at the beginning of class, so as to allow Okatsu’s lesson plan
to proceed uninterrupted after that. Kanzi dake o osaeru ‘covering only the kanji
themselves’ in turn 6 may be another suggestion for lessening Okatsu’s extra
work. In these ways, Egami tries to make Okatsu’s extra work appear as small
as possible, in an attempt at mitigating the face-threatening effect on Okatsu
constituted by this last-minute request to include extra work. The indirect
request expression, ~ site moratte mo ii ka sira? ‘I wonder if it is all right to have
you do ~. (lit. I wonder if it is all right (for me) to receive (the action of your)
doing ~’ is much gentler expression than a straightforward request expression
like ~site kureru? ’ Would you do it? (lit. Would [you] give (me) (the action of)
doing ~?’.

⁴ Each kanzi is numbered for reference.
In sum, in the three request sequences of this section, requests are expressed with *ka nua* or *ka sira* at the end, which have long functioned as markers of self-directed inquiry. One interaction was between two people who have not established a very close relationship. The other two interactions were between friends, but the requests were for action that would require some extra effort on the part of the addressee. The "self-directed" sound of the form .. *ka na(a)* appears to provide a confrontational way to suggest what it is one would like to request. Expressing requests as self-directed inquiries may be motivated by the request-maker’s desire to avoid confrontations and possible face-threats to their addressees.

This strategy was common in the prompted natives’ data, too, especially in tasks that assume casual relationship. In Task 3 (Casual: less face-threatening task), there were six examples that used .. *ka na(a)* at the end and in Task 4 (Casual: more face-threatening task), there were nine such cases. Six examples with *ka na(a)* were observed in Task 1 (Business: less face-threatening task).

### 4.1.4 The use of conditionals

Conditionals are used for the purpose of face-threat mitigation as in the following example. In (6), the interactants are Nakajima, a teaching assistant and Okutsu, an instructor, who teach a Japanese course together. Nakajima usually uses distal style speech to Okutsu. She is currently looking for a job, and had asked Okutsu to write a recommendation letter.
(6) Nakajima: Nakajima desu kedo...
   'This is Nakajima, but ..'

2Okutsu: Aa, konban wa!
   'Oh! Good evening.'

3N: Konban wa. Suimasen. Tanoo! Ieeto! Kyoo Okutsu-san no meeru
    bokkusu no hoo ni..
   'Good evening. Excuse me. Um, let's see, today, in your mailbox, ..'

4O: Haihai.
   'Yesyes.' (= 'I'm attending carefully..fromString)

5N: .. anoi suisen-zyoo no huutoo o irete okimasita no de..
    'um, I put an envelope for the recommendation letter, so..

6O: Hai, wakarimasita. Kyoo gakkoo ni gogo tanoo! Gozen-tyuu tyoko tto
    deta dake datta n de, mite nain da kedo,..
    'Okay, I've understand. Since I only dropped by the department
    briefly in the morning I haven't seen it, but ..'

7N: A! lie, moo..
    'Oh! No, already ..'

8O: .. narubeku..
    '.. as soon as possible, ..'

9N: .. kyoo no juugata..
    '.. this evening ..'

10O: A, honto ni.
    'Really.'

11N: .. girigiri de..
    '.. I barely [got it in your mailbox].'

12O: A, honto. Zya, narubeku hayaku..
    'Really. Then, as soon as possible ..'

13N: Sumimasen ga..
    '(I am) sorry, but ..'

14A: Simekiri toka wa aru no ka sira.
    '[I] wonder if there is a deadline or such.'

15N: Ieeto! Ikutu ka! Tanoo! Ieeto! Desu nee! Simekiri: Osoi no mo aru n
    desu kedo..
    'Let's see, some, um, there are some whose deadlines come later, but ..'

16O: N.
    'Yeah.'
17N: Zitu wa lanoo | M syuuriitu daigaku toka ..
   ‘Actually, um, universities such as M State University, ..’

18O: N.
   ‘Yeah.’

19N: .. lanoo | moo senkoo ni haitte kita tokoro toka atte ..
   ‘.. there are some that have already started the selection process ..’

20O: Aa, honto ni.
   ‘Oh, really.’

21N: (.. toka mo atte ..)5
   ‘.. there are such.’

22O: Hai.
   ‘Yes.’

23N: lanoo, memo ni mo lanoo okaki sita n desu kedo, lanoo mosi kanoo desitara, ano leeto okutte itadaku mae ni huakkusu o okutte itadaketara arigatai n desu kedo ..
   ‘Um, [I] wrote this, um, in the memo, but, um, if it is possible, [I]’d appreciate it, um, er.. if [you] could fax it before sending it, but ..’

24O: A, M-daigaku no hoo ni.
   ‘Oh, (you mean) to M University?’

25N: Ee.
   ‘Yes.’

26O: Hai, wakarimasita.
   ‘Okay, [I]’ll take care of it.’ (lit. ‘I’ve understood.’)

Following the exchange of greetings, Nakajima informs Okutsu, in turn 3, that she has put an envelope for the recommendation letter in the latter’s office mailbox. In turn 6, Okutsu tells Nakajima that she has not seen it, because she was at the office only briefly in the morning that day. Using turns 7, 9 and 11, Nakajima puts the blame on herself for Okutsu’s not yet seeing the envelope, explaining that she just managed to put it there late in the afternoon. Here, Nakajima makes sure to clarify that Okutsu is not at fault. At the same time, Okutsu attempts to tell her, in turns 8 and 12, that she will write the letter ‘as
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soon as possible’. In response to this, Nakajima expresses thanks in turn 13. In turn 14, Okutsu checks on whether there is a deadline for the recommendation letter. Lines 15, 17 and 19 constitute Nakajima’s answer about the deadline, and the information revealed here leads to Nakajima’s more straightforward request in turn 23. In turn 23, Nakajima tells Okutsu that it is preferable to have the recommendation letter faxed to M State University. Because of the news, revealed in turn 19, about some universities having already started the selection process, the focal request in turn 23 is made more understandable. Nakajima mitigates the face-threatening effect caused by her favor by adding *mossi kanoo desitara* ‘if it is possible’, using the distal form of the copula (*desitara*), which is marked in such non-sentence-final position. Her request is also expressed using a conditional *okuite itadaketara arigatai* ‘(I’d be) obliged, if (I) could receive (the action of your) sending’. Asking a superior to write a recommendation letter and then to fax it can be face-threatening. Nakajima mitigates this possible face-threat by using a conditional expression and a very formulaic way of asking ~*site itadaketara arigatai*. ‘(I’d be) obliged, if you could ~ (lit. if (I) could receive (the action of) ~).’

This strategy was observed in the prompted natives’ data. In Task 2 (Business: more face-threatening task), there were such examples as *yorosikattara* ‘if it is all right,’ *zikan ga arimasitara* ‘if [you] have time,’ and *tori ni iketara* ‘if [you] can go get [it].’ In Task 5 (Formal: less face-threat task) also, there were three such examples.

5 Parentheses indicate overlapping utterance.
In this section, we have observed strategies used in naturally occurring request sequences between natives residing in a U.S. academic setting. Sometimes, a request-maker refers to conditions that make the desired action possible, instead of directly asking for the desired action. A speaker's mentioning a desired or needed action is thus a strategy used somewhat regularly in request making. Between two people who do not have that close a relationship, ka na(a), with its ring of self-addressed inquiry, is also used to direct the addressee toward an understanding of what the speaker needs or would like the addressee to do. As we saw in (4) and (5), even between people in close relationships, ka na(a)/ka sira can be used when the desired action is face-threatening. Conditionals are used for the purpose of mitigating the possible face-threatening effect.

4.2 Request sequences in a corporate setting

The second type of naturally occurring data is request sequences occurring in telephone conversation in a corporate setting. Recording took place at a development company located in Tokyo, in 1997. With the help of two female employees at the company, their telephone conversations were recorded. Ten ninety-minute tapes were made. The data produced 104 request sequences. Those request sequences can be categorized into six types: (1) routine, (2) request from a superior position, (3) cooperation, (4) permission request, (5) negotiation, and (6) face-threatening request. In this section, request sequences from each type will be analyzed and their characteristics discussed.
4.2.1 Routine requests

In the category I have termed "routine requests," linguistically overt request expressions are not necessarily present. From previous experience, the addressee knows what action the speaker expects. Such examples are shown in (1) and (2):

(1) Kobayashi: Koowa Kaihatu de gozaimasu. ‘This is Koowa Kaihatu.’

Harada: Ee, Kamiyama-san. Harada desu. ‘Yes. Mr. Kamiyama. (This is) Harada.’

K: Omati-kudasai. ‘Hold on, please.’

At this company, telephone calls are made to the company’s general number. The rings of the incoming calls and calls made from inside the company are slightly different. All the female employees are secretaries, responsible for, among other things, receiving incoming calls and transferring them to the person requested. In this example, the president’s secretary Kobayashi took the call from Harada, who works for a different company. Because Harada frequently calls Koowa Kaihatu, he expects the receiver to recognize his voice. He simply indicates the name of the person to whom he wants to talk, Mr. Kamiyama, and then gives his own name. The secretary taking the call, Kobayashi, recognizes Harada’s voice and transfers the call to Kamiyama. In this interaction, no explicit request expressions are used. However, the action desired by Harada is achieved.

---

⁶ All names used in discussion in this chapter are pseudonym.
A similar example is shown in (2):

(2) X: Aa, sumimasen. Takara-Un'yu desu ga, kokusai-bin na n desu kedo..
   'Excuse me. This is Takara Shipping, but (it is) about oversea mail, but'

   Tanaka: A, ima ukagaimasu.
   '[I] will be there.'

   X: Saimase:n.
   'Excuse me.'

In (2), Tanaka, who works in the General Affairs Division receives a call from X of the oversea delivery service. X made this call from a telephone located at the reception desk of the company. When people come to this company for business, they use this telephone to contact the employees inside. Since this call is made directly to Tanaka's telephone, she knows the visitor wants to contact her personally. Hearing the name of the company and that his being there is about international mail, T understands that the action expected of her is to come to the reception desk and receive the mail from X. Because business concerning mail is one of her responsibilities, she knows how to respond, without being told who individual X is and why he is at the reception desk. (In fact, "Takara Un'yu" alone would probably suffice to get her to come to the reception desk.)

As observed in (1) and (2), when the same action happens repeatedly and has become established as a routine, and both parties involved thus know what action is expected, the desired action is understood and provided without overt request expressions and with a minimum of linguistic exchanges.

A routine is born out of repetition of the same action between a speaker and an addressee. Once the routine is established, however, the roles kind of
take on a life of their own. While it is individual speakers and addressees in whom the process is established and maintained, it need not be the same two people all the time. This type of interaction does not happen in role-plays where a speaker does not have previous contacts with her addressee, nor the roles have not been established. In the prompted data, there were no routine requests.

4.2.2 Requests from superior position

In the collected request sequences, there were several sequences in which people in the superior positions make requests to their subordinates. In their request expressions, the combination of a verbal gerund and a donatory verb kureru ‘give to me/mine’ or its distal form, kuremasu, was used most frequently. Several such examples are shown in (3), (4) and (5). In (3), the company president Imai makes a call to his secretary, who is in a separate room, and asks for a large envelope. He simply uses kuremasu ‘give me’ with a question marker ka? for his request.

(3) Imai: | Ano ne |
      | ‘Well,’ |
Kobayashi: Hai.
       | ‘Yes.’ |
I: Tyairoi oobuutoo, hitotu kuremasu ka?
   | ‘Will [you] give [me] a big brown envelope?’ |
K: Hai, wakarimasita.
   | ‘Yes, [I] will.’ (lit. ‘[I]’ve understood.’ |

In (4), Finance Department chief Asakawa is trying to locate the General Affairs Division chief, who is directly superior to Tanaka.
(4) Tanaka: Gaisyutaru
   ’[He] went out.’

Asakawa: Sareta. A, soo.
   ’[He] did. I see.’

T: Zyuuni-zi nizyuppun kara ..
   ’From twelve twenty.’

A: Ima, heya desu ka?
   ’Is [he] in his room?’

T: Sakihodo tyotto itta n desu kedo, irassyaranakatta n desu kedo ..
   ’[I] went to his room a short while ago, but [he] was not there, but ..’

A: Aa, soo desu ka. Zyaa ..
   ’Is that so? Then, ..’

T: .. modorimasitara, lanoo i ..
   ’.. when [he] comes back, um ..’

A: .. osite kureru? | Ano | .. zyuuni-zi nizyuppun..
   ’.. will you let me know? Um.. twelve twenty ..’

T: .. mae ni..
   ’.. before that time.’

A: .. mae ni motto mae, zyu-ppun ka zyuugo-hun mae ni
   modoraretara ..
   ’.. before that, way before, if [he] comes back ten or fifteen
   minutes before, ..’

T: Ee.
   ’All right.’

A: .. renraku-site kureru? Asakawa desu ga ..
   ’Will [you] let [me] know? This is Asakawa, but ..’

T: Hai, wakarimasita:..
   ’Yes, [I]’ll do that.’ (lit. ’[I]’ve understood.’)

Because the General Affairs Division chief is not visible from the desk of
Asakawa, the caller, he asks Tanaka to let him know when the chief returns to his
desk. Kureru, direct style equivalent of distal style kuremasu ’give to
me/mine/ours’ is used twice in Asakawa’s request.
In (5), Tanaka receives a call at the desk of another employee, Sasaki. Recognizing Tanaka’s voice, the caller, Wada, realizes that Sasaki has not returned to her desk, and requests that Tanaka ask Sasaki to call back when she returns.

(5) Tanaka: Hai, soomu-bu desu:. ‘Yes. This is the General Affairs Division.’

Wada: A! Wada desu kedo, Sasaki-san wa mada modotte kite nai ka na? ‘Oh. This is Wada, but [I] wonder if Ms. Sasaki has not returned yet.

T: Tyotto seki o hazusarete masu kedo, modorimasitara.. ‘[She] is away from her desk, but if [she] returns.’

W: | eeto | i:n: | boku ni denwa-suru yoo ni itte kuremasu ka? ‘Um, er.. will [you] tell her to call me?’

T: Hai, wakarimasita. ‘Yes. [I]’ll do that.’ (lit. ‘I’ve understood.’)

As illustrated in these examples, people in superior positions often use the combination /verbal gerund + kureru/kuremasu/. The choice whether to use direct style kureru or distal style kuremasu seems to depend on the individual. In the above examples, the superiors do not explain the reasons for their requests. This is partly because their requests are easily achieved and not face-threatening, or perhaps they feel that they need not explain their reasons because of their superior status. Their requests are to the point and brief.

In the prompted data, Task 1 (Business: less face-threatening task) represents this category, namely, requests from superior position. In that task, verbs operating over gerunds of other verbs in requests were not limited to kureru/kuremasu. Examples with Moraeru? (or humble itadakemasu↓ ka?) ‘Can [I] receive [it]?’ were observed.
4.2.3 Cooperative Clarification

With this category of request, I refer to those in which the requester does not make her request very explicit. She solicits the desired information by starting out a sentence and letting her addressee complete it, so that the overall impression is that the request-maker and the addressee are constructing the interaction in cooperation. In this process, the request-maker does not use focal request expressions. An example of such interaction is shown in (6). In (6), Tanaka calls the local City Hall concerning pension plans and the health insurance of retiring employees.

(6) 1X: Nenkin-gakari desu.
    ‘This is Pension Section.’
2Tanaka: A, sumimasen. Tyotto oukagai-sitai n desu keredo mo..
    ‘Excuse me. [I]’d like to make an inquiry, but ..’
3X: Hai.
    ‘Yes.’
4T: Kongetu-ippai de lanooru kaisya o taisyoku-suru mono ga orimasite ..
    ‘There are people who are retiring at the end of this month, and ..’
5X: Ee.
    ‘Yes.’
6T: .. ketc to o kenko hoken to nenkin no hoo o..
    ‘let’s see, company health insurance and pension ..’
7X: Ee.
    ‘Yes.’
8T: .. kokumin-kenkoo-hoken to kokumin-nenkin no hoo ni kirikaetai n desu kedo ..
    ‘.. (it is that) [I] want to change these to national health insurance and pension, but ..’
9X: Hai.
    ‘Yes.’
10T: Kaisya no hoo to site, lanooru nani ka ..
    ‘From company side, um, what ..’
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11X: Ee.
'Yes.'

12T: .. hituyoo na syorui toka ..
'.. such as necessary documents ..'

13X: lanoo \ taisyoku-syooomesyo ka ..
'Um, a proof of the retirement or ..'

14T: Taisyoku syooomesyo. Hai.
'A proof of retirement. Yes.'

15X: .. mata wa ..
'.. or ..'

16T: Hai.
'Yes.'

17X: ..kenkoo-hoken no sikaku no syoositu syooomesyo desu ne.
'.. a proof of losing the qualification for company health insurance.'

18T: A, leeto: l sore wa kenkoo-hoken to koosee-renkin ryoohoo ..
'Ah, um, is that for both health insurance and company pension ..'

19X: Soo desu ne. Taisyoku-syooomesyo areba nenkin no hoo mo sore de
lanoo \ simasu kedo mo, ..
'Yes. If [you] have the proof of the retirement, [we] will also do (the
transfer of) the pension but ..'

20T: Aa, soo na n desu ka. Sore o leeto: l sotira no siyakusyo no hoo ni ..
'Oh, is that so? Should [I] take that to City Hall there?'

21X: Soo desu ne, motte kite itadaku no wa desu ne, ..
'Well, the things [you] should bring are ..'

22T: Hai.
'Yes.'

23X: .. nenkin-tetyou to, ..
'.. pension booklet and ..'

24T: Nenkin-tetyou to, hai.
'pension booklet and, yes.'

25X: .. lanoo \ sono \ itu ..
'um, when'

26T: .. (.. sikaku ..)
'..qualification ..'

27X: .. taisyoku-sita ka wakaru syooomesyo desu ne.
'.. a document that indicates when (this person) retired'
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28T: Ee, a, hai.
‘Yes. Ah, yes.’

29X: Ee, sore to ato inkan.
‘Yes. And a seal’

30T: Inkan.
‘A seal.’

At turn 2, Tanaka starts the interaction indicating that she has something to inquire about. From turn 4 to turn 8, Tanaka describes the background of her inquiry, namely, that some individuals are retiring that month and that their company pension insurance should be switched to the national health insurance. At turns 10 and 12, Tanaka starts her inquiry, asking if there are any documents the company needs to prepare. When she mentions hituyoo na syorui ‘necessary documents’ in turn 12, before she completes her utterance, X feels certain enough she has understood her need to take over and begin to provide answers in turns 13, 15, and 17. Learning that she needs to prepare retirement certificates, T asks if she has to take these certificates to the City Hall offices. When Tanaka utters in turn 20 .. sotira no siyakusu no hco ni ‘to the City Hall offices there,’ as if X has already predicted the following predicate, she again takes over T’s utterance, and adds new information about the necessary documents in turns 21, 23, 25, 27 and 29. In this interaction, X is an employee whose responsibility is to respond to inquiries regarding pension and health insurance matters at the local City Hall. From the background information that Tanaka provides, X knows what information should be given to Tanaka. This results in her action of taking over Tanaka’s utterance and providing the necessary information (turns 13 and 21).
As a sequence, it seems as if both parties involved are cooperating to understand and complete the request.

In the prompted data, the researcher, who played the partner of the participants, made every attempt not to contribute positively to the interaction, although on occasion (e.g. Task 2, participant NNM6, turn 5' in [2-VI]), by continuing the interaction instead of reacting to rude behavior, she in effect gave "go ahead, continue" feedback. Her input was limited and she did not help her partners, even when they faltered. This was because she did not want to influence the data by her intervention. For this reason at least, in the prompted data, cooperative clarification as displayed above was not observed.

4.2.4 Solicitation of permission

In this type of interaction, requests are accomplished through the medium of soliciting permission. In the data from business setting, this type of request occurred mainly in interactions between members of different companies or institutions, which require more careful request strategies compared to the interactions between same company members, other things being equal. Examples are given in (7) and (8). In (7), Tanaka calls Nihon Travel Service and makes an inquiry.

(7) X: A, soo desu ka. Moosiwake arimasen. Soo itasimasu to, tyotto Okada de nai to wakarimasen no de ..

‘Oh, is that so? [I am extremely sorry. If so, Okada would be the only one who would know (about it), ..’

Tanaka: Soo desu nee.

‘That’s right.’
X: Ee, I ano! gorenraku sase masu.
   'Yes, [I] will have [her] call [you].'

T: Yorosii desu ka?
   'Can you do that?' (lit. 'Will that be all right?')

X: Leeto! Koowa Kaihatu-sama.
   'Um, you're with Koowa Kaihatu.'

T: Hai. Leeto! Tanaka to moosimasu.
   'Yes. Um, my name is (lit. '[I] am called') Tanaka.'

   'All right. Ms. Tanaka.'

T: Hai.
   'Yes.'

X: *Neen no tame ni odenwa bangoo itadaite yorosii desu ka?
   'Is it all right to have your telephone number, to be on the safe
side?'

Based on interaction preceding this section (not reproduced here), an employee
(henceforth "X") at Nihon Travel Service judges that fellow employee Okada is
probably the only one who can answer caller Tanaka's question. X promises to
ask Okada to call Tanaka when Okada returns. Not knowing whether Okada
has Tanaka's phone number, X requests it by soliciting permission: *Itadaite
yorosii desu ka? 'Is it all right to receive [your phone number]?'*. Asking for
permission to be granted this information action from which the speaker would
benefit is more polite than simply, for example, asking *Odenwa bangoo
kudasaimasu ka? 'Will you give me your phone number?' X uses *nen no tane ni 'to
be on the safe side' for the purpose of face-threat mitigation, and uses the verb
*itadaku 'receive' (humble equivalent of *morau*) instead of *kureru 'give.' This
combined use of a mitigating expression and word choice also help make her
request less face-threatening.
Another such example is shown in (8). In (8), Tanaka answers a call from someone with another company, Inoue. Inoue identifies himself and asks for the Secretarial Office chief, Onoda, who Tanaka explains is in a meeting and not at his desk. Tanaka then tells Inoue that she will ask Onoda to call him after the meeting. Inoue then asks to leave a message, and asks Tanaka if it is all right to do so.

(8) Tanaka: Koowa Kaihatu de gozaimasu.
‘This is Koowa Kaihatu.’

Inoue: A, I ano l kotira Taitoo no Inoue to moosimasu keredo ..
‘Um, this is Inoue at Taitoo, but ..’

T: A, hai, doomo.
‘Oh, yes. Hello.’ (lit. ‘in all ways [we appreciate your calling/business].’)

I: Doomo. Hisyo no Onoda-san, irassyaimasu ka?
‘Hello. Is Mr. Onoda, the Secretarial Office chief, in?’

T: A! Moosiwake gozaimasen. Tyotto utiawase, haitte orimasite ..
‘[I] am extremely sorry. [He] is in a meeting, and ..’

I: A!
‘Oh.’

T: I Aro l owari sidai kojiro kara orikaesi odewa-sasemasu keredo mo..
‘Well, [I] will tell [him] to call you as soon as it is over, but ..’

I: Hai, de I ano l ma leeto: I dengon de mo ..
‘Yes, um, er, even a message, [can I ..]’

T: A, soo na n desu ka.
‘Oh, is that it?’

I: .. yorosii ka to omoimasu no de ..
‘.. [I] think even [a message] would be good, so ..’

T: Hai.
‘Yes.’

I: .. dengon de onegai-site ii desu ka?
‘.. is it all right if [I] leave [you] a message?’

‘Yes. Yes, please.’
Here, Inoue's request takes the form of the solicitation of permission, Dengon de onegai-site ii desu ka? 'Is it all right if [I] leave a message?' In the preceding turn, in order to turn down Tanaka's offer, Inoue makes the somewhat roundabout move of saying Dengon de mo yorosii ka to omoimasu no de .. 'Since I think that maybe even leaving a message would be all right, ...' This also works for making the interaction less face-threatening, and as a result, more polite. We observed in section 4.2.2, that male superiors used kureru/kuremasu 'soto gives to uti' when making requests of female employees. Their requests were very brief and rather casual. Compared to those requests, the above interactions, and the requests within them, are performed more carefully. Here, we can see how social roles and in-group/out-group distinctions can affect Japanese interactions. In the data from prompted interactions, native participants did not use this permission-soliciting type of request in any of the tasks.

4.2.5 Negotiation

In these data, request making can also take the form of negotiation. In setting up an appointment, two parties involved in the interaction have to decide when to meet, where to meet, and so on, according to the schedule of each party. Asking a person's schedule in detail for no reason is considered to be impolite. However, if it is for the purpose of setting up an appointment, asking the details of someone’s schedule is permissible, indeed often necessary. In the following example, two secretaries try to set up a meeting for their respective supervisors. After several exchanges of inquiries about each other’s boss’s schedule, both
parties agree on a time slot convenient for those who will meet. In (9),
Kobayashi calls the Secretarial Office of Tonai Bank to set up an appointment
with the latter’s managing director Anzai for Koowa Kaihatu’s President Imai.

(9) 1Hamada: Tonai Ginkoo hisyo-situ de gozaimasu:.
‘Secretarial Office, Tonai Bank.’

2Kobayashi: Koowa Kaihatu hisyo no Kobayashi to moosimasu:
‘This is Kobayashi, a secretary at Koowa Kaihatu.’

3H: A, hai. Itumo osewa ni natte orimasu.
‘Oh, yes. [We] appreciate your continued business.’ (lit. ‘are obliged to
[you].’)

4K: (Osewa-sama de gozaimasu.)
‘[We] are obliged to [you].’

5H: Hamada de gozaimasu:.
‘This is Hamada.’

6K: A, suimasen, sakihodo wa odenwa tyoodai itadakimasite: ..
‘Um, excuse me, thank you for your call earlier ..’

7H: (Moosiwake gozaimasen, tabitabi:..)
‘[I] am extremely sorry (for calling you) often ..’

8K: .. arigatoo gozaimasu.
‘.. thank you.’

9H: Hai.
‘Yes.’

10K: Hai. | Ano | sassoku de gozaimasu ga, | ee | toosya no syatyoo no imai
g’a ..
‘Yes. Um, to get right to the point, er.. our company president Imai ..’

11H: Hai.
‘Yes,’

12K: .. | ee | Anzai-rizi to tyotto ozikan apointo o torasete itadakitai to iu
koto de gozaimasu ga ..
‘.. er., it is regarding (our President Imai) wanting to make an
appointment with Director Anzai (of your bank), but ..’

13H: A, hai.
‘Oh, yes.’

14K: Hai. | anoool, ozikan no hoo, ikaga de gozaimasu ka?
‘Yes. Well, time-wise, what would be good?’ (lit. ‘how is it?’)
15H:  Ee, honzitu de gozaimasu ka?  
All right, do you mean today?

16K:  Ie, | anoo | dekireba, asu ka asatte to iu koto de onegai-sitai n desu ga ..  
‘No, um, if it is possible, [we] would like to ask [you] (to have it) either  
tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, but ..’

17H:  Hai. Asu de areba ..  
‘Yes. If it is tomorrow, ..’

18K:  Hai.  
‘Yes.’

19H:  .. | anoo | ni-zi han ikoo zutto aite orimasu ga, ikaga de gozaimasu ka?  
‘.. um, [he] will be free after two thirty, but how that be?’

20K:  Ni-zi han ikoo de gozaimasu ka?  
‘After two thirty?’

21H:  Hai.  
‘Yes.’

22K:  A, sayoo de gozaimasu ka. | Eeto | ni-zi han. Totoeba | ano | | ano |  
myooniti no gozen-tyuu toka de wa gotugoo warui desyoo ka?  
‘Oh, is that so? Let’s see, two thirty. For instance, um, would it  
be inconvenient if it were tomorrow morning?’

23H:  | eeto | | desu ne | gozen-tyuu tyotto kaigi ga haitte orimasite: ..  
‘Let’s see, [he] has a meeting scheduled through the morning ..’

24K:  Soo desu ka.  
‘Is that so?’

25H:  .. arui wa asatte de areba gozentyuu zutto aite orimasu ga: ..  
‘.. or, on the other hand, if it is the day after tomorrow, [he] will be  
free the entire morning, but ..’

26K:  A, sayoo de gozaimasu ka.  
‘Oh, is that so?’

27H:  Hai.  
‘Yes.’

28K:  De wa ano zyuuii-niti no | ano | gozen-tyuu ni apointo o irete  
itadakemasu ka?  
‘Then, could I have [you] insert [an appointment for us] in the  
morning of the eleventh?’

29H:  A, hai. Kasikomarimasita:.  
‘Oh. I’ll do that.’ (lit. ‘I’ve understood.’)

30K:  Hai. | Ano | ozikan wa nan-zi gurai ga yorosii desyoo ka.  
‘Yes. Um, what time would be convenient (for him/you)?’
31H: Ee, soo desu ne, zyu-zi han ka zyuuiti-zi gurai ga: ..
‘Let me see, ten thirty or eleven o’clock would be (good) ..’

32K: Sayoo de gozaimasu ka.
‘Is that so?’

33H: Hai.
‘Yes.’

34K: Ee, soo simasitara | eeto | doo simasyoo ka zyaa, zyuu zyu-zi han to
iu koto de onegai-dekimasu desyoo ka.
‘Well, in that case, um, what shall we do? Then, could [I] ask you to
make it at ten thirty?’

35H: Hai, kasikomarimasita.
‘Yes. I’ll do that.’ (lit. ‘I’ve understood.’)

36K: Hai.
‘Yes.’

37H: Ozikan, sanzyu-ppun hodo de... 
‘And the time (for the meeting), being thirty minutes ..’

38K: Hai, | anoo | zyuugo-hun kara sanzyu-ppun to iu koto de ..
‘Yes. Um, being from fifteen to thirty minutes [in length] ..’

39H: A, hai, kasikomarimasita.
‘Yes. [I] understand.’

40K: .. onegai-dekimasu ka?
‘.. could [I] ask [you] (to arrange it)?’

From turn 1 to turn 9, Kobayashi and Hamada demonstrate the highly ritualized
opening of a careful business interaction. Using turns 10 and 12, Kobayashi
introduces the topic of her request, with the phrase, ~ to iu koto de gozaimasu ga
‘(this is) regarding ~.’ De gozaimasu is a distal (-masu) form of the polite copula
that marks this interaction as especially careful. From turn 14 to 27, they discuss
available dates and times. At turn 28, Kobayashi confirms the agreed date and
general time span, making her request by using a question that is, semantically, a
question about possibility: apointo o irete itadakemasu ka? ‘lit. Can [I] receive (the
action of) inserting an appointment?’ At turn 29, Hamada agrees to do so. From
turn 30 to 36, they arrange a specific appointment time. At turn 34, Kobayashi proposes an appointment time by using another potential expression: *Zyuu-zi han to iu koto de onegai-dekimasu desyou ka?* ‘Is it possible to request that you make it for ten thirty?’ From turn 37 to 40, they confirm the length of the appointment.

Negotiation is, for things like arranging meetings, simply a socially accommodating way to proceed. Arranging an appointment without consulting the other party’s schedule, for example, would be very rude and face-threatening. For instance, it would be inconceivable to start this sequence with Kobayashi’s focal request expression in turn 28. In order for turn 28 to be a reasonable request, or a felicitous utterance, the preceding negotiated passage is indispensable. Both are contributing parts of a single sequence. The interaction of Hamada and Kobayashi is very smooth, almost as if it has been rehearsed. In a real sense, it has been: as secretaries, they would have experienced just this type of negotiation many times. They exchange small bits of information needed in the exchange, and they do not waste time in their interaction. In the data from the prompted interactions, there were no tasks that called for this type of negotiation.

4.2.6 Requests with extra face-threat

In business interaction between people who work for different company members, there are times when one needs to request something the act of which can be very face-threatening to the other party. The following two examples illustrate this type of request sequence. In (10), Y, who works for a shipping
company, calls Tanaka at Koowa Kaihatu. This shipping company takes care of shipping for Koowa Kaihatu’s employees when they are transferred overseas.

(10) 1Y:  | Eeto! suimasen. Seekyuusyo no ken de, tyotto oukagai-sitai n desu ga..
   'Um, excuse me. There are some things [I’d like to ask regarding an invoice, but ..'.

2Tanaka: A, hai.
   'Ah, yes.'

3Y:  San-gatu ni watakusi-domo no hoo de, se, hakkoo-sasete itadakimasita seekyuusyo de..
   'Regarding the invoice that we issued in March,' (lit. 'that we had you allow us to issue ..')

4T:  Ee.
   'Yes.'

5Y:  .. | leeto | onamae ga Furuta Takao-sama na n desu ga ..
   '.. let's see, the name (on it) is Takao Furuta, but ..'

6T:  Ha, hai.
   'Yes.'

7Y:  .. | leeto | Doha ni ikareta kata desite, ..
   '.. um, it is someone who went to Doha, and ..'

8T:  A, soo desu ne, ee.
   'Oh. Yes, [he] is, yes.'

9Y:  .. de, | anoo | kookuubin no seekyuusyo no hoo, san-gatu matu ni sakusee-sasete itadakimasite..
   '.. and, um, [we] prepared an invoice for air mail at the end of March.'
   (lit. 'had you allow us prepare ..')

10T: Hai.
   'Yes.'

11Y:  .. se de | anoo! | gomen nasai, roku-gatu zyuuhati-niti genzai de..
   'well, [I am sorry, as of today, June eighteenth, ..'

12T:  Ee.
   'Yes.'

13Y:  .. tyotto, keeri no hoo kara mada go-nyuukin no kakunin ga dekite nai to iu renraku ga kita n desu ga..
   'From the accounting department, [I] heard that [they] have not been able to confirm the payment (from your company), but ..'
14T: A! Soo desu ka.
’Oh! Is that so?’

15Y: Tyotto osirabe itadakemasu ka?
’Could you check on this?’ (lit. ‘Is it possible to receive your checking ..?’)

16T: Hai, wakarimasita. ‘anoo | ..
‘Yes, we will check on it. (lit. ‘I’ve understood.’) Um ..’

17Y: Moosiwake gozaimasen.
’[I] am extremely sorry.’

18T: Ee! Sirabemasite, orikaesi odewa itasimasu:
‘Yes! [I] will check on it, and call you back after I do.’

19Y: Moosiwake gozaimasen, oisogasii tokoro:
’[I] am extremely sorry, when [you] are busy.’

20T: Hai. Tonde mo nai desu:
‘Yes. Not at all.’

21Y: Yorosiku onegai-itasimasu.
’Would you please?’ (lit. ‘I make a request of you.’)

‘Yes, thank you. Good bye.’

23Y: Situree-itasimasu.
’Good bye.’

At turn 1, Y indicates that she has an inquiry about an invoice. In turns 3, 5, 7 and 9, she describes the invoice that her company issued in March. In turns 11 and 13, she indicates to Tanaka that Koowa Kaihatu has not made the payment for this bill. However, Y breaks this news in a very roundabout manner, saying that she has heard from the Accounting Department of her company that they have not yet been able to confirm the payment from Koowa Kaihatu. She also uses an apology in turn 11 and a mitigating expression tyotto ‘a bit’ in turn 13. Explaining these situations to Tanaka, who is in charge of these matters at Koowa Kaihatu’s end, might be interpreted as an accusation aimed at Tanaka, so Y becomes very careful here. After laying out all the background information, in
turn 15 Y uses a focal request expression, and asks T to check the invoice. This request expression is also accompanied by a mitigating *tyotto*. Immediately following this request, Y apologizes twice, using a very formal and humble apology, *Moosiwake gozaimasen* ‘(I am) extremely sorry.’ If the payment has not been made, as Y claims, Tanaka is indeed to blame. However, if Tanaka shows that the payment has been made, Y’s company is at fault and Y’s request to Tanaka will be considered rude. So it is understandable that we see many attempts to reduce potential for lost face in Y’s utterances.

Another example of face-threatening request is (11), below. The company president’s secretary Kobayashi calls a secretary at a different company to inform the latter that the president is running late for his appointment.

(11) 1Kobayashi: Sassoku de gozaimasu ga, kyoo no ano san-zi no apointo no ken de gozaimasu ga ..
‘The reason I am calling (lit. ‘getting right to the point), it is about today’s appointment for three o’clock, but ..’

2Z: Hai.
‘Yes.’

3K: .. tadaima ano *tyotto* soto no kuruma ga konde ru to iu koto de ..
‘.. it seems that traffic is congested on the streets right now, ..’

4Z: Hai.
‘Yes.’

5K: .. yuu-ppun hodo okurete simau no de ..
‘.. (the president) will be ten or so minutes late [for his appointment], so ..’

6Z: A! Hai.
‘Oh, yes.’

7K: *sono mune o lanoo I tutaeoite itadakemasu desyoo ka.*
‘Would you inform [your superior of] (lit. ‘the gisti of’) this?’ (lit. ‘Could [I] have [you] inform’)

8Z: A, hai, syooti-itasimasita.
‘Yes. [I]’ll do that.’ (lit. ‘I’ve understood.’)
9K: Hai, oisogasii tokoro, moosiwake gozaimasen.
    ‘Yes. [I am extremely sorry when [you] are busy.’

    ‘Yes. Thank you for taking the trouble to let me know.’

11K: (Yorosiku onegai-itasimasu.)
    ‘Would you please.’ (lit. ‘I make a request of you.’)

12Z: Hai.
    ‘Yes.’

13K: Gomen kudasaimase.
    ‘Goodbye.’ (lit. ‘I beg your pardon.’)

14X: Hai.
    ‘Yes.’

In turn 1, Kobayashi introduces the topic, using _no ken de gozaimasu ga_ ‘(This is) regarding ~.’ Using turns 3 and 5, Kobayashi explains that the president will be late for his appointment due to a traffic jam. In order to mitigate the face-threatening effect of this delay, she uses the expression _tyotto_ ‘a bit’ regarding the traffic jam. In turn 7, Kobayashi asks X to inform her boss about the delay, and immediately following this utterance, she apologizes in a formal and humble way: _Oisogasii tokoro, moosiwake gozaimasen_ ‘([I] am extremely sorry (for this), when [you] are busy.’ In the following turn, X also makes an apology in return. These exchanges can be considered as strategies for minimizing the possibility of loss of face.

As we have seen, both request sequences (10) and (11) took place between members of different companies. In request sequences between members of the same company, elaborate mitigating expressions are not commonly found. In interactions between members of different companies, when business is going smoothly, such expressions are hardly ever used. In corporate culture, where
efficiency is valued, except for situations where one has to deal with potentially face-threatening matters, request sequences may be carried out in simple and efficient ways. In similar situations in the data from prompted interaction, in Task 2 (Business: more face-threatening task) and Task 5 (Formal: less face-threatening task), native participants used apologies and mitigating expressions skillfully. This was similar to what has been demonstrated just above.

In this section, naturally occurring request sequences recorded in a corporate setting were analyzed. It has become apparent that in such a setting, efficiency is valued. In routine situations where parties involved in the interaction know what action is expected of them, such actions are achieved without focal request expressions. Requests from superiors to their subordinates are made in a very plain fashion, and make free use of ‘soto gives to utii’ verbs, which focus on the requestee’s agency, but not the other way around. When an individual who seems to have a request does not indicate it clearly, the other party can help and provide what is needed, in cooperation with the request-maker. We saw that in request sequences between members of different companies, solicitation of permission is used as request expression. In arranging for appointments, given the nature of the goal, the two parties take turns negotiating to come up with a time and/or location convenient for both. We observed that the interaction was very smooth and efficient. When problems happen in business, especially between members of different groups, the person making the request uses mitigating expressions and apologies effectively to reduce the threat of lost face.
CHAPTER 5

SOME PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

In Chapter 3, we examined data from the prompted interactions for differences between the native request sequences and those of the non-natives, in terms of (1) verbal nuclei used in the focal requests, (2) verbs of giving and receiving used in the focal requests, and (3) the structure of request sequences. Data from unplanned native-native interaction, recorded at a commercial setting in Tokyo, confirmed some features observed in the prompted tasks as handled by the native participants. What can we learn from these native/non-native learner differences? What steps do these differences suggest we take to improve the performance of the non-natives? In this chapter, I discuss some pedagogical implications of this study, focusing on distal- and direct-style in predication, as an example case.

5.1 Contents of the non-natives' focal requests

The contents of the non-natives' focal requests were varied, as were the natives'. Choices in both groups were usually different, but sometime
overlapped across groups. When vocabulary items useful in handling the assigned task had not been introduced in their courses, the non-natives typically did not have access to them. However, this lack of alternative choice did not present a major problem. The non-natives usually chose appropriate words out of their rather limited vocabulary for their focal requests, and despite these limits, their choices were not problematic. By contrast, sometimes misuse of items already known (e.g. *Warui (n desu)* as an apologetic) were more of a problem.

5.2 Linguistic forms of the non-natives' focal requests

The major difference between the natives and the non-natives in the prompted interactions was found in the verbs of giving and receiving used in their focal requests. In five out of six tasks, the natives used some variant of *morau/itadaku* 'receive/'id.↓' as well as *kureru/kudasaru* 'soto gives to uti', while the non-natives stuck exclusively with *kureru/kudasaru* 'soto gives to uti'. This preference for *kureru/kudasaru* over *morau/itadaku* by itself did not cause overt problems. In many situations, it would not offend Japanese people with whom those non-native learners might interact, nor bring about communication breakdowns. However, natives do seem to interpret a subtle difference between using *morau/itadaku* on the one hand, or *kureru/kudasaru* to characterize the exchange of goods or acts. Hill et al. (1986:347) investigated "the systems of
sociolinguistic politeness\(^1\) in making requests" in Japanese and English. Using a five-point scale, they asked their American and Japanese subjects “to give their judgments of the degree of carefulness\(^2\) of certain request forms” in the context of borrowing a pen, and also “the distance they perceived between themselves and certain types of persons in typical situations” (1986:352-353). As a result, Japanese subjects ranked the politeness of the request forms as follows. The translations are mine, and have been kept somewhat literal, in the interests of revealing details and differences.

Okari site mo yorosii desyoo ka.
'I wonder if it is all right to borrow\(\downarrow\)[it].'

Kasite itadakitai n desu keredo ..
'(It is that) I would like to receive\(\downarrow\) [your] lending [it], but ..'

Kasite itadakemasu ka?
'Is it possible to receive\(\downarrow\) [your] lending [it]?

Okari dekimasu ka?
'Is it possible to borrow\(\downarrow\)[it]?'

Kasite itadakemasen ka?
'Couldn't [I] receive\(\downarrow\) lending [it]?'

Kasite kudasaimasen ka?
'Wouldn't [you] lend\(\uparrow\)[it] (to me/mine)?' (lit. give uti lending)

Kasite moraemasen ka?
'Couldn't [I] receive [your] lending [it][?]

---

\(^1\) Hill et al. (1986:349) define politeness as “one of the constraints on human interaction, whose purpose is to consider others' feelings, establish levels of mutual comfort, and promote rapport.”

\(^2\) In the questionnaire, subjects were instructed “to identify the linguistic expression ‘you would be most likely to use when you were being most careful in your speech act behavior’, then the one they would use when being ‘most uninhibited (relaxed)’ in speech act behavior” (Hill et al. 1986:352).
Kasite kuremasen ka?
‘Won’t you lend [it] (to me)?’ (lit. ‘give to lending’)

Ii desu ka?
‘Is it all right?’

Kasite kudasai.
‘Please lend [it] (to me).’ (lit. ‘give to lending’)

Kasite hosii n da kedo...
‘(It is that) [I]’d like to have [it] lent (to me), but ..’

Karite ii?
‘Is it all right to borrow [it]?’

Kasite kureru?
‘Would you lend [it] (to me)?’

Tukatte ii?
‘Is it all right to use [it]?’

Kasite yo.
‘Lend [it]!’

Kariru yo.
‘[I] will borrow [it].’

Ii?
‘Is it all right?’

Kasite
‘Lend [it].’

Pen.
‘A pen.’

Aru?
‘Is there (a pen)?’

(Hill et al. 1986:355, translations and arrows by the researcher)

This demonstrates little more than the fact that Japanese speakers can differentiate degrees of politeness for each of these request forms, when asked to do so. After the rating, Hill et al. asked their subjects which request forms they
would use to which types of addressees. As a result, they found that "the relative ranking of an addressee correlates with the relative politeness/ranking of request form, in both Japanese and English" (1986:359). For example, for a professor, who was rated at the top of the category of respectfully treated people/situation category ("middle-aged stranger," "physician," "workplace boss," "secretary," "police officer," etc. follow "professor," in this order), a large number of the subjects chose the use of Okari site mo yorosii desyo ka 'I wonder if it is all right to borrow ↓[it]?,' or Kasite itadakitai n desu keredo .. ' (It is that) I would like to receive ↓lending [it],.' but did not choose Kasite kudasaimasen ka?.

'Wouldn't [you] lend ↑[it] (to me)?' at all. This study makes it clear that Japanese subjects are aware of the subtle differences among focal request forms and can deliberately choose particular request forms to fit particular addressees. Hill et al. (1986:359) conclude that this tendency is observed in English, too, but that "the Japanese responses are more tightly clustered than those of the American subjects" in correlation of request form and people/situation categories. If we take the results of this study by Hill et al. into consideration, along with our own native-speakers' expressive choices, the non-native learners' demonstrated preference for using kureru/kudasaru regardless of circumstances and addressee constitutes a clear cut difference between them and native speakers.

While the variety of their focal request expressions was limited, the majority of non-natives demonstrated a certain sensitivity by distinguishing between ... kureru? 'give to uki' (direct style), which they chose for the casual: less face-threatening Task 3, and ... kudasaimasen ka? 'negative question using
give to uti (distal style), which they chose for the more face-threatening Tasks 2, 5, and 6. This is better than simply using ... kureru? of anyone regardless of that person's relation to the speaker. At the least, these non-natives had developed a sensitivity that prompted them to pay attention to the social rank of their addressees, or their social distance from themselves, and to adjust their language style accordingly. The language instruction that they received, in which language use is carefully presented as motivated by an awareness of social positions (of speakers, addressees, and referents) seems to have contributed to develop such behavior in them.

5.3 Structure of non-native request sequences

5.3.1 Multiple-turn sequence

First, I will present a brief account of the instructional regimen of the eighteen non-native learners who participated in the role-play tasks recounted in Chapter 3. There are two parts to the regimen. In the first part, the learners work on their own. They are provided with models through text, tapes, and video, and they rehearse with those materials in preparation for the class activities. It is expected that their performance of rehearsed materials will become smooth and effortless by the time of the class hour. Then, in class, based on this rehearsed materials, the learners are asked to perform memorized dialogues and, in addition, to engage in more open-ended tasks. It is instructor's job to make sure to set up appropriate situations, in which the use and adaptation of what the learners had rehearsed are natural and meaningful. It is
also a responsibility of instructors to give daily scores and weekly comments to the learners regarding their performance in the class. A more detailed account of the instruction will be given in 5.3.3.1.

The eighteen non-native learners have been using Japanese in contexts devised by their teachers, and played out in their class hours. Sometimes the task and context require that they go beyond a single turn and engage in a dialogue, while at other times (in drills or expansions based on drills), the exchange is minimal. In preparation for the class, the learners work with the model conversations and the drills that are provided as their models. Dialogues and drills always take the form of short conversational exchanges, that is, socially and otherwise contextualized sets. The drills are (a) partially transcribed in the textbook, with translations for the first two items in each drill, (b) fully recorded on audiotape, and (c) for Lessons 1-12, integrated in a cd-rom with visual cues and a fully recorded audio files. Learners are strongly encouraged (in part through daily grading) to come to class having practiced the dialogues and drills assigned for each hour, so that in class, they can engage in activities that demand ready use of the moves, grammar, and words they rehearsed with their cd, tapes, and text.

Neither in rehearsal nor in their classroom activities have the learners who participated in this study been asked to utter sentences devoid of contexts. Yet, although they have been trained in a regimen where use is motivated by features of the context, their performance in these tasks revealed them to be less than at home in producing multiple-turn sequences, perhaps because of a lack of
experience in doing so. The role-play tasks of this study were set up like problem-solving tasks. For each task in the research reported in Chapter 3 situation was described, and facts relevant to its solution were given. A participant had to solve the problem using the description and the additional relevant facts given on the instruction cards. For those tasks with complex situations, the amount of background information which participants had to keep in mind increased, even while the same complexity required them to produce multiple-turn request sequences. Some of the participants had trouble with this, and they expressed the difficulty that they felt, in the recall protocol interview, as follows.

- "This one was kind of hard, I thought. Uh, just because there were so many different elements to try to coordinate at the same time." (NNM2 – about Task 6)

- "It's kind of hard to know how mmm, how much conversation to introduce or to try to put all the information in one sentence. ... Even though I said 'try to break up a little bit it's hard sometimes to know when to break it up and how much to say first without really [sic] information to make the conversation still sound natural." (NNM2 – about Task 2)

- "Um, well, since it is so long, I kind of [??] difficult to arrange it taking from English and converting it into Japanese, so um, it's just hard for me to in English, ... I have a small amount of memory to form sentences with it. But when it gets something long like this, it is hard to keep it all aligned um, I'm not sure there is a better way to say." (NNM8 – about Task 5)

- "Just doing English wouldn't be so bad, but also having to convert it into Japanese and remembering the same information in both languages really that makes it difficult." (NNM8 – about Task 3)

Another individual mentioned the multiplicity she had to deal with in the role-play, and found it difficult:
• “These are kind of hard! (laugh) ... Because I think when you do this, like I try and think of how to say it correctly ... So, even when I say it tell you then I think I concentrate on saying it right or trying to say it right instead of telling you. Plus in this case you have to keep in mind like ah, honorific or polite levels, so it was harder.” (NNF18 – about Task 5)

Dealing with “the levels and conjugation and linking everything” was a challenge to her.

Learners experience different types of language activities in their class hours. Among them, the practice closest to the role-play or problem solving practice of my experiments would be the Utilization problems that conclude each lesson in Japanese: the Spoken Language (henceforth JSL, “Jorden with Noda” in the Bibliography). The Utilization problems provide brief English descriptions of situations with tasks to accomplish using Japanese, using language learned up to that point, with a focus on items introduced in that lesson. For illustration, two request exercises as laid out in the Utilization section of Lesson 28 (JSL, Part 3) follow.

(V-1)

a. Ask a classmate to let you read her notes from Professor Noguchi’s lecture

b. As your classmate hands them over, she warns that you may not be able to read them because her writing is sloppy.

(V-2)

a. Ask your professor (very politely!) for permission to look at the pictures he took the other day.

b. Your professor agrees enthusiastically.

These exercises set up situations clearly, and learners are asked to perform appropriately in each situation. The Utilization exercises are assigned as homework assignments, and learners are expected to prepare appropriate
expressions for responding, before they come to class. In class hours, the
instructor cues each situation, and learners are discouraged from looking at the
English task statements (in their textbooks) as they perform. They are expected
to deliver their lines smoothly and with suitable body language.

The above examples require making a request of a classmate and of one's
professor accordingly. However, as described, these tasks are simple enough for
learners to accomplish linguistically in one sentence. A common way to stage
such exchanges is for the instructor to assign the roles of (a) and (b) to two
students and ask them to perform the scene. Usually, each student tries to
express what was cued in the text in one turn, without expanding on it. It is
therefore necessary for the instructor sometimes to play one of the roles and/or
model an expansion of the task, so that the learners can follow that model and
develop the exchange further. For instance, in (V-1) above, the instructor might
play the role of (a) and expand the exchange by asking the classmate (played by
a learner) when she should return the notes. In response to this, the learner
would have to give an answer that follows from, but was not specified in, the
original cueing of the Utilization problem. When this learner is given the
opportunity to play the role of (a), she will have some idea of how to expand the
exchange because of the instructor's model. In doing so, she might repeat the
same kind of move, or choose to expand it in a different way. Or, instructors can
create slightly more complex versions of Utilization tasks. Whatever the
instructor does to further contextualize and/or vary the solving of the problems
as originally given in Utilization for that lesson, if s/he does so regularly, the
learners will come to expect such variation. That, of course, is the first step in dealing successfully with the instructional challenge Utilization presents. On the other hand, variations and the feedback an instructor ends up giving take time, a commodity already in short supply.

In communication with Japanese outside the classroom, learners will of course often not know beforehand what kind of responses they might receive from their addressees. And when leading up to their requests, they might have to explain background information, sometimes complicated to their addressee. By contrast, one feature of JSL’s Utilization problems is that they provide the background that makes it possible to dispense with much of this. Also, words and constructions demanded in Utilization problems tend to focus those introduced in that lesson. In other words, what the learners are expected to produce is somewhat predictable, but for reasons that depend little on interpreting the situation’s social variables on one’s own. To prepare learners to interact in situations where all of the background is not given or immediately apparent, we need models and tasks in context that illustrate and demand, respectively, some creative extrapolations. One of the participants expressed the difficulty of one of the tasks in the recall protocol interview in the following words.

- “This isn’t a situation I’ve been in, in Core Conversations or Drills, I don’t believe, so um, I had to go think about the situation think about how I’m gonna say it.” (NNM8 – about Task 3)

This particular individual also expressed a need for more practice “actually speaking the language:”
• "I need more practice actually speaking, so I can just think of something and say that. At this point, I still have to try to form it by thinking of it." (NNM8 – about Task 6)

Although he does actually speak Japanese daily in class, he expresses the need for "more practice actually speaking." He might mean speaking Japanese, just like he speaks his native language, i.e., interpreting contexts and acting linguistically on the basis of those interpretations. More experience of this sort, with enlightening feedback, might be needed in their instruction.

There was another individual who received the experience of role-play rather positively, and expressed the excitement of it with the following words.

• "Oh! God! That was fun." (NNF15 – about Task 4)

The non-native learners in my experiment, then, even though they had been practicing a similar type of exercise in the classroom, did not seem to be used to role-play tasks that required producing multiple-turn request sequences, in effect creating more context with their linguistic choices. Ten out of eighteen of them admitted feeling difficulty in accomplishing the tasks, in the recall protocol interview. More Utilization type role-play at greater intervals, i.e. with problems drawn from two, three, or four preceding lessons, would probably reduce the element of predictability identified above. In these, slightly more complex tasks might be introduced, too. A major challenge is to find the time to do these things.
5.3.2 Apologetic/mitigating expressions

When comparing the structures of the non-native request sequences and those of the natives, the native’s request sequences showed frequent and varied use of apologetic/mitigating expressions. Throughout the six tasks, non-natives’ apologetic expressions were, as noted earlier, few: either Sumimasen. ‘Excuse me.’ or Warui (desu) ga, .. ‘[It] is bad (of me), but, ..’. The natives’ choices showed much more variety. The following list of apologetic expressions used by native participants for Task 6 illustrates this point.

(V-3)
- Moosiwake arimasen ga/kedo ..
  ‘There is no justifying (excusing) it, but ..’
- Taihen moosiwake nai n desu ga ..
  ‘(It’s that) it’s awfully inexcusable/unjustifiable (is how it is), but ..’
- Makoto ni moosiwake nai n desu ga ..
  ‘(It’s that) it’s truly inexcusable/unjustifiable (is how it is), but ..’
- Hizyoo ni moosiwake nai n desu ga ..
  ‘(It’s that) it’s extremely inexcusable/unjustifiable (is how it is), but ..’
- Honto ni moosiwake nai n desu ga ..
  ‘(It’s that) it’s really inexcusable/unjustifiable (is how it is), but ..’
- Taihen situree na n desu keredo mo ..
  ‘(It’s that) it’s awfully rude (is how it is), but ..’
- Taihen kyosyuku na n desu keredo mo ..
  ‘(It’s that) I’m awfully intimidated (by my action, is how it is), but ..’

With set expressions like Moosiwake arimasen, the variations tend to be small, but they are there nonetheless. In the present cases, these involve the choice of extending the predicate with n (a way of emphasizing that one’s characterization of the situation is indeed how it is) or not, and the choices of whether to use an intensifier (taihen, makoto ni, etc.) and, if so, which one. Natives used these
apologetic expressions skillfully, especially in the more face-threatening tasks. They also used conditionals, such as Dekimasitara.. ‘If [it] is possible, ..’, and Mosi ozikan arimasitara.. ‘if there is time [for you], ..’ and provisionals, such as Dekireba .. ‘Provided [it] is possible, ..’ and Sasitukaе nakereba .. ‘Provided there are no problems [with that], ..’, to mitigate the requests that followed.

How, then, might non-native learners of Japanese better assimilate into their repertoires apologetic/mitigating expressions like those used by the natives? At what point in their training might such additional materials and training be appropriate? Given the demands of the tasks, later is better than sooner, probably after 450-600 hours of classroom instruction, at a time when learners’ lexicons and repertoires are up to the challenge.

First of all, examples of realistic request sequences by natives should be presented to the learners. If the non-native learners do not have experiential memories of situated language use regarding how Japanese people use apologetic/mitigating expressions in their request making, they will naturally fall back on their limited bank of relevant memories in Japanese and—the bottom line—how they would make requests in their own language. The principles with which these models are identified and used will not differ from the principles underlying the materials already in use.

Materials for these models can be produced by video-taping naturally occurring request sequences, adapting sequences from TV dramas, or scripting them anew and having them screened by a variety of native advisors. Second, detailed information about these request sequences should be presented, so the
learners also learn how to observe (and later imitate) with an appreciation for
nuance. Commentary in written form can be provided, which focuses on the
sequencing that leads up to the focal request, explain what is happening in each
move in the request sequence, what kind of focal request is used in what style
and why and what kind of apologetic/mitigating expression is used when and
why by native Japanese. Learners can study the commentary on their own
before class, and their understanding can be checked using “Check-up” type
questions. They can also engage the learners in a discussion, in English or
Japanese, of what is happening in the sequence with special attention to the use
of apologetic/mitigating expressions, i.e. when they are used, in what style, and
why.

In the six tasks assigned in the course of this study, we saw evidence that
native participants differentiated their use of apologetic/mitigating expressions
according to each task. They made regular use of elaborate mitigating
expressions for the more face-threatening tasks (Tasks 2, 4, and 6), but did not do
so for the casual: less face-threatening tasks (Tasks 3). It is important to orient
non-native learners to attend to relevant parameters in a range of situation (e.g.
who is involved, how, what kind of task this is, etc.), in relation to which types of
apologetic/mitigating expressions are used. Depending on this orientation, their
own interpretations of future encounters will or will not help develop intuitions
they can rely on. Through this process of modelling, explanation and discussion,
the learners should be exposed to new apologetic/mitigating expressions. After
familiarizing themselves with these new expressions and understanding where
(in the request sequence) they are used, the learners should be given the opportunities to use them. It is not useful to use apologetic/mitigating expressions alone; they should be in contexts. The importance of role-play tasks that require multiple-turn sequences was mentioned in the previous section (5.3.1); the use of apologetic/mitigating expressions should be monitored in these exercises and evaluated by the instructors. At the same time, the instructors should give feedback to the learners, specific advice on how to improve their performance, as soon as possible after the fact.

5.3.3 The use of distal vs. direct style predicates

Besides the use of apologetic/mitigating expressions, another major difference observed between native vs. non-native request sequences was the style on individual predicators (yoogen). To review briefly, this is the parameter of interpersonal distance between speaker and addressee that Jorden with Noda (1987) characterize as distal vs. direct. The distal alternative is expressed with suffix -masu on verbs and desu on adjectives and nominals, while the direct alternative is indicated by the absence of these on a predicator (verb, copula, or adjective). The distal/direct distinction is not indicated when there is no finite predicator (= “sentence fragments” Jorden with Noda Part 1, p. 20), in which case falling intonation, for example, may also be missing. If a sentence is concluded
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with a finite predicator, however, the distal/direct distinction is obligatory. The distinction is especially significant.3

The most conspicuous example of this occurred in Task 1 (Business: less face-threatening task), in which many of the natives (seven out of eighteen) used direct style while the majority of the non-natives (sixteen out of eighteen) used distal style. In this task, the subjects played the role of a company employee making a request to a part-time student worker, which means that they played the role of a superior. In the textbook and audiotapes, students are sometimes required to play the social superior. But in class, probably in anticipation of the non-native learners interacting with supervisors in Japan who will, after all, be their social superiors, such as college professors or company managers, instructors may tend to emphasize tasks that involve the learners interacting with people in such superior positions. This is a reasonable strategy, motivated by the same expectations whereby basic materials are designed to introduce foreign learners to the distal (-masu, copula desu) style of predicing a sentence before sentences without these markers of interpersonal distance. As a result, however, learners naturally get more experience interacting with would-be superiors than with their would-be cohorts or subordinates.

A relative lack of practice in social context where they are in charge might have resulted in their overly polite use of distal style toward the part-time student worker in Task 1. Also, the fact that the researcher, who was classroom

---

3 In Jorden’s analysis, distal vs. direct is one of several parameters that contribute to characterizing an interaction as predominantly careful vs. casual. Jorden defines distal form as ‘the -mas- (-masi- before consonants) portion’ (1987:32) of the verbals.
instructor, and thus to whom they usually used distal style, played the role of the part-time student worker, seems to have made it difficult for some of them to imagine her in a role for which direct style was appropriate. In other tasks besides Task 1, some learners expressed the difficulty of doing role-play with their teacher:

- "I didn’t know how to refer to you ... and I have ended up using anata ‘you,’ but, uh, I didn’t know if I should have said Okatsu-san or Okatsu-sensee. Even though, even though I know that, even though I know that I am your friend in this situation it’s hard for me to go beyond Okatsu-sensee or Okatsu-san.” (NNM2-Task4)

- "It’s probably fifty percent that you are a teacher, and whenever I see your face, my mind says ‘do this.’ It’s really hard for me to talk to teachers in direct style.” (NNM9-Task 6)

- "Because when talking to you I think I know I worry about what YOU think when like once I say something like when it’s wrong or something or when it’s not what you wanted to hear.” (NNF18-Task3)

Having their instructor as their addressee in the role-play tasks had an inhibiting effect on some learners’ performances, whereby they felt obliged to maintain their usual relation to her as an individual—a lesson for future experiments of this sort (and perhaps a lesson in the reality of roles practiced over time).

The researcher expected the participants to interact in direct style in Task 3 (Casual: less face-threatening task) and Task 4 (Casual: more face-threatening task). The number of non-native participants who used direct style throughout the sequences were five (out of eighteen) for both Task 3 and Task 4. Eight participants, for Task 3, used distal-style to their addressee, who was playing the role of a friend of theirs and nine for Task 4. Five others shifted their styles
several times in their interaction for Task 3. For Task 4, there were four such
participants. One participant had several occurrences of switching from distal to
direct, as here:

(V-4) X = NNM16 playing the role of a person whose car insurance is about to
expire in Task 3
Y = the researcher, playing the role of X’s friend

T1 X: | Anoo | | anoo | konsyuu konsyuu-matu konsyuu-matu ni ni iku
iku ha.. iku hazu ne.
‘Well, [we] are supposed to go this weekend, aren’t we?’

T2 Y: N, iku hazu da yo.
‘Yeah. [We] are supposed to go.’

T3 X: Hai. Demo, tyotto tyotto kamaimasu [sic]4. | Anoo | tyotto tyotto
komaru yo.
‘Yes. But, [I] am concerned (distal style). Well [it]’s a bit
troublesome (direct style).’

T4 Y: N.
‘Yeah.’

T5 X: | Anoo | boku no kuruma no insyuransu wa ..
‘Well, as for my car insurance ..’

T6 Y: N.
‘Uh-huh.’

T7 X: .. | anoo | raisyuu raisyuu kara raisyuu raisyuu kara ii desu [sic].
‘.. um, [it] will become valid starting from next week (distal style).’

T8 Y: A, raisyuu kara na no?
‘Oh, is [it] that (it will become valid) from next week?’

T9 X: Raisyuu kara ii yo.
‘[It]’s valid from next week (direct style).’

In this example, X shifts from distal style to direct style in T3, and again in T7
and T9. It appears as if X at first tries to speak in direct style, but catches himself
speaking in distal, and corrects himself immediately after that. There were

4 The speaker probably used affirmative kamaimasu (lit. ‘will matter/be a problem’, inappropriate
here) by analogy with negative kamaimasen ‘doesn’t matter/is not a problem’). He could have
said komarimasu ‘will be a problem’, as the next sentence suggests. ‘mind, care.’
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others whose style shifted from distal to direct, or vice-versa, in the same sequence, as shown in (V-5) and (V-6):

(V-5) X = NNM9 playing the role of a person whose car insurance is about to expire in Task 3
Y = the researcher, playing the role of X’s friend

T1 Y: Zyaa doo siyoo ka, Sinsinati no ryokoo.
‘Then, what should we do about the trip to Cincinnati?’

T2 X: \[ N:\text{ } \| eeto:\text{ } \| \text{ mosi eeto, gotugoo ga yokattara } ..
‘Well, if it is convenient for you.. [sic]’

T3 Y: N.
‘Yeah.’

T4 X: .. \| eeto \| \text{ unten-sureba ii kedo }..
‘.. let’s see, you should drive, but ..’

T5 Y: Aa, watasi ga?
‘Oh, me?’

T6 X: N.
‘Yeah.’

In (V-5), X uses a mitigation expression .. gotugoo ga yokattara .. ‘if it is convenient (for you)’ in T2. This phrase expresses the speaker’s consideration toward the addressee, and is quite appropriate. The word gotugoo, with its prefix go, indicates deferential reference to the other’s tugoo, or ‘circumstances.’ However in his next turn (T4), X shifts to direct style, and also uses a provisional predicate unten sureba ‘provided [you] drive, ..’ that presupposes his addressee’s willingness to drive, the effect of which is face-threatening. Hearing T2, which sounds very polite, the addressee might think that the speaker is trying to keep some distance from her, however, from the succeeding T4, which as a focal request is very casual, even presumptuous, she is prompted to reposition herself
as the recipient of advice from X. This gap between T2 and T4 might be perplexing to the average addressee (as opposed to Japanese language teacher!), because the two predicates contradict each other as indications of distance the speaker feels to hold between the two of them.

(V-6) X = NNM12 playing the role of a person whose car insurance is about to expire in Task 3
Y = the researcher, playing the role of X’s friend

T1 X: | Eeto | raisyyuu no syuumatu anoo, ryokoo desu kedo ..
‘Let's see, [it] is about next weekend, well about (our) trip, but ..
(distant style)’

T2 Y: N.
‘Yeah.’

T3 X: .. | anoo | boku no kuruma no insyuransu wa ..
‘.. um, my car insurance ..’

T4 Y: N.
‘Hm.’

T5 X: .. | anoo | raisyyuu kara ..
‘.. um, from next week ..’

T6 Y: N.
‘Hm.’

T7 X: .. hazimete kara ..
‘.. starts, so ..’

T8 Y: Aa, honto ni.
‘Oh, really.’

T9 X: | Ano | soo desu nee, | anoo | unten-site kurenai?
‘Um, let me see (distant style). Well, won’t you drive (the car)?
(direct style)’

T10 Y: A, watasi ga?
‘Who, me?’

T11 X: Soo desu.
‘That’s right. (distant style)’

In (V-6), X introduces his topic in distant style as in T1, but his focal request in (T9) is in direct style. In T11, he goes back to distant style. This shift in the same
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sequence makes the sequence incoherent in terms of distance. (Sometimes
speakers drop distal and speak from "closer up" in response to, say, introduction
of a topic they feel little distance from, but there is no sign of this here.)

There were others who consistently used distal style regardless of the
addressee, or the style s/he used. One such example is shown in (V-7), where
the conversants are supposed to be friends.

(V-7) X = NNM2 playing the role of a person whose car insurance is
about to expire in Task 3
  Y = the researcher, playing the role of X's friend

T1 X: A, |anoo| kuruma mo unten-menkyosyoo mo |anoo| hoken mo aru
       sooo desu. Hontoo desu ka?
       '[I] heard that [you] have a driver’s license and car insurance. Is that
       true? (distal style)'

T2 Y: N, aru yo.
       'Yeah, I do. (direct style)'

T3 X: |Anoo| unten-site kudasaimasen ka?
       'Well, would you drive (the car)?' (lit. 'Won’t you give (distal) uti
       driving?')

T4 Y: N, wakatta.
       'OK. Will do. (lit. '[I]’ve understood. (direct style)'

T5 X: Arigatoo gozaimasu.
       'Thank you very much. (distal style)'

In this sequence, X uses distal style in all of his turns (T1, T3, T5), while his
addressee Y keeps to direct style constantly. In such interaction, it is possible for
Y to interpret X’s attitude as trying to maintain distance. If, as we would expect
between friends, direct style predicates are the norm between these two people,
Y will assume that X has a reason for this unusual, distant attitude, and will try
to imagine what it is. It is probably not a happy one, either, since "going distal"
with topics and in contexts where the same two people would normally leave
their predicates in direct style is often an index of disaffection. If this misunderstanding happens, their relationship might be negatively affected. As we have observed, in interaction where the use of direct style is expected, the use of distal style or shifting from one style to the other without apparent reason creates an inconsistent impression. If the interpretation of these shifts is left entirely to the addressee, the speaker’s intention could be misunderstood, and could offend the addressee.

How, then, should non-native learners be introduced to and assisted in gaining a feel for the adjusting of personal distance that distal/direct marking makes possible? Learners using JSL and most other textbooks encounter distal style as their first style of Japanese. Even though direct style is introduced in their first year of study, these learners get used to the distal style sooner and, it seems, feel it to be more comfortable for some time. One of the learners elaborated on this point in his recall protocol interview:

- “It’s also because like I said I spent so much time doing masu, most of our drills are in masu, not direct?... that even anybody does direct in class, takes them while longer to ... because it’s like you have to first translate it into Japanese in your mind, and then translate it into direct. You ... nobody in our class can go straight to direct, I don’t think. At first I have to think masu, and then think what it would be from masu,; it takes twice as long. And when you are nervous, you go back to the first thing you learned usually.” (NNM9)

Although it is not certain that his statement about “most of our drills being in masu” is accurate (and hard to check with precision, given that the scope of his present tense is unclear), it seems true that, if we begin with Lesson 1 and track usage into the present lesson, the number of opportunities for using direct style final predicates is somewhat limited. It will help to know what kind of
information and models their materials and instruction provided regarding distal/direct style differences. The following section therefore describes how this kind of style is treated in JSL.

5.3.3.1 Description of distal/direct style use in JSL

In the previous section, I noted that the learners had difficulty in switching between direct and distal styles according to whom they are talking to. In recall protocol interviews, the learners themselves mentioned this difficulty. This section will describe how distal/direct style is treated in Japanese: the Spoken Language (JSL) Parts 1, 2, and 3, the textbook that these learners used in their Japanese courses. This description will illuminate one side of the instruction these learners had received. Before doing that, I will describe briefly how a lesson in JSL is structured, and how it is designed to be used.5

In JSL, one lesson consists of three sections: A, B, and C. In section A, there are Core Conversations (CCs), English Equivalents to the CCs, Breakdowns with Supplementary Vocabulary, Miscellaneous Notes (MNs), Structural Patterns (SPs), Drills, and Application Exercises (AEs). Section B has a structure parallel to Section A. CCs are sets of conversations, each of which is carried out by a pair or three characters, one of whom is non-Japanese.6 The conversations range in length from single exchanges to multiple turn sequences. They are

---

5 See Quinn's (1991) review, for a more detailed and in-depth discussion.

6 All actors on the videotapes are adult Japanese. Several of the characters they play have English-based family names, and these people have presumably come to Japan after spending the first part of their lives abroad.
provided as models for the learners, and they are “to be memorized, using the accompanying video and audiotapes,” as stated in How to Use This Book (1. xviii). CCs are followed by English Equivalents of their contents and Breakdowns, which list new vocabulary items with English equivalents. New vocabulary that do not appear in the CCs, but are somehow relevant to their contents and can be substituted in the CC frame are listed in the “Breakdown (Supplementary Vocabulary)” section.

MNIs provide explanatory background on the CCs. They typically include information on the social settings in which the conversations take place and the social relationships of the participants, especially as these relate to the language used in that CC. Thus, it is in the MNIs that style (distal/direct and other such distinctions) is commented on. When relevant to the scene portrayed in the CC, there is also background information on how things are done in Japanese society. Then a set of SPs provides information on new grammar and its uses. A set of drills follows the SPs, and consists of sets of two-turn conversational exchanges (typically eight or fewer for each drill) between two people. The initiating turn is the drill’s cue, to which the student responds following the model set by the first two items in the drill. All these exchanges are created using vocabulary and structural patterns that have been already introduced to the learners, with a focus on moves, words, and grammar introduced in the present lesson. Like the CCs, drills are provided as models for the learners, and learners are advised to

\[^{7} \text{Because JSL has three volumes, page number will be cited preceded with the volume number in this way.}\]
practice them with tapes outside class hours. In the introductory *How to Use This Book* section of JSL Part 1, the authors state "Your performance in these drills must not be considered satisfactory until you can participate promptly and accurately according to the models, without reference to the textbook" (1. xviii-xix).

Section B of the lesson follows, and introduces more new material, in the same component parts, presented in the same order as in Section A. Finally, what was newly introduced in Sections A and B of the lesson is further synthesized with language from earlier lessons, in the concluding Section C. Section C introduces no new linguistic items. Rather, it reintroduces previously learned material in new contexts and combinations.

Section C provides three kinds of activities: Eavesdropping, Utilization and Check-up. Eavesdropping provides a list of questions in English, about a series of audiotaped exchanges in Japanese. Students answer these questions in English, usually as a written homework assignment. Utilization presents from 20 to 45 descriptions of situations with tasks to accomplish, in the process of which learners must use vocabulary and structural patterns they studied in that lesson (in addition to other language learned previously). As indicated earlier, Utilization problems are typically assigned ahead of time and then performed in class, with feedback from the instructor. Check-up provides a series of questions in English regarding the information presented in SPs. These questions are
assigned as homework or used as quizzes. The most advanced learners who participated in the present study had studied through Lesson 29 of JSL Part 3.

Since it is relevant to assessing their performances in my experiment, I will now describe how information on style, in the sense of socially relevant linguistic distinctions, is provided to these learners in their textbook. While I will be tracking the declarative (as opposed to performative) introduction of these concepts, it should be kept in mind that the textbook also provides for the performed rehearsal (in CCs, drills, Eavesdropping) of every such distinction that is addressed declaratively. On top of this, of course, the same distinctions were utilized in classes attended by the learners.

Distal/direct distinction is discussed repeatedly throughout. They are treated in SP in Lessons 1A, 1B, 2A, 3B, 5A, 7A, 8A, 9A, 11A, 14A, 19A, 20A, and 21A. Lesson 1A introduces a verbal sentence, one of three major sentence types. In 1A’s Structural Patterns (SPs), distal style is defined as follows:

The -mas- (-masi- before consonants) portion of the above forms is a style marker. It signals what will be called DISTAL-STYLE for verbals. This style indicates that the speaker is showing solicitude toward, and maintaining some linguistic distance from, the addressee, i.e., s/he is being less direct and more formal as a sign of deference to the person addressed (and/or the topic of discussion), rather than talking directly, intimately, familiarly, abruptly, or carelessly. This variety of speech is most generally acceptable for foreign adults just beginning their study of the language. Distal-style contrasts with DIRECT-STYLE, introduced later. (1.32)

Jorden states that “there is no neutral style in the Japanese language,” and that the regimen starts out “with the ‘safest’ style for foreign adult speakers” (1.32). In Lesson 1B, the second major sentence type, an adjectival sentence, is
introduced. In the explanation of an adjectival, the distal/direct distinction is referred to again, as follows:

These adjectival forms are direct-style, and in casual speech, may occur as complete sentences all by themselves. The addition of desu serves only to convert them to distal-style, making them parallel to verbal forms containing -mas/-masi-. (For the present, we will be using distal-style exclusively, the only style introduced thus far for verbs.)

(1.40)

At the end of Lesson 1, in Section 1C, the learners’ understanding of these explanations and others is tested with Check-up questions like the following.

4. What is meant by direct-style and distal-style?
5. What signals distal-style for verbs? For adjectivals? (1.47)

Lesson 2A introduces nominal sentences, the last of the three major sentence types. Regarding the style distinction, the difference between a nominal and a nominal sentence is explained as follows:

Both takai and takai desu have the exact same meaning: the only difference is stylistic, i.e., direct-style as opposed to distal-style. However, the difference between the nominal alone and /X + desu/ is, in most contexts, the difference between ‘X’ and ‘it is or will be X’ distal-style.

(1.51)

In a footnote, it is added that “the corresponding direct-style equivalents of /nominal + desu/ and /nominal + desita/ will be mentioned later” (1.51).

In Sections 1A (i.e. Lesson 1, Section A), 1B and 2A, the three major sentence types are introduced, but only with predicates in sentence-final position, i.e. main clause predicates. For the three sentence types, the distal/direct classification of a sentence is thus noted to depend on the style marking of the final predicate. In Lesson 3B, the first examples adnominal
clauses are introduced in their default direct style. The relevant SP explains as follows.

In Japanese, a direct-style predicate may occur directly before a nominal as a description of that nominal. Our first examples of this pattern consists of : /adjectival in its –i form (=direct-style, imperfective, affirmative) + nominal/.... A combination like atarasi zisyo desu is still a distal-style nominal predicate (even though its nominal is itself described by a direct-style adjectival predicate); therefore its corresponding negative equivalent is atarasi zisyo zya nai desu or atarasi zisyo zya arimasen (1. 77)

This point is confirmed in the same lesson’s Section C Check-up with the following questions:

9. What sentence type does Takai zisyo desu represent? What is its exact negative equivalent? Is the sentence direct- or distal-style? Is takai (1) affirmative or negative? (2) imperfective or perfective? (3) direct or distal? (1. 83)

Up to Lesson 4, the most typical description made of entire CCs in the Miscellaneous Notes (MNs) is, “the CCs of this section are brief exchanges between individuals who maintain a certain amount of distance when communicating with each other” (1. 50). Starting with Lesson 5, even though sentence-final (main clause) predicates are kept in distal-style, more stylistic varieties are introduced. Starting from Lesson 3B, several CCs take place in shopping situations. In Lesson 5A, in the utterance of a sales clerk, gozaimasu, the “special polite” equivalent of arimasu is introduced. Learners are familiar with the word gozaimasu as part of ritual expressions Arigato gozaimasu. ‘Thank you’ and Ohayoo gozaimasu. ‘Good morning’, etc. that were introduced even
before Lesson 1, as "Greetings and useful phrases" (1. 26-27) but in this chapter, gozaimasu is treated as an independent lexical item, and explained in detail:

Gozaimasu is the polite equivalent of arimasu. Both of these verbal forms are distal-style, as evidenced by -mas-, but in addition, gozaimasu has a polite stem, which indicates deference and respect toward the person addressed (represented by /+/). In general, forms of arimasu can be replaced by corresponding forms of gozaimasu, but the reverse is not always true. The polite equivalent of both arimasen and nai desu is gozaimasen, and of both arimasen desita and nakatta desu, gozaimasen desita.

Except for its use in ritual expressions (arigatoo gozaimasu, ohayoo gozaimasu, etc.), gozaimasu occurs only in very polite, careful speech, including the language of service personnel. It is also heard frequently in public announcements. Note that in the Breakdowns, even the gerund for this verbal was cited in distal-style (gozaimasite), the only gerund form for this verbal that occurs in modern Japanese.

The speaker's relationship to the person addressed determines the appropriateness of gozaimasu: a Japanese secretary might use it in speaking to the company president, but the president would definitely not use it in addressing the secretary; a waiter might use it in addressing a customer, but the reverse would be unusual. It would not ordinarily occur in conversation among close friends nor in the language of young people or children. Beginning language students will find it to be a verbal they hear more often than use-except of course in ritual expressions used by everyone.

(1. 117)

In Lesson 5B, an inverted sentence, such as Mimasita ka→Tanaka-san no atarasii kuruma, is introduced. Although it is still in distal style, its occurrence is acknowledged with the comment "inverted sentences are more frequent in relaxed, informal conversation" (1. 128).

In Lesson 7A, the distal/direct distinction is augmented with the introduction of the difference between "plain" and "polite" forms, which is explained along with the concept of in-group/out-group:
The Core Conversation predicates thus far have been distal-style predicates: the participants have been colleagues who maintain a certain distance—who do not speak to each other as close friends or intimates.

But even within this style—as well as within direct-style—Japanese differentiates between plain and polite forms. Whereas distal-style reflects the degree of closeness and the level of formality the speaker feels toward the addressee, the second axis—which relates to politeness—is determined by the relative positions of the person to whom the predicate refers, the addressee, and the speaker.

Playing a crucial role in this is the distinction between in-group and out-group. Any individual Japanese belongs to a number of societal groups—the family, the school group, the work group, clubs, sports teams, etc.—and of primary importance in determining the kind of language to be used on any occasion is the identification of these groups in the setting of the moment. The groups are constantly shifting, depending on the participants and the speaker’s viewpoint. Group affiliation is so basic that it is probably valid to consider an individual who, at the moment, is operating in isolation, as a “minimal in-group.”

This explanation is followed up on in the Check-up at the end of the same lesson:

6. What is the difference between polite-style and distal-style?

(1. 188)

Lesson 8A introduces a CC in which “two people who are on more familiar terms” (1. 193) converse. These conversants do not use direct-style verbals, because those forms have not been introduced yet, but the style is clearly casual:

 ‘After this (to) Nagoya? ’Yeah. I’ll stop at Nagoya for three days, and then Kyoto.’

b. Kaeri wa?
‘When will you be back?’
(J) b. Zyuuyok-ka-goro.

(lit. [How about] your return?)
A very detailed explanation of this CC follows in SP:

The participants of CC3 are two students, a Japanese and a foreigner, who have become more informal in speaking with each other. Previously, at a time when they had first met, they used more deferential conversation, with distal-style final predicates. This kind of style shift is more common among students and young people who are peers. While CC3 does not include any actual direct-style inflected forms, it reflects a casual style in every sentence.

(N)a: The use of a fragment lacking a predicate is more casual than a corresponding major sentence in the distal-style, which might here include some form of ikimasu. The question status of the utterance depends entirely on question intonation.

(j)a: N is a casual equivalent of ee, used commonly, though by no means exclusively, by males. At the other end of the scale is the very formal affirmative, haa. The Nagoya...Kyoto sentence is an example of the dropping of sentence-final desu following a nominal, which frequently occurs in direct-style speech. In distal-style, we would expect sore kara, Kyotto desu.

(N)b: Kaeri wa? is a fragment—a casual equivalent of Kaeri wa doo (or itu) desu ka? Again, the question status of the utterance depends on question intonation.

(j)b: This utterance, like (j)a, is an example of the direct-style dropping of the desu of a sentence-final nominal predicate.

(1. 197)

With the presentation of this CC, another set of concepts regarding style is introduced:

Hereafter, we will use the terms CASUAL and CAREFUL to refer to speech styles. Casual speech is marked by the frequent use of fragments without predicates, particular vocabulary items (like n ‘yeah’), many contractions, and direct-style inflected forms. Careful speech has fewer fragments without predicates and more major sentences, particular formal vocabulary items, fewer contractions, and more distal-style inflected forms (i.e., -masu/desu forms) at least in sentence-final predicates. Note that both casual-and careful-style can be polite or plain. More will be said about this later. Clearly, casual and careful styles are not absolutes: they represent a range from maximally casual to maximally careful, with countless degrees in between. We label a particular conversation on the basis of the majority of all the signals given.

(1. 197)
This explanation is later followed up on with three questions in the lesson’s Check-up:

5. What do we mean by ‘casual-style?’ When is it used? With what style does it contrast? (1. 217)

In Lesson 9A, the first examples of casual-style conversations with direct-style main clause predicates are presented. They include direct-style final predicates of the three predicate types, i.e., verbal, adjectival and nominal. In the corresponding MNs, these CCs are described as “typical of informal conversations among close friends” (1. 221). One such example is CC3’:

CC3’ (J) Dekiru?
‘Do you know how to play? (lit. Can you do it?)’
(N) Kore? N. Dekiru yo?
‘This? Yeah, I can play.’

(1. 219)

The text notes the complication regarding style that learners face and the importance of examining “a number of different scales, each representing a continuum between two extremes with multiple divisions” (1. 226). Although the careful/casual style difference was touched upon in SP4 of Lesson 8, the text provides another thorough explanation about style differences in SP 3 in this Lesson. The first one concerns the careful/casual continuum:

*Careful and Casual.* The continuum which ranges from the most careful to the most casual involves an overall style of language. In particular, the following features are involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Careful</th>
<th>Casual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominant use of distal-style predicates in sentence-final position, and elsewhere where optional</td>
<td>Predominant use of direct-style predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer fragments</td>
<td>More fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer contracted forms</td>
<td>More frequent use of such particles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Longer, more complex sentences  Shorter, simpler sentences
Less use of sentence-particles,  More frequent use of such
    particularly those marked as particles
    colloquial, assertive, confirmatory,
    brusque, coarse, etc.

We describe language as being more careful or more casual on the basis of a measure of all the above-mentioned features. Remember that how one addresses a partner in a conversation is determined by the speaker’s relation to the addressee: the relationship is not necessarily reciprocal. Thus A’s position and/or age and/or gender may permit casualness in communicating with B, whereas B may be required to maintain careful-style because of his-her position vis-à-vis A.

(1. 226-227)

Next, the authors review the distal/direct and polite/plain distinction in the process of explaining differences between clause-particles kedo and ga:

The clause-particles kedo and ga, although very similar in meaning, present contrast in stylistic usage. The predicate preceding ga usually matches the final predicate of the sentence in terms of distal- or direct-style (and /direct-style + ga/ is comparatively rare in the spoken language, particularly in female speech). On the other hand, provided the final predicate is distal-style⁶, either direct- or distal-style may precede kedo, and therefore, the choice that is made may be significant in the interpretation of overall style.

(1. 227)

One more addition to these parameters is that of blunt/gentle (within which masculine/feminine distinctions are less directly indexed). It is explained as follows:

Here we have another continuum, which ranges from language which is markedly blunt, virile, tough, and aggressive through a neutral point to style which is markedly gentle, empathetic, and soft. The extremes are those few patterns used almost exclusively by one sex or the other.

One of the myths relating to Japanese is that there are many structures and features used exclusively by one sex. While this may have been more valid in the past, today most Japanese tend to use a greater range of styles, differentiated by situation. There are

⁶ With a final predicate in direct-style, the predicate preceding kedo is also direct-style.
occasions when men use a softer, more empathetic style of the kind traditionally identified as ‘feminine’ (particularly when speaking with women and children), and occasions when women elect to speak in a rougher, more blunt, ‘masculine’ style. (1. 228)

Not much later, the blunt/gentle distinction is put to work in explaining use of the extended predicate in direct-style:

The extended predicate also has a direct-style equivalent, which involves the substitution of da for final desu:

aru n desu > aru n da

However, this form is more typical of blunt-style speech, except when followed by the feminine sentence-particle /wa\/. It is particularly marked as blunt when it occurs in final position in a sentence or pre-final before yo. In that position, gentle-style speech is marked by the dropping of the unstable da and the replacement of n by its uncontracted equivalent no. Thus:

iku n da (yo). /blunt/
iki no (yo). /gentle/

These forms are marked as typically ‘blunt’ or ‘gentle,’ but not as strictly ‘masculine’ or ‘feminine.’ The no alternative with question intonation occurs commonly in direct-style extended predicate questions (cf. CC5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct-style</th>
<th>Distal-style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaeru no?</td>
<td>Kaeru n desu ka/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this direct-style pattern is classified as ‘gentle’ (i.e., empathetic, soft, and more typical of female speech), it is also used by men, particularly when talking familiarly to women and children. (1. 243-244)

Lesson 9 is rich with information and examples concerning style differences. All the explanation given in this lesson is followed up on with questions in its Check-up section:

1. What is the difference between wakaru and wakarimasu?

Abunai.
Kiree da.

These are representative of the three predicate types, and are all imperfective, direct-style, and affirmative. Convert them to (1)
distal-style; (b) perfective; (c) distal-style perfective; (d) distal-style tentative (= probable); (e) distal-style perfective tentative.

11. How is casual-style distinguished from careful-style?

12. Give examples of markedly feminine patterns; of blunt and gentle patterns.

16. What is meant by the extended predicate?

   Given: Wakaru.
   Abunai.
   Kiree da.

   Convert these predicates to (a) distal-style extended predicates; (b) distal-style tentative (= probable) extended predicates; (c) distal-style perfective extended predicates; (d) distal-style perfective tentative extended predicates. What form does the extended predicate take at the end of sentences in blunt and in gentle direct-style? (1. 253)

As the lessons progress, sentences become more complex. In Lesson 11A, sentences with two clauses connected by kara ‘because’ are introduced, and the relationship between the style of the first clause’s predicate and that of the following clause’s predicate is therefore explained, with the necessary reference to the distal/direct parameter:

   The predicate before kara follows the pattern of the predicate before kedo: if the final predicate is direct-style, only the direct-style occurs before kara; but if the final predicate is distal-style, or a polite request, either distal- or direct-style may occur before kara, the former indicating more careful style. (1. 297)

In the same Lesson 11A, /X to omou/ ‘[I] think X’ is also introduced, and here again the social parameter comes up; it is explained that the first predicate X “is regularly in the direct-style” (1. 300). In the Check-up of Lesson 11C, the following question seeks feedback on understanding of the explanation about kara:
4. What is the meaning of a /predicate (imperfective, perfective, or tentative + kara/? Describe occurrence of distal- and direct-style before kara. (1. 318)

Most references to style differences indicated grammatically are made in JSL Part 1. While introduced gradually, the basic parameters of these socially important distinctions have all been modelled and explained by this point. In Part 2 and Part 3 of the textbook (volumes two and three), the number of SPs concerning style differences decreases greatly. However, from start to finish of JSL, every MN on every CC in every lesson provide detailed information on style in the senses described above. In Lesson 14A, for example, questions without interrogative particle ka are discussed:

In such questions, a final su syllable always has full voicing. This pattern is slightly more gentle than the corresponding pattern with ka, but otherwise is similar in meaning. Examples:

Dekimasu? ‘Is it possible?’
Moo tabemasita? ‘Have you eaten [it] yet?’
Irassyaimasen? ‘Won’t you go/come/stay?’ (2. 36)

This explanation is followed up with questions in Check-up:

6. In what two ways can wakarimasu be converted into a question still in distal-style, the equivalent of ‘do you understand?’ How do the two patterns differ? (2. 56)

References to direct-style in Part 2 are mostly made regarding its occurrence in subordinate clauses. There are several examples. In Lesson 19A, adnominal sentence modifiers with verbal final predicates are introduced:

Since the earliest lessons, we have been using the pattern /adjectival + nominal/, as in takai zisyo, ookii hon, etc. If we examine this pattern, we find that it consists of a direct-style, imperfective adjectival followed directly by a nominal. Thus, takai ‘it is expensive’ (NOT SIMPLY ‘expensive’) + zisyo ‘dictionary’ = ‘a dictionary which is expensive,’ ‘an is-expensive dictionary.’
We have already learned that in general, in whatever kind of context an adjectival occurs, the corresponding form of a verbal can also occur. This pattern is no exception. Thus we find direct-style imperfective verbals immediately preceding nominals as descriptions of the nominals: **iru mono** ‘things [I] need; **dekiru sigoto** ‘work [I] can do’; **taberu sakana** ‘fish [I] eat (or am going to eat).’

(2. 169)

In Lesson 20A, the direct-style consultative is introduced:

The direct-style consultative may occur as the final predicate of a major sentence. In such occurrences, it is typical of casual-style, particularly blunt speech used by men. Examples:

- **Zyaa, ikoo.** ‘Well then, let’s go.’
- **Kaeroo ka.** ‘Sh’re go home?’
- **Yameyoo ka naa.** ‘I wonder if I should quit.’

One of the most frequent uses of this form is in the pattern /direct-style consultative X + to omou/ = ‘[I] think that [I]’ll X’. In such cases, identification with blunt-style is lost.

(2. 204)

After additional modelling and rehearsal work in the drills to sections 20A and 20B, this explanation is followed up on with questions in 20C Check-up:

6. How is the direct-style consultative of verbals formed? What is the distal-style equivalent? How is the distal form analyzed?

(2. 226)

One more case of a stylistic matter addressed in an SP is found in Lesson 21A. It is an introduction of the construction /predicate + soo da/:

/Direct-style perfective or imperfective predicate X + soo da/ = ‘X is said to be true,’ ‘I hear that X is true.’ The source of the information need not be made clear. **Soo** is one of the very few nominals preceding which the da form of the copula (ending a sentence modifier) occurs in an unchanged form.

(2. 234-235)

This is also followed up on with questions in the same lesson’s Check-up:

3. What is the meaning of **soo da** attached to a predicate? What forms does the predicate preceding **soo da** take? Which of these forms is unusual?

(2. 255)
As we have observed, information on the use of distal/direct style is systematically presented in JSL. In earlier lessons, the authors explain the differences between distal/direct styles, i.e., who would use which style in relation to whom, in what situations, etc. When newly introduced grammatical items are markable for this distal/direct parameter, the distinction is again introduced, in addition to the modelling and rehearsal opportunities continuously available to learners in CCs and drills. The authors’ account of distal/direct style choices as made by Japanese speakers is dynamic and flexible.

A person who uses distal style predicates may also choose to use other features that add to an effect that is more casual, depending on the conversation’s topic, setting, and/or participants. In order to explain this mixing phenomenon, the authors introduce the scalar notion of the careful-casual continuum. They present many CCs in which participants use casual features while using distal style final predicates. In later lessons, it is the direct style that gets more attention, mainly as a consequence of the introduction of more varieties of subordinate clauses, where predicates are by default in direct-style. All information pertaining to distal/direct style is provided in SPs and MNs, and every time a new stylistic matter is addressed in a SP, the Check-up questions that conclude the same lesson check learners’ understanding of it. The information is detailed and its presentation is systematic, and modelling and rehearsal continue throughout, in the many CCs, drills, and Eavesdropping. The learners would therefore find it hard to blame their textbook for the difficulty that they express regarding distal/direct style switching. In the next section, I
will focus on CCs, which have the function of being the primary models for new language and behavioral culture in each lesson.

5.3.3.2 Core Conversations in JSL

Core Conversations (CCs) are presented as models of newly introduced language, in a matrix of previously introduced language. Because learners in courses using JSL at Ohio State are required to perform the CCs from memory in class, CCs become the core foundation of their evolving “pedagogical dialect”9 of Japanese. Among other things, CCs need to demonstrate for the learners how different factors such as interactants’ social identities, the current topic of the conversation, or the presence or absence of bystanders can influence distal vs. direct style choices. This section therefore focuses on how distal/direct choices are treated in the textbook’s CCs.

Out of 241 sets of CC, 193 sets (80%) have their main-clause (sentence-final) predicates, at least partially, in distal-style. The number of CCs with main-clause predicates, at least partially in direct style is 30 (12.4%). The number of CCs with the conversants speaking in non-reciprocal styles (in which one participant speaks in distal and another in direct) is 15 (6.2%). There are three CCs (1.2%) in which the style change occurs as the speaker changes her addressee within the conversation.

In the majority of CCs whose main-clause predicates mostly in distal-style, CC characters are business colleagues. When they interact with strangers

---

9 A term due to Galal Walker.
on the street or service personnel such as store clerks and waiters, distal style is also used. Student CC characters who have not established casual relationships with each other in the earlier lessons speak to each other in distal style. When direct style for verbal sentences is introduced in Lesson 9A, however, these student characters start conversing in direct style. The relevant MNs note this major shift from distal to direct style in these relationships and provide motivating factors for it. The following explanation is given about the CCs carried out in direct style in Lesson 9A:

They are typical of informal conversations among close fiends. In the accompanying video, some of the participants who started out using careful-style (with distal-style final predicates) in earlier lessons are now shifting to casual-style (with direct-style final predicates) in some contexts, as they become more relaxed and informal.  

(1. 221)

Note, however, that although the CCs in Lesson 9A are the first conversations in which all main clause predicates are in direct style, examples of conversation with casual features have been presented and explained a number of times prior to Lesson 9A. CC4 in Lesson 7A is such an example:

4(N)a. Kyoo wa doko de tabemashita ka\(^{\sqrt {\text{J}}} \) (J)a. Tika no atarasi kissaten de.

‘Today where did you eat?’

b. Oisii desu ka\(^{\sqrt {\text{J}}} \) asoko.

‘Is it good—that place?’

b. Ee. Nakamura-san mo imasita yo\(^{\sqrt {\text{J}}} \)

‘Yes. You know, Mr/s. Nakamura was there, too.’

(1. 158)
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In this example, final predicates are in distal-style, however, as the MN points out, “the fragment (J)a and an inverted sentence (N)b suggest some informality, matching the topic” (1. 167). The characters in this CC are a Japanese secretary and a foreign businessman. They usually speak to each other in distal style, but as the MN mentions, the topic of this conversation has apparently contributed to the rather casual tone of this conversation. It is a good example of conversation in which the topic has influenced the style in the direction of the more casual, even while any main clause predicates used is marked as distal. This is one of a number of demonstrations that the distal/direct marking of individual predications is not the only way in which talk is rendered more or less casual or careful. Another such example is CC3 of Lesson 8B:

3(N)a. Kotosi no zyuu-gatu kara ik-kagetu-gurai Yooroppa e ite kimasu.

‘I’m going (lit. I’ll come [back] having gone) to Europe for about a month, starting this October.’

(J)a. Hontoo desu ka√ Ii desu nee.

Oyasumi desu ka√
‘Really? Isn’t that great! Will it be a vacation?’


‘Vacation? Heavens no! It will be work.’

b. De mo, tanosimi desyoo?

‘Even so, you’re looking forward to it, aren’t you?’
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c. Ee. Maa ne.
‘Yes, I guess so.’

This is a conversation between two business colleagues. The conversational norm for these men is distal style. However, the MN following this CC points out casual-style features in N(b) and N(c). Its explanation is as follows.

The occurrence of Yasumi? Is not a particularly significant style marker here, since it simply echoes a word that was just uttered. However, tonde mo nai is clearly a direct-style adjectival sentence, and (N)c is a fragment. This kind of stylistic mixture is common, resulting in the continuum from very careful to very casual,

referred to previously, assignment to which depends on the nature of the stylistic mix.

(1. 206)

As we observed in the above two examples, JSL does not treat casual-style and careful-style as two totally separate entities, but rather a continuum.

In the thirty sets of CCs whose main clause predicates in direct-style, the CC characters are mainly students, husband and wife, and business colleagues who have developed close relationship with each other. Settings for these conversations vary from the office used by graduate students to a room at a Japanese inn, but the settings themselves do not seem to influence much the choice of direct style. The primary motivating factor for the use of direct style seems to be the closeness of the relationship between the participants, combined with the presence or absence of others, which is of course partly a matter of setting. There seems to be no case in which use of a direct-style predicate was motivated by a topic or goal in the conversation.

As for the sixteen sets of CCs that constitute non-reciprocal uses of styles, the characters in these are indexing differences in their social identities vis-à-vis
each other. These participants include pairs consisting of graduate student-with-professor, business subordinate-with-superior, and businessman-with-professor. In the case of business subordinate-with-superior pair, the subordinate uses distal style and the superior uses direct style. This mutual indexing of differently gauged interpersonal distance is consistent, played out by these characters across all the conversations they appear together in. One such example (9A CC6) is shown below, in which (J) is the superior, and (N) is the subordinate:

   ‘Is Mr/s. Tanaka over there today?’ ‘I assume s/he is.’

b. Isogasii?
   ‘Is s/he busy?’

      ‘Probably not especially (busy).
      Shall I call him/her?’

   c. N.
   ‘Yeah.’

The motivating factor for the use of non-reciprocal styles is clearly the difference in social identity between two participants. Basically, the same principle seems to be at work in other CCs of this category.

Among those CCs with non-reciprocal styles, there are three slightly different cases. In these, we can observe style shifts in the speech of one of the participants. Our first example is CC3 of 26A:
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3(N)a. Tyotto gosoodan-sitai koto ga aru n desu ga.
   'There's a matter I'd like to discuss with you, but... (is it all right?)

(J)a. Nan desyoo.
   'What is it?'

b. | Anoo | Uti no senpai no Mizuno-san nee.
   'Uh, my senior colleague, Mr. Mizuno, you know.'

b. Ee.
   'Yes.'

c. Kono-goro tyotto yoosu ga hen na n desu.
   'It's that his manner is a bit strange these days.'

c. Hen to iu to?
   'When you say strange, (What do you mean?)'

d. Nan to naku, tumetaku natta yoo na ki ga suru n desu yo.
   'It's that somehow I have the feeling that he's become cold.'

d. Tumetaku natta
   'He's become cold?'

e. Ee. Sekkaku tomodati to site tukiaeru yoo ni natte kita to omottara desu nee!. Kyuu ni mata kyori ga dekita-mitai de.
   'Yes. [Just] when I thought I had at least become able to associate [with him] as a friend, you know. Suddenly it's (lit. being) as if distance [between us] has developed again.'

e. Aa, mosi ka suru to, koohai to site wa Hanasikata ga sitasi-sugita n zya arimasen ka?
   'Oh, isn't it perhaps the case that your way of talking has been too familiar for a junior colleague?'

f. Watasi ga desu ka?
   'I [ve done this]?'
f. Ee. Donnna ni sitasiku natte mo, koohai wa koohai-rasiku | desu nee |. Hanasikata nanka mo, tyotto ki o tukeru yoo ni site mitara doo desyoo.

'Yes. No matter how familiar you become, juniors [should act] like juniors, you know. Why don't you try to be a bit careful even about things like your way of talking, and see (how that works out).'

g. Aa. Naruhodo nee.

'Oh. Of course (I might have known).'

In this CC, (N) is a youngish businessman, a foreigner who has a concern about his relationship with a senior colleague, and (J) is an older professor. The young businessman seeks advice from the professor on this matter. The speech style of the professor shifts from distal in (J)a to minor sentence in (J)c, and direct in (J)d, and then back to distal in (J)e and f. The MN accompanying this CC explains that this shift takes place because "[the professor] is anxious to show concern and sincere interest in [the businessman’s] problems" (3. 44). It is difficult to determine the stylistic norm these two characters expect of each other. In two other CCs in which these two people interact, in one, both parties use distal style, and in another, only the businessman uses distal while the professor uses direct. At the least, we can say that the style of the businessman never shifts from distal to direct, while this shift can happen in professor's speech. In the above CC (26A
CC3), the distal to direct style shift occurred as manifestation of the professor’s sincere concern.

The second example also involves a stylistically non-reciprocal interaction. In this CC, a very subtle style shifts take place in one party’s speech. This is CC4 in Lesson 20B, in which a graduate student and a professor discuss, in the latter’s office, a recent conference the professor attended:

4(N)a. Doo desita–gakkai wa.
    ‘How was it—the academic conference?’
    ‘Somehow—you know… (It’s that) I went with the expectation of learning all kinds of things, but…(it didn’t turn out that way).’

b. Puroguramu ni wa zuibun rippa na namae ga dete (i)masita kedo nee.
   ‘On the program, very eminent names appeared, but…(was there a problem?)’
   b. Sore wa soo na n da kedo nee. Yaku ni tatanai hanasi no ooi puroguramu de nee.
      Gakkari sityatta.
      ‘(It’s the case that) that is so, but it was a program with lots of useless talks, and—you know! It was a letdown.’

c. Soo desu ka.
   ‘Really!’
In this CC, the graduate student uses distal style and the professor uses direct style, which both reflects and maintains their different social positions vis-à-vis each other. In the CCs where these two people interact, their distal/direct stylistic marking is always non-reciprocal. However, in this particular CC, as the MN points out, the graduate student’s use of an inverted sentence and a question without ka in (N)a “move her language slightly toward the casual on the casual-careful continuum” (2. 216). Jorden does not speculate as to what triggered this shift toward the casual but it could be a natural reflection of the graduate student’s eagerness to learn about the conference. Also, she apparently works for him in that office. That is, she often sees him there, and probably knows him better than grad students who do not work there.

In the third example, the characters are the same as in the one just above: the female graduate student and the professor. In this conversation (19B CC1), the student reports an unusual scene she observed that morning:

(N)a. Kesa takusii ni notta n desu ga ne√
Untensyu ga zyosee no takusii
na n desu yo. (J) Hee√ Mezurasii nee.
‘I rode in a taxi this morning, but do you know what? I’m talking about a taxi with a woman driver.’
‘Wow! That’s amazing, isn’t it!’

b. Desyoo? Watasi mo bikkuri-
simasita.
‘Isn’t it? I was amazed, too.’

The MN of this CC draws attention to the casual features of the graduate student’s speech: yo in (N)a and the stand-alone Desyoo? In (N)b. The sentence-particle yo indicates new information, and is often used in pointing out
contradictions, issuing warnings, and so on. The SP that introduces this particle notes that “this particle should be avoided in those situations in which assertion becomes rude,” and states that “its use with superiors requires caution” (1. 33). Stand-alone Desyou? (i.e. without a preceding nominal) seeks confirmation from the addressee, and it is used in casual settings. Note that this is the effect, even if desyou is, formally speaking, the distal form opposed to direct daroo. The contrast between desyou and daroo is not a simple one because the latter is blunter than, say, the average direct-style verb, with the consequence that desyou is used more often than it otherwise might be. The MN explains that these casual features appear because “the topic and setting are informal” (2. 180). In other words, the casual topic and setting of the conversation influenced the graduate student’s speech so that it became temporarily slightly casual while keeping the overall style careful. As we have observed above, JSL demonstrates to its users that people’s speech styles can shift, even in the context of a stable, non-reciprocal relationship (i.e. one in which each party relates to the other on a different social plane). The speech style can be influenced by the nature of topic and setting, and also by the participant’s psychological involvement. Over time (completing JSL typically takes 600 class hours), learners have ample opportunity, with this regimen, to learn that one social identity is not fixed with one particular speech style. The style can move on a casual-careful continuum.

The last category of style change is of a rather different sort, since it occurs as the speaker changes addressees. This may be within the same conversation, or after ending one conversation and immediately beginning a new (often related)
one. Three CCs (1.2% of total CCs) illustrate the latter kind of case. In the first, a student leaves a message on a telephone answering machine in distal style, and then switches to direct style as he speaks to his friend, who is a bystander. In the second case, a student asks her roommate in direct style if she knows the telephone number of a *sushi* shop. She is told the number, immediately calls the shop, and orders *sushi* delivery in distal style. In the third example, a company employee informs her supervisor that there was a phone call for her while she was away. Here, the employee uses distal, and the supervisor uses direct style. Immediately after this interaction, the person who called and left the message calls again, directly to the supervisor’s desk. The supervisor picks up the phone and starts speaking in distal style. The style changes shown in these examples frequently take place in Japanese people’s lives, and are a realistic portrayal of such aspects of linguistic life in Japanese.

As we have seen above, JSL presents very authentic models of Japanese conversations in the form of 241 CCs. In these CCs, the characters choose their speech style according to their relative social positions, as they perceive them in that setting, with that topic, with those others present or not. CC characters who keep some distance between themselves use distal style reciprocally. Those who have established a mutually casual relationship maintain that relationship by continued use of casual features, including direct-style predicators. When there are mutually recognized differences in social position between two participants, such as business superior and subordinate, or student and teacher, the superior typically uses direct style and the subordinate, distal style, although as we saw in
once case (e.g. 26A CC3), the superior is free to modulate. The CCs of JSL 
regularly present conversations in which casual features, such as minor 
sentences, fragments, and inverted sentences are used. Such features are more 
affected than the distal/direct marking of individual predicators is by 
conversation settings and topics. JSL not only presents these models, but in its 
SPs and MNs also provides detailed and thorough explanation of distal/direct 
style choice as one factor in the larger casual-careful style.

5.3.3.3 Discussion

As we have observed in the previous sections, JSL provides learners 
sufficient explanation on distal/direct style difference, and a wealth of model 
and rehearsal items (in drills and Eavesdropping conversations) that we did not 
review. However, whether learners had enough practice deciding when and 
how to use of the direct style in appropriate situations is questionable. Just 
looking at the number of CCs, main clause predicates, at least partially in distal 
style (80% of the total) exceeds those in direct style (12.4%) by far. Because the 
learners have much knowledge about the use of distal/direct style, they certainly 
pay attention to it. But knowing it when you hear it is not the same as knowing 
by feel when you need to come out with it.

Some comments on direct style use were as follows:

- "I was, ah, I kept in mind to use the direct style, umm, to maintain the fact 
  that we are friends."  (NNM1-Task3)
• "... during the class we are so much used to using the distal form, sometimes switching back to the like like direct form is sometime confusing." (NNF14-Task3)

Here again, a learner mentions the lack of experience using the direct style. The following learner consciously chose distal style because, as he says, he could not assess the relationship between the role he was playing and his addressee:

• "Um, and then I wasn’t sure how close of friends we were, so I I tried to stick with the more distal form of communication rather than the really familiar form." (NNM12-Task4)

Some learners become anxious about not being polite enough:

• "Well, maybe there’s a more polite way to ask, if you have your, a, meeting at the bank, but ah I was too worried about being polite to you. I was so worried that I wasn’t polite to you." (NNM6-Task2)

• "Ahh, mmm, again I was a little nervous because I knew that the person was a little higher than me and I use some form of keigo at some point." (NNM7-Task6)

• "I still I still am not to the point where I understand where I can, uh I if I thought it through slowly, I could use teenee in the right places. Like before I was trying to use direct style as much as possible, ‘cause I was speaking to the arubaito, but this time since I was speaking with my teacher I tried to use it more often, but still it doesn’t come naturally. The only form I can use really quickly is masu, you know, ‘cause that’s the form we studied the most." (NNM9-Task3)

Because learners have studied repeatedly that addressing someone in an inappropriate style could offend, they seem to be carefully aware of their style choices, at least in order not to offend. In this regard, there were very similar reactions from two different individuals:

• "I was trying to remember to use I guess the honorific not honorific but, ah, maybe respect respect language or something because it’s a butyoo, .." (NNM 13-Task2)
• “I first of all I thought like it’s butyoo so I have to use distal style, off course, ...”

(NNF14-Task2)

In the minds of these learners, there seems to be one to one correspondence, i.e., “if my addressee is a social superior, I need to use distal style”. This simplistic equation is very different from the models and explanations the authors of JSL, not to mention, the students' teachers, have presented. In regard to the CCs, the same students have seen, heard, read, and been told repeatedly that conversation topics and settings can influence slight changes in style.

In my own case, as lead instructor, when direct style was introduced, I encouraged the learners to use direct style among themselves, so that they could get in the habit of using distal style when speaking to their instructors, and direct style when speaking to their fellow learners. However, it was very difficult to keep the use of these two styles separate. When CCs in the textbook were in distal style, and when they rehearsed them before the class hours, they had to demonstrate in class what they had rehearsed. This means that they spoke in role, in distal style to an addressee already decided in the CC model. In fact these addressees were actually played by their classmates, in the process of performing the same CC, and they were often—almost always—someone superior or otherwise distant.

When several drills, again usually in distal style, are assigned as homework (as they are almost every night), learners rehearse them with cd or tapes in preparation for class. Since their in-class performance of CCs and tasks based on other assigned rehearsal is graded for each hour, there is presumably
some motivation to actually invest the time in preparation. In the class, the instructor typically establishes an appropriate situation in which a task is situated, for example, ‘at a company office’ or ‘at a store’, but usually specifies no particular social relationship, other than the role of employee, clerk, or customer, to each learner. In such case, in my experience, learners tend to assume that they should perform in a way that resembles what they did in the drills assigned for rehearsal for this hour. If the drills are written and recorded with distal style predicators in the responses, and the learners faithfully rehearse with these drills until they are fluent, coming up instead with a direct-style version for an altered scenario in class can be challenging.

It is necessary for instructors to insist that learners speak in the style appropriate to their assigned roles (both in advance and in the feedback given), and to encourage them to speak, when outside roles taken up for scenarios to negotiate in class, to classmates they are closer to in direct style. Learners need more opportunities to decide for themselves when to use direct style, and then come up with the form. Instructors should make this a rule inside and outside the classroom, and they should demand that learners to speak in appropriate styles in their roles and outside of their roles.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

At the outset of this study, its two purposes were described. The first was to examine the request performances of a subset of learners of Japanese at The Ohio State University. The second was to attempt to begin to explore the relationship between the learners’ performance and the instruction they received in that program. In the following sections, the results of the examination and the achieved understanding will be discussed.

6.1 Request sequences produced by learners of Japanese

Based on six request tasks that required some kind of request without specifying "Request (that) ...", both native speakers and learners of Japanese produced request sequences in a role-play setting. Collected data were analyzed, and performances were compared. Apart from the sequences, actual focal requests (moves in which a speaker specifically makes mention of desired things or actions in a way that can be interpreted as assuming that the desired action
would be achieved by the addressee) varied depending on the specific task. When differences in the form of the focal request set one group apart from the other, it was usually due to the lack of availability of appropriate lexical items on the part of the learners.

How participants expressed their focal requests indicated a major difference between two groups. While native speakers used both morau/itadaku 'receive'/'id. ↓' and kureru/kudasaru 'give to me & mine'/'id. ↑', learners showed a strong tendency to use kureru/kudasaru. Although the learners were inclined to use kureru/kudasaru, they demonstrated a certain sensitivity in distinguishing between distal/direct predicates. Nine out of eighteen learners used direct-style predicates (including.. kurnai? 'give to uti' (direct style)) in the casual: less face-threatening task (Task 3), while they used ..kudasaimasen ka? in more face-threatening tasks. They must have developed this sensitivity through their instruction.

In tasks where the researcher expected the use of direct style final predicates in playing the specified role (Task 4, for instance), the majority of learners used distal style instead. By contrast, native speakers used direct style as expected. In the recall protocol interviews for this task, there were a number of learners who commented on the difficulty of using direct style final predicates. Some of them equated the use of direct style with the behavior of "talking down to someone" or "not being nice". This means that they were aware of the propriety of using direct style here, even if they couldn't bring themselves to do
so. This hesitancy may well be typical of "well trained" thoughtful students who have not yet had the experience of establishing and maintaining a casual relationship in Japanese.

Another clear difference was the use of apologies and mitigating expressions by native speakers, and a new look of the same for the non-native. Their expression of these also showed much more variety and choices appropriate to their addressee's social rank, relationship with the addressees, and the weight of possible face-threats. They used such expressions frequently, even in the casual tasks, while the learners' use was limited or, in some cases, nonexistent.

6.2 Learners' performance and instruction

As noted in the above section, learners had difficulty in switching between direct and distal style predicates, in response to whom they were talking. Many of them said, in the recall protocol interviews, that they pay attention to which style they should use in relation to their addressee. However, they had difficulty actually manipulating the style. For instance, in the request sequences performed by learners for Task 3 (casual: less face-threatening task), there were five learners who shifted their styles several times in their interaction. This indicates that they are not in total control of the distal/direct distinction.

In order to understand aforementioned learners' difficulty in freely deploying direct-style predicates, an account of how the distal/direct style distinction is introduced and developed in Japanese: the Spoken Language (JSL)
Parts 1, 2, and 3 was given. Based on this description, we cannot but conclude that the textbook provides sufficiently detailed grammatical and pragmatic explanations regarding the distal/direct style distinction, and its presentation is very systematic. Jorden and Noda introduce the scalar notion of the careful-casual continuum. They demonstrate in textbook's (and video's) many C(ore) C(onversation)s (CCs) that distal/direct choices made by Japanese speakers are not a rigid, fixed matter, but rather that they can change according to the topic of the conversation, degree of participants' concern, and so on.

JSL provides ample models of natural Japanese conversations using CCs. Eighty percent of the CCs shows a model conversation in which main-clause (sentence-final) predicates are in distal-style. CCs with main-clause predicates in direct style, by contrast, account for about twelve percent of total CCs. CCs with the conversants speaking in non-reciprocal styles (in which one participant speaks consistently in distal and another in direct) is about six percent. Even with these models and those in the drills that follow each set of CCs, the opportunity for learners to speak in direct style is still limited. In class hours, oftentimes they need to speak in roles that require distal style predicates. As a result, they get used to speaking to their classmates primarily “in role,” in distal style. They can of course speak in direct style outside the roles they are assigned in tasks in class, but instructors cannot coerce them into using direct style. In fact, instructors cannot assume that all the learners in a class have close enough a relationship with their classmates to warrant interacting in direct-style. Learners themselves must initiate these ways of relating. They need to decide for
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themselves with whom to interact in direct-style, and when to do so. In order to do so, it might be necessary for them to have the opportunities to (a) retain several “identities” of some kind (e.g. part-time worker, supervisor, etc.) across classes and courses they take, and (b) get to know some people in Japanese outside the class. As they develop these relationships, some in class activities, some outside, choosing direct-style may become easier. Opportunities for such decision making should be increased, and the need to be on the lookout for more such opportunities has to be communicated to learners.

6.3 Suggestions for future research

6.3.1 Request tasks

An examination of learners’ request sequence performance similar to the one reported in this dissertation might be repeated, but with more carefully planned request tasks. In the data collection process of the present study, some of the Japanese participants were critical of the tasks. They pointed out the unnaturalness of requesting of one’s butyoo (division head) that he take care of the errand in Task 2. Some of them also mentioned regarding Task 4 that the majority of university students in Japan own a VCR, since VCRs are no longer that expensive in Japan. Regarding the same task, some of them also thought that watching a video for a university class as an assignment is not commonly practiced in Japanese universities. These two problems were caused by the researchers’ lack of understanding of present Japanese students’ life.
In future research of this kind, a researcher might be well advised to solicit possible request tasks from native Japanese, both students and working people, and choose from them. Or s/he can present possible scenarios to such people, and ask them to rate them. In these ways, request tasks for data collection role-plays could be scripted in ways that have a more realistic reflection of present Japanese life.

6.3.2 Data collection of naturally occurring request sequences

In the present study, a comparison of data produced by role-plays and naturally occurring data was attempted. However, the data generated in role-plays were collected before it was possible to collect naturally occurring request sequences at the corporate setting reported on. As a consequence, the majority of tasks, as scripted, were not based on any actually documented request-making. Task 3 and Task 5 were the only exceptions. They were created based on actual request sequences that took place in naturally occurring data. If the data collection of naturally occurring data were to precede the role-plays, then the role-play tasks could be created based on request sequences that actually took place in real social interaction. This would make it more likely that these two sets of data would share enough features in common to correspond to each other. This would, in turn, make comparisons of role-play data and live interaction data easier and more to the point.
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