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Abstract

In recent years, studies of "interlanguage pragmatics" have been receiving more attention in second language research. Acquiring sociolinguistic competence, an important component of communicative competence, requires that L2 learners of Japanese have knowledge of concepts such as politeness and face that are determined by Japanese social context. Learners of Japanese must therefore learn how to use socially appropriate linguistic devices that are specific to the target culture in order to show politeness and save both hearers' and speakers' face.

This case study examined how native Japanese speakers and native English speaking learners of Japanese approached and attained their request goals while maintaining the face of both requester and requestee. The following research questions were considered in this case study:
1) How do Japanese native speakers and English-speaking learners of Japanese attain their request goal while maintaining effective communication?
2) How do Japanese native speakers and English speaking learners of Japanese show politeness?
3) How do Japanese native speakers and English learners of Japanese react when their initial request is indirectly refused?

The speech data were collected through an oral role-play. The results showed that there was not much difference in the use of honorific language between the Japanese and learners of Japanese. However, different linguistic devices were used for sentence endings, especially request speech act endings, between the native Japanese and the learners of Japanese. Based on the raw tallies (without statistical analysis), it was found that the Japanese used more unfinished sentences and nominalizers while the learners of Japanese used more finished sentences and fewer nominalizers. The use of nominalizers and unfinished sentences might be sociolinguistic devices which function to reduce imposition and create feelings of mutual understanding.
Differences were also found in the way that the native Japanese and learners of Japanese reacted when the requestee indirectly refused their initial request. The native Japanese made long pauses and waited for the requestee's suggestion or decision, while the learners of Japanese attempted to negotiate with the requestee immediately. Differences in perception of social variables such as relative status might have led to these different reactions.

One pedagogical implication of the study is that learners of Japanese should be made aware of the functions of sociolinguistic devices such as nominalizers and clause particles as well as concepts (e.g., empathy and reserve) that are related to social variables that determine appropriate speech behavior in order to communicate more effectively with native speakers of Japanese.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

1. 1. Background and the Problems

In recent years, studies of "interlanguage (IL) pragmatics" (i.e., studies addressing how non-native speakers comprehend and produce speech acts, and how they acquire second language speech act knowledge), have been receiving more attention in second language research (Kasper and Dahl, 1991; Wolfson, 1990). This knowledge is related to pragmatic competence, defined as "illocutionary force, or the knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for performing acceptable language functions" (Canale, 1988, p. 90). Pragmatic competence is a part of sociolinguistic competence which in turn is one of the four components of communicative competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980). Sociolinguistic competence has to do with producing socially and culturally appropriate speech behavior in a given context. Sociolinguistic competence is particularly difficult for second language (L2) learners to acquire because the norms and values which inform speakers' knowledge as to what is appropriate in a given context vary from one culture and language to another.

Linguistic devices that are used to show politeness also differ among cultures. Politeness is one of the communication strategies used when people consider the feelings of others in order to develop and maintain interpersonal relationships. Lakoff (1979) notes that "a device in order to reduce friction in personal interaction" may be used in order to maintain a good relationship between speaker and hearer.

Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed a theory of politeness which is related to saving 'face'. People want to save 'face' in order to preserve their individual self-esteem. When speakers want to say something that may impose on the hearer, they must attempt to avoid threatening the hearer's face while saving their own face. Brown and Levinson call acts which threaten the speaker's or hearer's face "face-threatening acts (FTAs)". A speaker must utilize certain strategies to avoid or minimize the face threat. There is some debate regarding the universality of Brown and Levinson's claims. Matsumoto (1988, 1989) and Ide (1989) claim
that the theory of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson is based on a Western culture point of view (i.e. individualism). From a non-Western culture point of view (e.g., Japanese culture), the concept of face is more related to sensitivity to social norms. The use of face-saving deference strategies in Japanese culture is related to hierarchical distinctions that are not found in Western culture (Matsumoto, 1988). Since Japan is a group-oriented vertical society, there is a great emphasis on maintaining social harmony. Striving to be accepted by other members of the group, showing empathy to others, and exhibiting sensitivity to social context/norm play important roles in politeness (Ide, 1988, 1989; Lebra, 1976; Matsumoto, 1988, 1989; Nakane, 1967).

Cultural values also affect the ways of conducting a conversation and the linguistic devices that are used to show politeness. Given the relatively homogeneous nature of Japanese society, maintaining social harmony and showing empathy (e.g., anticipating and taking care of a hearer's wants) are important aspects of Japanese communication. It is often observed that speakers use unfinished sentences (i.e., they leave a part of the sentence unsaid) in Japanese conversation. The use of an unfinished sentence sounds more reserved and polite, and also allows the hearer to have options or make judgments. A pattern consisting of a nominal predicate \( n(o) \) followed by some form of the copula \( desu \) and ending with the clause particle \( galkedo \) ... is one device that is often used to soften the speaker's statement and help create feelings of empathy.

In addition, because of the hierarchical nature of Japanese society (Nakane, 1967), the Japanese are very conscious of social status, power, age, and degree of closeness between speaker and hearer. One speaks very differently depending on whether the addressee or referent is higher, lower, or co-equal in rank. Other variables (e.g., gender, situation, etc.) may also affect one's choice of a particular politeness level. These social variables determine both the level of politeness (e.g., the use of honorifics) and the stylistic choice (i.e., the choice between using either a direct style of speech that is normally used when speaking to close friends or family members, or a more formal distal style that is regularly used when
speaking to people who are not especially close to the speaker). The speaker is thus required to be sensitive to social context and norms.

Learners of Japanese must therefore have certain knowledge about Japanese social norms, cultural values and ways of conducting a conversation if they are to communicate in an effective and appropriate manner. Lack of such knowledge may result in pragmatic failure and subsequent communication breakdown. At the very least, a misunderstanding of the speaker's intent can lead to feelings of embarrassment that might have other negative effects on subsequent interaction.

The relationship between sociolinguistic competence and overall communicative competence has become an increasingly important issue in recent years. Many previous interlanguage (IL) pragmatics studies were concerned with politeness in face-threatening speech acts such as requests, apologies and refusals, as well as the organization of discourse. While most of these studies have been conducted in ESL settings, relatively few have been done in Japanese language settings (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). There is therefore a need for further investigation of IL pragmatics in Japanese language settings.

1.2. Previous Studies

There are a few previous interlanguage pragmatics studies on request speech acts in Japanese settings. Mizutani, Echizenya, Murakami, Okada, and Tamon (1986-1990) investigated how learners of Japanese make requests in various contexts. They found that learners of Japanese who did not use unfinished sentences and certain other request strategies were perceived by native speakers of Japanese to be imposing or impolite. Kumai (1992) and Kashiwazaki (1993) found the same results as Mizutani et al. Japanese people may thus have negative feelings if learners of Japanese do not use acceptable strategies and conduct their conversation in appropriate ways when making requests.

Results from those studies that have examined the differences in speech act behaviour, in showing politeness, and in conducting a conversation between native speakers of Japanese and learners of Japanese support the notion that it is important for students of Japanese to learn
how to use socially appropriate linguistic forms as well as certain ways of conducting conversation that are determined by Japanese social context. Students who fail to understand that learning Japanese requires an awareness of cultural differences that are reflected in certain ways of conducting a conversation may not only have their intentions misunderstood, but may also be perceived of as arrogant, imposing, and /or rude.

Thus, when speakers make a request, they must consider their social relationship vis-a-vis the addressee as well as the degree of imposition on the addressee regardless of their personal background (e.g., gender, hometown, educational background, etc.). At the same time, speakers must try to minimize the face threat or avoid embarrassment by using politeness rules. Consequently, depending on the social context, the speakers may want to preface the request with an explanation for making the request and/or add an apology for imposing on the speaker. These request strategies are used to mitigate the intensity of a request. These strategies may be a universal phenomenon, but social attitudes that determine how strategies are used appropriately in a given context might differ from culture to culture. While people in most cultures probably have ways to show politeness and save the face of both speaker (requester) and hearer (requestee), the linguistic devices used to show politeness might be very different between cultures.

1. 3. The Present Study

In this study, I will investigate how native speakers of Japanese and native English speaking learners of Japanese attained their request goals while maintaining effective communication. This study will be a partial replication of Kumai's (1992) study which is based on Mizutani et al.'s studies (1988-1990) of how non-native speakers of Japanese approach and make requests in various contexts. The focus will be on advanced learners who are assumed to have already been exposed to instruction on the appropriate use of honorifics. Since this study has to do with the pragmatic side of language use, grammatical errors, with the exception of the inappropriate usage of honorifics, will not be examined.

The following research questions will be considered:
1) How do Japanese native speakers and English-speaking learners of Japanese attain their request goal while maintaining effective communication?

2) How do Japanese native speakers and English speaking learners of Japanese show politeness?

3) How do Japanese native speakers and English learners of Japanese react when their initial request is indirectly refused?

1.4. Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is organized as follows: chapter II presents a review of literature related to the study, chapter III presents the methodology used in the study, chapter IV presents the results of the study, and chapter V presents a discussion of the results. Finally, chapter VI presents the conclusions and implications. The implications of this study could potentially be used to help teach sociolinguistic aspects of Japanese to English speakers, and help teachers of Japanese become more aware of the cultural obstacles that prevent students from acquiring sociolinguistic competence.
CHAPTER II
Review of the Literature

This chapter reviews literature related to theories of linguistic politeness, interlanguage pragmatics, and methodology used in studies of interlanguage pragmatics. In the first section, theories of linguistic politeness from the perspectives of Lakoff (1973) and Brown and Levinson (1987) will be examined. The concept of politeness from the Japanese point of view will also be considered. Next, the way in which sociolinguistic competence is related to studies of interlanguage pragmatics will be examined. In the last section, the major instruments used in studies of interlanguage pragmatics to collect speech act data will be examined.

2. 1. The Cooperative Principle and Linguistic Politeness

2. 1. 1. The Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975) proposed the Cooperative Principle (CP) which incorporates the basic rules operating in a conversation. He described the elements of CP as follows:

Quantity:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.

2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relation: Be relevant.

Manner: Be perspicuous.

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.

2. Avoid ambiguity

3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

4. Be orderly. (pp. 45 - 46)
According to Grice (1975), the CP requires that each participant of a conversation should conduct a conversation obeying the rules that make up the CP. Green (1988) notes that the CP could be defined as rational behavior for communication. There are some arguments related to the CP. It is often observed that people violate the CP in certain circumstances when the violation seems to be more polite. Leech (1983) argues that the CP can not sufficiently explain politeness phenomena. In order to analyze real language use, the CP should include socially and psychologically oriented maxims of language use. Leech proposes adding Politeness Principles (PP) to the CP as a necessary complement. Leech claims that the PP can explain why people sometimes may be less than informative or less than relevant. Moreover, depending on societal differences, each maxim operates in different ways. Keenan (1978; cited in Green, 1987) argues that the CP does not universally govern communications because some maxims might not be applied in some societies. However, Schmidt and Richards (1980) note that "it can be argued that the maxims are universal, but that deviations from the norm force us to attempt to uncover additional maxims, motives and strategies to account for departures from an 'ideal' communication system" (p. 139). Usages that appear illogical when taken at face value but convey much more than is actually said can be explained by the maxims which govern the CP (Green, 1987).

The theories of politeness proposed by many researchers (e.g., Lakoff, 1973; Brown & Levinson, 1987) are derived from Grice's work and modified on the basis of their own observations of conversation and politeness. Lakoff's (1973) and Brown and Levinson's (1987) perspectives will be examined below.

2. 1. 2. Lakoff's Rules of Politeness

Lakoff (1973) proposed the following 'Rules of pragmatic competence' in order to dictate whether an utterance is pragmatically well-formed or not.

RULES OF PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

1. Be clear

2. Be polite (p. 296)
Lakoff claimed that Grice's CP is related to the rule 'Be clear', and functions such that the content of an utterance is conveyed as clearly and with as little confusion as possible. She observed that politeness often supersedes clarity when they are in conflict. Through the use of politeness rules, "one often seeks at the same time to impart a favorable feeling about the factual information, best achieved by making one's addressee think well of one" (p. 298). She proposed the following three rules of politeness and claimed that they are universal, but noted that different orders of precedence might be observed in different languages.

**RULES OF POLITENESS**

1. Don't impose.
2. Give options.
3. Make A (addressee) feel good --- be friendly.  

According to Lakoff, Rule 1 may be interpreted "Remain aloof, don't intrude into other people's business" (Lakoff, 1973, p. 298). Rule 2, which states "Let A make his own decision - leave his options open for him" (p. 299), sometimes operates along with Rule 1 when the use of Rule 1 by itself is inappropriate. Rule 3 has to do with friendly or intimate politeness; its use encourages feelings of camaraderie and is appropriate between intimates or close friends. It should be noted that these rules do not necessarily operate independently. A single linguistic device which provides options to the hearer may also function to reduce imposition, make the hearer feel good, and prevent embarrassment.

Lakoff claims that politeness is one of the communication strategies used when people consider the feelings of others in order to develop and maintain interpersonal relationships. In order to maintain a good relationship between speaker and hearer, "a device in order to reduce friction in personal interaction" may be used (Lakoff, 1975, p. 64).

Devices that are used for expressing politeness may be different between cultures. For example, Lakoff's Rule 2 (Give options) operates both in English and Japanese, but the linguistic devices used to provide options to the hearer might be quite different. In Japanese, the clause particle *kedo/ka* might be used to soften a statement and allow hearers to express
their opinions (e.g., Zikan desu kedo... "It's time to leave, but... what do you think?"). In English, hedging (e.g., I guess it's time to leave.) is a device which allows hearers options in making their decisions. Thus, the use of these devices does not sound assertive and leaves the final decision open.

Nelson (1984) examined Lakoff's rules to see if they operate in Japanese society and found that Rule 3 may not be applicable. She claims that Rule 3 works in a different way in Japanese society and notes that "being friendly and treating people equally might be a way of making a hearer feel good in English, but that being formal and avoiding embarrassment is the Japanese way of making a hearer feel good" (p. 14). However, this does not mean that Japanese people always feel good when being treated in a formal manner. In fact, in situations such as talking to friends, being formal might make the hearer feel bad or embarrassed. Rule 3 would thus seem to apply in informal situations, but would not apply in more formal situations. In Japanese culture, therefore, speakers must choose an appropriate speech style and politeness level which depends on their relationships to the hearers in order to make the hearers feel good.

Nelson notes that "empathy" also plays an important role in Japanese culture in that it helps the participants avoid embarrassment and makes the hearer feel good. She proposes a modification of Rule 3 "Make A feel good--empathize" and includes a new rule (Rule 4) "Avoid embarrassment" (p. 16). She claims that Rule 4 could be a super ordinate rule or maxim in Japanese. It seems that the rules of politeness proposed by Lakoff and the modification of Rule 3 and Rule 4 proposed by Nelson operate in Japanese. Depending on the situation, people must choose the most acceptable strategy in order to maintain good relationships.

2. 1.3. Brown and Levinson's concept of 'Face' and Politeness

The theory of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) has partly been supported by the literature (Kasper, 1990), but despite claims of universality, there are some problems that suggest a need for elaboration and revision (Fraser, 1990; Kasper, 1990).
The concept of 'face' proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) plays a crucial role in maintaining interpersonal relationships. People want to save face in order to preserve their individual self-esteem. Brown and Levinson claim that face consists of two specific desires: positive face and negative face. Positive face is the desire to have one's self-image appreciated and approved of. On the other hand, negative face is the desire to be free from imposition. They defined the two aspects of face as follows:

(a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction - i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.
(b) positive face: the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants. (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 61).

When speakers want to say something that may impose on hearers, they must attempt to avoid threatening the hearers' face while saving their own face. Brown and Levinson call speech acts that are intrinsically threatening "face threatening acts (FTA)". Making a request can usually be considered to be an FTA because the speaker (the requester) imposes on the hearer (the requestees). When speakers are making requests, they will try to minimize the face threat either by using an appropriate strategy or by avoiding the FTA altogether. Brown and Levinson proposed politeness strategies for when the speaker does an FTA. They claim that these strategies are universally valid. The following schema is illustrated by Brown and Levinson for possible sets of strategies.

**Figure 1.** Possible Strategies for Doing FTAs (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 69)
In an 'on record' strategy, the speakers express an unambiguously attributable intention of committing themselves to the future act. An utterance (e.g., "I (hereby) promise to come tomorrow" (p.69)) can be interpreted only one way by the use of on record. On the other hand, in an 'off record' strategy, "there is more than one unambiguously attributable intention so that the actor cannot be held to have committed himself to one particular intent" (p. 69). For example, an utterance can be interpreted more than one way by the use of an 'off record' strategy.

There are two choices in an on record strategy: an expression 'with/without redressive action'. The expression without redressive action is the most direct, clear and unambiguous expression, (i.e., "Do X.", for a request). In contrast, the expression with redressive action is used to show the hearer that the speaker does not have any intention of threatening the hearer's face. There are two aspects, either positive politeness or negative politeness, depending on which aspect of face (positive or negative) is being stressed. Positive politeness is oriented toward the positive face of the hearer. It is used by a speaker to satisfy a hearer's positive face by indicating solidarity with the hearer's positive self-image. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson consider positive politeness utterances to be associated with intimate language usage. They write that "positive politeness strategies are used as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy, to imply common ground or sharing of wants to a limited extent" (p. 103). The use of positive politeness enables speakers to show that they want to become closer to the hearer. In other words, positive politeness is used in order to minimize social distance.

Negative politeness, on the other hand, is oriented toward satisfying a hearer's negative face. It is a strategy used when the speaker recognizes and respects the hearer's negative face wants, and avoids or minimizes the imposition of a face-threatening act on the hearer. Negative politeness is characterized by self-effacement, formality, restraint, and conventionalized indirectness. In general, the use of negative politeness shows social distance between the speaker and the hearer.
The choice of politeness strategy and FTA expression are determined by social variables that are determined by the degree of weightiness of an FTA: the degree of social distance (D), the relative power and status of the participants (P), and sensitivity to the degree of imposition (R). This reflects the right of the speaker to perform the act and the degree to which the hearer welcomes the imposition. The 'weightiness' (Wx) of an FTA is calculated by adding the value of the social variables: P, D, and R. The value of these three factors is culture-specific, thus the assessment of weightiness differs from culture to culture. Some cultures place high levels of importance on P and D values while others place low levels of importance on P and D values.

This difference results in the distinction between "positive-politeness culture" and "negative-politeness culture". In positive-politeness cultures (e.g., the U.S.), the general level of Wx tends to remain low; the level of P, D and R values are either low or negligible. In contrast, in negative-politeness cultures, the general level of Wx tends to be high; and the level of P, D and R values are high. According to Brown and Levinson, Japanese culture is considered to be a negative-politeness culture because the use of honorifics indicates that Japanese society assumes high levels of P and D values. People in negative-politeness cultures have more desire for negative-face satisfaction than positive-face satisfaction. This may be related to the fact that negative-politeness cultures tend to be hierarchical in nature. The problem with categorizing cultures in terms of positive/negative politeness will be discussed later.

Matsumoto (1989) argues that Brown and Levinson's treatment of honorifics as one of the strategies of negative politeness, 'Give deference', does not explain the nature of Japanese honorifics. In Japanese, speakers may use honorifics for utterances that are not usually considered to be face threatening when required by social context, such as when the hearer is of a higher status, the situation is formal, and so on. For example, the utterance "Today is Saturday" can be said to anyone in English no matter what the social context is. However, in Japanese, "Today is Saturday" can be either "Kyoo wa doyoobi desu" (plain) or "Kyoo wa
doyoobi de gozaimasu” (polite) depending on social context. Matsumoto claims that there is no neutral utterance in Japanese with respect to social context because social and psychological attitudes are necessarily expressed through linguistic conventions in Japanese (Matsumoto, 1989). This claim is also supported by Ide (1989) who notes that the choice of honorifics or non-honorifics is obligatory even for a non-FTA utterance and is determined by the speaker's observation of conventional rules of politeness. Ide claims that this aspect of Japanese politeness is neglected in the politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson.

2. 1.4. The Concept of 'Face' and Politeness in Japanese

The concept of face in Japanese culture does not seem the same as that defined as universal by Brown and Levinson (Ide, 1989; Ikeda, 1993; Matsumoto, 1988, 1989). Matsumoto (1988, 1989) re-examined the universality of face and claims that Brown and Levinson's theory fails in Japanese culture because "the postulated motivation underlying politeness phenomena seems unsuited to Japanese culture and language" (1989, p. 219). Ide (1989) also argues that Brown and Levinson's universal theory of politeness and the concept of face are based on a Western point of view that is biased toward individualism. From the Japanese point of view, the concept of face seems to be related to the need for a member of a group or society to be accepted by other members of the group (Ide, 1989; Matsumoto 1988, 1989; Nakane, 1966). This view is also supported by other Japanese scholars. Nakane (1967) observed that Japanese society is characterized by a 'vertical structure'- "the primary relations in Japanese society are between persons who are related hierarchically in a certain social grouping, rather than relations between persons having the same quality" (Nakane, 1967, 1970, cited in Matsumoto 1988, p. 406). In a vertical society, it is very important to know "where s/he stands in relation to other members of the group or society" (Matsumoto, 1988, p. 405). The group orientation in Japanese culture seems to be related to the concept of amae proposed by Doi (1981). He notes that Japanese behaviour is based on the concept of "amae - to seek to protect a relationship" (translated by Barnlund, cited in Doi, 1974, p. 18), "to depend on another's affection" (Doi, 1981, p. 167) and "a feeling of dependency"
Doi claims that the concept of *amae* is "a key concept for understanding Japanese Personality Structure" (p. 21). The face wants of the Japanese people might be related to the desire to be accepted by others. Being accepted rather than insisting on individuality in the 'vertical structure' of Japanese society requires sensitivity to social context including the situation, relative position, and role structures among the conversational participants (Ide, 1989; Ikeda, 1993; Matsumoto, 1989). The underlying motivation for politeness phenomena in Japanese seems to be based on these concepts.

*amae* and a desire to be accepted by others is related to positive-face satisfaction rather than negative-face satisfaction. In this sense, Japanese culture can be categorized as a positive-politeness culture. This contradicts Brown and Levinson's treatment of Japanese culture as a negative-politeness culture. Because Japan is a group-oriented and relatively homogeneous society, solidarity and conformity are very important aspects of saving face in order to maintain harmony. Even though the level of P, D and R values is high in Japanese society, positive face satisfaction is as important as negative face satisfaction. This seems to present a problem for Brown and Levinson's analysis of positive/negative politeness culture, which is based on high/low levels of P, D, and R values.

Ide (1989), who studied the notion of politeness in Japanese society, argues that the theories of linguistic politeness proposed by Brown & Levinson are not relevant to the major concept of politeness in the Japanese language. She claims that "[f]or Japanese people, linguistic politeness is mainly a matter of conforming to the social conventions for the choice of linguistic forms" (p. 2). She believes that the concept of 'discernment' (*wakimae*, in Japanese), which was originally proposed by Hill et al. (1986), is fundamental to politeness in Japanese. According to Ide, discernment is one of two general strategies, the other being called volition. They are used in order to achieve effective communication. With regard to discernment, the speaker must consider certain factors (e.g., social status, power, age, closeness etc.) that pertain to the addressee, in addition to the situation. These factors automatically determine the selection of an appropriate linguistic form and/or appropriate
behavior. According to Hill et al. and Ide, these are the most important factors related to politeness in the Japanese language (Hill et al., 1986; Ide, 1989).

On the other hand, the concept of 'volition' is "the aspect of politeness which allows the speaker a considerably active choice, according to the speaker's intention, from a relatively wider range of possibilities" (Hill et al., 1986, p. 348). Speakers can freely choose a linguistic form depending on their own intention instead of it being determined by social norms. Hill et al. and Ide (1989) claim that the strategy of volition is observed in a large part of the framework of politeness in Western culture and is more closely related to the politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Since Brown and Levinson's concept of politeness is based on an individual face want (i.e., one wants to preserve his/her face), their proposed politeness strategies derive from a speaker's volitional choice rather than socially prescribed norms. Accordingly, factors so important and integral to Japanese culture (e.g., social status, power, age, etc.) seem to have little effect on linguistic politeness in Western languages. However, in Japanese culture, the choice of expression is not usually related to volitional choice, but rather to observation of conventional rules of politeness to show discernment (Ide, 1989).

Hill et al. (1986) and Ide (1989) note that discernment does not conflict with the universal theory of politeness proposed by Brown & Levinson. Rather, discernment is complimentary in that it is a part of the strategy of negative politeness (e.g., to 'give deference'). However, Matsumoto (1988) argues that Japanese deference strategies are different from those used in Western culture. Deference in Japanese culture focuses on the ranking difference between the conversational participants, whereas this ranking difference is not as important in Western culture. She notes that Brown and Levinson's theory does not emphasize the importance of social context, which is the most crucial factor in Japanese culture. Therefore, knowledge of the ways in which social norms operate in specific cultural contexts is required before the potential threat to one's face can be determined (Matsumoto, 1988).
To behave in accordance with social norms or show discernment is one of the important aspects of politeness in Japanese culture. In addition to sensitivity to social context, the concept of *omoiyari* (empathy) also plays an important role in maintaining face between the speaker and hearer (Clancy, 1985; Lebra, 1976; Nelson, 1984). Lebra (1976) refers to Japanese culture as "*omoiyari* (empathy) culture". She defines *omoiyari* as "the ability and willingness to feel what others are feeling, to vicariously experience the pleasure or pain that they are understanding, and to help them satisfy their wishes" (p. 38). The speaker's sensibility to the hearer's feeling might be another essential aspect of face in Japanese culture. Clancy (1985) notes that "an important goal of socialization in Japan is to promote the unanimity in feeling that will support the norms of verbal agreement and empathy" (p. 216).

Empathy can help to maintain consensus among the group or society. Empathy is an important aspect in any culture; however, Doi (1971, cited in Lebra, 1976) notes that the way of showing empathy is different between cultures. Showing empathy in American culture is to give hearers freedom to make up their minds, while showing empathy in Japanese culture is to anticipate and take care of the hearers' wants. The speakers' empathetic considerations of the hearers are also shown through 'enryo'. *Enryo* is social self-restraint (Lebra, 1976), and is often translated into English as 'reserve' and 'restraint' (Wierzbicka, 1991). According to Wierzbicka, *enryo* can be seen as a desire to avoid hurting, offending, inconveniencing, or embarrassing anyone. Enryo helps allow a speaker to avoid imposing on a hearer in Japanese culture.

2.1.5. The Communicative Style in Japanese

The group-oriented Japanese society and the speaker's empathetic considerations for the hearer affect Japanese communicative style (Clancy, 1985; Lebra, 1976; Wierzbicka, 1991). Barnlund (1975) observes that "Japanese conversation is a way of creating and reinforcing the emotional ties that bind people together with the aim of social harmony" (cited in Clancy, 1985, p. 215). Clancy (1985) points out that empathy and conformity to group norms in order to maintain group harmony are an important aspect of the Japanese
communicative style. Of course, group harmony is an important aspect of any society, but it is probably not emphasized in America as much as it is in Japan. American society is a heterogeneous society in which there is great ethnic diversity and individualism is highly valued. In contrast, Japan is a homogeneous society in which the value of what others think and say is considered to be more important than individual achievement (Clancy, 1885; Okabe, 1983). The differences in structure between American and Japanese society affect their respective ideals for interpersonal communication. According to Clancy, in American society, speakers are expected to express their thoughts and feelings explicitly in words. It is their responsibility to know how to convey their point. On the other hand, in Japanese communication, each party is expected to understand and anticipate the needs of others, even without verbal expression. Thus, the use of indirectness and ambiguity takes a greater part in communication. It is the hearer's responsibility to know what a speaker means regardless of the words that are used. Clancy notes that this style can only work because Japan is a homogeneous society in which people can understand and anticipate the needs of others. She also sees that this style is related to the concept of "amae, with the speaker presuming upon the listener's willingness to cooperate, empathize, and intuit what he or she has in mind" (p.217).

This view of communication can often be identified in Japanese conversation. Okada, Mizutani et al. (1988, 1989) and Mizutani (1983, 1989, 1991) observe that the speaker and hearer may make up one statement together, that is, the hearer often finishes up what the speaker is going to say. In other words, the hearer understands the speaker's intent and finishes up the omitted part, thereby making up one complete statement. The conversation is thus conveyed with both participants interacting to produce statements. Okada notes that this type of conversation, in which the speaker uses an unfinished sentence and the hearer finishes it up, implies consideration of a harmonious relation between speaker and hearer. An unfinished statement [leaving part of a sentence unsaid] shows that speakers have empathy for hearers and share their feelings because open-ended sentences allow speakers to avoid asserting themselves on hearers (Lebra, 1976; Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987). Mizutani and
Mizutani also point out that the use of unfinished sentences invites the hearer to give an opinion or judgment and thus sound more reserved. Leaving a part of the sentence unsaid is thought to be more considerate and polite in Japanese culture because the hearer can supplement it. This way of communicating can often be seen in Japanese conversation and is considered to be a characteristic of the Japanese language (Lebra, 1976; Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987). Of course, it appears in other cultures too, but perhaps to a lesser extent.

The use of the nominalizer 'n(o)' is frequently observed in Japanese conversation and is also considered to be one of the characteristics of Japanese communication (Maynard, 1992; Ohta, 1991). It can be used to nominalize an adjectival, verbal, or nominal sentence. A form of the copula 'da/desu' can be added to mark the style of the utterance (...n(o) da/desu).

Jorden and Noda (1987) call 'n(o)' the extended predicate. They note that this pattern is used to explain a certain situation and functions to create a feeling of empathy and understanding. Cook (1990) notes that "the use of no indexes that the authority for an utterance lies with a group of which the speaker is a member" (p. 419). Du Bois (1986) claims that "an utterance is never accepted without authority i.e., without someone's taking responsibility for the truth of the utterance" (cited in Cook, 1990, p. 419). The use of n(o) maintains group harmony because it creates common ground and rapport between a speaker and hearer (Cook, 1990; McGloin, 1980, 1983, Ohta, 1991). The clause particle 'ga/kedo' ending is often observed following the pattern '...n(o) desu' as in the indirect request "Karitai n(o) desu kedo..." (It's that I want to borrow it, but...). Noda (1990, 1992) proposes that the use of nominalizer '...n(o)' with the clause particle 'ga/kedo' ending functions as a relation maintenance strategy.

2. 1. 6. Politeness and the Speaker's Concern for the Hearer

Minami (1987) notes that both linguistic forms and acts are affected by the speaker's concern for the hearer. He points out that politeness is determined by a speaker's concern for the hearer, situation and content. Based on the speaker's concern and judgment, the speaker decides on the most appropriate linguistic forms and actions. These choices are influenced by how the speaker appraises social, cultural and psychological variables. Therefore, there
would be different choices in the same context between different societies and cultures.

Minami (1987) notes that the concept of linguistic politeness as it relates to the speaker's concern for the hearer or situation is universal. However, the choice of linguistic forms and acts would be different between cultures.

Related to Minami's analysis, Sugito (1983) also analyzed linguistic politeness in terms of 'a linguistic act for a speaker's concern'. He proposed a two-stage process that determines how speakers decide the most appropriate linguistic expression of politeness in a situation. In the first stage, speakers recognize and appraise a hearer's situation. Speakers appraise the hearer's social relations (e.g., age, power, distance), circumstances, formality, situation, and content. Then, based on this appraisal, speakers decide how they should treat it by choosing the most appropriate linguistic forms. The speaker's choice of act shows the speaker's concern for the hearer.

2. 2. Interlanguage Pragmatics

2. 2. 1. Sociolinguistic Competence

Studies of "interlanguage pragmatics" (i.e., studies addressing how non-native speakers comprehend and produce speech acts, and how they acquire second language speech act knowledge), have been recently receiving more attention in second language acquisition (SLA) research (Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Wolfson, 1990). This knowledge is related to pragmatic competence. Koike (1989) defined pragmatic competence as the "speaker's knowledge and use of rules of appropriateness and politeness which dictate the way the speaker will understand and formulate speech acts". Pragmatic competence is a part of sociolinguistic competence, which in turn is one of the four components of communicative competence proposed by Swain and Canale (1980). The other three components are grammatical, strategic, and discourse competence. Sociolinguistic competence has to do with producing socially and culturally appropriate speech behavior in a given context. Canale (1988, p. 90) distinguishes between the two as follows: the notion of pragmatic competence is related to "illocutionary force, or the knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for performing
acceptable language functions", while sociolinguistic competence refers to "knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions for performing language functions appropriately in a given context." However, Wolfson (1990) notes that the terms sociolinguistic competence and pragmatic competence are similar in meaning, and are often used interchangeably in SLA research. In this study, the concept of sociolinguistic competence will include pragmatic competence.

2.2.2. Pragmatic Failure

An L2 learner's inability to discern the intended illocutionary force of an utterance may result in a violation of the conversational norms and social rules particular to the target language. These violations are potentially more serious than grammatical errors because they may cause misunderstandings and breakdowns in interpersonal communication. Furthermore, as Thomas (1983) notes, "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" (p.97). When L2 learners make pragmatic mistakes, people in the target culture may feel that they are impolite, unfriendly, boorish or perhaps even stupid, possibly resulting in the creation of unhelpful and offensive cultural stereotypes.

Thomas (1983) distinguishes between two types of pragmatic failure, "pragmalinguistic failure" and "sociopragmatic failure". Thomas defined pragmalinguistic failure as occurring "when the pragmatic force mapped on to a linguistic token or structure is systematically different from that normally assigned to it by native speakers" (p. 101). The different linguistic encoding of pragmatic force between L1 and L2 leads to failure. According to Thomas, native speakers fairly predictably assign certain pragmatic force to certain utterances. For example, the utterance "Can you X?" in English is a highly conventionalized politeness form interpreted by native speakers as a request to do X, rather than a question as to one's ability to do X. However, the opposite is true in French and Russian (Thomas, 1983; p. 101).

On the other hand, sociopragmatic failure results when an L2 learner produces inappropriate utterances because of that learner's misunderstanding of sociopragmatic norms
(i.e. the degree of social distance, the power and status of the participants, and sensitivity to the
degree of imposition, etc.). Value judgments reflected in the L2 learner's performance are
often different from a native speaker's perception of appropriate language use as they relate to
formality, directness, politeness, speech act strategies, taboos and different pragmatic rules
(Thomas, 1983; Hudson, Detmer, & Brown, 1992). These two kinds of pragmatic failure are
mainly caused by the L2 learners' inappropriate transfer from the base language to the target
language (Thomas, 1983; Hudson, Detmer, & Brown, 1992). However, Hudson, Detmer, and Brown (1992) state that "there is no absolute distinction between pragmalinguistic
and sociopragmatic failure because sociopragmatic concerns are realized pragmalinguistically" (p.
7).

Beebe and Takahashi studied disagreement and chastisement (1989, a, b), refusal
(Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990), and correction (1993) by utilizing a discourse
completion test (see section 2.3.1 for a definition). Their data show that the level of
directness and the ways of expressing disagreements and corrections of Japanese learners of
English are influenced by the interlocutor's social status or power, compared to native speakers
of English (American). According to Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz, when higher-status
Americans disagree with lower-status Americans, they start out with something positive before
letting on that they disagree. Their strategy is to make a suggestion or a request to avoid
directly expressing disagreement. In contrast, a Japanese in the same situation expresses
disagreement directly. However, when lower-status Japanese disagree with higher-status
Japanese, they try to avoid directly expressing disagreement. The different choice of speech
style is clearly related to the hierarchical nature of Japanese society. Japanese learners of
English may therefore be influenced by negative transfer of sociopragmatic norms from
Japanese to English (Beebe & Takahashi, 1993; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). It stands to
reason that English-speaking learners of Japanese may also transfer sociolinguistic norms from
English to Japanese. Of course, there is bound to be a great deal of interpersonal variation
among members of a higher status or lower status even within groups of a particular culture.
Thomas notes that pragmalinguistic failure is easy to overcome because "it is simply a question of highly conventionalized usage which can be taught quite straightforwardly as 'part of the grammar.'" On the other hand, sociopragmatic failure "is much more difficult to deal with, since it involves the student's system of beliefs... "(p. 91). However, Thomas seems to have oversimplified the concept of pragmalinguistic failure. As mentioned earlier, the use of unfinished sentences in particular situations (e.g., request, refusal, and complaint) is related to reserve and politeness in the Japanese language (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Mynard, 1990; Nelson, 1984). Of course, using finished sentences in such situations is grammatical and still acceptable. However, when learners of Japanese fail to use unfinished sentences in situations where most native Japanese speakers use them, it might sound imposing. As Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) point out, "a lack of L2 pragmalinguistic sophistication, combined with negative transfer of sociopragmatic norms from L1 or nonnative perceptions of L2 negative sociopragmatic norms, ..." (p. 7) might cause failure. Avoidance of pragmalinguistic failure might not be so easily taught as 'part of the grammar'.

2.2.3. Requestive Schema

Blum-Kulka (1991, pp. 255 - 256) hypothesizes that speech production in any language is based on general pragmatic knowledge, the basic knowledge that is associated with the use of language in context. She claims that this hypothesis is empirically supported in findings of previous studies. According to Blum-Kulka, the general pragmatic knowledge in a requestive situation can be organized as a request schema. Certain components of the schema and principles governing their modes of combination are shared across languages; therefore, the general model of requestive schema is applied to all languages. However, culture governs specific modes of speech act realization, the appraisal of requestive situations, and the selection of situationally appropriate forms. In order to attain a requestive goal, requestive speech is produced through a cultural filter in terms of linguistic encoding, situational parameters, and social meanings in the model of the request schema. The three components interact in linguistically, situationally and culturally varied ways. Social meaning is defined as a
dimension which is related to "the degree to which a given request is deemed socially appropriate by members of a given culture in a specific situation" (p. 260). Cultural belief systems determine the appraisal of an appropriate politeness level in interpersonal relations. Situational and cultural variability in the use of requests is significantly correlated with the situational parameters. The situational parameters have to do with a speaker's appraisal of social variables (e.g., social power and distance) and legitimacy in making a request. They are based on different cross-cultural values, and the differences affect the linguistic encoding and social meaning.

Blum-Kulka assumes that both learners and native speakers act in a given requestive situation with accord to the general pragmatic knowledge of request schema. Learners can pragmatically associate a given situation with a linguistic form in their general pragmatic knowledge. However, learners need to apply this basic knowledge to the target language and culture, thus the request schema from their perspective is both simpler and more complex than the native speakers' perspective. Blum-Kulka explains that the limited learner's level of linguistic and pragmalinguistic proficiency makes it simpler. In contrast, it is more complex because a combination of pragmalinguistic and socio-cultural systems influence the choices made every time learners make a decision in appraising the situation, choosing the appropriate form, and estimating its level of effectiveness and politeness. The result is an interlanguage pragmatics of request which does not conform to either the native language or the second language.

2. 2. 4. Request Speech Acts in Japanese

Politeness and speech act strategies may be universal to a certain extent, but they most certainly are influenced by culturally specific norms and values. Candlin (1978) points out that the "performance of speech acts depends on 'culturally specific appropriateness criteria" (cited in Schmidt & Richards, 1980, p. 141). Therefore, "learners of new languages need to learn the particular conventionalized forms in the new languages, particular applications of general principles which vary systematically among cultures and groups (and to a certain
extent among individuals" (Schmidt & Richards, 1980, p. 140). Schmidt and Richards (1980) point out that learners of new languages also need to learn the general 'ethos' of the new speech community, those speech acts which are particularly threatening in a particular culture, the social relationships of the community, as well as some very culture-specific contexts which call for particular speech acts.

Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) looked at request and apology behaviour in six languages (the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project). They note that the use of 'supportive moves' is a request strategy that functions to mitigate the intensity of the speaker's request. Supportive moves are external to the core of the request sequence occurring either before or after it (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). Sugito (1983, 1985) points out that Japanese people use many supportive moves in order to facilitate effective communication.

Related to supportive moves, Mizutani et al. (1990) and Murakami (1991) propose a request behavior flow chart which shows how and when request strategies are used. Request strategies seem to be used for making a request effectively while maintaining a good relationship between the speaker and hearer. They claim that the speaker should exhibit sensitivity to the hearer's feelings in Japanese. Of course this may not actually happen in all situations. A higher status person may or may not care so much about a lower status person's feelings. Individual personality differences must also be taken into account.

According to Mizutani et al., Japanese people tend to preface a request with an apology, explanation/justification, or permission in order to minimize the speakers' imposition and addressee's anxiety. At the same time, they try to create a situation in which they do not need to make a direct request. Kashiwazaki (1993) also found that before making a request, native speakers of Japanese use supportive moves, such as 'Preparator'(announcement of request, permission of request), more than learners of Japanese, especially when the request is highly imposing to the hearer. The speaker's use of 'Preparator' creates a situation in which the hearer might more easily get involved in a requesting conversation. The involvement of the
hearer might make it easier for speakers to attain their request goal. Kashiwazaki notes that failure to use 'Preparator' might make the hearer misunderstand the speaker's request.

In addition to the use of request strategies, the way of conveying a request also seems to play an important role in making a request. Echizenya, Mizutani et al. (1989, pp. 84-90) points out that when speakers make a request, especially to someone who is higher in status, they divide the requesting statement into small segments in order to check the hearer's reaction. In this way, the speaker reduces the imposition on the hearer when making a request. In contrast, Okada, Mizutani et al. (1989, pp. 78-84) found that learners of Japanese tend to make a request before the hearer is ready to be asked. They tend not to break sentences into smaller segments to check on the hearer's feeling. It may thus sound more arrogant and imposing to native Japanese.

The ending of request speech acts seems to help in making a request effectively. Kumai (1991) and Kashiwazaki (1993) studied request behavior between Japanese speakers and learners of Japanese (see section on Previous studies for more detail) and found that most of the Japanese subjects' utterances were unfinished and contained the nominalizer n,(o) (e.g., ....tai n desu kedo..... (It's that I want to ...., but....). In contrast, few unfinished sentences with kedo and nominalizer n(o) were found in non-native speakers' utterances. Kashiwazaki notes that learners of Japanese tend to use finished sentences which might make their speech sound unnatural and arrogant. It might be because the use of finished sentences forces the hearer to either accept or refuse the request. The use of unfinished sentences with kedo and nominalizer n(o) might reduce the imposition of the request and allow the speaker to make the request without seeming arrogant.

2. Methodology Used in Studies of Interlanguage Pragmatics

2.1. General Method of Data Collection for Speech Acts

There are three major instruments used to collect speech act data: a Discourse Completion Test (DCT), an oral role-play, and an observation of authentic conversation. The DCT is a written role-play questionnaire consisting of short dialogues with an empty slot for
the speech act under study. It includes a short description of the situations in order to specify the setting. Subjects are asked to fill in a response for each situation in order to complete the dialogue. The format was originally developed by Levinson and Blum (1978) to study lexical simplification, and was adapted to investigate the speech act realization of native and non-native Hebrew speakers by Blum-Kulka (1982). The DCT has been a widely used elicitation format in cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics studies (Blum-Kulka, 1982; House & Kasper, 1987, 1989; Olshtain & Weinbach, 1987; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987; Tanaka & Kawabe, 1982). The greatest advantage of this instrument is that it allows one to collect data from a large sample of subjects in a relatively short period of time. Moreover, as the subjects are given a specific situation, their responses can be controlled.

Another commonly used instrument which can be employed to collect speech act data is an oral role-play. A situation is described to the subject by the experimenter, who then asks the subject to say what the person whose role they are playing would say in that situation. This instrument is considered a good way of collecting the subjects' "natural" speech acts. Kasper and Dahl (1990) referred to the studies of Kasper (1981) and Tanaka (1988), and noted that "request performance can be strategically planned right from the beginning of the conversation, manifesting itself in invested face work and steering moves that direct the course of the conversation towards the requester's goal" (p. 19). Even though it is not authentic conversation, the subjects are required to respond spontaneously and to interact and negotiate with an interlocutor, just as they might in a real-life situation in order to reach their communicative goals. It allows the researcher to observe how subjects choose politeness strategies and how speech act performance is sequentially organized. Moreover, it allows him/her to control and elicit the subject's responses by specific strategic choice (Kasper & Dahl, 1990).

The third instrument is an observation of authentic conversation. Wolfson (1986, 1989) claims that the observation of authentic interactions is the best approach to collecting data about speech acts. However, as Wolfson (1986, 1989) and Olshtain and Cohen (1983) point
out, it is very difficult to collect large samples of certain naturally occurring features of speech behaviour in a particular situation. Moreover, some speech acts occur less frequently and are more situation-dependent than others. Thus, collecting speech data in natural settings takes a great deal of time. In addition, personal speech behaviors differ depending on the situation and the person to whom the speaker is talking. For example, one person's speech data might be different depending on the interlocutor's age, gender and appearance. Therefore, it is often difficult to generalize the findings (Wolfson, 1989). However, this problem is not unique to the observation of authentic conversation. The same problem is also encountered in the DCT and oral role-play.

As mentioned above, there are some advantages and disadvantages for each of these three methods. Many researchers (Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Beebe & Cummings, 1985; Wolfson, 1989; Olshtain & Cohen, 1983) agree that the DCT can be used to collect a large amount of situation-specific data that is controlled by a researcher in a short period of time. However, Wolfson (1989) claims that written data can not give us valid information because a speech act is performance in a spontaneous interaction. Whether or not all speech acts are performed spontaneously is debatable, but Wolfson points out that subjects have more time to plan and evaluate a given situation on a DCT than they would during an ongoing interaction in a natural setting. Furthermore, the participants must negotiate during an authentic conversation, but there is no negotiation by subjects to reach their communication goal on a DCT. In fact, most successful outcomes of speech events are not reached through a single speech act but through a sequence of acts. The quality of data between written and oral responses is different because conventional rules for speech and written language are very different. Wolfson (1989) notes serious limitations of written responses and writes that "it is impossible to obtain the kind of negotiated behaviour which we typically find in naturally occurring interactions" (p. 70). Beebe and Cummings (1985) also claim that DCT data do not represent the actual wording used in real situations, and are characterized by less talk, less evaluation, less variety, and less hedging. Because of the nature of written data, subjects reach
their communication goals without any interaction and negotiation. Naturally, the elicited written data tend to be shorter and less complex.

An oral role-play also has advantages and disadvantages. The serious disadvantage is that a given situation is artificial rather than authentic. The subjects may tend to be self-conscious or pay inordinate attention to their speech behaviour. This can affect the quality of data such that the data would be different from that collected in a natural setting. Compared to the DCT, however, the data are considered closer to natural data because the subjects interact with an interlocutor in a given situation.

There seems to be no question that natural data from an authentic conversation is relatively better for a study of speech behaviour even though there may be some questions as to the validity of the collected speech data. However, as mentioned above, it is time consuming to collect natural data and certain speech acts occur less frequently and are more situation dependent than others. Thus, it is difficult to collect speech data in a natural setting.

Some previous studies compared findings that collected the speech data through different methods. Rintell and Mitchell (1987) conducted a study to investigate whether speech act data collected in a DCT and a closed oral role-play would reveal any differences. Rintell and Mitchell found that non-native speakers' oral responses were more lengthly than their written responses. However, differences in length effects were not found in native speakers' data. They also found that the frequency of direct strategies was higher in the written data than the oral data. Rintell and Mitchell claim that the DCT and closed role-play can be used to collect very similar data, but the reliability of the data from the two methods is not clear.

Bodman and Eisenstein (1988, cited in Kasper & Dalh, 1991) examined the quality of data collected by the DCT, open-ended role-play, and observation of authentic conversation. They found that data collected through the DCT is the shortest and least complex, that authentic data is the longest and most complex, and that the role-play data is somewhere in between. They point out that an important outcome of analyzing the role-play and authentic data is that speech acts are collaboratively enacted, involving the speaker as much as the hearer (Bodman

Beebe and Takahashi (1989a, b) collected data through an observation of authentic conversation and a DCT. They point out that the interpretation of authentic data might be affected by researcher bias. For example, researchers tend to notice non-native like performance, rather than native-like performance. This, of course, may be a problem with all three methods. Moreover, authentic data provide many different examples, but it is difficult to compare all of the data in terms of speakers, hearers, and social situations.

Dahl (1991) studied the difference between authentic and open role-play interactions. She found that there is a greater amount of talk (e.g., more words, more speech acts, more pre-exchanges, more turns, etc.) and more indirectness in an authentic conversation.

It seems difficult to conclude which method is best for collecting speech act data because each method has certain advantages and disadvantages. Kasper and Dahl (1991) reviewed the methodologies used in studies of IL pragmatics and proposed that "there is a great need for more authentic data, collected in the full context of the speech event, and for comparative studies of the validity of different elicitation techniques" (p. 42).

2. 3. 2. Retrospective Interview

A retrospective interview is used to obtain information concerning the subjects' perception and interpretation of a given task. Kasper and Dahl (1991) point out that the different perception of illocutionary and politeness values of speech act realization between native speakers and non-native speakers may cause misunderstanding or miscommunication even though they both intend the same meaning. Moreover, since subjective understanding of the context affects the subject's interpretation of a given context, each subject perceives it differently (Ellis, 1991). As Faerch and Kasper (1987) and Kasper and Dahl (1991) point out, without consulting the subjects' own perceptions of their interaction with interlocutors and the given context via retrospective interview, the researchers can not verify the subjects'
intention behind their speech production and accurately interpret it. Retrospective interviews help the researcher interpret and analyze data from the subject's role-play without the researcher's inference. However, the retrospective method does have some limitations. Ericsson and Simon (1984) and Robinson (1991) point out three main problems with using a retrospective interview: the elapsed time between task performance and learner comment, subjects knowledge about the retrospective interview before the task performance, and the researcher's bias during the retrospective interview. However, Ericsson and Simon (1984) suggest that retrospective data can be made more reliable if data is collected in the following ways:

1. a retrospective interview should be held immediately after the task performance when the subject's memory is still fresh;
2. video or audio recording of task performance should be used in order to activate subjects' memories;
3. the questions in the retrospective interview should be related to specific problems or a specific situation;
4. no leading questions should be asked;
5. the subjects should not be informed of the retrospective interview until the time of the task performance.

2. 3. 3. Previous Studies

Three studies have been conducted to investigate the request speech act of interlanguage pragmatics in the Japanese language. The present study is a partial replication of Kumai's study (1992) which is based on Mizutani et al.'s studies (1987 - 1990). The methodology that they used is as follows:

(1) Mizutani et al.'s Study

Mizutani et al. (1987-1990) studied the speech behaviour of learners of Japanese (six Americans, six Chinese and six Koreans) in various contexts, such as when making a request, asking directions, interrupting, etc. In one of the requesting situations, the subjects asked a
Japanese instructor, whom they had not met yet, if they could borrow a word processor. The subjects were enrolled in the Japanese Language and Literature Institute at Nagoya University in Japan and had stayed in Japan for one year. For a course assignment, they were required to write a research paper using the word processor at school. Mizutani et al. gave the subjects an information card and utilized an oral role-play. The information card contained the following information (1990, p. 95):

1) You have a research paper which is due tomorrow.
2) You have not finished it yet.
3) In order to submit this research paper, you need to type it on the school's word processor. However, school will be closed soon.
4) You heard that an instructor, Murakami, whom you have not met yet, owns the same type of word processor as the school has.

The subjects were asked to go to the instructor's office and borrow her word processor. The speech data were recorded with a portable tape-recorder. Mizutani et al. claim that the elicited speech data is close to the natural data of a real-life situation because the subjects might have had a similar experience to the situation in the oral-role play. Based on the speech data, they did an error analysis in terms of conversation flow and request strategies.

(2) Kumai's Study

Based on Mizutani's study, Kumai (1992) conducted a study of the request behaviour of learners of Japanese and native speakers of Japanese. The subjects, age 19-22, were enrolled in Shizuoka University in Japan. Kumai controlled two variables: social status (a Japanese instructor or classmate), and age (older or younger). She utilized an oral role-play in order to gather speech data. The oral role-play consisted of three situations and required each subject to ask an experimenter (an older Japanese instructor, a younger Japanese instructor, or a classmate) to borrow a book in order to finish his/her assignment. However, as the experimenter was also using this book, the subjects were required to perform a more complex
request. The speech data were recorded and analyzed based on Mizutani et al.'s (1990) study.

(3) Kashiwazaki's Study

Kashiwazaki (1993) analyzed the discourse of learners of Japanese and native speakers of Japanese when making a request. She observed and audio-taped authentic conversations between Japanese college students (native speakers of Japanese) and university instructors or teaching assistants; as well as conversations between learners of Japanese and university instructors or teaching assistants at Azia University in Japan. She analyzed the discourse in terms of the use of supportive moves, directness of request speech, and the ending of request.

2. 4. Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature related to theories of linguistic politeness, interlanguage pragmatics, and methodology used in studies of IL pragmatics. Theories of linguistic politeness from the perspectives of Lakoff (1973) and Brown and Levinson (1987) were examined. Even though Brown and Levinson claim that their concept of face is universal, Matsumoto (1988, 1989) and Ide (1989) argue that it does not seem applicable to Japanese culture. Because Japanese culture is a vertical society characterized by group orientation, the concept of face in Japanese culture has to do with sensitivity to social context and behavior in accordance with social norms. Of course sensitivity to social context is related to the concept of face in many other cultures as well, but it would seem to be a relatively important aspect of Japanese interpersonal communication. In addition, **omoiyari** 'empathy' and **enryo** 'reserve' play important roles in maintaining face (Clancy, 1985; Lebra, 1976; Nelson, 1984; Wierzbica, 1991). Unfinished sentences and nominalizers 'n(o)' are frequently used in Japanese conversation to show the speakers' empathy and reserve.

In the interlanguage pragmatics section, the way in which sociolinguistic competence (i.e., producing socially and culturally appropriate speech behavior in a given context) is related to studies of interlanguage pragmatics was examined. It was noted that L2 learners' violation of the conversational norms and social rules particular to the target language may lead to pragmatic failure. Thomas (1983) distinguished between two types of pragmatic failure:
pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure. Blum-Kulka (1991) explained that differences in speech production in a requesting situation between native speakers and learners can be examined in terms of the general pragmatic knowledge of request schema.

In the general methods of data collection for speech acts section, the three major instruments used in studies of IL pragmatics (i.e., the DCT, the oral role-play, and the observation of authentic conversation) were examined. Each method has advantages and disadvantages. However, many researcher agree that there is a need for more authentic data research. Finally, the methodologies used in previous studies of request speech acts in the Japanese language (Mizutani, et al. (1987-1990), Kumai (1992), and Kashiwazaki (1993)) were reviewed.
CHAPTER III
Methodology

This chapter describes the methods and procedures by which speech act data were collected and analyzed in order to examine how the Japanese native speakers and English speaking learners of Japanese attained their request goals while maintaining effective communication in terms of the use of request strategies and conversation flow. This case study partially replicates the research framework used in Kumai's study (1992), which was based on Mizutani et al.'s studies (1987-1990). The following research questions will be considered:

1). How do Japanese native speakers and English-speaking learners of Japanese attain their request goal while maintaining effective communication?
2). How do Japanese native speakers and English speaking learners of Japanese show politeness?
3). How do Japanese native speakers and English learners of Japanese react when their initial request is indirectly refused?

Firstly, detailed descriptions of the collected data and participants in the present study will be presented. Next, a description of how the data was analyzed in the present research will be presented.

3.1. Pilot Study

Before the pilot study, an informal preliminary study was conducted in order to see what kinds of speech data could be elicited from an oral role-play. Four Japanese women and three American women participated in this informal preliminary study. All Japanese participants grew up in Japan and came to the U.S. to study at a university on the west coast of North America. All American participants took Japanese language courses at the university level and their level of proficiency ranged from intermediate to advanced. Each subject was given an information card containing a short description of a situation. The researcher pretended to be a Japanese instructor and asked each subject how she would borrow a book from the instructor. Since this role-play was informal, it was conducted in various locations...
(e.g., the cafeteria, the researcher's apartment, etc.) rather than in an atmosphere approximating a real-life situation (e.g., in an office). The elicited speech data showed differences between the Japanese subjects and American subjects in terms of the length of talk, the use of supportive moves, and the use of request strategies.

A more formal pilot study was then conducted in order to establish the procedures and modify the methodology if needed. The purpose was to try out the questions in the questionnaire and the retrospective interview, and practice using the audio-video equipment. There were four women who participated in the pilot study. Ideally, the participants in the pilot study would have satisfied all criteria for participating in the present study, but none of the volunteers in the Canadian group met all of the predetermined criteria (see section 3.2 for the criteria).

For the Japanese group, two women from a Japanese academic exchange program in Canada participated in the pilot study. For the Canadian group, one participant was a graduate student in the Asian studies program at a west coast university whose parents were native speakers of English. Her Japanese proficiency was at an advanced level and she had the experience of staying in Japan. The other was a Japanese-Canadian who was taking the first year Japanese course at the same university. She was the only person in the class who volunteered to participate in the pilot study. As she did not meet the criteria of the present study, her participation mainly allowed the researcher to get used to the procedures and audio-equipment.

The main purpose of the pilot study was to find problems with the procedure and/or instruments as well as to practice coding. Thus, the participants were asked if they had any difficulty in understanding the task. Firstly, they were given a questionnaire to be filled out at home. The questionnaire included questions about the subject's background (e.g., the amount of exposure to English/Japanese experience of studying abroad, work experience, etc.). They were asked to write a small note if they found any difficulty or had any trouble understanding or answering a question. Although the questionnaire was written in English, the Japanese
participants did not have any difficulty understanding the questions. However, I found several questions needed to be modified. Secondly, the oral role-play and retrospective interview were conducted in the same office where the real study would occur. The room in the pilot study was exactly the same as the one in the subsequent study. Several participants mentioned that they got nervous, especially when they saw the video-camera in a corner of the room. Although their nervousness may have affected their speech, recording their performance by video-tape seemed to have more advantages than audio-taping, especially when using it to elicit reactions and insights during the retrospective interviews. Thus, it was decided that the video-camera would be used in the subsequent study. Except for the video-camera problem, the participants did not have any problem performing the oral role-play. Information from the retrospective interview was found to be useful in helping to interpret performance data. However, several questions seemed difficult to answer because the subjects could not explain why they responded in certain ways. Questions that were problematic were not used in the subsequent study.

3.2. Subjects

There were two groups of subjects who participated in this study. One group consisted of four female adult native speakers of standard North American English, age 21-24 (one was 21 and three were 24), who were majoring in Japanese at a west coast Canadian university. They either were or had previously been enrolled in an advanced Japanese conversation and composition course at the university. Two subjects had taken this course last year and were currently enrolled in a Journalistic Japanese Prose course at the university. One subject was enrolled in both courses. The other was currently enrolled in the advanced Japanese conversation and composition course at the university. Their level of Japanese proficiency corresponded to level II of the Japanese Language Proficiency Test (see section 3.3.4. below). Level II is equivalent to near-completion at an intermediate level. (One subject held an official certificate of level II in the Japanese Proficiency Test, but took the same test again in
order to determine her current proficiency. The researcher conducted level II of the Japanese Proficiency Test in 1992, and all of the subjects passed the test).

Members of this group had received most of their education (at least through high school) in Canada and were presently working on their undergraduate degrees at the university. Moreover, both parents of all the subjects were native speakers of English. Therefore, this group had grown up in an English speaking environment and had completed studies of spoken Japanese language at an intermediate level in Canada. Their experience of having stayed in Japan varied from one to two years. This group of Japanese learners was chosen with the expectation that they had a general knowledge of spoken Japanese and would be more sensitive to Japanese pragmatics than would less advanced learners.

The other group consisted of four female adult native speakers of Japanese who had received most of their education (at least through high school) in Japan. All four were enrolled in a Japanese academic exchange program at a west coast Canadian university. The length of their stay in Canada was approximately six months. Therefore, their use of the Japanese language might be closer to Japanese people who live in Japan than that of Japanese who have been in Canada for more than one year. The range of their ages was 19-21.

The selection of subjects in each group was controlled as much as possible because certain variables might have affected their speech data (Duff, 1991). For the Canadian group, the following variables were controlled: (1) the level of Japanese proficiency (level II), (2) their experience of having stayed in Japan (between 1-2 years), (3) gender (female), (4) their cultural background (both parents were native speakers of English), (5) age, (6) class standing (undergraduate). For the Japanese group, the following variables were controlled as much as possible: (1) length of their stay in Canada (6 months), (2) the amount of exposure to English, (3) gender (female), (4) age; (5) class standing (undergraduate) (see Appendix A for details of the Subjects’ Background).
3. 3. Instrumentation

The data for this study were collected by means of three instruments: a researcher-constructed questionnaire, an open-ended oral role-play, and a retrospective interview.

3. 3. 1. Background Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) was used to learn more about the subjects' background. The Canadian subjects were asked questions regarding age, the length of their Japanese study, the purpose of their having gone to Japan, their experience of living in Japan, other second language experience, the teaching methods used in their Japanese language courses, language used at work, number and type of social contacts in which the Japanese language was used, their exposure to Japanese, and the amount of TV or movies they had watched in the Japanese language, etc.. On the other hand, the Japanese subjects were asked questions regarding age, hometown, parents' hometown, experience of studying abroad, the amount of English exposure in Japan and North America, their work experience, etc. The questionnaire was written in English for both the Canadian and Japanese subjects. Information from the questionnaires was useful because differences in the subjects' background might have affected the elicited production/speech data. It was also necessary in order to establish the degree of homogeneity in the two groups.

3. 3. 2. Oral Role-play

After considering the advantages and disadvantages of the three methods of speech data collection that were previously discussed (i. e., a DCT, an oral role-play, and an observation of authentic conversation) it was decided that an oral role-play would be the most appropriate instrument for the present study. The following reasons support this:

1. The present study examines how the subjects negotiate with an interlocutor in order to reach their communication goals in a given situation, as well as conversation flow in terms of pre-request sequences and supportive moves. Thus, the speech data needs to contain the whole conversation in the given situation. Comparing the DCT to the oral role-play, the use of the oral role-play seemed better suited for this study.
2. The data from authentic conversation is very difficult to collect and takes a great deal of time. Considering the degree of difficulty and the amount of time required, it seemed better to use the oral role-play than to observe authentic conversation.

In order to collect data related to request patterns, I utilized an open-ended oral role-play similar to that used in Rintell and Mitchell (1990) and Kasper and Dahl (1990). This was weakly controlled with partially self-directed interaction between the participants. In the present study, the oral role-play required each subject to make a request (see Appendix B); that is, the subject asked a Japanese instructor (the researcher's colleague) to borrow a book in order to write a paper which had to be submitted by the following Monday. Prior to beginning the role-play, each subject was provided with a situation card which explained that the subject had already asked a Japanese professor, Dr. Koosaka (for the Canadian subjects) /English teacher, Mr. Satoo (for the Japanese subjects) to borrow the book, but it had already been lent to a Japanese instructor, Ms. Furuta. Since this instructor was the only person who had this book, Dr. Koosaka/Mr. Satoo suggested that the student go to see Ms. Furuta (see Appendix B). This was done in order to set up a situation that would be as natural as possible because the Canadian subjects were taking a Japanese course from Dr. Koosaka, and the Japanese subjects were taking an ESL course from Mr. Satoo. The social status difference between a "professor" and "instructor" did not affect the collection of speech data because the subjects were making the request to Ms. Furuta.

The oral role-play began after the subject knocked on Ms. Furuta's door. When the subject entered the room, Ms. Furuta was reading a book for a research project. There was a pile of books on her desk that suggested she had been working. This was intendent to elicit some kind of supportive move such as an apology for interrupting. After the subject asked Ms. Furuta to borrow the book, she pretended to call Dr. Koosaka/Mr. Satoo about the book to verify the student's request. After Ms. Furuta hung up the phone, she told the subject that she was using this book. This response implied that it would be difficult to grant the request. It put the subject in a difficult situation because of the high degree of imposition. Furthermore, it
required the subject to consider how she should ask the instructor (Ms. Furuta) again. After the subject made the request again, Ms. Furuta granted it. The subject then left Ms. Furuta's room and the oral role-play was over.

In this oral role-play, the researcher's colleague played the part of the Japanese instructor. She was a native speaker of Japanese, age 35-40, and a graduate student in Modern Language Education at the university. She role-played with every subject in the same situation. Even though she had to interact spontaneously with each subject, she was provided with an instruction format that she could follow. Thus, the subjects' responses could be controlled to some degree because each subject was given the same specific objective situation.

3. 3. 3. Retrospective Interview

The retrospective interview was used to obtain information concerning how the subjects perceived their own speech act performance and the task, as well as how the researcher's colleague perceived the native Japanese and the Canadian subjects' performance. It was assumed that the learners' perceptions based on their L2 intuition might be different from that of the native Japanese speakers based on their native intuition. Information from the retrospective interview helped the researcher interpret and analyze data from the subject's role-play without the researcher's inference.

The following points were considered in order to satisfy Simon and Ericsson's (1984) requirements: retrospective data were collected immediately after completion of their oral role-play; video-tape of their performance was used for activating their memory; questions were asked concerning the appropriateness of speech acts in the role-play and their perception of the situation; the subjects had not been informed about what kind of interview they would have.

3. 3. 4. The Japanese Language Proficiency Test

In order to measure the level of Japanese ability of the Canadian subjects, the Japanese Language Proficiency Test, published by the Japan Foundation, was used. This test has been administered for ten years and has involved 68,565 people sitting for the test in 25 nations and regions (Horie & Shimizu, 1993). This test has four levels. Level 1 is the most advanced level.
and requires the same Japanese proficiency as does completion of study at a Japanese high school in terms of grammar, vocabulary, and writing. It requires enough ability to study at the university level in Japan. Level II is near-completion of the intermediate level. Level III is completion of the beginning level, and Level IV is completion of the middle of the beginning level. This test is divided into five sections: writing, vocabulary, listening, reading, and grammar, but mainly focuses on reading and listening. In order to pass the test, a total score of 70% is needed for Level I, and over 60% for the other levels.

In 1992, a copy of the level II test was used for measuring the subjects' ability in the Japanese Language. Level II requires over 600 hours of study. The knowledge of approximately 1000 Chinese characters (Kanji) and approximately 4800 vocabulary items is required, as well as the ability to speak, write and read about general subjects. The level II structures cover various fields of readings: text books at an intermediate level, newspapers, literature, novels, science books, magazines, etc.). The test takes 140 minutes (35 minutes for the writing and vocabulary section, 70 minutes for the reading and grammar section, and 35 minutes for the listening section).

3.4. Procedures
3.4.1. Site

The oral role-play and the retrospective interview were conducted in a Language Education office at the university. This office is used as a recording studio and houses two offices for graduate students as well. The room has two desks, a computer, a printer, two bookshelves, a telephone, and audio-video equipment (two TV sets and two VCR's). This office was chosen because the oral role-play needed to be in an office setting and the retrospective interview required the use of audio-video equipment, such as a TV and VCR.

3.4.2. Data Collection

First, in order to choose the subjects who met certain criteria (e.g., for the Canadian respondents, only those who had been in Japan for less than one year would be selected), I planned to give the questionnaire to students who were enrolled in a Japanese advanced
conversation and composition course, a Journalistic Japanese Prose course, and a Japanese acadamic exchange program. However, I could not find a sufficient number of subjects to select based on information gathered from the questionnaire. Thus, I decided not to use the questionnaire for the selection of subjects. Instead, I went to the classrooms for a Japanese advanced conversation and composition course and a Journalistic Japanese Prose course and the Japanese acadamic exchange program and asked female Caucasian students to participate. For the Japanese subjects, I went to classrooms and asked female students to volunteer. Those who met the necessary criteria and were willing to participate were instructed to fill out the questionnaire. It took approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The researcher contacted each subject later and set up a time for the oral role-play. The subjects were informed that the oral role-play was not a test, but rather an investigation of communication skills.

Secondly, each subject was given instructions regarding the oral role-play. The researcher gave each subject an information card containing a short description of a situation. The situation was described on the card to specify the setting (see Appendix B). The information card was written in English for the Canadian subjects and in Japanese for the Japanese subjects.

The researcher's colleague played the part of a Japanese instructor who had come from Japan to do her own research two months prior to the study. She was reading a book while waiting for the subject in the next room. The researcher then asked the subjects to go to the instructor's office (the next room) to begin the role-play. When the subject entered the room, the oral role-play began. After the subject said something, the researcher's colleague responded to her utterance. Thereafter, the subject and the researcher's colleague engaged in a short conversation. It took 2-3 minutes to complete the oral role-play. The role-playing of each subject was video-taped and later transcribed.

Immediately after the role-play, the researcher interviewed the subjects individually. First, the subject watched a video-tape of her role-play performance with the researcher. Then
the researcher interviewed the subject about the task (the role-play), her role-play performance, and her perception of the task. It took 10-15 minutes to complete each interview. Then, the researcher's colleague watched the video-tape of the role-play and was interviewed about the subject's performance. All of the interviews were audio-taped.

3. 4. 3. Transcription

The data from the oral role-play was transcribed in Roman letters. In general, a smooth English translation was provided within quotation marks at the end of each turn. In order to translate into smooth English, something that was not contained in the original data (e.g., a personal pronoun) was added to the English translation whenever it was needed. Also, Japanese particles were given an appropriate English translation whenever possible.

Information regarding speech level (honorific or humble), the use of request speech patterns, and request strategies was provided underneath each corresponding Japanese word. Abbreviations and transcription conventions are in Appendix C.

3. 5. Data Analysis

This case study was descriptive in nature. Because of the small number of subjects and the nature of the role-playing that they were doing (which means that there was only a small number of tokens or examples of request types), the data can only be reported descriptively with the raw tallies (i.e., statistical analysis can not be used). Considering the differences in the subjects' backgrounds, a qualitative method was appropriate because the researcher could observe qualitative differences between each subject. The purpose of this study was to describe how English-speaking subjects and Japanese subjects made use of their sociolinguistic knowledge and attained their request goals while maintaining effective communication. Therefore, with the exception of inappropriate usage of honorifics, grammatical errors of speech were not considered in this study. Transcriptions of the subjects' role-playing were typed out and discourse related to the requestive conversation acts was analyzed. The subjects' use of request speech patterns, request strategies, honorifics, and finished/unfinished sentences were categorized and analyzed. In order to establish the
reliability of coding, all of the subjects' data sets were assessed by inter-rater agreement. The results of this study were compared to the previous studies of Mizutani et al. (1990), Kumai (1992) and Kashiwazaki (1992).

3.5.1. Analysis of Requestive Conversation Acts

Making a request is a goal-oriented behavior that attempts to get the hearer to do something. A single utterance might not sufficiently convey the speaker's intention (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, cited in Ikuta, 1988). Rather, the request goal must usually be attained through the speaker and hearer's interaction during the entire requestive conversation.

In a previous study, Kumai (1992) analyzed requestive conversation acts in terms of (1) the preface to a request, (2) giving information, (3) the request speech act (4) reaction to the refusal (re-requesting), (5) requesting information, and (6) closing. Kumai's analysis was based on Mizutani, et al.'s study (1990). Kashiwazaki (1993) divided the discourse of requests into two parts and analyzed them in terms of preface to a request and the request speech act. In the present study, the elicited discourse related to requestive conversation acts was divided into three parts: (1) pre-request, (2) the request speech acts, and (3) post request.

In order to analyze how subjects reached their request goal (to borrow a book), a combination of request strategy categories that were adapted from a request behaviour flow-chart proposed by Mizutani et al. (1990) and Murakami (1992), and the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper et al. (1989) were modified and used in the present study. The previously mentioned request strategy categories have been modified for the present study (see Appendix D for definitions).

Each discourse part was analyzed in terms of the choice of request strategy and the kind of request strategies used in certain circumstances of the conversation flow. Moreover, each part of the discourse was analyzed in further detail. The 'pre-request' part was analyzed in terms of how the subjects gave reasons to justify making a request. Three pieces of information were considered to be important: 1) You have a paper assignment due next Monday, 2) You need the book to write a paper, and 3) You came to borrow the book because
a Japanese professor (for the native English speakers) or an English instructor (for the native Japanese speakers) said that s/he had already loaned it to Ms. Furuta.

This analysis corresponds to "giving information" in Kumai's study. Kumai (1992) noted that it did not matter whether or not the subjects presented all of the information, but it was important how effectively the subjects presented information in order to justify making their request. However, in the present study, all three pieces of information seemed necessary, especially the third piece of information, because the subjects had not met the instructor before. Therefore, the subjects were expected to explain how they got the instructor's name. Mizutani et al. (1990) noted that in a situation where a hearer and a speaker do not know each other, the speaker must mention how s/he knew to come to the hearer. The analysis of the present study focused on the way in which the subjects presented information as well as the amount of information that the subjects mentioned to the instructor. The information that each subject gave the instructor was listed and compared between individuals and between the Japanese and Canadian subjects.

The request speech act part was analyzed regarding request speech patterns. The request speech patterns were categorized in terms of semantic devices used in making the request. In order to define the semantic devices, indirect request categories proposed by Naka and Muto (1983) adapted from Gibbs (1986), were used in the present study. Kashiwazaki (1993) also used these categories for her study to examine a variety of request speech patterns. The following categories were used in the present study:
Table 2. Request Speech Patterns (Adapted from Naka & Muto, 1983, and Gibbs, 1986, modified by the researcher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition and Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Want or desire</td>
<td>The speaker asserts a particular want or desire from which the hearer can infer that s/he is to take action to fulfill the speaker's wish. e.g., <em>Hon o karitai n desu kedo</em> (It's that I would like to borrow the book, but...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Permission</td>
<td>The speaker asks that the hearer grant permission for the speaker to have his/her request fulfilled, e.g., <em>Hon karite mo ii desu ka</em> (Is it OK to borrow the book?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Potentiality</td>
<td>The speaker asks a question about the speaker's potentiality of performing the desired action, e.g., <em>Hon kariraemasu ka</em> (Can I borrow the book?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperation</td>
<td>The speaker asks a question about the hearer's cooperation to perform the desired action, e.g., <em>Hon kashite kuremasu ka</em> (Can you lend me the book?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Embedded</td>
<td>The speaker embeds one category type for making the request within another, e.g., <em>karirareru ka dooka tazune ni kimashita</em> (I came to ask you whether or not I could borrow it.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The request utterances of two Japanese subjects in the present study were "*okaridekitara o matte ohanashi ni kita n desu kedo ....*" (It's that I came to talk to you because I'm wondering if I could borrow the book, but...) and "*karirareru ka dooka tazune ni kita n desu kedo...*" (It's that I came to ask you whether or not I can borrow the book, but...). This type of request utterance could be interpreted as 'S's potentiality', however, in the utterance "*karirareru ka dooka tazune ni kita n desu kedo...*" (It's that I came to ask you whether or not I can borrow the book, but...), "karirareru (can borrow) is embedded within karirareru ka dooka (whether or not I can borrow) to form an embedded alternate question. Moreover, in "*ohanashi ni kita n desu kedo...*" and "*tazune ni kita n desu kedo ....*" the subjects are giving the reason why they came to the instructor's office. Providing the reason...
for coming apparently functions to minimize the imposition of the request. Naka and Muto did not treat this type of utterance in their study. Therefore, the utterances, "okaridekitara to omotte ohanashi ni kita n desu kedo ...." (It's that I came to talk to you because I'm wondering if I could borrow the book, but...) and "karirareru ka dooka tazune ni kita n desu kedo..." (It's that I came to ask you whether or not I can borrow the book, but...), were placed into both the 'potentiality' and 'embedded' categories. In addition, the sentence fragments "ohanashi ni kita n desu kedo..." and "tazune ni kita n desu kedo ..." were placed into the request strategy 'grounder' because they provide the reason for coming.

The request speech patterns used by the subjects were categorized and counted. If an utterance included more than one request speech pattern, all patterns were categorized and counted. For example, in the utterance "karitai n desu kedo ii desu ka? " (It's that I want to borrow the book, but is it OK with you?), Karitai (I want to borrow) was categorized as 'want/desire' and "ii desu ka? " (Is it OK?) was categorized as 'permission'. This kind of utterance was counted as both 'want/desire' and 'permission'. A description/comparison of the use of the request speech patterns between the Canadian and the Japanese subjects was then made.

The use of request strategies embedded in request speech acts was analyzed as to how the subjects used these strategies. For example, "Chotto karitai n desu kedo, ii desu ka? " contains an embedded imposition minimizer (the limitation word "chotto ") so it was categorized as a # 3 (a) request strategy (see Appendix D). In addition, the structure of the request speech act for each subject was identified in terms of the use of request strategies (see Figure 2) and request speech patterns (see Appendix D) The above sentence was thus analyzed as consisting of two request strategies (Imposition minimizer/limitation and Nominalizer) and two request speech patterns (Want/Desire, and Permission).

The end of the request speech act was analyzed as to whether an unfinished or finished sentence was used. An unfinished sentence is defined by Mizutani and Mizutani (1987) as leaving part of a sentence unsaid. Use of unfinished sentences with a softener ending is
considered to be a request strategy in this study. An example of a finished sentence is "*karitai n desu kedo ii desu ka*" (I want to borrow it, but is it OK with you?). An example of an unfinished sentence is "*karitai n desu kedo...*" (I want to borrow it, but...). Furthermore, the use of honorific language in the request speech act was analyzed.

The 'post request' part was analyzed regarding how subjects reacted and negotiated with the researcher's colleague in order to obtain the book. Their utterances were analyzed in terms of request speech patterns, request strategies, and request for information (when a requester asks for more information about the requestee's situation in order to negotiate with the requestee more effectively). Request for information is considered an effective strategy for negotiation (Kumai, 1992). In the present study, questions such as "Are you using the book?" or "How long have you been using the book?" were considered 'request for information'.

Moreover, pauses that subjects made were analyzed. Many subjects made long pauses after the instructor indirectly refused their initial request. Data obtained from the retrospective interview helped to interpret the reasons for their pauses.

3.5.2. Analysis of the Communicative Style in Japanese

The researcher analyzed the subjects' discourse in terms of Japanese communicative style which includes the use of finished/unfinished sentences, nominalizers, and honorifics. The use of unfinished sentences is considered to be one of the characteristics of Japanese conversation (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987). The use of extended predicates (the request strategy "nominalizer") is also an important element of Japanese conversation. The frequency of occurrences of honorifics, finished/unfinished sentences, and nominalizers were counted for each subject during the entire discourse.

3.5.3. Analysis of the Retrospective Interview

The data from the retrospective interview was analyzed qualitatively. The data from the subjects was examined as to how they solved and perceived their task as well as how they used their sociolinguistic knowledge. The data were analyzed in terms of: (1) the use of honorific language, (2) the most important point that was paid attention to by them during the role-
playing, (3) the perception of making a request to an instructor in a Japanese setting, (4) the image of the Japanese subject's role-play performance as perceived by the Canadian subjects, and (5) the perception of the characteristics of Japanese (or Canadian) ways of communication.

Item (1) was analyzed as to what the subjects thought about using honorifics. The use of honorifics is considered to be one of the most difficult aspects of Japanese for English speakers to master because they do not have the same set of honorific conventions or norms. Thus, the analysis of item (1) focused mainly on how the Canadian subjects perceived the use of honorifics. Item (3) was analyzed in terms of the subjects' perception of the instructor's behaviour and their perception of negotiating with the instructor to borrow the book. The subjects' perception of negotiating with the instructor to borrow the book was closely related to their perception of making a request to the instructor. Therefore, they were put in the same category. Item (5) was examined to determine how the Canadian ways of communicating seemed to affect the Canadian subjects' role-play performance.

Data collected from the retrospective interview helped the researcher to interpret the performance of the subjects' role-play and was necessary in order to determine the underlying cause of certain actions. For example, the reason for a long pause after an indirect refusal could not be interpreted by looking only at a subject's performance.

The data from the researcher's colleague was analyzed to determine how she perceived the Japanese and Canadian subjects' performance with respect to their way of requesting, their reaction after an indirect refusal, their use of honorifics, their choice of speech style, and their way of conducting a conversation. These data helped to show how a native Japanese speaker might feel when talking to a non-native speaker in the Japanese language.

3. 5. 4. Analysis of the Japanese Proficiency Test

The test was scored by the researcher, roughly following a published guideline for scoring the Japanese Proficiency Test (The Japan Foundation Association of International Education, 1993). Since the guidelines in 1993 did not state the point value for each question, the researcher decided to score each question with one point and obtain a sub-score for each
The sub-score was then divided by the total score to obtain a percentage for each section. One section consisted of a combination of vocabulary and writing, the second section consisted of both reading and grammar, and the third section consisted of listening only. The researcher sorted the data so as to obtain a percentage for each skill (i.e., reading, grammar, writing and vocabulary).

3. 5. 5. Analysis of the Background Questionnaire

Information from the questionnaires was used to gather information about each subject's background. This information provided a useful reference for helping to interpret their performance. The data from the Canadian subjects was mainly analyzed in terms of their exposure to Japanese. The data was categorized in terms of: 1) the length of their Japanese study, 2) their experience of living in Japan, 3) language used on the job, 4) number and type of social contacts in which the Japanese language is used, 5) their exposure to Japanese, and 6) the amount of TV or movies they watch in the Japanese language.

The data from the Japanese subjects was mainly analyzed in terms of their identification with Japanese culture and their experience of having been exposed to an environment in which honorifics should be used. The data was categorized in terms of: 1) their experience of studying abroad, 2) the amount of English exposure in Japan and North America, and 3) their work experience in Japan.

3. 6. Summary

Speech data from four Japanese native speakers and four native English speaking learners of Japanese were collected and analyzed in order to examine how the Japanese subjects and Canadian subjects attained their request goals while maintaining effective communication. The elicited discourse related to conversation acts was analyzed as to how the subjects used request speech patterns, request strategies, honorifics and finished/unfinished sentences in order to maintain a harmonious relationship with the requestee with respect to the concepts of

1. The subjects' tests were rescored using the 1994 guidelines for scoring the test.
face and politeness. A combination of request strategy categories adapted from Mizutani et al. (1990), Murakami (1992) and the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper et al., 1989) were used in the present study.

The elicited discourse related to requestive conversation acts was divided into three parts: pre-request, the request speech act, and post-request. The pre-request part was analyzed as to how the subjects gave reasons to justify making the request. The request speech act part was analyzed in terms of the use of request speech patterns and request strategies. Indirect request speech categories proposed by Muto and Naka (1983) and Gibbs (1986) were used for this analysis. The post-request part was analyzed as to how the subjects negotiated with the researcher's colleague in order to obtain the book. It was analyzed in terms of request speech patterns, request strategies and request for information. Moreover, the entire discourse was analyzed in terms of Japanese communicative style which includes the use of finished/unfinished sentences, nominalizers, and honorifics.
CHAPTER IV

Results

This chapter presents the findings of this study in terms of how Canadian subjects and Japanese subjects attained their request goals while maintaining effective communication. The discourse of the requestive conversation acts was described as to how subjects reached their request goals (to borrow the book) by the use of request strategies. Moreover, the broader discourse of communication was examined. The quantitative data can only be presented on the basis of the raw tallies (i.e., an indepth quantitative analysis can not be performed because of the small sample size). The data from the retrospective interview was also used for a close interpretation of the subjects' speech data. Their perception of the task and their way of communicating was also examined.

4. 1. The Requestive Conversation Acts

The requestive conversation acts were divided into three parts: 1) pre-request, 2) request speech acts, and 3) post-request. The 'pre-request' part was analyzed in terms of how the subjects gave reasons to justify making their request. The use of the request strategy that the subjects chose and the amount of information they presented in order to justify making their request was examined and comparisons between the Canadian and Japanese subjects were made. The 'request speech act' part was analyzed in terms of request speech patterns, the use of request strategy, ending of the request speech (finished/unfinished sentences) and the use of honorifics (honorific language). The subjects' frequency of use of these categories were based on raw tallies and provided information only. The 'post-request' part was analyzed as to how subjects negotiated with the instructor in order to obtain the book. Data from the retrospective interview were also analyzed in order to interpret pauses that the Japanese subjects made. An inter-rater assessment of all of the subjects' data sets for coding of request strategies, ending of sentences (finished/unfinished sentences), nominalizers and honorifics was also used (inter-rater agreement: 95.87%).
4.1.1. Pre-request

The subjects' use of the request strategies "preparator" and "grounder" (see Appendix D) was examined. It was found that uses of the preparator strategy were different between the Canadian and Japanese subjects, both in terms of frequency of use and type of strategy used.

(1) The Canadian Subjects

All four Canadian subjects used the grounder strategy and three subjects used both grounder and the preparator strategies. Before using the grounder strategy, three subjects used the preparator strategy by providing the instructor with a reason for coming to see her.

The preparator strategy includes three sub-strategies: announcement of the request, permission to make the request, and implication of the content of the request. Two subjects (C-2 and C-3) used the 'implication of content of request' and mentioned the name of the book that they wanted to borrow: "chotto 'kiku to katana' no hon de kita n desu ga .... (It's that I came about the book 'C & S', but...)

"kiku to katana' no hon no koto nan desu ga ...

(It's that it's about the book 'C & S', but...)", One subject (C-1) used the 'announcement of request' by telling the instructor that she came to ask the instructor a favor: "sensee ni chotto onegai ga arimasu ga ...(I have a little favor to ask you, but...)

The grounder strategy was used to justify making their requests. Three subjects (C-1, C-3, and C-4) gave all the pieces of information considered to be important:

1) their need of the book titled 'kiku to katana' (C & S) to write a paper

2) the paper is due next Monday

3) a reference from the professor.

Two of them (C-1 and C-3) used all of the information and also used the preparator strategy. The following is the speech data from the Canadian subject (C-1) who used both the preparator and grounder strategies.
EX. 1

(Preparator) C-1: Sensee lanol Furuta sensei ni onegai ga arimasu ga
"I have a favor to ask of you Ms. Furuta (lit. teacher)"

Furuta: Hai
"Yes"

C-1: lAnool raishuu no kayoobi made ni
"Well, by Tuesday of next week

Furuta: Ee
"Yes"

(Grounder) C-1: Ronbun o kakanakute wa ikemasen ga
"I have to write a paper but..."

Furuta: Ee
"Yes"

(Grounder) C-1: lAnol "kiku to katana" no hon ga ronbun no tame ni irimasu ga
"I need the book "C & S" for the paper, but..."

Furuta: Hai
"Yes"

(Grounder) C-1: lAnol Koosaka-sensei ga lanol osshatte kuremashita ga
hon
"Dr. Koosaka told me but....."

As the data show, C-1 first told the instructor that she wanted to ask a favor of her
by using the 'announcement of request' preparatory strategy, then started giving all of the
information that she had to justify making the request.

One subject's (C-2) pre-request statement was difficult to interpret because her
utterance had many grammatical mistakes and wrong word choices. It seemed that she tried to
explain that she went to the professor to borrow the book, but the professor told her that she
had already lent it to Ms. Furuta. She gave only one reason to the instructor, but did use the preparator strategy and implied the content of the request.

(2) The Japanese Subjects

Compared to the Canadian subjects, the Japanese subjects did not use the preparator strategy as often. Three subjects just started giving reasons for the request without announcing the request or implying the content of the request. Only one Japanese subject used the preparator strategy before using the 'grounder' strategy. This subject (J-1) mentioned the name of the instructor and clarified the reason why she came. She then started to give reasons to justify making the request. She presented all of the information that she had in trying to get the instructor to grant her request. The following is the speech data from J-1:

EX. 2

(Preparator) J-1: は、satoo sensee no koto o Satoo sensee kara ukagatte kochira ni kita n desu kedomo
"Well, I heard about you from the teacher, Satoo, that's why I came here, but...."

Furuta: Hai
"Yes"

(Grounder) J-1: は、watashi kurasu no repooto no kadai ga arimashite
"Well, I have a report assignment for my class..."

Furuta: Ee
"Yes"

J-1: は、nihonbunka ni tsuite dooshitemo kakanakute wa ikenakute
"then, I have to write about Japanese culture"

Furuta: Ee
"Yes"
J-1: Sono tame ni 'kiku to katana' to iu hon ga dooshitemo hitsuyoo na n desu

"I definitely need the book called "C & S" for that reason"

Furuta: Aa, Ee. Ee

"Oh, yes, yes."

J-1: Sore de Satoo sensee ni okarishiyoo to omotte hon

ohanashi shimashitara lanol Furuta sensei ga omochi hon to iu koto o kiite sono repooto no kadai ga raishuu getsuyoobi made a, teishutsu ni natte iru n de.......

"Having heard from Satoo that you (Furuta) have it, I'm thinking that if I talk to you, I can borrow it. It's that I have to submit the report by next Monday..."

All of the Japanese subjects used the grounder strategy, but the amount of information they presented was different for each subject. Only one subject (J-1) presented all of the information: (1) the need of the book for an assignment, (2) the paper is due next Monday, and (3) the reference is from an English teacher. One subject presented both the reason for needing the book for the assignment and the reference from the English teacher. Two subjects just gave the reason for needing the book for the assignment. They did not mention the name of the English teacher until the instructor mentioned it. The following speech data is from J-2 who gave just one reason why she needed the book:

EX. 3

(Grounder) J-2: IAnoo anool chotto lanool shukudai no repooto de

"Well, it's about a paper assignment."

Furuta: Hai

"Yes"
J-2: 'Kiku to katana' to iu hon ga dooshitemo hitsuyoo na n desu ga
"I definitely need the book called "C & S' but..."

Furuta: Hai
"Yes"

J-2: Sono sen* sono hon o sensee ga motte irassharu to iu hon koto na no de ....
"It's that I heard you have the book..."

J-2 started giving the reason without using the preparator strategy. She told the instructor about her paper assignment but did not mention how she knew that the instructor had the book. Since J-2 did not mention the source from which she knew the instructor had this book, the instructor later told J-2 that she borrowed the book from the English teacher.

4. 1. 2. The Request Speech Act

The following is a transcription of each subject's request speech act. The way in which each subject used request speech patterns, request strategies, and sentence endings was examined. The category of the request speech patterns and request strategies are provided underneath the Japanese words.

EX. 4

C-1: Sukoshi dake lanool raishuu no getsuyoobi made sukoshi (limitation) (limitation) kashite itadakemasen ka? hum
{Cooperation}

Lit. "Couldn't I receive your lending it to me just a little until Monday? (i. e. ) Couldn't I borrow it for just a little while until Monday?"
EX. 5

C-2: |Anol (1.0) mooshiwake nai n desu ga lmaal ichinichi de lanool hum (apology) (nominalizer) (limitation)

kashite itadakenai ka to iu koto de hum {Cooperation}

Lit. "I'm terribly sorry but, for one day, couldn't I receive your lending it to me?
(i.e.) I'm terribly sorry but, uh- only one day, well, couldn't I borrow it..."

EX. 6

C-3: |Eetol chotto karite mo ji deshoo ka?

(limitation) {Permission}

"Would it be OK if I borrowed it for a bit?"

EX. 7

C-4: Soshite lanol hon o (0.5) kari* (0.5) karitai {Want/Desire} n desu kedo (nominalizer)

"Then, well, it's that I want to borrow the book, but...

Furuta: Aa kore desu ne? "oh, this is it, isn't it?"

C-4: [ ji desu ka?

{Permission}

"is it OK with you?"

EX. 8

J-1: |Yoroshikattara chotto getsuyoobi made hon o ichijiteki ni chotto (condition) (limitation) (limitation) (limitation)

okaridekitara to omotte kyoo ohanashi ni kita hon (condition) hon {Potentiality} {Embedded} (grounder)

n desu kedo (nominalizer)
"It's that I came to talk today because I was thinking that if it's OK with you, I was wondering if I could borrow the book for a little bit until next Monday, but..."

EX. 9

J-2: Moshi yokattara lanool chotto dake kashite itadakenai ka to iu koto hum (condition) (limitation) {Cooperation}

a, tsukawaremasu ka?

hon

"If it's OK, couldn't I borrow it for a bit? "

Furuta: Hai

"Yes"

J-2: (3.0) lAnol moshi sono hon o (0.5) aa, tsukatte tsukawanai toki ga (condition)

attara karitai n_ desu kedo {Want/Desire} (nominalizer)

"It's that I want to borrow that book if/when you're not using it, but... "

EX. 10

J-3: Sore o zehi okarishitai n_ desu kedo hon (Intensifier) {Want/Desire} (nominalizer)

"It's that I want to borrow that (book), but..."

EX.11

J-4: Chotto karinareru ka dooka tazune ni kita n_ desu kedo (limitation) {Potentiality} (Embedded) (grounder) (nominalizer)

"It's that I came to ask whether I can borrow (the book) for a bit, but..."

Request speech patterns used by the Canadian and Japanese subjects were categorized and examined. As shown in Table 1, the raw data showed some subtle tendencies exhibited by
the Canadian and Japanese subjects. For example, none of the Japanese subjects used the
permission pattern and none of the Canadian subjects used the potentiality/embedded pattern.
C-4 used a combination of request categories in one request speech act, and J-2 made her
requests twice before the instructor called the English teacher to clarify it. Since some subjects
used more than one pattern, the total number of patterns is larger than the total number of
subjects in Table 1.

Table 1

Frequency of Use: Request Speech Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Canadian subjects (n = 4)</th>
<th>Japanese subjects (n = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want/Desire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentiality/Embedded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, the Canadian subjects tended to use 'permission' in their request
speech patterns. On the other hand, the Japanese subjects tended to use
'potentiality/embedded' in their request patterns. The item 'want/desire' was used by one
Canadian subject and two Japanese subjects. The basic request pattern '.....shite
itadakimasen ka?' (Couldn't I receive your having done [something]?) in 'cooperation' was
used by two Canadian subjects and one Japanese subject. Two Japanese subjects embedded
"karirareru" (can borrow) within a main clause: "karirareru ka doo ka".(whether or not I can
borrow it). This kind of utterance was categorized as both 'potentiality' and 'embedded' in this study.

One Canadian subject used a combination of request patterns, 'want/desire' and 'permission': "karitai n desu kedo ii desu ka? " (I want to borrow the book, but is it OK with you?). "Karitai n desu kedo" was categorized as 'want/desire' and "ii desu ka? " was categorized as 'permission'.

Request strategies used before or after the main request speech act included 'Imposition minimizer', 'Apology', 'Intensifier' and 'Nominalizer'. These strategies were embedded in the request speech act and might have functioned to mitigate the imposition of the request. Both Canadian and Japanese subjects used these strategies in their request speech acts. Table 2 shows the frequency of use of request strategies based on the raw tallies.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Canadian subjects</th>
<th>Japanese subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 4)</td>
<td>(n = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounder</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifier</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalizer</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number without ( ) is the total number of times the strategy was used. The number in ( ) is the number of subjects who used that strategy.
The same number of subjects used the 'imposition minimizer', but different varieties of expressions were observed between the Canadian subjects and the Japanese subjects. All of the Canadian subjects used the 'imposition minimizer' related to limitation "chotto dake " (only a little) or "chottosukoshi " (a little). In contrast, the Japanese subjects used more varieties of 'imposition minimizer' expressions related to limitation "chotto dake ", (only a little), "chotto ",(a little), and "ichijiteki ni chotto" (for a little while) as well as the conditionals "yoroshikattara yokattara " (if it's O.K. with you) and "tsukawanai toki ga attara " (if there is a time when you will not use it). The 'condition' was to ask about the convenience of borrowing the book. Two Japanese subjects (J-1 and J-2) used the condition strategy; on the other hand, none of the Canadian subjects used it. Two subjects (C-3 and J-4) used words of limitation, minimizing the extent of imposition in their request speech: "chotto karitai n desu kedo ii deshoo ka,(C-3)" (I want to borrow it a little, but would it be OK with you?)/ "chotto kariraruru ka doo ka tazune ni kita n desu kedo (J-4)" (It's that I came to ask you whether I can borrow it for a little, but...). Two subjects (C-1 and J-1) used these limitation words more than twice: "sukoshi dake anoo raisyuu no getsuyoobi made sukoshi kashite itadakemasen ka? (C-1)"/"yoroshikattara chotto getsuyoobi made hon o ichijiteki ni chotto okaridekitara to omotte..........(J-1)". C-1 used limitation words three times, while J-1 used limitation words four times, as well as a conditional word one time. Use of these devices might have effectively functioned to mitigate the imposition of making the request.

Two Japanese subjects (J-1 and J-4) used the 'grounder' strategy after the core of the request speech. As mentioned above, the 'grounder' was used with the embedded request pattern, such as "okaridekitara to omotte ohanashi ni kita n desu kedo ....(I'm wondering if I could borrow the book, that's why I came to talk to you, but...)" and "kariraruru ka doo ka tazune ni kita n desu kedo....(I'm wondering if I can borrow the book, that's why I came to ask you but...)". Use of this type of utterance was not observed in the Canadian subjects' speech data.
One Canadian subject (C-2) used an 'apology' ("mooshiwake nai n desu ga. I am terribly sorry but..."). In Japanese culture, this is a conventionalized expression used before making a request. She then used the basic request expression "kashite itadakenai ka to iu koto de" (lit. I'm wondering if I couldn't receive lending. (i.e., Couldn't you lend me the book?)."This expression "kashite itadakenai" is a variation of "Kashite itadakemasen ka", which is a commonly used request pattern introduced in a number of different text books (Kashiwazaki, 1993). One Japanese subject (J-3) used an 'intensifier' "zehi" (lit. by all means) in the sentence "sore o zehi okarishitai n desu kedo...". In this utterance the literal translation of "zehi" does not work well. Something like "It's that I really want to borrow the book, but..." seems closer to the actual meaning.  

The ending of the request speech act was analyzed as to whether an unfinished or finished sentence was used. Use of unfinished sentences with a softener ending is considered to be one of the characteristics of Japanese conversation (Kashiwazaki, 1993). Based on the raw tallies, Table 3 shows that there were some differences in the request speech act endings between the Canadian and Japanese subjects.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Ending of Request Speech Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canadian subjects (n = 4)</th>
<th>Japanese subjects (n = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finished sentences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished sentences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the Japanese subjects used at least one unfinished sentence which combined the request strategy 'nominalizer (n)' and the clause particle kedo such as "...n desu kedo..." (It's that ...., but...), and "...tai n desu kedo..." (It's that I want to..., but ...).

In contrast, only one Canadian subject (C-2) used an unfinished sentence "kashite itadakenai ka to iu koto de..." (It being that couldn't you lend it to me...). This is a grammatical sentence in Japanese, but the ending consists of a gerund rather than a clause particle. The rest of the Canadian subjects used finished sentences. The utterance of one Canadian subject (C-4) contained the 'nominalizer + the clause particle kedo' pattern (i.e., ".... n desu kedo ") in her requestive speech act; however, she finished the rest of the sentence "ii desu ka? " (is it OK with you?) following the instructor's utterance. C-4's utterance was not considered as an unfinished sentence because it was qualitatively different from the utterances of the Japanese subjects.

The use of honorific language in the request speech act was also analyzed. Based on the raw tallies, Table 4 shows the frequency of use of honorifics between the Canadian and Japanese subjects.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Canadian subjects n=4</th>
<th>Japanese subjects n=4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kashite itadakemasen ka.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite form of &quot;kariru&quot; (okari shimasu)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain form of &quot;kariru&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Canadian subjects (C-1 and C-2) and one Japanese subject (J-2) used the pattern "kashite itadakemasen ka?" (Couldn't you lend to me?). Two Japanese subjects (J-1 and J-3) used the polite pattern "okarishimasu". One Canadian subject (C-4) and one Japanese subject (J-2 in her second request) used a plain form "karitai n desu kedo, ii desu ka" (It's that I want to borrow it, but is it OK?). Based on the raw data, there was not much difference in the frequency of use of honorifics between the Canadian subjects and the Japanese subjects, but there were differences in the way in which the honorifics were used.

4. 1. 3. Post-request

The indirect refusal occurred when the instructor told the subjects "Doo shimashoo ka nee. Watashi mo tukatte iru n desu yo nee" (What should we do? It's that I'm using it, too...). The instructor then waited to see what the subjects would say to her in order to obtain the book. Even though both groups of subjects realized that it was an indirect refusal, the reaction to the refusal was different between the Canadian and the Japanese subjects. The Canadian subjects reacted immediately and made another request. In contrast, the Japanese subjects made long pauses after the instructor's refusal such that the conversation seemed to break down. The data from the retrospective interview showed that it might have been due to differences in the perception of making a request to an instructor and negotiating with an instructor. The Canadian and Japanese subjects' reaction and responses to the instructor's refusal is analyzed in more detail below.

(1) The Canadian Subjects

In the post-request stage, all of the Canadian subjects except one dealt smoothly with the indirect refusal by asking for more information about the instructor's situation or minimizing the imposition (e.g., offering to reduce the length of the time of borrowing the book, remaking the request under a given condition, etc.) in order to negotiate with her more effectively. Two subjects (C-1 and C-3) first acknowledged the instructor's refusal by saying "Aa soo desu ka." (Oh, is that right?) and then started to negotiate. The subjects implied that
they understood the instructor's situation before trying to find some way of borrowing the book by negotiation. The following example from C-1 shows how she made another request:

**EX. 12**

C:1  
A, soo desu ka. lanol raishuu no getuyoobi mae sukoshi dake 
( limitation) 
shuumatsu to ka. lanol, ichinichi gurai de sukoshi dake 
( limitation) 
(kashite itadakemasen) ka. hum 
{Cooperation}

"Oh, is that right? Oh, before Monday of next week only a little [on the] weekend..., couldn't you lend [it] to me for about one day for only a little [while]?

After accepting the instructor's situation, C-1 minimized the imposition of her request by reducing the length of time she wished to borrow the book. She specified the time span for borrowing the book (weekend, only one day) in order to show the instructor that the degree of imposition was small. She used the strategy 'imposition minimizer' in trying to obtain the book from the instructor.

Two subjects (C-3 and C-4) asked for more information about the instructor's situation by asking how long the instructor would be using the book, then tried to find a way to borrow it without inconveniencing the instructor. When the instructor told the subjects she was going to use it for a long time, they reduced the length of time of their borrowing the book to one or two days while re-requesting. The following data demonstrates how C-3 asked for more information and re-made her request:

**EX. 13**

C:3  
A, soo desu ka. Itsu made tsukatte imasu ka? 
Asking information

"Oh. Until when will you be using it?"

Furuta: Chotto nagaku tsukau yotee na n desu kedo ne 

"It's that I plan to use it for a bit of a long time, but...
C-3: Futsuka kan gurai tsukatte mo voroshii deshou ka.
(limitation) [Permission]
"I wonder if it would be all right if I used it for about two days?"

All subjects (except for C-2) used the same request speech pattern that they had used in the initial request. One Canadian subject (C-1) used 'cooperation' and two subjects (C-3 and C-4) used 'permission'. However, when they made their second request, they used 'imposition minimizer' (i.e., limitation) more than they had when making their first request. They seemed to use the strategy effectively during the negotiation in order to obtain the book.

One subject (C-2) did not say anything for five seconds after the indirect refusal, so the instructor offered to let her use the book. In the retrospective interview, the subject said that she did not know what she should say in this situation so she just kept silent.

(2) The Japanese Subjects

Compared to the Canadian subjects, the Japanese subjects made long pauses before starting to negotiate with the instructor. Three subjects paused after the indirect refusal, seemingly hesitant to negotiate with the instructor.

Only one Japanese subject (J-3) did not pause after the indirect refusal. Since J-3 had not told the instructor when the paper was due in the pre-request part, J-3 gave the instructor this information in order to make the instructor understand her situation. She also told the instructor that she wanted the book after the instructor was finished with it. J-3 was apparently showing her awareness that the instructor had priority in using the book. However, the instructor told her that she would be using it for a long time, so J-3 then reduced the length of time of borrowing the book to one day when re-requesting.

Two subjects (J-1 and J-2) made long pauses (about 6-11 seconds) and one subject (J-4) made a short pause (3 seconds) after the refusal. In the retrospective interview, they said that they were waiting for the instructor's suggestion. However, the purpose of the present study was to examine how the subjects made another request. Thus, the instructor
had been told not to lend the book until the subjects re-made their request. In the case of C-2, however, the instructor was not sure how to respond to the subject's silence and thus quickly offered to lend her the book.

One subject (J-1) did not directly make another request to the instructor. Instead of mentioning any specific request word, such as 'borrow' or 'lend', she implied her request by explaining her situation and telling the instructor that she would return the book as soon as she could. Following that, she paused and waited for the instructor to offer a suggestion. The following speech data demonstrate how J-1 obtained the book from the instructor without using any request word:

EX. 14

J-1: Anol moshi (2.0) lanol dooshitemo sensee no gotsugoo de
(intensifier)
hitsuyoo deshitara toshokan ni ite mitari toka sagashite..miyoo to mo
(condition)
omotta n desu kedo chotto miataranakatta n de
(nominalizer) (limitation) (nominalizer)
"It's that I thought if it's [not] convenient and you need it, I'd try going to the library to try to find it, but the fact is it can't be found [there]"

Furuta: Aa, soo desu ka. Eetol doo shiyoo kashira nee (6.0) Eetol getsuyoobi made
to osshaimashita yo ne
hon
"Oh.... what shall we do? You said until Monday, right?"

J-1: Hai. (5.0) a, shimekiri ga getsuyoobi made na n de lanol dekishidai
(nominalizer)
sugu ni jibun no hoo ga owarishidai sugu ni okaeshi shimasu kedo
hum
"Yes. Given that the due date is Monday, uh, I'll personally return it as soon as [my paper] is finished."

Furuta: Aa, soo desu ka. Ja wakarimashita

"Oh [okay]. I understand. "

As the data show, there were many pauses after the instructor's utterance. First, J-1 gave more information about her situation by explaining that there was no alternative way to get the book except by borrowing it from the instructor. She tried to justify her request to borrow the book from the instructor, but seemed hesitant to make the request again. However, the instructor was still wondering "Doo shiyoo kashira nee " (I'm wondering what we should do). Unlike the Canadian subjects, J-1 did not ask for more information about the instructor's situation. Instead, she kept silent and waited for the instructor's suggestion. After the instructor confirmed the due date of the paper, J-1 paused for five seconds before promising the instructor that she would return the book as soon as she was done. The instructor granted J-1's request.

Two subjects (J-2 and J-4) minimized the imposition of the request by offering some alternate solutions. J-2 made a long pause (about 11 seconds) and then asked the instructor if she could borrow the book a little while in order make photo copies of the parts that she needed. Limitation words like "Chotto dake (only a bit)" were often used to downplay the importance of the request thereby minimizing the imposition of the request. J-4 also offered to make copies instead of borrowing the book for a lengthy period of time. By offering a condition, she allowed the instructor to easily grant her request. The following speech data from J-4 shows how she minimized the imposition of the request:

EX. 15

J-4: A, soshitara (1.0) sukoshi dake de mo ii n de, chotto (limitation) (nominalizer) (limitation)

kashite itadaite hum kopii de mo sasete hum itadakenai desyoo ka. (Cooperation) (limitation)

"Oh, then, if you could lend it to me for just a little while, I wonder if I couldn't copy it."

In contrast to the initial request, the Japanese subjects' request speech patterns were different following the instructor's refusal. Two subjects (J-1 and J-2) did not use any request
speech patterns that were in the categories so they were put into the 'others' category. J-3 used the 'potentiality' "okari dekiru tte koto wa dekimasu ka?" (Is it possible to borrow the book?) in the second request, but used 'want/desire' "okarishitai n desu kedo" (It's that I would like to borrow the book, but...) in the initial request. J-4 used 'cooperation' "kashite itadaite" (Couldn't I receive your lending [of the book]?) in the second request instead of 'potentiality' and 'embedded' "karirareru ka doo ka tazune ni kita n desu kedo" (I'm wondering whether I could borrow the book, that's why I came here)" that she used in the first.

The Japanese subjects used 'imposition minimizers' such as 'limitation' and 'condition' more often in the second request than they did in the first request. All subjects minimized the imposition of the request and limited the length of time of their borrowing the book to one day or a few hours (time in which students would typically make copies). It seemed that the Japanese subjects used 'imposition minimizers' as an attempt to lessen the degree of implosion of the request.

4.1.4. The Japanese Ways of Communicating

Based on the raw tallies, Table 5 shows the total number of uses of honorifics, unfinished/finished sentences, and nominalizers during the entire discourse.
Table 5  
Frequency of Uses of Honorifics, Unfinished/Finished Sentences, and Nominalizers during the Entire Discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Canadian subjects (n = 4)</th>
<th>Japanese subjects (n = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honorifics</td>
<td>12 (4)</td>
<td>19 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished sentences</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>9 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished sentences</td>
<td>14 (4)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalizers</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td>20 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalizer and <em>kedo</em></td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(... n desu kedo....)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The number without ( ) is the total number of times the strategy was used. The number in ( ) is the number of subjects who used that strategy.

Based on the raw tallies, large differences in the frequency of the use of nominalizers between the Canadian and Japanese subjects were found. The Canadian subjects used fewer nominalizers than the Japanese subjects. One subject (C-1) did not use nominalizers at all. Two subjects (C-3 and C-4) used it one time, and C-2 used it twice. They did not use the nominalizer in combination with "*kedo*" (e.g., "... n desu kedo ..." It's that ..., but...). In contrast, the Japanese subjects frequently used nominalizers. Two subjects (J-2 and J-3) used it four times, J-4 used it five times, and J-1 used it seven times. All of the Japanese subjects used the nominalizer in combination with "*kedo*" in their request speech act.
Differences were also found in the use of finished/unfinished sentences between the Canadian and Japanese subjects. The Canadian subjects used more finished sentences and fewer unfinished sentences. C-2 used unfinished sentences twice, C-3 used them once, and C-1 and C-4 did not use them at all. C-2 was the only subject who used unfinished sentences in making the request, but did not use them during the remainder of the discourse. In contrast to the Canadian subjects, the Japanese subjects used unfinished sentences more frequently than finished sentences. In particular, all of the Japanese subjects used unfinished sentences when they were making their initial requests. Interestingly, all of the Japanese subjects used finished sentences when making their second requests.

The number of subjects who used honorifics differed individually. No qualitative differences or tendencies were found between the Canadian and Japanese subjects. The individual frequency of use of honorifics is as follows: one Japanese subject (J-1) used honorifics ten times, C-1 used them five times, C-2 used them four times, three Japanese subjects used them three times, C-3 used them two times, and one Canadian subject (C-4) used them one time.

4. 2. The Retrospective Interview
4. 2. 1. The Use of Honorifics

All of the Canadian subjects said that the use of honorifics was the most difficult aspect of learning Japanese. They gave several reasons why they felt that way. C-1 and C-3 commented that this kind of device is not found in English. They added that native English speakers do not change their speech style depending on whom they are talking to. Therefore, using honorifics was not natural to them. Even though they understood the rules, it was difficult to use them appropriately. They needed time to think about using the appropriate style before uttering their response. C-1 stated that she could understand honorifics that were spoken to her more easily than she could use them herself. C-2 said that it was most difficult to deal with an unknown person, because she could not judge the politeness level she should use. Several students thought they needed more opportunity to use/practice honorifics since
they did not have much opportunity to practice/use them at school. C-4 said that she did not know much about honorifics because she hadn't had much chance to study them before. She was an exchange student in high school and lived in Japan for one year. When she lived over there, no one expected her to use honorifics appropriately because she was a foreigner. All subjects stated that they wanted to be able to use honorifics appropriately because it is a very important aspect of Japanese culture. Therefore, when they were doing the role-play, they were very careful about using honorifics because they did not want to be rude to the instructor. The most important point for the Canadian subjects was to pay attention to honorifics during the role-play.

In contrast, the Japanese subjects used honorifics naturally even though their role as students in Canada (away from the hierarchical social structure of Japan) does not provide many opportunities to use honorifics. However, when something unexpected happened (e.g., their request was turned down), two of the subjects could not control their speech style and switched to a plain form (without using honorifics) when addressing the instructor. As with the Canadian subjects, all of the Japanese subjects paid attention to their use of honorifics in trying not to be rude to the instructor during the role-play.

4.2.2. The Perception of Rerequesting to the Instructor

As demonstrated above, the Canadian subjects and the Japanese subjects reacted differently after the instructor's refusal, "Doo shimasyoo ka nee. Watashi mo tsukatte iru kara..."(What should we do? It's that I'm also using (this book), so...). The Canadian subjects (except C-2) asked for more information about the instructor's situation and negotiated to reach a compromise. In contrast, the Japanese subjects (except J-3) made a long pause after the instructor's refusal, and then made another request to briefly borrow the book to make photo copies. The different ways of making the second request between the Canadian and Japanese subjects might have been affected by different perceptions of the task. This will be further discussed in chapter V. The data from the retrospective interview showed how the
Canadian subjects and Japanese subjects perceived the task of making the request to an instructor.

In the retrospective interview, C-4 mentioned that North American culture was based on negotiation. Therefore, even if the instructor needed the book, C-4 would negotiate with the instructor to borrow the book. C-4 said that it was difficult to give up on borrowing the book because she needed it. Two subjects (C-2 and C-4) asked about the instructor's need for the book and tried to compromise by somehow cutting down the length of time of their borrowing the book in order to lessen the inconvenience to the instructor. Since some subjects thought that they had a right to borrow the book, they thought that it would be unreasonable for the instructor to refuse to lend the book to them for only one day or so. The subjects felt the English way of communicating tended to be more forceful. If they needed something, they needed it. So they had to compromise in order to obtain it. However, Japanese culture is different, so one Canadian subject (C-3) wondered whether Japanese people would have insisted on borrowing the book in this situation or whether they might have given up on borrowing the book and left.

In contrast, the Japanese subjects thought that the instructor had priority in using the book because she borrowed it first. Moreover, the instructor was older and higher in status than the subjects. It made the subjects feel that they should be humble and polite, and try to bother the instructor as little as possible. They did not want to impose on the instructor. Instead of immediately negotiating with the instructor, they waited for the instructor's decision or suggestion. For example, after J-1 explained her situation and the reasons for her need of the book, she felt that she could do nothing but wait and follow the instructor's decision. If the instructor wanted to keep it, she would have given up on the idea of borrowing the book. That's why she paused and waited for the instructor's decision. Other subjects (J-2 and J-4) tried to think of a better way in which they would not bother the instructor, so they asked to borrow the book in order to make photo copies because this would cause the least amount of trouble. It seemed that the Japanese subjects were not willing to negotiate with the instructor to
borrow the book and did not ask for more information about the instructor's need of the book, her situation, etc., until they perceived that the instructor was not going to offer a suggestion or decision. One Japanese (J-1) mentioned that if this situation had happened in real-life, she might have left without borrowing the book. Long pauses made by the Japanese subjects showed that they preferred to leave the decision or suggestion to the instructor.

4. 2. 3. The Image of the Japanese Subjects' Performance

The Canadian subjects assumed their own performances would be different from the Japanese subjects' performances. Firstly, they thought that the Japanese subjects would use more honorifics and be more polite than themselves. Secondly, some subjects (C-3 and C-4) thought that the Japanese subjects might have given up borrowing the book after the instructor's refusal. C-3 wondered whether the Japanese subjects would make a second request to the instructor. If the script had not said "you have to borrow the book", C-3 would have backed off. C-4 said that it was very difficult to give up borrowing the book because the culture and society that she grew up in was based on 'negotiation' and 'compromise'.

4. 2. 4. The Perception of the Subjects' Performance

The researcher's colleague role-played as the instructor for each subject. Her perception of the politeness level between the Canadian and Japanese subjects was based on two different standards. When she role-played with the Canadian subjects, she did not expect that the subjects would be able to use honorifics appropriately. If the subjects did not use honorifics, the researcher's colleague did not perceive that they were impolite because she was more tolerant. She felt that they were still learning and could not help making mistakes. When the Canadian subjects used honorifics appropriately, the colleague perceived them as being very polite. However, her perception of the Japanese subjects was more severe. She felt that because they were native speakers, they should be able to use honorifics appropriately. Since her expectation was high, any mistakes by the Japanese subjects could not be accepted. Thus, when the Japanese subjects did not use honorifics appropriately, even if it was only one time, she felt that they sounded impolite. In addition to the use of honorifics, the researcher's
colleague perceived the Japanese subjects' performances in negative ways in the post-request stage. Since the Japanese subjects made long pauses, the conversation seemed to break down. The researcher's colleague felt that the Canadian subjects seemed better able to deal with the instructor's indirect refusal than the Japanese subjects.

4.2.5. The Perception of the Characteristics of Japanese/Canadian Ways of Communication

The perception of the characteristics of Japanese and Canadian ways of communication was almost the same among both groups. The Canadian and Japanese subjects both perceived that the Japanese approach was not straightforward. C-3 mentioned that "English people tend to be more forceful than Japanese. The Japanese tend to not speak straightforwardly". Thus, the Japanese subjects did not come right out and say what they wanted to say, but rather implied what they wanted to say. The Japanese subjects also perceived that the Japanese tended to be humble and passive in communicating with people. In contrast, the Canadian and Japanese subjects perceived that the Canadian ways of communication were more straightforward, aggressive and sometimes forceful. Some of the Canadian subjects mentioned that if they had done this role-play with an English speaker, they would have been even more straightforward in stating what they wanted.

4.3. Summary

The discourse was analyzed and described as to how the Canadian subjects and the Japanese subjects attained their request goals while maintaining effective communication. The major results are summarized as follows:

(1) Before making the request, three Canadian subjects introduced their request by using the preparator strategy. In contrast, only one Japanese subject used the preparator strategy.

(2) Before making a request, all of the Canadian and Japanese subjects introduced their request by using the 'grounder' strategy. However, the amount of information the subjects presented was different. Three Canadian subjects presented all of the information considered to be important. On the other hand, only one Japanese subject presented all of the information.
The rest of the Japanese subjects gave the instructor only part of the information in order to justify their request.

(3) Various uses of request speech patterns were found. The Canadian subjects tended to use 'permission' and 'cooperation'. On the other hand, the Japanese subjects tended to use 'want/desire' or a combination of 'potentiality' and 'embedded'. The difference is that none of the Japanese subjects used the permission pattern and none of the Canadian subjects used the potentiality/embedded pattern.

(4) For the ending of the request speech act, all of the Japanese subjects used unfinished sentences with the clause particle "kedo". None of the Canadian subjects used "kedo" to end their request speech act.

(5) Based on the raw data, the Japanese subjects used the 'imposition minimizer-condition' and 'grounder' strategies in their request speech acts, but none of the Canadian subjects used these strategies in their request speech acts.

(6) The number of subjects who used a combination of nominalizers and unfinished sentences was different between the Canadian and Japanese subjects. All of the Japanese subjects used this pattern in their request speech act, but only one of the Canadian subjects used it.

(7) Based on the raw tallies, the frequency of the use of nominalizers and unfinished sentences by the Canadian and Japanese subjects during the entire discourse was quite different. The Canadian subjects used nominalizers 6 times and unfinished sentences 3 times while the Japanese subjects used nominalizers 20 times and unfinished sentences 9 times during the entire discourse. In contrast, the number of uses of honorifics was not much different between the two groups.

(8) After the instructor's indirect refusal, the Canadian subjects immediately asked for more information about the instructor's use/need of the book and negotiated to borrow the book. They minimized the length of their borrowing the book and reached a compromise. In contrast, three Japanese subjects made long pauses and waited for the instruction's suggestion.
or decision instead of immediately negotiating with the instructor. After the long pauses, two subjects asked to briefly borrow the book for making photo copies rather than asking to borrow the book for a lengthy time period. One subject gave more explanations and promised to return the book as soon as her paper was finished without making a direct request.

(9) The perception of making a request to the instructor was different between the two groups: the Canadian subjects tended to perceive that they should reach a compromise and borrow the book. On the other hand, the Japanese subjects tended to perceive that the instructor had priority in using the book, so there was nothing they could do except wait for the instructor to make a suggestion or decision.

(10) The perception of the researcher's colleague was based on two different standards: a more tolerant scale with low expectation for the Canadian subjects, and a more severe scale with high expectation for the Japanese subjects. Thus, she did not feel that the Canadian subjects were impolite even if they did not use honorifics or used them inappropriately. However, when the Japanese subjects did not use honorifics in making their request, she felt that they were very impolite.
CHAPTER V
Discussion

This chapter will discuss the findings of this study and compare them to previous studies.

5.1. How Speakers Attain their Request Goals while Maintaining Effective Communication

This section will discuss how Japanese native speakers (the Japanese subjects) and learners of Japanese (the Canadian subjects) attained their request goals in each stage: pre-request, request speech acts, and post-request. The focus will be on the use of request strategies. In the post-request stage, the focus will be on how the subjects reacted to the instructor's refusal and attained their request goals.

5.1.1. Pre-request

During the pre-request stage, the presentation of information seemed to be an important matter because it helped subjects to justify their request. The results show that prior to making the actual request, the Canadian subjects used preparator and grounder strategies in a qualitatively more effective manner than the Japanese subjects. Three of the four Canadian subjects used the preparator strategy, and informed the instructor of the request. By using it, the subjects prepared the instructor for the ensuing request. In contrast, only one of the four Japanese subjects used it. The rest of the Japanese subjects just gave reasons to justify their request without any announcement or implication of a request. All of the Canadian and Japanese subjects used the grounder strategy to justify making their request; however, the amount of information that the subjects gave to the instructor was different between the Canadian and Japanese subjects. The Canadian subjects tended to present all of the information that they had (see section 3.5.1 for a list of information). On the other hand, the Japanese subjects tended to present only some of the information. However, due to the small sample size, these findings are tentative.

Since the instructor and the subjects had not met before, it was expected that all subjects would reveal to the instructor how they knew her name. Mentioning the name of the Japanese
professor/English teacher early in the discourse might have helped the instructor (Ms. Furuta) to understand the reason for the stranger's visit. It might also have helped the instructor to realize that the topic of conversation was somehow related to the professor/English teacher. Failure to provide information on the source of the reference might have caused the instructor to worry because she had also borrowed the book. Since she had the responsibility of taking care of the book, she probably would not want to lend the book out to someone whom she did not know. Mentioning the reference from the professor/instructor might justify the request more than just giving the reason of having to do an assignment in this situation.

In contrast to the present study, different results were found in some previous studies (Mizutani et al., 1989; Kashiwazaki, 1993; Kumai, 1992). They found that Japanese native speakers used preparator and grounder strategies more than learners of Japanese. They claim that it is important for speakers to explain why they are requesting. Providing a reason for the request shows that the speaker is apologetic for imposing on the hearer. Okada (1990) notes that simple explanations might give the impression that the speaker does not care about imposing on the hearer. In order to maintain a good relationship between the speaker and hearer, the grounder strategy is necessary because it leads to attainment of the request goal without the speaker having to make a direct request. It creates a situation in which the speaker prepares the hearer for the upcoming request (Mizutani et al, 1990; Murakami, 1990). The above researchers claim that this is one of the characteristics of making a request in Japanese. However, as Levinson (1983) points out, this is observed universally in requesting situations. Faerch and Kasper (1989) also note that giving reasons, justifications, and explanations for the request give the hearer insight into the speaker's underlying motives and show an empathetic attitude toward the hearer. Thus, the use of grounder strategies mitigates the imposition of the request.

Many researchers support the contention that the use of the grounder strategy in a request situation is important. However, a question is raised: why did the Japanese subjects use the grounder strategy less than the Canadian subjects? The results of the CCSARP (Blum-
Kulka, Hose, & Kasper, 1989) were similar to those of the present study in that the native speakers used the grounder strategy less frequently than the non-native speakers. Blum-Kulka (1991) notes that more explanations and justifications tend to be used by native speakers when making a request. However, the learners tend to use external modifiers more often than the native speakers. Although the methodology used in the CCSARP was different (the data was collected through a discourse completion questionnaire), the explanation of this phenomenon made by Blum-Kulka and others can perhaps be applied to this study. Kasper (1989) explains that native speakers use the grounder strategy less frequently because they prefer to create a situation in which the speaker relies on the hearer's co-operation in comprehending the implied justification for making the request. In contrast, the non-native speakers' self-perception as non-members of the target culture might make them feel it necessary to explicitly express the reasons for imposing on their hearer. The learner's preference in the use of more transparent, overcomplex, explicit, and longer procedures of request modification might be a strong characteristic of interlanguage-specific features (Faerch & Kasper, 1989; Kasper, 1990). Kasper (1990) notes that it may function as "a playing-it safe strategy of communication" (p. 54). Edmonson and House (1991) reviewed other researchers' analyses of this phenomenon and proposed the 'Insecurity Hypothesis.' Because of learners' lack of confidence, uncertainty, and insecure social status, they may have produced more verbose utterances in order to ensure that the message came across.

Another possible explanation might be, as Kumai (1992) points out, that the speech behaviour of college students does not always conform to norms that are considered to be appropriate in Japanese society. Also since the Canadian subjects in this study were older than the Japanese subjects, the age difference might have affected their speech production. Moreover, if the use of the grounder strategy prior to making a request is in fact a universal phenomenon, it may be that the Canadian subjects used their general pragmatic knowledge of English and transferred it to the Japanese setting.
5. 1. 2. Request Speech Acts

Different ways of requesting between the Japanese and Canadian subjects can be observed in their speech production. Japanese subjects used the 'imposition minimizer-condition' and 'grounder' strategies but the Canadian subjects did not. The 'grounder' strategy was used as a component of embedded request speech patterns, such as "...ka doo ka tazune ni kita n desu kedo..." (...whether or not, that's why I came to see you, but....). Since the content of the request is embedded within a grounding sentence, it is not a yes/no question type of requesting utterance. Thus it sounds more indirect. In this way, the speaker can avoid making a direct request thereby minimizing the imposition of the request. The reason that none of the Canadian subjects used this pattern might be because it is not often introduced in textbooks. On the other hand, the pattern "Kashite itadakemasen ka? " (which was used by two Canadian subjects) is a basic expression for requesting that is introduced in almost all of the Japanese language textbooks (Kashiwazaki, 1993). Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) point out that the learners' speech productions are more restricted and less complex than native speakers'. A possible reason could be a lack of learners' lexical and syntactic knowledge.

The 'permission' pattern (e.g., "...karite mo yoroshii deshoo ka? " ..would it be OK to borrow [the book]?) was used by two Canadian subjects. None of the Japanese subjects used the permission pattern, but the utterances of two Japanese subjects included an omission of the pattern "ii desu ka? " (is it OK?). For example, in one utterance from a Japanese subject (J-2)"...karitai n desu kedo...." (... I want to borrow [the book], but...) it is obvious that the pattern of permission "ii desu ka ?" is omitted. One Canadian subject (C-4) actually used "...karitai n desu kedo ii desuka?" (... [I] want to borrow [the book], but is it OK ?) which is exactly the same as J-2's utterance except that the permission pattern is included. The Canadian subject asked the instructor for permission "ii desu ka ?", but the Japanese subject left her utterance unfinished without asking for permission. By not verbalizing the request for permission, the Japanese subject not only allowed the instructor to understand the speaker's
intent, but also provided options to the instructor other than a yes or no response to the implied request.

Based on the raw data, the frequency of use of the request strategy 'condition' was also different between the Japanese and Canadian subjects. As Mizutani et al. (1990) point out, the use of condition, such as "Moshi tsukawanai toki ga attara,..." (If there is a time when you won't be using it,...), gives a hearer options, thus minimizing the imposition of the request. The use of 'condition' was observed in two of the Japanese subjects' utterances, but was not found in any of the Canadian subjects' utterances. One Japanese subject used both the 'condition' and 'embedded' request pattern. All of the Japanese subjects except one used either the request strategy 'condition' or the 'embedded' request pattern. The use of these patterns might indicate the speaker's reserve, restraint, or hesitation when making a request. It seems that the speakers wanted to avoid troubling the instructor as much as possible.

The results of the ending of the request speech act showed important differences between the Japanese and Canadian subjects. All of the Japanese subjects used unfinished sentences which contain the pattern 'nominalizer + clause particle kedo ', "...n desu kedo...." (It's that ...., but...), for ending their request speech act. On the other hand, none of the Canadian subjects used this pattern. All of the Canadian subjects except one (C-2) used finished sentences for their request speech act ending. C-2 used an unfinished sentence for the ending, but it consisted of a gerund rather than a clause particle. One Canadian subject (C-3) used "ii deshoo ka" (would it be OK?) at the ending. The use of "deshoo ka" was considered to be more polite than "desu ka" because the "deshoo" form indicates probability, imprecision, and /or indirectness and allows for something other than a yes/no response (Jorden & Noda, 1989).

In a previous study, Kumai (1992) found that most of the Japanese subjects' utterances were unfinished and contained the pattern 'nominalizer + clause particle kedo ', such as in ".....tai n desu kedo.." (It's that I want to ..., but...). In contrast, few unfinished sentences using 'nominalizers + kedo ' were found in non-native speakers' utterances. Kashiwazaki (1993) also
analyzed the end of request speech acts and found the same results as Kumai. Kumai and Kashiwazaki note that the use of the pattern 'nominalizer + kedo' at the ending is one of the characteristic of Japanese communication.

Clause particles, such as 'kedo' (but) are used at the end of a clause or sentence in order to leave the sentence unfinished. The use of 'kedo/ga' (but) as an ending leaves space for the hearer to fill in his/her own interpretation and thus creates a softened and empathic statement (Jorden & Noda, 1987; Maynard, 1990; Noda, 1990, 1992). Jorden and Noda (1987) note that the 'ga/kedo' ending is often used "as a device to present material politely: 'I make this statement but' --- this is not the only possibility; or what do you think? or I hope you don't object; or what happens now?" (p. 104). Thus, request sentences often trail off with a softening "kedo" (Martin, 1988, p. 979). Noda often uses '...' (i.e., dot-dot-dot) in order to capture the open-endedness associated with 'ga/kedo' when rendering it into English (1990, p. 35).

Furthermore, since an unfinished sentence is not syntactically a yes/no question, it does not require a yes/no answer. Tatematsu (1989) notes that the use of unfinished sentences in a requesting situation allows the requester to make a request without imposing on the requestee. The Japanese subjects' use of this pattern when making the request allowed for a situation in which the instructor did not need to clearly answer "yes/no". In this way, it minimized imposition because it gave the instructor options as to how to respond and allowed her to save face if unable to grant the request.

The clause particle 'ga/kedo' ending is often observed following the nominalizer strategy (i.e., ... n(o) desu kedo...). Martin (1975) noted that the use of nominalizers "gives an utterance extra indirectness or politeness. (p. 853)" According to Martin (1988), "the use of '.....n da' is especially common when some sort of reservation may be mentioned,.... implied, or expected, as with the desiderative: Iki tai n desu ga... (I want to go, you see, but ...dare I? may I? can I?) (p. 853)" It is interesting to note that the examples of nominalizers provided by Martin are all associated with unfinished sentences ending with the clause particle
'kedo/ga'. It would seem that nominalizers are often used in combination with clause particles in unfinished sentences when the speaker is showing reservation. McGloin (1980, 1983) notes that "n desu ga/kedo ..." reduces the directness of feelings or desires in the requestive situation. One might thus expect to find nominalizers used with a clause particle during certain speech acts (e.g., requests) in which there is a high degree of imposition. Related to the observation of nominalizer and the clause particle 'ga/kedo', Noda (1990, 1992) claims that 'the use of 'n desu kedo ...' is a conversational strategy to form a sympathetic relationship with the listeners. (Noda, 1990, p. 41)" She proposes that the nominalizer '...n(o) ' followed by the clause particle 'ga/kedo ' ending is used as a relation maintenance strategy.

5. 1. 3. Post-request

Some different findings are observed between the present study and Kumai's study (1992). Kumai (1992) found that Japanese subjects were better able to deal with an indirect refusal than learners of Japanese. She found that the Japanese subjects first accepted the instructor's situation (the instructor is using the book), then started negotiating with the instructor to borrow the book, i.e., giving more information or promising a reward (e.g., offering to return it soon). Most of the Japanese subjects uttered "Soo desu ka" (Is that right?), to show their understanding. By showing their understanding /consideration of the instructor's situation, the Japanese subjects were also asking for her cooperation in allowing them to use the book. The Japanese subjects in Kumai's study dealt with the problem immediately without any pauses after the instructor's refusal.

On the other hand, learners of Japanese tended to repeat their request or insist on the necessity of borrowing the book without enough follow-up explanation or indication of understanding. Kumai observed that the learners' re-request sounded imposing because it ignored the instructor's situation. Mizutani et al. (1990) and Murakami (1992) also note that this kind of situation requires speakers to explain more about their situation in order to elicit the hearer's cooperation.
However, the findings of the present study did not confirm the results of Kumai's. In the present study, the Canadian and Japanese subjects' approach to the instructor in order to attain their request goals after the instructor's indirect refusal was different. Neither group of subjects were expecting the instructor's refusal. In the retrospective interview, both groups of subjects mentioned that the instructor's refusal made them upset and forced them to think of some way to solve this problem immediately. Even though both groups of subjects had the same impression about the instructor's refusal, their reaction was different. Three Canadian subjects attempted to negotiate with the instructor to borrow the book by asking for more information about the instructor's need of the book. Two Canadian subjects (C-1 and C-2) uttered "Soo desu ka " (Is that right?), as did the Japanese subjects in Kumai's study in reaction to the instructor's indirect refusal. Interestingly, none of the Japanese subjects in this study used "Soo desu ka ". In contrast, three Japanese subjects made long pauses instead of justifying the request or asking for more information. In the retrospective interview, they commented that they were waiting for the instructor to make a suggestion or decision. The Japanese subjects' choice of silence might be seen as "Don't do an FTA", which is one of the possible politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). After long pauses, two subjects suggested that they make copies of the book. In J-4's utterance "kopii de mo sasete itadakenai deshoo ka" (I wonder if I couldn't even copy it), the use of "mo" (also/even) shows that the option mentioned by the speaker is not the only possibility and is therefore softer and more polite (Jorden & Noda, 1988). One subject gave more explanations and promised to return the book as soon as her paper was finished. However, she did not make a direct request and waited for the instructor's decision or suggestion. Since the subject (J-1) kept silent, the instructor offered to lend it her. Even though J-1 did not do an FTA, she successfully attained her request goal to borrow the book. Compared to the Canadian subjects' approach, the Japanese subjects changed their request speech patterns without asking the instructor for more information.
The different results between Kumai's study and the present study might have been related to differences in the subjects' interpretation of the task. In Kumai's study, the subjects role-played with an instructor whom they had talked to before. On the other hand, in the present study, the subjects role-played with an instructor whom they had not met before. The role-relations between actors (e.g., whether or not they were role-playing with a stranger) might have affected the subjects' performance. Subjects in this study might have felt a greater reluctance to be aggressive or to insist on making another request to the instructor because they were role-playing with an unfamiliar person. Familiarity with the instructor might have led to the different results between Kumai's study and this study. Moreover, subjects were both male and female in Kumai's study, and the person who played the part of the Japanese instructor was male. On the other hand, in the present study, the subjects were all female and the person who played the part of the Japanese instructor was female. The gender difference between actors in the two studies might have affected the subjects' performance. In addition, individual personality differences might have influenced the subjects' interpretation of the task. Subjects who participated in Kumai's study and the present study might have interpreted the task differently. This might also have led to differences in the results between the two studies. Considering these issues, it is difficult to interpret the elicited data from the role-play and compare the results of Kumai's study and the present study.

If only the ways of making another request between the Japanese subjects and the Canadian subjects were compared (i.e., the speech data without consideration of the pauses made by the Japanese subjects or the use of "soo desu ka"), it might be observed that the Japanese subjects' performances were similar to those of the Japanese subjects in Kumai's study. The Canadian subjects stuck to the same request speech patterns and strategies (i.e., they used the same patterns that they had used in the initial request). They did not give any explanations that helped to reduce the instructor's worry. On the other hand, the Japanese subjects changed their request strategies or suggested an alternative way. The Japanese subjects approach to the problem was to leave the decision to the instructor, while the Canadian
subjects approach was to start negotiation immediately. It is true that the Japanese subjects also used negotiation, but only after it become apparent that the instructor was not going to offer a suggestion or decision. These different approaches might be due to different perceptions of making a request to an instructor. This will be discussed in the next section.

5.2. Possible Explanations for the Differences in Performance in the Post-request

5.2.1. The Perception of Social Relations

The different reactions observed between the Japanese and Canadian subjects might be explained in terms of different perceptions of making a request to an instructor. The Japanese subjects felt that the instructor had priority in using the book because she borrowed it first. In addition, the instructor was older and higher in status than the subjects, so the Japanese subjects tried to be humble and show as much reserve as they could. It could not be helped if they had to give up on the idea of borrowing the book. In contrast, two Canadian subjects felt the instructor's refusal to be unreasonable. If the book was the instructor's, it might have been understandable for her to refuse to lend it. Since the instructor had also borrowed the book, it would be strange to refuse the subject's request. The subjects who felt the instructor had priority in using the book thought of the difficulty she would have giving up the book even though they needed it. Thus, they tried to negotiate with the instructor to borrow it for a short period of time.

This different perception might result from a different appraisal of social relations (i.e., the social relation between an instructor and a student). Hill et al. (1986) studied how social variables (e.g., power, distance, age, etc.) affect the choice of linguistic politeness of Japanese and Americans at a university. They found that the choice of politeness expressions used by the Japanese subjects tended to be affected by the addressee's social variables. The results showed that politeness levels used when addressing higher status people and lower status people were clearly distinguished and very different. Most of the Japanese subjects also agreed on the choice of an appropriate linguistic form based on social relations. This means that linguistic choice is determined by social variables. On the other hand, the addressee's social
relations were less prone to affect the choice of expressions used by the American subjects. The results showed that the linguistic choice for a higher and lower status is not clearly distinguished, compared to the results from the Japanese subjects. The same expression can be used regardless of the addressee's status. Their choice of expressions seemed to be influenced by the situation and there was greater variability from subject to subject. This means that the American subjects might perceive that the social variables of linguistic politeness are largely irrelevant. Beebe and Takahashi (1993) also report that the Japanese subjects seemed to change their speech style and directness depending on the addressee's social status, while the American subjects seemed not to change so much.

Hill et al's (1986) and Beebe and Takahashi's (1993) studies imply that the Japanese subjects were more sensitive to perceived social variables than the American subjects. This shows that the Japanese subjects place higher levels of importance on the P value (i.e., the relative power and status of the participants) than the American subjects. Minami (1987) notes that social variables, especially power, seems to influence the choice of linguistic politeness in Japanese society. Thus, the Japanese subjects in the present study might have felt strongly that since the instructor was socially higher than they were, she had priority in using the book. Recognizing the ranking difference between the conversation participants is important (Ikeda, 1993; Matsumoto, 1988) in Japanese society, which is characterized by its the vertical structure (Nakane, 1967). In the present study, the Japanese subjects might have been cognizant of their social relation to the instructor in terms of vertical structure, in which social status and age are important elements to be considered. In contrast, the Canadian subjects might not have felt as strongly about the hierarchical difference. They might have perceived the social relation more in terms of horizontal structure.

Ikeda's study of apologies between Japanese and American subjects showed that their face saving strategies might be influenced by the nature of the different social structures (i.e., vertical or horizontal structure). Because of the vertical social structure in Japan, saving a hearer's face might be more important than saving one's own face in apologizing to someone
who is higher in status. The Japanese subjects tended to admit their faults and apologize without explaining or negotiating with the hearer. Ikeda notes that the speaker would apologize even if it was not his/her fault. In this way, the speaker could avoid threatening the face of the hearer, who was higher in status. On the other hand, it seems that saving both the hearer's and speaker's face is important in American society, regardless of the hearer's status. The American subjects tended to give explanations or negotiate with the hearer in order to save the face of both speaker and hearer.

Different conceptualization of the nature of power in Japan and the West must also be considered. Differences in the nature of power are observed by Wetzel (1988), who claims that "power in Japan is less an attribute of the individual than of role and position" (p. 562, cited in Watanabe, 1991, p. 293). Watanabe (1991) also notes that the power inherent in Japanese roles and positions is defined within the hierarchical social structure. On the other hand, power in American society is negotiated through individual abilities and skills (p. 293). She points out that this different sense of power may cause problems in negotiation between Japanese and American. Watanabe's (1991) study of group discussions showed that the Japanese subjects found it difficult to talk in free discussion without a clear speaking order being assigned by someone. Similar observations are found in Lebra's research. Lebra (1987) observes that in a situation in which participants were encouraged to speak freely in group therapy, the Japanese participants tended to keep silent and waited for older participants or therapists to take the lead in speaking (p. 352). Lebra notes that the Japanese participants seemed to wait to be ordered to speak freely by an authoritarian.

The previous researchers' results show that the Japanese tend to be passive and wait to be ordered by someone (e.g., an authoritarian) to participate in the conversation. This phenomenon is related to the concept of "amae", the feeling of dependency on someone. When the Japanese deal with someone who has more power, they tend to obey his/her decision or order. If the situation of the role-play in this study (i.e., the student was told that the instructor needed the book) occurred in a real life situation, the student would probably
apologize for interrupting and leave without negotiation. Instead of negotiation, waiting for the instructor's suggestion or decision might be natural behaviour in this situation. In the retrospective interview, two Japanese subjects mentioned that during pauses, they were waiting for the instructor's suggestion or decision. At the same time, they were thinking what they should do in this situation and how they could solve the problem. One Canadian subject also mentioned that she was not sure whether or not the Japanese subjects would still try to make another request.

In Japanese culture, the person who has more power (e.g., is older) makes some suggestion to the subordinate in formal situations. Subordinates do not usually negotiate with their superiors. That being the case, the Japanese subjects in the present study were asked to perform very un-Japanese cultural behavior. This can explain why the Japanese subjects in the present study made long pauses.

Interestingly, the instructor's perception of long pauses made by Japanese subjects was negative. In the retrospective interview, she mentioned that long pauses gave her an impression that the Canadian subjects seemed better able to deal with the indirect refusal than the Japanese subjects. Because the Japanese subjects did not respond immediately, the conversation broke down temporarily. The instructor felt that the Japanese subjects should have been able to deal with this problem more smoothly without any communication breakdown. It must be noted, however, that norms in Japanese society do not often allow a person of lower status to make a decision or suggestion to a person of higher status. The instructor's perception of the Japanese subjects' performance may therefore be questionable. Because the researcher's colleague (the instructor) had been living in Canada for a long time, her perceptions may have become Westernized to the extent that they no longer conformed to certain Japanese norms. If the person role-playing as the instructor had not lived in the West for a lengthy period of time, her perception of the Japanese subjects might have been more in accordance with Japanese norms.
5.2.2. Politeness and the Speaker's Concern for the Hearer

A different perception of mitigating the imposition of the request might have led to differences in performance in the post-request between the Japanese and Canadian subjects. This may be related to the speaker's concern for the hearer or situation as described by Minami (1987) and Sugito (1983). The different reaction between the Japanese and Canadian subjects after the instructor's refusal can be explained by the fact that they interpreted and treated it in a different way. Figure 3 shows how both groups of subjects interpreted the situation in order to choose a linguistic act of politeness in the two-stage process. In the present study, the subjects had to borrow a book that the instructor was using. Both groups of subjects felt that the act of borrowing the book would bother the instructor. In the first stage, the Japanese and Canadian subjects evaluated the situation in the same way. The next stage, however, reflected differences in the subjects' interpretation. The Japanese subjects' interpretation was "showing reserve, I will wait for the instructor's suggestion or decision". Thus, the choice of linguistic act of politeness was silence. On the other hand, the Canadian subjects' interpretation was "I will reduce the span of time for borrowing the book". Thus, the choice of linguistic act of politeness was negotiation. For the Japanese subjects, silence was the polite and appropriate act, as opposed to the act of saying something to the instructor. For the Canadian subjects, negotiation was the polite choice and appropriate act, as opposed to "silence".

Figure 3 The process of the choice of a linguistic act of politeness

The Japanese subjects
<Situation> "Borrowing the book that the instructor is using"
<Appraisal> "The act of borrowing the book will bother the instructor"
<Interpretation> "Showing reserve, I will wait for the instructor's suggestion or decision"
<Act of politeness> Silence

The Canadian subjects
<Situation> "Borrowing the book that the instructor is using"
<Appraisal> "The act of borrowing the book will bother the instructor"
<Interpretation> "I will reduce the span of time for borrowing the book"
<Act of politeness> Negotiation (offer or suggestion)
5. 2. 3. Requestive Schema

The differences in performance between the Canadian and Japanese subjects in this study can also be explained by the different appraisal of requestive situations and the selection of situationally appropriate forms in the requestive schema proposed by Blum-Kulka (1991). The requestive goal "Borrowing the book that the instructor was using" was attained through a cultural filter. Through the cultural filter, the Canadian subjects thought that the Japanese approach was less straightforward in this situation, compared to the English approach, (i.e., more aggressive and straightforward). Therefore, the Canadian subjects tried not to be pushy. This attitude was evident in their speech production in that the Canadian subjects used more grounder strategies before making their request. They might have hoped that giving explanations would lead to the instructor's realizing the content of the request. The learners' performance in the pre-request stage seemed to be a more "Japanese-like" approach, compared to the Japanese subjects' performance. In the Japanese cultural setting of the situational parameters, there is the difference in social power between the instructor and the students. Since both groups of subjects used honorifics when addressing the instructor, they recognized an appropriate degree of social distance between the instructor and themselves. However, as mentioned earlier, the Japanese subjects felt the instructor's social power more strongly than did the Canadian subjects. In addition, the Canadian subjects might have felt the degree of legitimacy of the request greater than the Japanese subjects. The combination of different appraisal of social variables and legitimacy between the Japanese and Canadian subjects led to different reactions in the post-request phase.

5. 3. How Speakers Show Politeness

During the entire discourse, the number of uses of honorifics, nominalizers, and unfinished/finished sentences were different between the Canadian and Japanese subjects. The use of these categories can be used to show politeness in Japanese. Table 5 shows the total number of uses of these categories between the two groups of subjects. In the following
section, the discussion will focus on how the Canadian and Japanese subjects showed
politeness in the requestive situation.

5.3.1. The Use of Honorifics and "Discernment"

All of the Canadian subjects thought that the Japanese subjects would perform more
politely and use more honorifics. However, it seemed that there was not much difference in
the frequency of use of honorifics between the Canadian subjects and the Japanese subjects.
The appropriate use of honorifics by Canadian subjects might have been affected by their
experience of living in Japan. When they lived in Japan, all subjects except one spent most of
their time with Japanese (see Appendix A). They tried to speak Japanese and socialize with
Japanese friends as much as they could. During the role-play, the Canadian subjects were very
careful about using honorifics. Given that their greatest concern was to use honorifics in an
appropriate way, the results did not show much difference in the use of honorifics between
themselves and the Japanese subjects. Kumai (1992) also found that there was not much
difference in the use of honorifics between native speakers of Japanese and learners of
Japanese. However, Kumai notes that Japanese college students sometimes use an
inappropriate speech style in real life situations. For example, they might use a plain style in a
situation where they would be expected to use honorifics. Thus, the speech behaviour of
college students does not always conform to norms that are considered to be appropriate in
Japanese society. She proposes that there is a need for further analysis of the speech behaviour
of college students.

Honorifics are a very important linguistic device used to show politeness in the
Japanese language. The use of honorifics is one of the elements of negative politeness (i.e.,
"Give deference") proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). It is also related to Nelson's
modification of Rule 3 "Make A feel good --empathize"(1984, p. 16). Showing deference or
humbleness to instructors by using honorifics is a way of making them feel good in Japanese
culture, which contrasts with the "be friendly" approach in North American culture. Both
Canadian and Japanese subjects used honorifics effectively and showed deference to the
instructor in order to create formality. In addition, the use of honorifics showed that the subjects understood the social context in which they were making the request (i.e., to an instructor who was higher in status than the subjects). The use of honorifics was an appropriate behaviour required by the social context. Such behavior, determined by Japanese social norms and social contexts, is an example of the politeness strategy 'discernment' proposed by Hill et al. (1986) and Ide (1989).

Given that most textbooks teach that the use of honorifics when speaking to a person who is higher in status is a basic rule in the Japanese language, the performance by the Canadian subjects in this respect was not surprising. Moreover, they might have had the perception that "the Japanese are very polite". Schmidt and Richards (1980) point out that most Japanese ESL learners are taught that American English is 'logical', 'direct', and not particularly polite, in contrast to their own language. It is assumed that learners of Japanese are similarly taught that Japanese is indirect and more polite than English. Thus, it might not have been difficult for the Canadian subjects to perform in accordance with the Japanese sociopragmatic rules related to the use of honorifics in this context.

In addition to the use of honorifics, the approach to the request might be another way to show 'discernment' in this context. Since the subject (low in social status) was making a request to the instructor (high in social status), it would have been considered impolite to ask in an overly persuasive way. Both groups of subjects perceived that the Japanese approach is generally passive, humble and non-straightforward. The Canadian subjects said that they tried not to be pushy, persuasive or straightforward. C-1 said that making a request to a higher status person requires one to show extra politeness and avoid the use of strong statements. In fact, the researcher's colleague (the person who played the role of instructor) did not perceive that the performance of the Canadian subjects was more persuasive than the Japanese subjects. Therefore, the Canadian subjects' performances were also acceptable in terms of not being overly aggressive.
5. 3. 2. The Use of Nominalizer and Unfinished Sentences

Based on the raw tallies, the use of honorifics and the approach to the instructor were not much different between the Japanese and Canadian subjects. Thus, the Canadian subjects' way of showing politeness was almost the same as the Japanese subjects in these two respects. However, the use of nominalizers and unfinished sentences were considerably different between the two groups.

Based on the raw data, it was found that the Japanese subjects used nominalizers more frequently during the entire discourse than the Canadian subjects. The frequent use of nominalizers is found in a number of studies. Many researchers (Aoki, 1986; Cook, 1990; Maynard, 1991; McGloin, 1983, 1984; Noda, 1990, 1991; Ohta, 1990) agree that the use of nominalizers is an important characteristic of Japanese communication. Although researchers analyze the function of nominalizers from different perspectives, they agree that nominalizers create a sense of rapport with a hearer and establish common ground. McGloin (1983, p. 133) explains that the speaker tries to create a sense of rapport with the hearer by presenting information as if it were shared by the hearer. Cook (1991, p. 432) argues that rapport created by use of nominalizers derives from "group authority" which subordinates the individual desire. Noda (1991, p. 95) notes that the use of nominalizers develops solidarity by encoding the speaker's re-characterization of a specific situation shared by conversation participants. Maynard (1991) notes that the Japanese way of communication is strongly other-dependent and other-accommodating and that the use of nominalizers is an important feature of this communication.

Researchers also agree that the rapport created by the use of nominalizers is related to the politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Positive politeness is a strategy used to satisfy the hearer's desire (positive face) to be approved and understood by treating the hearer as a member of the speaker's group. Cook (1991) notes that the use of nominalizers functions to establish common ground between the speaker and hearer and can be a maker of harmony in a non-conflict situation. In contrast, when nominalizers are used in a
conflict situation, they function to mitigate threats to the hearer's positive face. This finding contradicts Brown and Levinson's treatment of Japanese culture as a negative politeness culture. Even though Japanese culture is hierarchical in nature, which means that there are high levels of P, D, and R values, satisfaction of positive face is also an important aspect of showing politeness in Japanese culture.

Another major difference between the Japanese and Canadian subjects was the use of unfinished sentences. The use of unfinished sentences can be seen as an off-record strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Brown and Levinson write that off-record strategy allows speakers to avoid the responsibility for an FTA because they can do it off record and leave it up to the hearer to decide how to interpret it. It is an indirect use of language since the meaning of a speaker's utterance is either more general or different from what was actually said. Therefore, the hearer must infer in order to recover what was in fact intended. The Japanese subjects' use of unfinished sentences (i.e., leaving part of an utterance unsaid) can be seen as one of the sub-strategies of the off-record "be incomplete, use ellipsis". By leaving part of an utterance unsaid, the speaker gives options to the hearer on how to interpret it. The hearer has to make an inference as to the meaning of the rest of the sentence and what the speaker tried to convey. Brown & Levinson point out that the use of ellipsis is one of the most favored strategies for requests (p. 227). In order to successfully convey the conversation, mutual knowledge between the speaker and hearer is required. Brown and Levinson note that the use of ellipsis and the existence of shared knowledge are associated. As previously mentioned, the use of nominalizers is also associated with shared knowledge. It would seem that the use of both nominalizers and ellipsis together functions to create an enhanced mutual understanding between the conversation participants.

In the requestive speech act, all of the Japanese subjects used a combination of nominalizers and unfinished sentences. The ending of the request speech act of the Japanese subjects was characterized by the use of the pattern 'nominalizer + clause particle kedolga', i.
e., "...n desu kedo" (It's that ..., but...). This pattern was not observed in the Canadian subjects' data.

Noda (1990, 1992) analyzed confrontation discourse and found that Japanese people often use the pattern /nominalizer + clause particle/ before starting to attack or disagree. She proposed that this pattern seemed to function as a relation maintenance strategy which parallels the social phenomenon of *nemawashi*, 'common ground building'. Noda gives the following translations for *nemawashi*:

(1) dig round the root (of a tree before transplanting);
(2) groundwork laid unobtrusively in advance; behind-the-scenes negotiations

According to Noda, *nemawashi* can be viewed as a key instrument which is used in seeking consensus and harmony in Japanese society. It is important in developing a sense of solidarity among concerned individuals. The use of nominalizers creates solidarity and establishes common ground. Noda proposed that the use of the 'nominalizer + ga/kedo' pattern is linguistic *nemawashi*, a strategy used to reduce conflict. The use of this pattern eases the tension inherent in confrontation by helping the hearer to understand the speaker's reluctance to confront. Noda (1992) notes that *nemawashi* activity as a relation maintenance strategy is also observed in requestive speech acts. For example, in the utterance "karitai n desu kedo ..." (It's that I want to borrow it, but...), the use of the nominalizer establishes common ground and solidarity while the clause particle 'kedo ...' leaves the utterance open-ended and invites the hearer's opinion. At the same time, by showing empathy, hesitation, and reserve, the speaker produces a statement that is softened. Through the use of linguistic *nemawashi*, the speaker might be able to reduce the force of the request. The Japanese subjects used unfinished utterances which contained a combination of nominalizers and the clause particle 'kedo' to effectively create a situation in which they could avoid confronting the requestee who was higher in status.
In order to attain a requestive goal, it is necessary to gain the hearer's cooperation or understanding of the requester's situation. The use of nominalizers by the Japanese subjects might have helped them to gain the instructor's cooperation or understanding. The frequent use of nominalizers during conversation can be interpreted as an attempt by the Japanese subjects to create a sense of rapport and solidarity between the speaker (the subjects) and the hearer (the instructor). By treating the instructor as a member of the speaker's group, the Japanese subjects could mitigate threats to the instructor's positive face. In addition, by presenting information as if it were shared by both the Japanese subjects and the instructor, the Japanese subjects could establish common ground. It seems that the Japanese subjects utilized nemawashi in order to lesson tension inherent in the requestive situation, as well as gaining the instructor's understanding of the speaker's reluctance to confront her.

The combined use of nominalizers and unfinished sentences seems to be an important way of showing linguistic politeness. First, the use of nominalizers allows the speaker to create a feeling of empathy and understanding (Jorden & Noda, 1987). Second, the use of unfinished sentences shows the speaker's reserve and empathy for the hearer. In this way, the modification of Rule 3 "Make A feel good--Empathize" proposed by Nelson (1984) seems to operate. At the same time, the speaker allows the hearer options so that the speaker can avoid imposing on the hearer. In this sense, the rules of politeness proposed by Lakoff (1973) are operating. By using nominalizers and unfinished sentences throughout the discourse, the Japanese subjects were successfully able to show a sense of politeness to the instructor in the requesting situation. The use of nominalizers within unfinished sentences may thus function as sociolinguistic devices which help to convey politeness in a requesting situation. The use of unfinished sentences, however, can potentially be ambiguous in that the hearer may not always grasp the illocutionary force (i.e., the speaker's intended meaning) of the speaker's ellipted utterance. Unfinished sentences may thus violate the maxm "Manner: avoid ambiguity" in the CP proposed by Grice (1975). However, this violation is necessary in order to show
politeness in Japanese culture. As Leech (1983) points out, the PP may predominate over the CP in requesting situations when people want to show politeness.

The use of fewer unfinished sentences and nominalizers by the Canadian subjects could be due to a pedagogical problem. Most textbooks are likely to use more finished sentences and fewer unfinished sentences and nominalizers. Moreover, teachers and learners tend to use more finished sentences in the classroom. In addition, teachers tend to emphasize the appropriate use of honorifics in order to show politeness. However, they seem to neglect the use of unfinished sentences and nominalizers as well as showing reserve. The Canadian subjects might thus not have had many opportunities to practice these devices in the classroom. Compared to teaching honorifics, teachers might feel that these devices are relatively unimportant in language learning. However, Mizutani and Mizutani (1987) note that in a requestive situation, even though a speaker uses honorifics to show respect toward others and humbleness toward him/herself, the speaker can still be impolite unless s/he shows reserve. Makino (1982) points out that 'enryo' (reserve) is a difficult concept for learners of Japanese to grasp, especially for those who are from North American cultures. Makino notes that showing reserve could be more difficult to master than using honorifics. Japanese teachers should thus re-examine these devices and provide more opportunities for learners to use them in the classroom.

5.4. The Perception of the Instructor and Pragmatic Failure

The Canadian subjects' failure to use unfinished sentences and nominalizers could have potentially resulted in pragmatic failure. However, interestingly, the researcher's colleague, who role-played as the instructor for each subject, did not perceive the Canadian subjects' performance as being impolite or imposing even though they did not use these other sociolinguistic devices. It would seem that Japanese use unfinished utterances which contain a combination of nominalizers and the clause particle 'kedolga' at an unconscious level in their natural speech. On the other hand, the use of honorifics operates at a more conscious level because it is something that is taught when Japanese enter the workforce. While some basic
uses of honorifics may be acquired naturally, special training is required to master their complexities. Because it is such an important aspect of Japanese communication, it is understandable that teachers of Japanese would emphasize the appropriate use of honorifics while neglecting other, more subtle linguistic devices such as nominalizers and unfinished sentences.

The retrospective interview showed that the colleague's perception of the politeness level of the Canadian and Japanese subjects was based on a different scale. When she role-played with the Canadian subjects, she was more tolerant and excused their misuse of honorifics and grammatical errors. Since she felt that they were still learning and could not be expected to have mastery of the complexities of honorifics, she did not perceive that they were impolite. Because her expectation was low, even ungrammatical or inappropriate uses of honorifics sounded polite. However, her perception of the Japanese subjects was more severe. Because her expectation was high, any mistakes by the Japanese subjects could not be accepted. Thus, when the Japanese subjects failed to use honorifics, even if only once, she felt that they sounded impolite.

The researcher's colleague's perception of the non-native speakers' performance was positive. However, many researchers seem to have a negative perception of non-native speaker's misuse of language. The non-native speaker's lack of pragmatic knowledge and misuse of language may sound impolite, imposing, or boorish (Mizutani et al, 1990; Thomas, 1983; Yokoyama, 1993; Wolfson, 1989). Wolfson (1989) notes that when non-native speakers break sociolinguistic rules, native speakers often perceive them in a very negative way. However, the colleague's perception implies that when native Japanese speakers communicate with non-native speakers of Japanese, they might not necessarily expect non-native speakers to use language in the same way that native speakers of Japanese use it. Native speakers might perceive a non-native speaker's performance from a different perspective or scale than they would use in perceiving another native speaker's performance. It seems that
there is not much research on native speakers' perception of non-native speakers' performance. Further research in this area is needed.

5. 5. Summary

The Canadian and Japanese subjects who participated in this study attained their requestive goals in different ways. Based on the raw tallies, the use of honorifics and request strategies were not much different between the Canadian and Japanese subjects. The use of request speech patterns, unfinished sentences and nominalizers were, however, considerably different.

Since both groups of subjects perceived the use of honorifics as a very important linguistic aspect of the Japanese language, they were very careful about using them when performing the role-play. The use of honorifics showed that both groups of subjects behaved according to 'discernment' in which they satisfied the hearer's negative face.

In addition to the use of honorifics, the Japanese subjects used nominalizers throughout the entire discourse to establish common ground and rapport between the speaker (the subject) and the hearer (the instructor). This strategy can be seen as a positive strategy for satisfying the hearer's positive face. At the same time, the use of nominalizers and unfinished sentences allowed the speaker to show empathy, hesitation and reserve. The use of unfinished sentences might be seen as an off-record strategy. The use of the clause particle 'kedo/ga' at the request speech act ending leaves an utterance open-ended and invites the hearer's opinion. The Japanese subjects seemed to try to ease the tension inherent in the requestive situation by gaining the instructor's understanding of the speaker's reluctance to confront by using nominalizers and unfinished sentences. By utilizing honorifics, nominalizers, and unfinished sentences, the Japanese subjects showed politeness and maintained harmony between the instructor and themselves.

The Canadian subjects, in contrast, did not use nominalizers and unfinished sentences. Their failure to use these devices, however, did not make a negative impression on the instructor. It seems that these devices are used at an unconscious level by native Japanese
speakers. Moreover, the instructor's perception of politeness between the Canadian and Japanese subjects was apparently based on two different standards. Because her expectation of the Canadian subjects was low, the Canadian subjects' performance did not sound impolite or imposing even if they failed to use honorifics. However, since her expectation of the Japanese subjects was high, any failure to use honorifics sounded impolite.

Differences in the perception of power could have led to different reactions in the post-request stage between the Canadian and Japanese subjects. The Japanese subjects perceived power as inherent in the Japanese roles and position in the hierarchical social structure. On the other hand, the Canadian subjects might have perceived power as being negotiated through individual abilities. The different perception of power might also have affected appraisal of the requestive situation (social variables, imposition of the request, etc.) between the Canadian and Japanese subjects. The Japanese subjects seemed to be more sensitive to social power than the Canadian subjects. Because social norms discourage a lower-status person from speaking up to a higher-status person, the Japanese subjects made long pauses and waited for the instructor's suggestion. In contrast, the Canadian subjects tried to negotiate with the instructor to borrow the book. The Canadian subjects might have felt the degree of legitimacy of the request greater than the Japanese subjects. It seemed that a part of the task asked the subjects to perform un-Japanese cultural behavior. Because previous research (Kumai, 1992) did not report on the authenticity of the task, it needs further investigation.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

In this chapter, I will discuss the limitations of this study and attempt to answer the research questions considered in this study. I will also discuss what implications the findings of this study may have for teaching Japanese in the classroom.

6.1. Limitations of the Study

There are some limitations in this study. The main limitation might be related to the authenticity of the task because a part of the task asked the subjects to perform un-Japanese cultural behavior. Since previous researchers did not discuss the authenticity of the task, future researchers should pay more attention to this problem. Moreover, the speech data from the oral role-play was oral production data rather than totally natural data. Even though the subjects were told that it was not a test and asked to perform as naturally as possible, they might have become nervous or more careful in choosing their speech styles. Therefore, speech data from the oral role-play might have been different from the natural data of a real life situation.

Before making a request, people tend to think about what they are going to say and consider the kinds of strategies they will use in making the request, especially if they are making a request to someone who is higher in status. In this situation, the subjects did not have much time to think about how they would make the request such that their speech behaviour may not have been the same as it would be in a real-life situation.

Given that the native Japanese speakers had been in Canada for some time, their Japanese speech and way of conveying a conversation may have been different from that of Japanese people who had not had the experience of staying in Canada.

Differences in the background of the subjects might also have affected the results of this study. For the Japanese subjects, their work experience, the amount of their exposure to English, and their experience of studying abroad might have affected their speech acts. On the other hand, for the native English-speaking subjects, the amount of exposure to Japanese and their experience of living in Japan might have affected their speech acts.
Individual personality differences could also have influenced the subjects' choice of request strategies and their ways of conveying a conversation. Moreover, as the subjects interpreted the task differently, their performance differed individually. Therefore, the quality of speech data could have been slightly different from one subject to another. Furthermore, since the number of subjects was small (4 Canadian and 4 Japanese), any generalizations made from the data would be very tenuous.

The researcher's skill (or lack of skill) in conducting the retrospective interview could have affected the data because the researcher had not been officially trained and had only limited experience conducting this kind of interview.

The researcher's colleague had been living in Canada for a long time, so her perceptions of the norms of Japanese society might have been influenced by Western culture. Her perception of the subjects' performance might be different from a person who had little or no experience living in a foreign county.

After conducting several role-plays, the researcher's colleague might have been able to predict the subject's performance. This might have unconsciously influenced the colleague's responses thereby affecting the elicited speech data. Furthermore, it was impossible for the researcher's colleague to have conducted all eight of the oral role-plays in exactly the same way because each subject's performance differed individually. Therefore, the quality of speech data might have been slightly different from one subject to another.

6. 2. Considerations of the Research Questions

In the present study, the following research questions were considered:

1). How do Japanese native speakers and English native speaking learners of Japanese attain their request goal while maintaining effective communication?

Differences in the approach to attaining their request goals were found between the native Japanese speakers and learners of Japanese in this study. In the pre-request stage, the Canadian subjects tended to present all information in order to justify their requests. It established a situation in which the speaker prepared the hearer for the upcoming request. In
the request speech acts, the Canadian subjects tended to use a basic expression such as "Kashite itadakemasen ka?" (Couldn't I borrow it?). None of the Canadian subjects used nominalizers or clause particles and almost all of their sentences were finished. In the post request stage, the Canadian subjects attempted to negotiate with the instructor to borrow the book by asking for more information about the instructor's need of the book.

On the other hand, the Japanese subjects did not give enough explanation to make the instructor understand their situations during the pre-request stage. Failure to provide enough information might have caused the instructor to worry about the upcoming request. In the request speech acts, the Japanese subjects used unfinished sentences which consisted of 'nominalizer + the clause particle kedol/ga'. Using open-ended sentences allowed the hearer to have options or make judgments. At the same time, the speaker showed his/her reserve and hesitation about making the request. In the post request stage, the Japanese subjects made long pauses and waited for the instructor's suggestion or decision.

2). How do Japanese native speakers and English learners of Japanese show politeness?

The use of honorifics were not significantly different between the Japanese and Canadian subjects. Both groups of subjects used honorifics to show respect to the instructor. In this sense, both groups of subjects behaved in accordance with 'discernment'. In addition to the use of honorifics, the Japanese subjects used unfinished sentences and nominalizers during the entire discourse in order to create rapport and common ground between themselves and the hearer. All of the Japanese subjects used the 'nominalizer + the clause particle kedol/ga' pattern in the request speech act ending, which showed the speakers' reserve and hesitation as well as empathy. These linguistic devices can be seen as a relation maintenance strategy which parallels the social phenomenon of nemawashi. It seems that the use of nominalizers and unfinished sentences function as sociolinguistic devices that are used to help convey politeness in a requesting situation. None of the Canadian subjects used the 'nominalizer + kedol/ga' pattern.
3). How do Japanese native speakers and English learners of Japanese react when their initial request is indirectly refused?

It was found that the Canadian and Japanese subjects reacted in different ways after the instructor's indirect refusal. The Canadian subjects attempted to negotiate with the instructor to borrow the book by asking for more information about the instructor's need of the book and offered to reduce the length of time of borrowing the book. In contrast, the Japanese subjects made long pauses and waited for the instructor's decision or suggestion. After they realized that the instructor was not going to make a decision or suggestion, the Japanese subjects asked to borrow the book briefly in order to make photo copies. One subject gave more explanations and did not make a direct request. The Japanese subjects' approach was to avoid negotiating with the instructor by leaving the decision or suggestion up to her, while the Canadian subjects' approach was to start negotiation immediately.

6. 3. Implications for Teaching

In the classroom, teachers tend to emphasize the appropriate use of honorifics. This is understandable because honorifics are a very important sociocultural aspect of the Japanese language. However, teachers seem to neglect more subtle linguistic devices such as nominalizers, unfinished sentences, and the 'nominalizer + kedolga' pattern. As the results of this study show, there were significant differences in the use of these linguistic devices between the Japanese and Canadian learners of Japanese. This kind of problem might seem to be a small matter in learning a language. However, these devices have important functions in the Japanese way of conducting conversations. Compared to the use of honorifics, these devices seem to operate at an unconscious level in native speakers' natural speech. Moreover, it might not be easy to learn these devices in natural settings. Yokoyama's study of foreigner talk in a refusal setting (1993) showed that native Japanese speakers simplified sentences by not using sociolinguistic devices such as nominalizers and unfinished sentences. She explained that the native Japanese speakers' perception is that non-native speakers would not understand these kinds of very subtle sociolinguistic devices. In that case, the Japanese
speakers' simplification may prevent learners of Japanese from acquiring these sociolinguistic devices in natural conversation. They might not notice the existence of these important sociolinguistic devices which function to maintain good relationships in Japanese conversation. Yokoyama proposed that these sociolinguistic devices should be taught consciously in the classroom because it might not be easy to learn these devices at an unconscious level (Makino, 1983; Mizutani, 1983; Yokoyama, 1993).

Even though learners of Japanese may be aware of these sociolinguistic devices, it seems difficult for them to be able to use them in conversation. Two Canadian subjects in this study mentioned that they knew that the use of unfinished sentences make a statement softer. However, the findings showed that they were not able to use these devices in conversation. In fact, one of them did not use unfinished sentences at all during the entire discourse. This might indicate that Japanese teachers do not provide many opportunities for learners to use these devices in the classroom.

The lack of knowledge of subtle sociolinguistic devices might not be so important for beginners of Japanese. However, as learners become more advanced and more adept at using Japanese honorifics, it becomes increasingly important for them to use other devices such as unfinished sentences as well. Failure to do so may result in speech that sounds arrogant or imposing even if it is grammatically correct. Japanese teachers should re-examine these other sociolinguistic aspects of Japanese language and attempt to teach them in the classroom.

One benefit of video-taping the requestive speech acts in this study is that the tapes could possibly be used to help learners of Japanese see how native speakers of Japanese make requests. Since the speech data for both native speakers and learners were collected in the same situation, showing the video-tape to learners in the classroom would provide an opportunity for them to compare and contrast the performances of the subjects. This might help to raise the learners' consciousness of Japanese culture and help them to better understand the Japanese way of conducting a requestive conversation.
In addition to using the tapes to show how sociolinguistic devices are used by speakers to show hesitation, reserve, and empathy, they might also be used to show how native speakers perceive social power. For example, a teacher might point out that the long pauses made by the Japanese subjects suggest that social norms discourage lower-status persons from being overly aggressive when speaking to higher-status persons. The videotapes could thus be used to teach learners valuable lessons about socially and culturally appropriate speech behavior in requestive situations.

6. 4. Conclusion

The present study investigated how Japanese native speakers and non-native speakers of Japanese attained their request goals while maintaining the face of both requester and requestee. It was found that the Japanese subjects used sociolinguistic devices (e.g., nominalizers and unfinished sentences) as well as honorifics in order to show politeness and mitigate imposition. The Canadian subjects, on the other hand, used honorifics but did not use other, more subtle sociolinguistic devices. Differences were also found in the way that the native Japanese and learners of Japanese reacted when the requestee indirectly refused their initial request. The native Japanese made long pauses and waited for the requestee's suggestion or decision, while the learners of Japanese attempted to negotiate with the requestee immediately. Differences in perception of social variables such as relative status might have led to these different reactions.

The researcher concludes that while honorifics are used to show politeness in formal requesting situations, other more subtle linguistic devices such as nominalizers and unfinished sentences are also used to lessen the degree of imposition and create feelings of empathy and understanding between the requester and requestee. Learners of Japanese must be made aware of these devices in order to communicate more effectively with native speakers of Japanese. Learners must also be aware of the concept of 'enryo', that is, a speaker is expected to show reserve in a requesting situation, especially if the requestee is higher in status than the requester.
Since the data for this study were not collected in natural conversation, the findings might be different from studies which utilize natural data. However, this kind of data would be exceptionally difficult to collect in a natural setting. Further research is needed in this area, especially by collecting data in natural settings if possible.
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Appendix. A. Subjects' Background

1. Abbreviations for the background questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Native speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>NE Native English speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. English</td>
<td>NF Native French speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. French</td>
<td>NJ Native Japanese speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Japanese</td>
<td>NP Native Portuguese speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Korean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Speaking</td>
<td>h hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Listening</td>
<td>w week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Writing</td>
<td>w. e. weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Reading</td>
<td>m month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Grammar</td>
<td>y year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RM a roommate
2. Subjects' Background

(1). The Canadian Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C-1</th>
<th>C-2</th>
<th>C-3</th>
<th>C-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class enrolled in J.</td>
<td>416 (Journalistic Prose) (finished 315)</td>
<td>315 (advanced conversation)</td>
<td>315 / 416</td>
<td>416 (finished 315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency level</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2 (holds official certificate)</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hometown</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Business man</td>
<td>Business man</td>
<td>Business man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Japanese other than UBC</td>
<td>Tezukayama Gakuin Univ.</td>
<td>Kyoto YMCA</td>
<td>YWCA Sony</td>
<td>Kyoai Gakuin High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following items provide information about subjects while living in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese friends in Canada</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- amount of language used in talking with them</td>
<td>J: 100% 1 - 2 h/week</td>
<td>J: 30%, E: 70% 3 - 4 h/week</td>
<td>J: 30%, E: 70% 2 - 3 h/week</td>
<td>J: 40%, E: 60% 3 - 4 h/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities with Japanese friends</td>
<td>ski, movies, shopping, dinner</td>
<td>parties, dancing, movies</td>
<td>tourist attractions, coffee shop</td>
<td>dinner, movies, bowling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of use of Japanese/day</td>
<td>All: 5%</td>
<td>All: less than 20%</td>
<td>S: 20%, L: 40% W &amp; R: 30%</td>
<td>S &amp; L: 20% W &amp; R: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read J. papers &amp; magazines</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
<td>4 - 6 h/day</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Movies</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
<td>1 - 2 h/day</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following items provide information about subjects while living in Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of stay and purpose</th>
<th>1 y : study, homestay 4 m : working holiday</th>
<th>1 y : study</th>
<th>1 y : English teacher 1 y : study</th>
<th>1 y : Exchange student 2 m/3 w : holiday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work experience in Japan (how often)</td>
<td>English teacher 4 m (2 - 3/w)</td>
<td>English teacher 1 m (1/w)</td>
<td>English teacher 16 m (6/w) 4 m (3/w)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Amount of speaking language</td>
<td>E: 60 % J: 40 %</td>
<td>E: 80 % J: 20 %</td>
<td>E: 80 % J: 20 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Single: 75 % NJ. RM: 25 % (4 m)</td>
<td>Homestay: 100 % (1 y)</td>
<td>Single : 50 % Homestay : 25% (4 m)</td>
<td>Homestay: 100 % (1 y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Amount of speaking Japanese with RM/family</td>
<td>w. : 2 -3 h w. e. : over 5 h</td>
<td>w. &amp; w. e. : over 5 h</td>
<td>w. : 2 - 3 h w. e. : 3 - 4 h</td>
<td>w. &amp; w. e. : over 5 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of free time spent with</td>
<td>NJ: 90 % NE: 10 %</td>
<td>NJ: 40 % NE : 50 % NF/NP : 10 %</td>
<td>NJ: 80 % NE: 20 %</td>
<td>NJ: 98 % NE: 2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of use of Japanese</td>
<td>S : 60 %, L : 80 % W &amp; R : 20 %</td>
<td>S &amp; L : 70 % W : 20 %, R : 30 %</td>
<td>S : 75 %, L : 25 % W : 40 %, R : 20%</td>
<td>S &amp; L : 100 % W &amp; R : 60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read J. papers &amp; magazines</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
<td>0 - 1 h/day</td>
<td>1 - 2 h/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Movies</td>
<td>1 - 2 h/day</td>
<td>3 - 4 h/day</td>
<td>1 - 2 h/day</td>
<td>over 4 h/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
The subjects' level (except C-2) was determined by the researcher by use of the Japanese Language Proficiency Test, level II in 1992.
(2). The Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J-1</th>
<th>J-2</th>
<th>J-3</th>
<th>J-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>E. Education</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of stay in Canada</strong></td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hometown</strong></td>
<td>Shizuoka</td>
<td>Nara</td>
<td>Chiba</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's occupation</strong></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Business man</td>
<td>Business man</td>
<td>Business man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study abroad</strong></td>
<td>USA: 40 days</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work experience in Japan</strong></td>
<td>Waitress: 1.3 y Office work: 4 m Sales clerk: 1.5 y</td>
<td>Waitress: 1 y Sales clerk: 6 m</td>
<td>Hotel: 3 m Lodge: 1 m Coffee shop: 1 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal training for full-time employees</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English friends in Japan</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- amount of language used in talking with them</td>
<td>E: 100%</td>
<td>E: 100%, J: 80%</td>
<td>E: 100%</td>
<td>E: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of speaking English in Japan</strong></td>
<td>3-4 h/week</td>
<td>1-2 h/week</td>
<td>0-1 h/week</td>
<td>1-2 h/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of time spent in English environment</strong></td>
<td>40 %/week</td>
<td>10 %/week</td>
<td>5 %/week</td>
<td>10 %/week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following items provide information about subjects while living in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Canadian</th>
<th>Canadian</th>
<th>Singaporian</th>
<th>Hong Kong (native English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- nationality</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>Singaporian</td>
<td>Hong Kong (native English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- amount of time speaking English with RM</td>
<td>w &amp; w. e.: 0-1 h E: 100%, J: 80%</td>
<td>w &amp; w. e.: 0-1 h E: 100%</td>
<td>w &amp; w. e.: 0-1 h E: 100%</td>
<td>w: 0-1 hr w.e.: 2-3 h E: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of free time spent with others</td>
<td>NJ: 60 % NE: 40%</td>
<td>NJ: 80 % NE: 20%</td>
<td>NJ: 80 % NE: 10 % German: 10 %</td>
<td>NJ: 60% NE: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of use of English</td>
<td>S: 70 %, L: 80%, W &amp; R: 60%</td>
<td>S: 40 %, L: 60 %, W: 40 %, R: 60%</td>
<td>S: 30 %, L: 60 %, W &amp; R: 100%</td>
<td>S: 40 %, L: 60 %, W &amp; R: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read E. papers &amp; magazines</td>
<td>0-1 h/day</td>
<td>0-1 h/day</td>
<td>1-2 h/day</td>
<td>0-1 h/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Movies</td>
<td>2-3 h/day</td>
<td>0-1 h/day</td>
<td>0-1 h/day</td>
<td>0-1 h/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Please answer the following questions.

Pseudonym: __________________________
1. Age: _______
2. Status: Undergraduate / Graduate
3. Major: ______________________
4. Which Province are you from? ______________________
5. Did you grow up in the same Province? If no, write the name of Province. __________
6. Which Province are your parents originally from? ______________________
7. What are your parents' occupation? ______________________
8. Have you studied Japanese language at a school other than U.B.C.? Yes / No
   If yes, answer the following questions. If no, go to the question 9.
   (1) Write the name of the school(s). ______________________
   (2) What did the class emphasize? (e.g. speaking, listening, grammar, reading, or writing, etc.)
   (3) Which textbook was used? ______________________
9. Have you studied other second/foreign languages before? Yes / No
   If no, go to the question 11. If yes, write the name of the language, estimated level
   (beginning, intermediate, or advance) and length of study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Length of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Have you worked in a place where Japanese language was used (other than Japan)?
    If no, go to the question 11. If yes, please list the type of company, the position and length of time spent working.
    | Job       | Position | numbers of days/week | Total number of wks/mos/hrs |
    |-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
    | 1. _______ | _______  | ________________       | ___________________________ |
    | 2. _______ | _______  | ________________       | ___________________________ |
    | 3. _______ | _______  | ________________       | ___________________________ |
    | 4. _______ | _______  | ________________       | ___________________________ |
How often did you speak Japanese when you were working in the listed working place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company 1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How often do you use Japanese language outside of class per day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 How often do you read Japanese newspapers/magazines in a week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2hrs</th>
<th>2-4hrs</th>
<th>4-6hrs</th>
<th>more than 6 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. How often do you watch Japanese TV and movies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2hrs</th>
<th>2-4hrs</th>
<th>4-6hrs</th>
<th>more than 6 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
14. Do you have a Japanese friend?
*If no*, go to question 15. *If yes*, answer the following questions. (If more than one, consider the average when answering the following the questions)

(1). How often do you talk to your Japanese friends in a week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>5-6 hrs</th>
<th>more than 6 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2). Do you talk to him/her in Japanese or English

Japanese: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

English: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(3). How often do you do something together with your Japanese friends in a month?

[ ] 0-2 times  [ ] 3-5 times  [ ] 6-8 times  [ ] 9-11 times  [ ] more than 12 times

(4). What do you do when you are with your Japanese friends?

15. Do/Did you have a Japanese roommate?

*If no*, go to the question 16. *If yes*, answer the following questions.

(1). How often do/did you talk to him/her in a day?

Weekday: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>more than 5 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Weekend: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>more than 5 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(2). Do/Did you talk to him/her in Japanese or English?

Japanese: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

English: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
16. Have you been in Japan? Yes/No

If no, go to the question 17. If yes, answer the following questions.

(1) How long?
(2) What was your purpose of going to stay in Japan?
(3) What did you do in Japan?
(4) Did you work? (including part-time job) If yes, please list the type of company, the position and the length of time spent working. (hrs/day, days/week, total number of weeks, months, or years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Company</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>numbers of days/week</th>
<th>Total number of wks/mos/hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) How often did you speak Japanese or English in the listed workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company 1.</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 4.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(6) What percentage of your housing arrangements in Japan were spent:

___ single/living alone? -> Go to the question (9)

___ shared with a Japanese person? --> Go to the question (7)

___ shared with an English speaking person? -> Go to the question (9)

___ living with a Japanese family? --> Go to the question (8)

(7) If you chose "shared with a Japanese person" in question (6), how long? ___________

How often did you talk to him/her in Japanese per day?

Week day: ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______

0-1hr 1-2 hrs 2-3 hrs 3-4 hrs 4-5 hrs more than 5 hrs

Weekend: ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______

0-1hr 1-2 hrs 2-3 hrs 3-4 hrs 4-5 hrs more than 5 hrs

(8) If you chose "living with a Japanese family" in question (6), how long? ___________

How often did you talk to them in Japanese per day?

Week day: ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______

0-1hr 1-2 hrs 2-3 hrs 3-4 hrs 4-5 hrs more than 5 hrs

Weekend: ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______

0-1hr 1-2 hrs 2-3 hrs 3-4 hrs 4-5 hrs more than 5 hrs

(9) What percentage of your free time in Japan was you spent with:

___ Japanese native speakers?

___ English native speakers?

___ Other language speakers? Language(s) ___________________
(10) How often did you use Japanese language?
Speaking: ---------------------------------------------------------------
0 20 40 60 80 100 %

Listening: ---------------------------------------------------------------
0 20 40 60 80 100 %

Writing: ---------------------------------------------------------------
0 20 40 60 80 100 %

Reading: ---------------------------------------------------------------
0 20 40 60 80 100 %

(11) How often did you read Japanese newspapers/magazines per day?

            0-1hr   1-2hrs   2-3hrs   3-4hrs   more than 4 hrs

(12) How often did you watch Japanese TV and movies per day?

            0-1hr   1-2hrs   2-3hrs   3-4hrs   more than 4 hrs

17. Have you taken the Japanese Proficiency test? Yes/No
If yes, (1). Which level did you take? _________
(2). Did you pass? Yes/No

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
A sample of the questionnaire (This one was used for the Japanese subjects.)

QUESTIONNAIRE

- Please answer the following questions. It is O.K. to write in Japanese.

Pseudonym:________________________
1. Age:

2. Major:

3. How long have you been in Canada?

4. Which prefecture are you from?

5. Did you grow up in the same prefecture? Yes / No
   If no, please write the name of prefecture.

6. Which prefecture are your parents originally from?

7. What are your parents' occupation?

8. Do you have any other experience of studying abroad? Yes / No
   If yes, write the name of country, the length of stay, and the purpose.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>the length of stay</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Have you worked in Japan? (including part-time jobs) Yes / No
   If yes, please list the type of job, the position and the length of time spent working.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of company</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>the length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have you had the experience of being trained by a Japanese company? Yes / No
    If no, go to the question 11. If yes, answer the following questions.
    
    (1) How long?
    
    (2) Please describe the content of your training.
11. Did you have a English-speaking friend when you were in Japan?  Yes/No

If Yes, answer the following questions. (If more than one, consider the average when answering the following questions). If no, go to the question 12.

(1). How often did you talk to your English speaking friends in a week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>5-6 hrs</th>
<th>more than 6 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2). Did you talk to him/her in Japanese or English?

Japanese: 0  20  40  60  80  100 %

English: 0  20  40  60  80  100 %

(3). How often did you do something together with your English-speaking friends in a month?

[ ] 0-2 times  [ ] 3-5 times  [ ] 6-8 times  [ ] 9-11 times  [ ] more than 12 times

(4). What did you do when you were with your English-speaking friends?

12. How often did you speak English before you came to Canada in a week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>5-6 hrs</th>
<th>more than 6 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How often were you in an English-speaking environment in a week?

0  20  40  60  80  100 %
14. Do you have a roommate who is an English native speaker now?  Yes /No

If yes, answer the following questions. If no, go to the question 15.

(1). How often do you talk to your roommate per day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week day:</th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>more than 5 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekday:</th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>more than 5 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2). Do you talk to him/her in Japanese or English?

English: 0 20 40 60 80 100%

Japanese: 0 20 40 60 80 100%

15. If your roommate is not an English native speaker, where is your roommate from?

(1). Do you talk to him/her in English, Japanese or another language?

(2). How often do you talk to your roommate per day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week day:</th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>more than 5 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekday:</th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2 hrs</th>
<th>2-3 hrs</th>
<th>3-4 hrs</th>
<th>4-5 hrs</th>
<th>more than 5 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What percentage of your free time in Canada do you spend with:

_ Japanese native speakers?

_ English native speakers?

_ Other language speakers? Language(s) ____________________
17. How often do you use English outside of class per day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How often do you read English newspaper/magazine per day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2hrs</th>
<th>2-3hrs</th>
<th>3-4hrs</th>
<th>more than 4 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. How often do you watch North American TV and movies in a day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-1hr</th>
<th>1-2hrs</th>
<th>2-3hrs</th>
<th>3-4hrs</th>
<th>more than 4 hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Date of most recent TOEFL test_____  TOEFL score at that time_______

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
Appendix B. The Situation Card for the Oral Role-Play

Your name is Smith (Tanaka) and you are enrolled in a 4th year Japanese course. You need to write a paper about Japanese culture in Japanese class. In order to write this paper, you need to read "Kiku to Katana (The Chrysanthemum and the Sword)". You heard that your Japanese professor, Dr. Koosaka (English teacher, Satoo) has a copy, so you went to her office to ask her to loan this book to you. Unfortunately, you were told that she has already loaned it to Ms. Furuta. She is a lecturer at a Japanese university, who recently came to UBC to do her own research. You have not met yet. As she has been in Canada for only two months, she speaks little or no English. Dr. Koosaka (Satoo) suggests you go and ask Ms. Furuta if you can borrow this book. Today is Tuesday, and the paper is due next Monday. You can not write the paper without this book, so you must borrow it from Ms. Furuta as soon as possible. Please go to Ms. Furuta's office and borrow the book.

Note: This scenario was written in Japanese for the Japanese subjects.
Appendix C.

Abbreviations and Transcription Conventions

(#) length of pause in seconds

 hesitation noises

[ overlap with the previous speaker

[ ] word(s) not explicitly stated but implied from context or word(s) supplied by translator to make English translations smoother

( ) category of request strategy

{ } category of request speech pattern

* a false start

< > part of word that was omitted during false start if it can be determined

hon honorific style

hum humble style

lit. literal meaning
Appendix D

The Request Strategies (Source: a combination of Mizutani et al., 1990, and Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper et al., 1989, modified by the researcher.)

1. Preparator:

The speaker prepares the hearer for the ensuing request by announcing that he or she will make a request ("announcement of request"), by asking about the potential availability of the hearer for carrying out the request, by asking for the hearer's permission to make the request ("permission to make a request"), or by introducing a topic related to the request ("implication of content of request").

* e.g.  
  Otazune shita ga aru n desu ga... (It's that I'd like to ask you something, but.....)  
  Shitsumon shite mo yoroshii desu ka. (May I ask you a question.....)  
  Hon no koto na n desu ga... (It's that it's about the book, but...)

2. Grounder:

The speaker gives reasons, explanations, or justifications for his or her request, which may either precede or follow it.

* e.g.  
  Kinoo kurasu yasunda no de. Nooto o kashite moraemasen ka. (I missed class yesterday. Could I borrow your notes?)

3. Imposition minimizer:

The speaker tries to reduce the imposition placed on the hearer by maintaining

(a) a limitation

* e.g.  
  Chotto dake kashite kudasaimasen ka. (Would you lend it to me for just a little bit?)

(b) a concessive condition:

* e.g.  
  Kuruma ni nosete kudasaimasen ka, Moshi hookoo ga watashi to onaji nara de ii n desu kedo (Would you give me a ride, but only if you are going my way.)
4. **Intensifier:**

Adverbial modifiers used by speakers to intensify certain elements of the proposition of the utterance.

*e.g.* *Kono kogitte o okane ni kaete itadaku no ni hontoo ni kamaimasen ka,* (Would you mind **awfully** cashing this cheque for me?)

5. **Apology:**

The speaker apologizes to the hearer for making the request.

*e.g.* *Sumimasen ga, hon o kasite itadakemasen ka.* (**I'm sorry,** but may I borrow a book?)

6. **Nominalizer:**

The use of nominal "*(n)o*" followed by a form of the copula "*da/desu*" nominalizes a sentence. Also referred to as the extended predicate, the pattern "*...*(n)o da/desu*" is used to explain a certain situation and functions to create feelings of empathy and understanding. It thus helps to create a world of shared information between speaker and hearer.

*e.g.* *Byooki na *(n)* desu.* (**It's that** I am sick - that's the reason why I can't do something...*