UCLA
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
Evidentiality and Politeness in Japanese

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/29x4q44m

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 2(2)

ISSN
1050-4273

Author
Ohta, Amy S

Publication Date
1991-12-31

DOI
10.5070/L422005143

Peer reviewed

Evidentiality and Politeness in Japanese

Amy Snyder Ohta
University of California, Los Angeles

According to language socialization theory, language learning does not occur in isolation but is intimately related to the process of becoming a competent member of the target language society (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). To become competent members of society, language learners must learn, among other things, how to display their knowledge appropriately, using epistemic markers (evidentials) effectively. In this paper, the importance of epistemic markers in language socialization is discussed from the perspective of the second language classroom, the broader goal of the study being to more fully understand what second language learners must acquire in order to become competent members of the target language community. Through analysis of a conversation among Japanese teachers outside the classroom, this paper investigates the linguistic resources for constituting epistemic stance in Japanese. Like English, Japanese evidentiality can be marked with adverbials and idiomatic phrases. In addition, Japanese is rich in sentence-final particles which directly index interactive contexts. The function of epistemic markers in Japanese discourse is investigated, focusing on how epistemic markers, such as sentence-final particles, adverbials, and hedges function to reduce speaker responsibility.

INTRODUCTION

Second Language Acquisition as Language Socialization

The purpose of this paper is to show, through the analysis of spontaneous naturalistic discourse, how linguistic resources for constituting epistemic stance in Japanese make an utterance more polite by reducing the speaker's responsibility for that utterance. This analysis furthers the broader goal of more fully understanding what novices need to acquire in order to be full participants in Japanese interaction. For second language learners of Japanese residing outside of Japan, the Japanese language classroom is the crucial agent of language socialization[1]--for it is through the language that learners are socialized how to the express stance in

Japanese. However, as pointed out by Maynard (1985), in the language classroom, overemphasis on the teaching of formal structural rules has eclipsed the use of language for communicative interaction. Thus, unless language learners are provided with natural models of Japanese interactive discourse, they are likely to be socialized into inappropriate modes of communication in Japanese. In the typical teacher-fronted classroom where students may not be exposed to such models, students are unlikely to be socialized into appropriate expression of epistemic stance, because appropriate models of interaction are absent in the environment in which language socialization is taking place. By more fully understanding what occurs in spontaneous naturalistic discourse, Japanese language teachers not only may be enabled to analyze what is missing in the language socializing spaces which they provide their students, they may also be better equipped to provide their students with the input necessary for appropriate interaction in Japanese language contexts.

Epistemic Stance and Language Socialization

While stance can be defined as "the overt expression of an author's or speaker's attitudes, feelings, judgements, or commitment concerning the message" (Biber & Finnegan, 1988, p. 1), epistemic stance relates more specifically to the speaker's relationship with what s/he knows or believes to be true. Epistemic stance, revealed through epistemic markers (or evidentials) therefore gives interlocutors information about the speaker's commitment to the truth of his or her message, the speaker's source of knowledge, and the speaker's certainty about his or her utterance (Givón, 1982; Chafe, 1986). Epistemic markers are crucial tools in human communication--without them we would not be able to discern fact from conjecture, the speaker's own ideas from the ideas of another, or even have any idea of how a speaker felt about the information he or she was presenting. Maynard (1985), states that "for successful communication one must present information so that the listener can assimilate new information with already given and established knowledge" (p. 217). Epistemic markers are an important part of this process. In addition, through epistemic markers, speakers constitute themselves as experts or novices (Latour, 1987)--and since language socialization occurs through such expert-novice interaction, epistemic markers are a key part of the process. In language socialization theory, language learning is not something that occurs in isolation, but is intimately related to the process of

becoming a competent member of a society. Ochs & Schieffelin (1984) explain this as follows:

1. The process of acquiring language is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member of a society.

2. The process of becoming a competent member of society is realized to a large extent through language, by acquiring knowledge of its functions, social distribution, and interpretations in and across socially defined situations, i.e., through exchanges of language in particular social situations. (p. 277)

According to Schieffelin (1990),"Much of socialization takes place simply through recurrent participation in interactions with knowledgeable members. In many of these interactions, caregivers make explicit 'what everyone knows'" (p. 18). Thus, the role of epistemic markers in language socialization is an important one. Novices, whether children or second language learners, must learn how to display their knowledge in an appropriate way without imposing it in circumstances which may change drastically from moment to moment. They must learn to deal with the tension between knowledge and the socially appropriate display of knowledge. And, the medium through which these things are learned is language. How, then, are epistemic markers used in daily conversation? Understanding what epistemic markers are and how they work can give us a window through which to view how novices are socialized through language.

Epistemic Markers

Epistemic markers, also called "evidentials" have been defined differently by different scholars. In general, epistemic markers are considered to be those linguistic markers which show the source of knowledge or the speaker's evaluation of the truth of an utterance. Givón (1982) describes evidentials as markers showing speaker's evaluation of the truth-value of a proposition and revealing the speaker's placement of the proposition in epistemic space. According to Chafe (1986), "evidentiality involves attitudes toward knowledge" (p. 262). Biber & Finnegan (1988) consider epistemic markers to mark not only the source of knowledge but

also to encode what Weber (1986) termed "validational" information--the speaker's attitude towards his or her message.

Each language has its own resources which speakers draw upon to show the source of their information or their evaluation of the truth of their messages. Chafe (1986), in his discussion of evidentiality in English, points out that English "expresses evidentiality with modal auxiliaries, adverbs and miscellaneous idiomatic phrases" (p. 261).

What about Japanese? Japanese, like English has broad resources for the expression of epistemic stance. In Japanese, evidentiality can be marked with adverbials and idiomatic phrases. In addition, Japanese is rich in sentence-final particles[2] which directly index interactive contexts. Chafe (1986) explains that since "speaking is an involved, social activity . . . speakers pay more attention to direct experience, and to the ways in which their thoughts and expressions match ongoing expectations" (p. 262). Japanese sentence-final particles and other epistemic markers directly index the social contact involved in speech, showing in linguistic form this matching process (Clancy, 1982; Cook, 1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1991; Matsumoto, 1985). Clancy (1982) points out that

> The personal contact between speaker and hearer in Japanese triggers not only morphological markers of politeness, but also a number of different particles which express the speaker's attitude, the illocutionary force of the message, and concern for the listener's comprehension. (p. 61)

Givón (1982) states that propositions which are considered to be certain, "taken for granted," or "unchallengeable" require "no evidentiary justifications" by the speaker (p. 24). However, in Japanese face-to-face interaction even the most certain, most taken-for-granted utterances often contain epistemic markers. In order to determine the characteristics of evidentiality in Japanese conversation, an investigation of face-to-face interactive contexts is crucial.

There have been several studies concerned with epistemic markers in Japanese, yet few of these use natural conversational data to determine what Japanese epistemic markers are and how they are used. Kuroda (1973) discusses Japanese sensation words which exist in adjective/verb pairs, in general, the adjective being used to describe the speaker's own sensations and the verb form being used to describe the sensation of someone besides the speaker. Kuroda's

data is based on native speaker intuitions about Japanese. Aoki's (1986) work outlines "three areas of meaning associated with Japanese evidentials" (p. 233). Because he does not use natural conversational or written data but relies on his intuitions to discover these epistemic markers, his list of epistemic markers is quite incomplete. Of the three areas of meaning Aoki describes, the first comprises expressions showing indirect evidence--the Japanese adjective/verb pairs describing sensation discussed by Kuroda (1973). Secondly, Aoki discusses expressions which show that evidence is valid--expressions containing the particle *no* or *n*. Aoki explains *no/n* + copula (*desu* or *da*) as, among other things, a marker of factivity which "removes the statement from the realm of a particular experience and makes it into a timeless object. The concept thereby becomes nonspecific and detached" (p. 229). Aoki asserts that *no/n* + the copula "is a marker which converts a statement for which ordinarily no direct knowledge is possible into a statement which is asserted as a fact" (p. 230). Thirdly, Aoki discusses hearsay or inferential statements using *soo, yoo,* or *rashii*, three forms which carry the sense that the word "seems" carries in English. The word *mitai* also carries the same sort of meaning, though it is not mentioned by Aoki. In his discussion of hearsay, Aoki does not discuss direct or indirect quotations marked by *to* or *tte*. Aoki does, however, explain how adverbials function in inferential statements in Japanese to show "the speaker's attitude towards the truth value of a statement" (p. 234), whether the speaker's attitude is one of certainty or uncertainty. He then explains how some of these epistemic markers may function in politeness. I will return to this notion later.

McGloin's (1980, 1983/1984) work is primarily concerned with *no/n* + the copula. McGloin proposes that *no* is used when the speaker assumes knowledge or familiarity of the hearer to mark an explanation or a contrast, to persuade or convince the addressee of the speaker's opinion, to emphasize a statement, or to give background information. Using Kamio's (1979) analysis of the speaker's territory of information, McGloin states that *no* can be used to make an utterance more polite by presenting "information which is held exclusively in the speaker's territory of information *as if* it also belongs to the hearer's territory of information" (1983, p. 135). McGloin (1983/1984) also discusses *ne* as a particle used "to create rapport between the speaker and the hearer . . . by assuming knowledge on the part of the hearer" (p. 137).

Tsuchihashi (1983) seeks to place the sentence-final particles on a continuum from certainty (declaratives) to uncertainty

(interrogatives) through an analysis of their use in dialogue occurring in Japanese novels. According to Tsuchihashi, Japanese sentence-final particles serve to show (1) a speaker's confidence or certainty in an assertion, (2) a speaker's level of willingness to have an utterance challenged, and (3) a speaker's "solicitation of confirmatory or corrective response" (p. 361). Tsuchihashi discusses sixteen sentence-final particles: *daroo, deshoo, ja nai ka, ka, kamoshirenai, ka na, kashira, na/ne, sa, wa, yo, ja nai kashira, wa ne*, and two phonetically null particles. Through various analyses, such as an analysis of the subject of each utterance, with a stated first-person subject serving as evidence of certainty, Tsuchihashi places the particles on a continuum from declarative to interrogative (high degree of certainty to low degree of certainty).

However, Tsuchihashi's conclusions are tentative, and, because her data do not consist of spontaneous naturalistic discourse but of dialogues written in novels, the validity of her results may be questioned. In addition, while some of the particles she discusses were quite numerous, others were quite rare in her corpus--for example, while *yo* occurred 108 times, *kamoshirenai* only occurred 8 times. Although one might be able to begin to draw conclusions about the particles which occur quite frequently, I have reservations about drawing any conclusions concerning the certainty represented by a particle on the basis of only a few occurrences. Therefore, while I find Tsuchihashi's efforts to empirically demonstrate a continuum from declarative to interrogative interesting, more work needs to be done if the existence of such a continuum is to be truly validated.

Cook (1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1991) uses data from naturally occurring tape-recorded conversations in her analysis of Japanese sentence-final particles. Cook (1988) discusses Japanese sentence-final particles as indexicals. According to her analysis, *yo* is used by adults to negotiate power and indexes social status/power in adult relationships. *Yo* is also used to point out facts/events unnoticed by others. Cook (1988, 1991) discusses *ne* as a particle which expresses the "general attitude of mutual agreement" (1988, p. 155). Cook (1990b, 1991) proposes that *ne* is a marker of "affective common ground," showing how an affect marker can index an epistemic stance. According to Cook *ne* is generally used when a speaker is displaying or seeking agreement, confirmation, or cooperation. Cook (1988) also discusses the function of *ne* in politeness--this will be discussed later in this paper.

Cook (1988, 1990a) sees *no* as a particle whose "most important indexical meanings concern a speaker's epistemological

disposition" (1988, p. 180). While a bare declarative indexes the speaker's "individual authority for knowledge" (1988, p. 180), according to Cook, statements marked with *no* show that the speaker, together with his or her group, authorizes knowledge. According to Cook's analysis, this relates to Aoki's analysis of *no* as a marker of factivity because knowledge authorized by a group may be assumed to be true. When *no* acts as a nominalizer, it indexes the speaker's removal from the feelings and experiences described.

The Role of Epistemic Markers in Japanese

In several studies, Japanese epistemic markers have been noted as playing a role in politeness.[3] Both Cook (1988, 1990a) and Aoki (1986) explain how the linguistic markers they discuss function to make language more polite. Aoki explains how *no/n* as a marker of factivity "is a despecifying evidential, and is used to minimize the speaker's involvement" (p. 235). He points out that the use of *no/n* may "tone down the harshness of a request," "soften the expression of desire," or "cite a statement as something for which the speaker cannot be held responsible" (p. 235). However, the first two categories ("tone down the harshness of a request" and "soften the expression of desire") may be collapsed into the third, the function of *no* in all three cases being to reduce the speaker's responsibility for an utterance by minimizing the speaker's involvement in his own utterance. For instance, in Aoki's example showing "tone down the harshness of a request," *no* is used to express the fact that a request has been made by someone other than the speaker, and thus the speaker is exonerated of any responsibility for the request. His example showing the function of *no* to "soften the expression of desire" may be analyzed similarly, since *no* takes the speaker's expression of desire and makes it into a depersonalized fact for which the speaker is now less responsible. Cook analyzes the use of *no* in politeness by pointing out that *no* makes an utterance more formal or polite because, as a nominalizer, its use indexes a speaker's removal from the feelings and experiences described. In this way, to use Brown & Levinson's (1987) analysis, particles such as *n/no*, which distance the speaker from his or her assertion, thereby reducing his or her responsibility for the utterance, may function to protect the addressee's negative face wants.[4] Cook (1990a) and McGloin (1983/1984) also point out that *no*, which can be used to create rapport,[5] can be used to protect the addressee's positive face wants[6] as well.

In her analysis of *ne*, Cook (1988) points out that among its many functions, the over-arching purpose of the particle is to create common ground between speaker and hearer by showing the speaker's desire for harmonious and agreeable interaction. Cook (1991) analyzes *ne* as a marker of positive politeness. However, *ne* may also be analyzed as a particle which reduces the speaker's responsibility for his utterance--by indexing the speaker's desire for harmonious interaction, the speaker shows the addressee that his or her ideas may be modified at any time. By using *ne*, the speaker invites the addressee's participation in the co-construction of ideas, thereby reducing his or her responsibility for what occurs in the conversation and satisfying the addressee's negative face wants.

Besides the particles *n/no* and *ne,* however, many other epistemic markers also function to protect the face wants of the addressee by reducing the speaker's responsibility for his or her utterance. Many of the Japanese epistemic markers found in this study's corpus serve the aims of positive or negative politeness. Moreover, epistemic markers in the corpus commonly appear towards the end of an utterance--this is by no means surprising, since many of the epistemic markers are sentence-final particles which must occur in sentence- or phrase-final position. What is interesting, however, is how these markers are used in combination to reduce the speaker's responsibility[7] for his or her utterance.

EPISTEMIC MARKERS USED IN A
JAPANESE CONVERSATION

The Conversational Corpus

The 2400-word[8] corpus analyzed for this paper is a transcription of 30-minute audio-taped meeting between "O," a lecturer in charge of an intermediate-level Japanese course, and his two teaching assistants, "T" and "S." O, the lecturer, is a Japanese male, 31 years of age, who has had several years of experience in teaching the intermediate Japanese course. His teaching assistant, S, a Japanese female, is 38 years old and has worked as a teaching assistant in the intermediate Japanese course for four years, in the previous three years having worked with O's predecessor. T, a 28-year old Japanese female, is new to Japanese language teaching. All three participants are native speakers of standard Japanese. During the teachers' meetings, O explains the grammar points to be taught

the following week and provides time for trouble-shooting and problem-solving related to difficulties the teaching assistants are having in their classrooms. This meeting being a face-to-face interactive context, the corpus is rich in sentence-final particles and other epistemic markers which show source of knowledge and the speakers' attitudes towards their utterances. This data is also interesting because the interactants have varying levels of experience, age, and professional status, and these differences are reflected in their language use.

Distribution of Epistemic Markers in the Conversational Corpus

Though by no means an exhaustive list of Japanese epistemic markers, from the corpus I isolated 38 different markers which might be considered epistemic markers. Each item below is followed by an approximate gloss in English and by the frequency of its occurrence in the corpus:[9]

Sentence-Final Particles[10]

ne	marker of affective common ground	53
no/n + copula	factivity/group authority/ shared knowledge	46
ja nai/ja nai ka	'couldn't it be that'	15
keredomo/kedo/kedomo	non-logical 'but'	12
yo ne	emphatic + *ne*	10
deshoo	tag question: formal form	5
ka na	'I wonder'	5
kamoshirenai	'perhaps'	3
mitai	'seems'	2
daroo	tag question: informal form	1
kashira	'I wonder'	1
na	'I wonder'	1
nan tte iu kashira	'I wonder what I should say'	1
no ka	'could it be that'	1
to iu koto	factivity marker	1
Total occurrences		157

Hedges		
ano	'uh'	70
nanka	'something'	35
ma	'well'	2
Total occurrences		107

<u>Adverbials</u>

amari/*anmari* + neg.	'not much'	9
betsu ni	'not particularly'	8
ichioo	'sort of'	7
jissai ni	'in reality'	4
hijoo ni	'extremely'	1
wari to	'pretty much'	1
sugoku	'extremely'	1
daitai	'roughly'	1
dooshite mo	'absolutely'	1
kanarazushimo + neg.	'absolutely not'--negative polarity	1
Total occurrences		34

<u>Direct/Indirect Speech</u>

tte iu/*to iu*	quotation markers	8
sore dattara	'if it is as you said'	3
sakki itta yoo ni	'as you said earlier'	1
Total occurrences		12

<u>Other</u>

tada	'just'	8
yappari	common sense knowledge	7
dake	NOUN + 'only'	3
gurai	NOUN + 'about'	4
dochira ka to iu to	'whatever one says'	4
VERB/ADJ-*i-soo*	'seems'	1
Total occurrences		27

Function of Epistemic Markers in the Corpus

As was discussed above, one major function of epistemic markers in Japanese is to minimize the speaker's responsibility for his or her utterances, thereby elevating the role of the addressee and satisfying the addressee's positive and negative face wants (Goffman, 1967; Brown & Levinson, 1987). These markers are used alone and in combination, reducing speaker responsibility in a number of ways. Through the use of epistemic markers, speakers may (1) show hesitation about an utterance, (2) show information to exist as independent fact, (3) attribute an utterance to someone else, (4) omit reference to themselves, or (5) even abort an on-going predication, thereby giving listeners responsibility for completion of the message.

Show Hesitation About an Utterance

In the corpus, speakers show hesitation in a number of ways. The speaker may **question the truth of his/her proposition**, transforming it from being an assertion of fact to being a suggestion. Sentence-final particles with this function include *ja nai ka* [is it not so?], *ka na* [I wonder], *kashira* [I wonder], *na* [I wonder],[11] and *no ka* [is it the case that]. In excerpt (1), O is explaining to his two teaching assistants (TAs) how the structure "*no nara*" is used in Japanese. After giving examples of "*no nara*" in sentences, O states his opinion concerning its meaning, using *ja nai ka*:[12]

(1)O: dakara dochira ka to iu   to
      so   which *q qt* say *pt*
      So whatever is said

-->   "when" ni chikai n **ja nai ka na** to omou n desu kedo,
      "when" *pt* close *pt* **cop-ng q pt** *qt* think *pt cp*   but,
      is it not, perhaps, that (it is) close to "when" in meaning
          I think but,

Rather than stating the meaning of "*no nara*" using declaratives, O limits his own responsibility for the truth of the utterance, by questioning the truth of his own proposition, thereby allowing room for his interlocutors to respond.

Speakers may also directly **elicit the involvement of others** through the use of *ne*, *deshoo* [tag question, formal form], or *daroo* [tag question, informal form]. In the following excerpt, O is explaining to his two TAs the difference between the conditional structure "*tara*" and the provisional structure "*ba*" in Japanese. When T responds that she doesn't understand his explanation, O begins again, giving a particular example of a context where "*ba*" cannot be used in place of "*tara*." As in the excerpt above, O does not state his opinion using declaratives. He instead elicits the involvement of T, thereby reducing his responsibility for the utterance:

(2)O: "wakaranakereba   dooshite,
      "understand-*ng-prv* why,
      "Should you not understand, why

-->   kikanakatta n desu ka" tte hen   **deshoo**?
         ask-*ng-pst pt cop q" qt*   strange *pt* ?
         didn't you ask" sounds strange, **doesn't it**?

In his discussion of the grammar point at hand, rather than telling T
that the sentence "Should you not understand, why didn't you ask"
is strange in Japanese, he gives his own opinion that it sounds
strange and elicits her involvement through the use of the particle
deshoo, here functioning as a tag question.
        Speakers also show their hesitation by **showing their
uncertainty of the facts**.   In the corpus this is accomplished
through use of the sentence-final particle *mitai* [seems/as if] and the
lexical items *yoo* [seems], *gurai* [about], and *kamoshirenai*
[perhaps].   Speakers can underscore this uncertainty by using
various negative polarity adverbials, such as *betsu ni* + negative
verb [not particularly], *amari/anmari* + negative verb [not much] ,
sonna ni + negative verb [not so much], and adverbials such as
ichioo [sort of], *wari to* [pretty much], and *daitai* [roughly].   In
excerpt (3), S's answer to O's inquiry about the week contains both
the adverbial *betsu ni* + negative verb [not particularly] and *mitai*
[seems/as if]:

(3)O: nanka   konshuu are ga arimashita? Mondai.
         something this week that *pt*   existed?   Problem.
         So, this week were there any problems?
         (4)
   O: Ano
         Uh

-->S: **Betsu ni**   nakatta   desu ne.
         Not   especially exist-*ng-pst cp   pt*.
         There weren't any **especially**.

-->   Konshuu   wa yariyasukatta   **mitai** desu ne=
         This week *tp* easy-to-do-*pst* **seems** *cp   pt*=
         This week **seems** to have been pretty easy to teach=

         =yappari   fukushuu da shi
         =Of course review   *cp pt*
         =Of course, it was review

By using *betsu ni* and *mitai* to show her uncertainty of the facts, S
allows room for the opinions of others.   But S's second marked

sentence sounds distinctly odd in English--why would S show uncertainty of the truth of her own experience? Perhaps S, as the more experienced of the two TAs, may be expressing uncertainty because she is speaking for both herself and for T, a role which is commonly taken by more experienced group members. While S's intentions are impossible to determine, the use of *mitai* effectively reduces her responsibility for her utterance by showing uncertainty.

Another way that speakers demonstrate hesitation is by **implying the inadequacy of their ideas** through the non-logical use of *kedo/keredomo* [but]. While this 'but' can be used as a logical connector to show logical relationship between ideas, the sentence-final non-logical 'but' does not show how the propositions it modifies logically connect to other ideas. Instead it shows the speaker's hesitation or attempt to discount the importance of an utterance. In excerpt (4), T uses *kedo* to show hesitation when pointing out to O something he didn't fully explain in the lecture:

(4)T: A   hitotsu dake   ano:
        Oh one   item only uh: but,
        Oh there's just one thing uh:

-->   "aida" -no tokoro na   n desu **kedo,**
        "during" *ps* place *cmp pt cp* **but**
        it's the construction "during,"

    O: Hai
        Yes
        Uh-huh,

    T: "nantoka shiteiru"   toka "nantoka suru" toka
        "doing   something" or   "do something" or
        The constructions "doing something" or "to do something"
             for example,

        sore-   sore o sonna ni
        These- these *ac* not so much
        You didn't particularly

        setsumei   shinakatta desu yo ne
        explanation do-*ng-pst* *cp*   *pt pt*
        explain these.

This use of *kedo/keredomo* also appears in excerpt (1) and in excerpt (7), but in (7) it functions as a logical connector.

Hedges such as *nanka* [kind of/something], *ano* [uh], and *ma* [well] are also quite common as markers of hesitation. Examples of the use of *nanka* and *ano* can be found in excerpts (3), (4), (7), (8), and (12).

Another effective method of showing hesitation involves not linguistic structure but the suprasegmental feature of loudness-- speakers may **turn down the volume**, allowing their speech to trail off into silence at the ends of their utterances. In some cases this fading away is so dramatic that capturing the utterances on tape proved impossible. While the difficulty in collecting data caused by these drops in volume prevents the statement of any firm conclusions, these sharp decreases in volume seem to be used by speakers to reduce responsibility for utterances by demonstrating hesitation. In the corpus, decreases in volume are used in statements of personal opinion, when making requests, and when combined with linguistic markers of uncertainty. In excerpt (5), O is continuing his explanation of the conditional and the provisional. The decrease in volume (shown by the falling black line) occurs in the third line of this excerpt as an accompaniment to his statement of opinion as to what he thinks the students find easy to understand:

5) O: Kore wa sonna ni   kyoochoo shinakute ii   desu.
          This *nm* that much emphasize do- *ng*   good *cp*.
          It's okay not to stress this so much.

          Ano provisional de yatta hoo   ga
          Uh   provisional *pt* do-*pst* side *nm*
          Uh, calling it the "provisional"

          gakusei wakariyasui   to omou.
          students understand-easily *pt* think.
          makes it easier for students to understand I think.

In this excerpt, it is only the decline in volume which shows O's hesitation in giving his opinion.

Unlike excerpt (5), in most of the other cases of this phenomenon in the corpus, these sharp decreases in volume are

accompanied by the use of other epistemic markers which heighten the effect of hesitation. In excerpt (1), for instance, repeated below as (6), the decline in volume accompanies a statement of opinion by O. However, in this case, the decline in volume overlays other markers of hesitation, such as *ja nai ka,* which elicit the involvement of others, as well as the non-logical use of *kedo* [but] which heightens the tentative feeling of the utterance. Excerpt (6) is a good example of how epistemic markers can be layered with declining volume to heighten the effect of uncertainty:

6) O: Dochira ka to iu to=
    Which   *q*   *qt* say *pt*=
    Whatever is said=

    ="when" ni chikai n   ja nai ka na=
    = when *pt* close *pt* neg   *q pt*=
    =it's close to "when" in meaning=

    =to omou n   desu kedo,
    =*qt* think *pt* *cp*   but,
    =I think isn't it, but,

Most examples of declining volume in the corpus are like (6) in which decreases in volume are accompanied by other epistemic markers, a combination of resources which produces a general effect of hesitation or tentativeness, thereby decreasing the speaker's responsibility for his or her utterance.

Show Information to Exist as Independent Fact

Showing information to have an existence independent of the speaker is accomplished through a variety of linguistic means in the corpus. The speaker may use a **marker of factivity** such as *n/no* or *to iu koto* [the fact that ~]. The speaker may also mark information as existing outside of him/herself by **marking an utterance as "common sense"** through the use of the lexical item *yappari* [as expected/of course/as anyone would expect]. In the following excerpt, S is describing to O the attendance problems she is having in her class. S uses both the factivity marker *no/n* and the

lexical item *yappari* to mark her statements as independent fact/common sense, while O uses *yappari* in his response to show his judgment of the situation to be a common-sense conclusion:

(7)S: De, ku ji-no kurasu ga ano:
           And, 9:00-*ps* class *nm* uh:
           And, in my 9:00 class uh:

-->   ni juu nin   gurai iru **n** desu kedo
          twenty people about exist ***pt*** *cp*   but
          there are about twenty people but

-->   **yappari** asa   hayai noka ()
          naturally morning early *cmp q* ()
          naturally maybe since it's early   ()

-->   nan nin   ka konai   **n** desu ne?
          what people *cmp* come-ng *cp* ***pt***
          some of the students don't come you know?

   O: [A: konai.   () un.   Ee sore to ne,
          [Oh: come-*ng* . () uh-huh. Yes that and *pt*,
          [Oh: they don't come. () uh huh. Yes that and also,

-->   are **yappari** () nn,
          that **of course** () uh,
          that **of course** () uh,

          sekushon de kuizu ga nai   kara , () doo shite mo ne ...
          section   *pt* quiz *nm cp-ng* thus , () how do   even *pt* ...
          there are no quizzes during section time, () so whatever we
              do ...

By using markers of factivity and common sense such as those in excerpt (7), the speakers display propositions as facts which exist independently of their own individual opinions, thereby reducing their personal responsibility for the truth of the message.

      Another way to mark a statement as an independent fact is to **mark the utterance as group-authorized** or shared knowledge through the use of *no/n* (Cook, 1988, 1990a). In excerpt (8), O explains to the TAs that the provisional structure "*ba*" was covered in the first year curriculum, relying on the group's common knowledge of the first-year Japanese curriculum:

(8)O: De ano: (1) mazu saisho wa kore ano !ba! () to   iu yatsu
       de.
    pt uh: (1) first   *tp* this uh !ba! () *qt* say thing
    pt
    So uh: (1) first, this uh "ba" structure.

    De ichioo   ano () ichi nen sei-no (are ga) ano::: nan
       daroo na
    pt somewhat uh () first year-*ps* (that *nm*) uh::: what *pt*
    pt
    Anyway uh () during the first year they did that uh::: what
       should I say

\-\->   !tara! tte iu no wari to shikkari () yatteiru **no** ne?
    !tara! *qt*   say *cmp* fairly   rigorously do-*prg* **pt** *pt* ?
    the structure "tara" was pretty rigorously done, right?

No in the last line of (8) marks the entire proposition as being factual information that is authorized by others. After marking the information as group-authorized, the speaker then further reduces his responsibility for the statement by eliciting the involvement of his listeners through the use of the particle *ne*.

Attribute the Utterance to Someone Else

    In the corpus, speakers attribute their utterances to others through a variety of linguistic means, whether **indirect/direct quotation**, **mimicking another's voice**, or **making the truth of their utterance contingent upon the truth of a previous speaker's utterance** (as in the phrase *sore dattara* [that being the case]). In excerpt (9), T uses an indirect quotation marked by *sakki itta yoo ni* [as you said earlier] and bases her disagreement with O on something that he said earlier in the conversation, thereby limiting her own responsibility for contradicting O:

(9)T: yappari "yooroppa ni ikeba () nantoka ga miremasu"
    Obviously "Europe *pt* go-*prv* () something *nm* see-*pot*"
    Obviously ((we can say)) "Were you to go to Europe you
       could see one thing or another"

-->   toka **sakki itta**   **yoo**   **ni** rojikku-no toki   shika
              amari ...
         or   **just**   **say-***pst*   **manner** *pt* logic-*ps*   time except
              not much ...
         or **like you said a moment ago** unless there's a logical
              connection ...
              ((implied: we can't use this structure. See the
              discussion of excerpt (13) below for an analysis of
              this ellipsis.))

In excerpt (10), T **mimics another's voice.** Rather than
voicing her own opinion to O as to what was or was not difficult for
her students, T uses her students' voice to speak, even using a
different tone of voice to make her students' voice distinct from her
own:

(10)O: nanka   konshuu are ga arimashita? Mondai.
         something this week that *pt* existed?   Problem.
         So, this week were there any? Problems.

         [segment of transcript omitted]

-->T: ichiban saigo-no toko dake wa minna **"muzukashii**
              naa" toka
         The very last *ps* place only *tp* everyone   **difficult**
              pt   and
         Just the last part everyone was saying
              "This is soo hard" and ...

That T is using her students' voice in this excerpt is made apparent
not only through her use of a different tone of voice, but also
through her use of the particle *na/naa* which is much less formal than
the language T uses when talking to O and S. *Na/naa* is used in
Japanese when people talk to themselves, and T is thus mimicking
her students' voices as they talked to themselves.

Avoid Pronominal Reference to Self

One simple way to reduce responsibility for an utterance is
for the speaker to avoid the use of first-person pronouns. Moeran
(1988) points out that "one of the features of Japanese is a marked
absence of pronominal usage" (p. 430). Moeran states that in
Japanese "personal pronouns are avoided because using them

creates a sense of differentiation amoung individuals in a group" (p. 430). There are only nine occurrences of the first-person pronoun "I" (either *boku* or *watashi*) in the corpus, while it is ellided forty times ("zero" pronoun). The distribution of the first-person pronoun in the corpus is as follows:

Uses of the First-Person Pronoun

Zero Pronoun:	40
Pronoun used to show	
personal experience/personal opinion	4
solidarity shown through the particle "mo" (also)	4
Other: possessive structure	1
Total occurrences	49

As in other languages, the absence of first-person pronouns represents the norm in Japanese conversation, yet speakers are well able to conduct conversations which include the statement of their opinions. When these pronouns are used, what seems to be their function? When the first-person pronoun appears alone, as it does in four of the nine cases in which the first-person pronoun surfaces in the corpus, the pronoun seems to emphasize the personal or individual nature of an opinion or experience. In four other cases, the pronoun appears in combination with the particle *mo* (which means 'also') to show the speaker's agreement with a previous speaker's assertion--in these cases, the first-person pronoun plus *mo*, rather than emphasizing the personal or individual nature of a proposition, show solidarity and agreement with a previous speaker.

In excerpt (11), first-person pronouns are used three times, each followed by the particle *mo*. In this brief exchange, S has just explained how she told her class that the Japanese -*teiru* construction is useful for expressing duration. O and T both agree with her, using the first-person pronoun followed by *mo*. In the excerpt both the first-person pronouns *watashi* (used by female speaker T) and *boku* (used by male speaker O) occur with the particle *mo* (meaning 'also'):

(11)O: soo da ne,
           Yes, *pt pt*,
           Yeah uh-huh,

-->   ii/ii   koto wa ii   to   omoimasu **boku mo**=
           good/good thing *tp* good *qt* think   **I   also**=
           I also think that's a good thing=

-->T: [soo desu ne, n: **watashi mo**
       [right *cp pt*, uh: **I**   **also**
       [uh-huh, uh, **me too**

   O: =Kokuban ni   kaite chotto hen   da na to omotteita
              kara=
       =Board   *pt*   write a little strange *cop pt cmp* think-*prg-pst*
              so=
       =Writing on the blackboard I thought (the alternative
              explanation) was a little strange so=

-->T: **watashi mo** kocchi no hoo ga   ii   desu ne tte
       I   **also** this   *ps* side nom good cp   *pt qt*
       I also thought that this one was better

       jibun de koo   doriru yattete omotta   kara
       self *pt* this way drill   do   think-*pst* so
       because doing the drills myself I thought the same thing

The repetition of the first-person pronoun and *mo* provides a strong
sense of agreement and solidarity in excerpt (11). The speakers are
not just asserting their opinions and taking individual responsibility
for the utterances. Instead, by agreeing with a previous speaker
they share responsibility for the utterances with the previous
speaker, thereby reducing their responsibility for the utterance.
However, it is important to note that 82% of first-person pronouns
in the corpus were ellided. Not only does this absence of personal
pronouns avoid the "sense of differentiation among individuals"
described by Moeran, it also gives a speaker even broader leeway in
reducing responsibility for his or her utterances.

A bort

Rather than directly stating their point, another way speakers
reduce responsibility for their utterances is not to come to the point
at all, but to abort an ongoing predication (Besnier, 1989). One of
the functions of ellipsis in Japanese is to reduce the speaker's
responsibility for his or her utterance (Okamoto, 1985). In excerpts
(12), (13), and (14), speakers discontinue their utterances before
reaching or completing the verb, leaving the main point of the
utterance to be discovered by a perceptive listener, who may voice
and thus be credited with the completed utterance. In excerpt (12),
O is giving examples of the provisional "*ba*" in order to explain the

structure to his TAs. T, however, disagrees with O's analysis, but manages never to directly state her disagreement because she leaves off the verb ending which would directly contradict O. In O's subsequent turn, he completes the verb form which T had left incomplete:

(12)O: Nanka   "yooroppa ni ikeba" to iu   to nanka   ano:
        Something "Europe   *pt* go-*prv*"*qt* say *pt* something uh:
        Uh if you say "Were you to go to Europe" or something uh:

   S: Aa
       Oh

   O: Jitsu   ni soo iu   koto nai   n dakedo mo nanka
                un.
       Reality *pt* this say thing exist-*ng pt* but   something ()
                uh.
       In reality no such thing'll happen, but still there's something
                () uh.

-->T: Demo (soo iu   toki mo amari) "ikeba"   tte () **tsuka**:::=
       But   (that say time *pt* not really) "go-*prv*" *qt*   **use**:::=
       But in that case "ikeba"=
       ((NOTE: T ellides the negative ending on the verb "use."))

   O: =**tsukawanai**=
       =use-*ng*=
       =**isn't used**= ((O re-states verb adding negative ending))

Without explicitly saying so, T states her opinion in excerpt (12) that the linguistic structure being discussed isn't used in the way O has described. T provides only the bare stem of the verb *tsuka-* and stretches out the final vowel without giving the verb its negative ending. O completes her utterance by repeating the stem *tsuka* previously uttered by T and adding negative ending *wanai*. By means of this strategy, T expresses her disagreement with O without actually stating her contradiction--O utters the crucial negative ending which she elides.

       In excerpt (13), which is the next line of the same conversation, T uses the same strategy, leaving her last sentence incomplete. In this case, however, O does not utter her missing words, but T's unstated meaning is clear:

(13)T: yappari   "yooroppa ni ikeba () nantoka   ga miremasu"
         Obviously "Europe *pt* go-*prv*   () something *nm* see-*pot*"
         Obviously ((we can say)) "Were you to go to Europe you
                  could see one thing or another"

-->   toka sakki itta   yoo   ni rojikku-no toki shika
                  amari ...
         or   just   say-*pst* manner *pt* logic-*ps*   time except not
                  much ...
         or like you said a moment ago unless there's a logical
                  connection ...((implied: we can't use this structure.))

In excerpt (13), T ellides the verb altogether, leaving her sentence
incomplete, but by using the words *shika* [except] and *amari* [not
very], two negative polarity adverbs which require a negative verb,
her negative implication can be grasped by the listeners without
being directly stated. The last line of excerpt (7), repeated below as
(14), provides another good example of this ellipsis (See excerpt (7)
for context):

(14) O: sekushon de kuizu ga nai kara,   () doo shite mo ne,
         section   *pt* quiz *nm cp-ng* thus , () how do   even *pt,*
         there are no quizzes during sections, () so whatever we do,
         ((implied: some students will be absent.))

In excerpt (14), O leaves his sentence incomplete for his listeners to
interpret.

CONCLUSION

    As the excerpts from the corpus indicate, Japanese epistemic
markers do not occur in isolation but are used in combination,
frequently at the ends of utterances. Their location is by no means
remarkable since many of these markers are sentence-final particles.
What is remarkable, however, is that almost every utterance in the
corpus, regardless of speaker, contains one or more of the markers
discussed. Out of 178 total utterances,[13] 138 (or 78%) contained
one or more epistemic markers.[14] Unmarked utterances were
generally comments like "Oh really" or were responses echoing
words uttered by a previous speaker. Indeed, throughout the
corpus, the conversation appears to undulate as each speaker's

responsibility for his or her utterances is reduced due to the clustering of these epistemic markers at the ends of utterances. The examples which showed declining volume also demonstrate how speaker responsibility for an utterance declines suprasegmentally.

Why are epistemic markers which reduce a speaker's responsibility for his or her utterance so frequent in Japanese? If these epistemic markers are functioning as politeness strategies, what face threatening act (FTA)[15] is being mitigated? One possibility is that, in Japanese, face-threatening interactions are not only those proposed by Brown & Levinson (1987).[16] Perhaps many more kinds of interaction in Japanese are potential FTAs. For example, something as seemingly innocuous as an explanation of a grammatical structure may be a threat to the addressee's negative face because to explain may be seen as an imposition of the speaker's view on the hearer. The speaker, then, may mitigate this FTA by using epistemic markers to reduce responsibility for the utterance, allowing the hearer to maintain or contribute his or her own point of view. The simple act of keeping the floor to talk about one's own experiences may also be seen as an imposition on those listening, and thus epistemic markers may be used to increase the participation of others, thereby satisfying their positive and negative face wants. If it is true that in Japanese what counts as an FTA includes a much broader range of actions than in English, this could begin to explain why interactive communication in Japanese requires constant mitigation through epistemic markers--mitigation which is necessary in order to maintain the positive and negative face wants of interlocutors.

Implications for Language Socialization

According to the theory of language socialization (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin, 1990), language learning does not occur in a vacuum but is imbedded in the process of becoming a competent member of society and is a tool through which socialization occurs. Japanese children learning their first language are surrounded by and co-participate in constantly interactive contexts in which they are exposed to all of the strategies used by interlocutors in Japanese to display attitudes towards knowledge. Through the process of growing up in Japanese society, then, Japanese children learn how to understand and use these epistemic markers successfully.

What about adult second language learners? If second language learning is taking place in Japan, where adult novices can

choose to become active participants in Japanese society, the motivated learner has a good chance of acquiring these conversation strategies both through interaction with experts and through peripheral participation in Japanese society.[17] However, the learner of Japanese outside of Japan has much more limited contact with cultural experts, being very dependent upon the language teacher as the source of cultural data. As has been noted by Clancy (1982) and Cook (1991), the use of sentence-final particles is dependent upon the speech genre, with a high incidence of these particles indicating a high level of interaction. Clancy (1982) has pointed out that in public lectures these particles are seldom used. Cook (1991) has found other genres with limited use of particles, most notably debates between government officials in the Japanese Diet. I suspect that in the typical teacher-fronted Japanese language classroom, epistemic markers might be used quite differently than they are in non-pedagogical face-to-face communicative interaction. And, if we consider language learning to be a process of socialization, two questions present themselves: What aspects of culture are these learners being socialized into? Will the most successful of these students be able to interact in diverse social situations in Japanese society? Investigating both how epistemic markers are used in the Japanese language classroom as well as how these epistemic markers, therefore, appear in the interlanguage of adult second language learners may be able to provide us with more insights into the process of language socialization.

NOTES

[1] The term "language socialization" here includes "language acquisition"-- acquired linguistic competence (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) as well as "the process of becoming a competent member of a society" (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984, p. 227) as that society is represented in the language socializing spaces available to the learner. Whether or not "language socialization" can take place in the classroom may be questioned because the society of the target language of course cannot be completely represented in the classroom. However, I propose that to the extent that the classroom can reflect properties of the target society, the classroom functions as a language socializing space. Because socialization is always taking place, the classroom which does not reflect the target language culture is a classroom in which learners will be socialized inappropriately. Therefore, it is imperative that those in the business of classroom language teaching consider how to make their classrooms places where learners not only acquire linguistic structure, but also undergo the process of language socialization by which they may learn modes of social interaction which are appropriate in the society where the target language is spoken.

[2] In this paper "sentence-final particles" includes a wide range of sentence-final devices based on Tsuchihashi (1983).

[3] The analysis in this paper is based on Brown & Levinson's (1987) model.

[4] In Brown & Levinson's (1987) analysis, negative face wants are the desire that a person has "that his actions be unimpeded by others." The politeness of negative face is the "politeness of non-imposition" (p. 62).

[5] McGloin (1983) states that this rapport is derived from the speaker's presentation of new information as if that information were known to the listener. Cook (1990), however, states that "rapport created by *no* derives from the group authority which subordinates the [speaker's] individual desire and intention to those of the group" (p. 432).

[6] Brown & Levinson (1987) define positive face as "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" or, in other words, a person's desire for shared values, including "the desire to be ratified, understood, approved of, liked or admired" (p. 62).

[7] That these markers are used to reduce speaker responsibility does not mean that the speaker is denying or refusing responsibility for his/her statements, but that the speaker is backing away from the force of an unmitigated personal assertion through a variety of evidential means. In addition, reducing responsibility for an utterance is not the only function of evidential markers in Japanese, but is one way that evidential markers may be used. Evidential markers may also be used for the opposite purpose, that is, to index the speaker's certainty of his/her message or to index the speaker's assumption of complete personal responsibility for the content of his or her utterance. How this occurs in discourse is an important area for further study.

[8] This rough word count is intended only to give the reader an idea of the length of the corpus.

[9] In this qualitative study, frequencies are provided for the reader's information only.

[10] These particles are listed as they appeared--commonly occurring combinations have been counted as combinations. Some particles occurred both alone and in combination, but none are counted twice.

[11] While the particle *na* alone can be glossed "I wonder," the particle *na* plus the question particle *ka* in the combination *ka na* also means "I wonder." While both *ka na* and *na* can be found in female and male speech, *kashira* marks speech as feminine.

[12] The data in this paper is displayed in the following manner: the Japanese utterances are romanized; the second line contains a word-for-word literal translation (for an explanation of the italicized particles, see Appendix); the third line is a free translation in English.

[13] In counting utterances, one-word responses, such as "uh-huh" and "yes," were not counted.

[14] This finding is consistent with the findings of a study by the Japanese National Language Research Institute (Kokuritsu Gengo Kenkyuujo, 1955) which found that 73% of predicates in conversation contain sentence-final particles. The figure in this paper includes not only sentence-final particles but other evidentials as well.

[15] A "Face Threatening Act" (FTA) is an act by a speaker which might threaten the positive or negative face of the listener. See Brown & Levinson (1987) for a detailed discussion.

[16] Examples of acts which threaten an interlocutor's negative face wants are orders, requests, suggestions, offers, promises, compliments, expressions of thanks, and excuses. Acts which may threaten an interlocutor's positive face wants include criticism, disagreement, violent emotions, irreverence, non-cooperation, apologies, acceptance of a compliment, confessions, and lack of control over bodily functions or emotions.

[17] See Lave & Wenger (1989) for a discussion of "legitimate peripheral participation" in learning.

REFERENCES

Aoki, H.   (1986).   Evidentials in Japanese. In W.L. Chafe & J. Nichols (Eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology* (pp. 223-238). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Besnier, N.   (1989).   Information withholding as a manipulative and collusive strategy in Nukulaelae gossip. *Language in Society, 18,* 315-341.

Biber, D. & Finnegan, E.   (1988). Adverbial stance types in English. *Discourse Processes 11,* 1-34.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S.   (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chafe, W.L.   (1986).   Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing.   In W.L. Chafe & J. Nichols (Eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology* (pp. 261-272). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Clancy, P.   (1982).   Written and spoken style in Japanese narratives. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy. (*pp. 55-76). *Advances in discourse processes* (Vol. 9). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cook, H.M.   (1988).   Sentential particles in Japanese conversation: A study of indexicality.   Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation.   University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Cook, H.M.   (1990a). An indexical account of the Japanese sentence-final particle *no. Discourse Processes, 13,* 401-439.

Cook, H.M.   (1990b).   The sentence-final particle *ne* as a tool for cooperation in Japanese conversation.   In H. Hoji (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* (pp. 29-44).   Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cook, H.M.   (1991). The Japanese sentence-final particle *ne* as an affect marker. Lecture presented at UCLA.

Givón, T.   (1982).   Evidentiality and epistemic space. *Studies in Language, 6* (1), 23-49.

Goffman, E.   (1967).   On face-work. In E. Goffman, *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior* (pp. 5-46). New York: Pantheon.

Kamio, A.   (1979).   On the notion of speaker's territory of information: A functional analysis of certain sentence final forms in Japanese.   In G. Bedell, E. Kobayashi, & M. Muraki (Eds.), *Explorations in linguistics: Papers in honor of Kazuko Inoue* (pp. 213-31). Tokyo: Kenkyuusha.

Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo [National Language Research Institute]. (1955). *Danwa-go no jittai* [Actual features of discourse markers] (Report No. 8). Tokyo: Shuuei Shuppan.

Krashen, S.D. & Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* New York: Pergamon/Alemany.

Kuroda, S.Y. (1973). Where epistemology, style and grammar meet: A case study from Japanese. In S.R. Anderson & P. Kiparsky (Eds.), *A festschrift for Morris Halle* (pp. 377-91). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1989). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation* (Report No. IRL 89-0013). Palo Alto, CA: Institute for Research on Learning.

Matsumoto, Y. (1985). A sort of speech act qualification in Japanese: *Chotto. Journal of Asian Culture, 9,* 143-159.

Maynard, S.K. (1985). Contrast between Japanese and English participant identification: Its implications for language teaching. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 13*(3), 217-229.

McGloin, N.H. (1980). Some observations concerning *no desu. Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, 15*(2), 117-149.

McGloin, N.H. (1983/1984). Some politeness strategies in Japanese. In S. Miyagawa & C. Kitagawa (Eds.), *Studies in Japanese language use.* (pp. 127-145). Carbondale, IL: Linguistic Research, Inc.

Moeran, B. (1988). Japanese language and society: An anthropological approach. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12,* 427-443.

Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Schweder & R. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self & emotion* (pp. 276-320). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Okamoto, S. (1985). *Ellipsis in Japanese discourse.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

Schieffelin, B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tsuchihashi M. (1983). The speech act continuum: An investigation of Japanese sentence-final particles. *Journal of Pragmatics, 7,* 361-387.

Weber, D.J. (1986) Information perspective, profile, and patterns in Quechua. In W.J. Chafe & J. Nichols (Eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology* (pp. 137-155). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Amy Snyder Ohta holds an M.A. degree in Teaching English as a Second Language from UCLA where she is currently a doctoral student in applied linguistics. She has taught EFL in Japan and teaches both Japanese and ESL in the United States. Her research interests are in discourse analysis, language socialization, second language acquisition, and second/foreign language teaching.

APPENDIX

Abbreviations and Transcription Conventions

!xxx!	increased volume of utterance between exclamation points
(#)	length of a pause in seconds
(( ))	comment
()	brief pause shorter than 1 second
(xxx)	utterance in parentheses not clearly heard by transcriber
...	ellipsis
:	lengthened vowel
=	next turn begins without any pause
[	overlap with the previous speaker
ac	accusative marker
cmp	complementizer
cp	copula
ng	negative
nm	nominative case marker
pot	potential form
prv	provisional
ps	possessive marker
pst	past tense marker
pt	particle
q	question marker
qt	complementizer often used to set off quotations
tp	topic marker