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ほめ・ほめへのこたえに関する参考文献


An interview with 56 participants (20 Americans in the US, 18 Japanese in the US, and 18 Japanese in Japan) revealed that the Americans gave compliments much more frequently than the Japanese – Americans reported to have given a compliment in the previous 1.6 days whereas Japanese had only done so in the previous 13 days. Some of the findings: most frequently praised features were appearance and personal traits among Americans and acts, work/study, and appearance among Japanese. Americans used a wider range of adjectives than Japanese who used fewer adjectives and adjectives with less of a range in meaning. In responding to compliments, Americans tended to accept compliments or justify or extend them; Japanese questioned their accuracy, denied them, explained the reason why they were not deserved, or responded by smiling or saying nothing at all. The closer the relationship was, the more frequently Americans gave compliments, while Japanese were less likely to offer praise. Female speakers in both cultures were more likely to give and receive compliments. The authors also report their findings from a questionnaire given to 260 Japanese and 260 American participants. Although preferred strategies of expressing admiration were similarly indirect among both the American and Japanese participants, Japanese preferred noting one’s own limitations twice as much as Americans and relied on non-verbal communication much more frequently. Americans preferred giving praise to a third party twice as much as Japanese. Some other findings are in relation to gender, topic focus, and communicative partners.

115 compliment exchanges were collected in natural conversations by 50 native speakers of Japanese and analyzed in terms of age, gender, relationships, situations, and non-verbal cues. The most frequently used adjectives in the compliments were: にいく “nice/good,” すごい “great,” 美しい “beautiful/clean,” かわいい “pretty/ cute,” おいしい “good/delicious,” and 優れ “great/diligent.” The “I like/love NP” pattern never appeared in the data. Although there was a great similarity between compliments in Japanese and English (as was found by Wolfson, 1981) with regard to the praised attributes, in Japanese, compliments about one’s ability or performance (73%) or character (rather than one’s appearance) were common. While Americans praised their family members in public, the Japanese seldom complimented their spouses, parents, or children as this would be viewed as self-praise. Ninety-five percent of all responses to compliments fell into the “self-praise avoidance” category, which included rejection of the compliment (35%), smile or no response (27%), and questioning (13%). The author argues that compliments in Japanese seem to show the speaker’s deference to the addressee and this perhaps creates distance between the interlocutors. The addressee fills in this gap by rejecting or deflecting the compliment in order to sustain harmony between the interlocutors.

Furukawa, Y. (2000). “Home” no joukenni kansuru ichikousatsu [An observation on conditions for compliments]. Nihongo nihon bunka kenkyuu [Research on the Japanese Language and Culture], 10, 117-130. The author illustrates through examples that compliments reflect not only sociocultural values but also personal values and standards, and defines the compliment in consideration of the recipient of the compliment and closeness and status of the interlocutors. The paper also includes analyses of written compliments, compliments directed at a third party, and other functions of compliments using data from newspapers and books.

Furukawa, Y. (2001). Gengo kinou dounyuueno ichi shian: “home” wo chuushin [Introducing linguistic functions: Compliments among other functions]. Nihongo nihon bunka kenkyuu, 11, 57-72. Compliments directed at someone who is of higher status are considered a face-threatening act in Japanese, yet native speakers use a number of strategies to retain respect and politeness while realizing the act. The author argues that no textbook or research has completely analyzed such potentially face-threatening use of speech acts and
begins by listing the situations that require particular strategies and commenting on common errors made by learners. The situations in interaction with those of higher status include: when one does a favor or receives one, when one has more knowledge or experience, when one is at advantage, when one gives a compliment, when one invades the hearer’s private territory, when one refers to the hearer’s misfortune, when the hearer makes some sort of an error. The article also includes some sample dialogues in which a person of lower status compliments another of higher status.


Analyses of responses to compliments were based on the data from natural conversation in which research assistants complimented their friends and family members in authentic situations. The response strategies in the data obtained from 326 native speaking subjects were examined separately for interpersonal variables, generations, and gender. The author also came up with her own categorization based on past studies (acceptance, rejection, and neutral responses, and sub-strategies in each). Subjects in their 30s tended to either express thanks (25%), or reject the compliment and offer humble comments (44%), while those in their 60s mostly responded favorably, often accepting the compliment. Among family members, rejection and humble comments were found much less frequently than in other interpersonal situations, but speakers tended to sound proud or offer positive comments. In responding to work-related people, such a positive tendency drastically decreased and rejection, humble responses, and thanks occurred five times as frequently as in family relationships. Responses to friends were found somewhere in between. Women used rejection, humble comments, and thanks more often than men, while men responded proudly or expressed shyness more than women.


The author provides his impressions of compliments in English in comparison with those in Japanese.

The author uses 40 complimenting conversational excerpts in Japanese taken from television broadcasts and popular magazines and argues that there were two forms of politeness: one related to the relationship between the parties involved in the conversation (“local politeness”) and the other related to the surrounding environment (“global politeness”).


The author provides his impressions and historical analysis of use of compliments in Japanese in comparison with that in English, using such concepts as: fugen no bitoku, gengo fushin, and uchi/soto.


Using 901 responses to compliments from TV talks shows and authentic conversations, the author focuses on characteristics of compliment responses in Japanese in this article. Compared to Holmes (1986) (although the taxonomy is slightly different) where acceptance types occurred 60% of the times, acceptance was found less than a third (30%). Rejection was used much more frequently in Japanese (25%) than in English (10%). By drawing examples and analyzing some lexical items (e.g., dakewa, nomi, igaito, kekkou, warito ichou, chotto, sukoshi(wa)), the author points out that even in acceptance types in Japanese, there were humble comments that speakers offered. Speakers also used various other semantic strategies to avoid self-praise and admiration for their family members (e.g., offering negative comments and perspectives).

This is a short article that introduces some typical expressions of complimenting and congratulating in English.


This research was conducted to test a hypothesis that American learners of Japanese tend to transfer their L2 pragmatic norms in accepting compliments directed to their family members rather than deflecting or refusing them as Japanese speakers would normally do. Nineteen learners of Japanese took the DCT that included 5 items in which the speakers were complimented and another 5 where their family member was complimented both by a same-gender friend of their age. Their responses were compared with those by 20 native speakers of Japanese and those by 21 native speakers of American English (responded in English). The responses were categorized into acceptance, deflection, and rejection, each in combination with upgrading, offering comments, shifting topics, downgrading, returning a compliment, and joking. In her taxonomy, native speakers deflected the compliments more than half of the time. Although they accepted and rejected a compliment about 25% of the time respectively, they tended to make the acceptance and rejection ambiguous by adding negative comments (avoidance of self-praise). Learners seemed to believe that rejection was most polite (overgeneralization) and rejected compliments about 40% of the time. Although most natives deflected or rejected compliments directed at their family members, learners tended to accept them (70%).

感謝に関する参考文献


The author considers thanks and apologies, and argues that a contrastively informed analysis can help to reveal
typological relationships between them. He draws on materials from European languages and from Japanese. He makes the point that both thanking and apologizing are linked to the notion of indebtedness, through gratitude and regret respectively. He notes that in Japanese culture, the concept of gifts and favors focuses on the trouble they have caused the benefactor rather than the aspects which are pleasing to the recipient. So leaving a dinner in a Japanese home we might say, *O-jama itashimashita* “I have intruded on you.” The response, *Iie, iie, do itashimashite* “No, no, don’t mention it” is a responder for both apologies and thanks. Coulmas notes that *sumimasen* “thank you” or “I’m sorry” tends to be appropriate for a host of occasions. It is noted that in Japan the smallest favor makes the receiver a debtor. Social relations create mutual responsibilities and debts. Both thanks and apologies stress obligations and interpersonal commitment. In fact, gratitude is equated with a feeling of guilt. The Japanese language has a large range of routine formulae for exhibiting sensitivity to mutual obligations, responsibilities, and moral indebtedness.


The authors point out that expressing gratitude is a complex act, potentially involving both positive as well as negative feelings on the part of the giver and receiver. They note that thanks is a face-threatening act in which the speaker acknowledges a debt to the hearer – thus threatening the speaker’s negative face. Thus the very nature of thanking, which can engender feelings of warmth and solidarity among interlocutors stands as well to threaten negative face (a desire to be unimpeded in one’s actions). They report on four studies that they conducted on expressions of gratitude. In the first they audiotaped or wrote field notes on 50 situations in which expressions of gratitude occurred. They then prepared 14 vignettes which they had 56 NSs of American English write written responses to. These natives were found to draw from a finite pool of conventionalized expressions and ideas. In the second study, the same questionnaire was administered to 67 nonnative speakers in advanced-level ESL classes. Twenty-five of them also provided L1 responses, so that they could check on transfer from the L1. In their report of the findings, they focused on the seven situations that were problematic. The Japanese respondents were found to have a low percentage of acceptable responses. One explanation given was the lack of cultural congruity and the fact that this written DCT did not allow for nonverbal cues and prosodic features which could soften the response.
In addition, they might have wanted to apologize instead, since that would be acceptable in Japanese given the indebtedness implied in an expression of gratitude in Japanese culture. In a third study, the questionnaire was administered orally to 10 NSs. They found the results almost identical to the written DCT results for NSs. In a fourth study, they set up role plays – 34 by NS pairs, 40 by NNS pairs, and 24 by NS with NNS pairs. They found that the role plays contained the same words and semantic formulas as in the written data, confirming that the written data were representative of oral language use as well. NNS role plays were 50% shorter than those of natives, most likely because they lacked the words. Also, they lacked the warm and sincere tone conveyed by NSs. NNSs sometimes lacked the expression of reciprocity that NSs gave or did not convey it in an appropriate manner. They conclude that expressing gratitude involves a complex series of interactions and encodes cultural values and customs.


The researchers looked at 6 DCT situations out of 14, administered first to 56 NSs and then revised and administered to 67 NNSs from five countries. The study found native speakers to show consistent use of expressions of gratitude within specifically defined contexts, often in the form of speech act sets. For example, the thanks was accompanied by other functions such as complimenting, reassuring, expressing surprise and delight, expressing a lack of necessity or obligation. The speech act sets ranged from two to five functions. Shorter thanking episodes sometimes reflected greater social distance between the interlocutors. Longer episodes would come under conditions of social disequilibrium when the perceived need for thanking was great. Advanced nonnative English speakers had considerable difficulty adequately expressing gratitude in the target language. They found limitations at the sociopragmatic level that were severe because they created the potential for serious misunderstandings. Other problems arose at the pragmalinguistic level: divergence at the lexical and syntactic levels and inability to approximate native idioms and routines. They had the most difficulty with a situation involving a lunch treat. Almost all native speakers stated in general terms an invitation to reciprocate ("Thank you very much. Next time it's on me.") NNSs rarely said this, though some indicated in interviews afterwards that they intended to do this but felt it unnecessary and inappropriate to mention it. When this was omitted, native speakers felt the responses were
incomplete or lacking the appropriate level of gratitude. The researchers were struck by the fact that the Japanese respondents had the lowest percentage of acceptable and native-like/perfect responses. The researchers speculated that they either could not find the words, were perhaps not comfortable socializing in the US, or had not had opportunities to express gratitude.


The study examines the social and metapragmatic functions of *sumimasen* (lit., “there is no end” or “it is not enough”), a conventional expression of apology in Japanese that is also used to express the feeling of thanks. Using Goffman’s (1971) notion of “remedial” and “supportive” interchanges as the conceptual framework, the paper first describes seven pragmatic functions of *sumimasen* based on 51 instances of *sumimasen* recorded through ethnographic participant/non-participant observations of discourse in an ophthalmology clinic in Tokyo. The professionals were two female doctors, a female nurse, and a female receptionist. Fifty-eight patients participated, males and females of many ages. The seven functions were: 1) a sincere apology, 2) quasi-thanks and apology, 3) a request marker, 4) an attention-getter, 5) a leave-taking devise, 6) an affirmative and confirmational response, and 7) a reciprocal exchange of acknowledgment (as a ritualized formulas to facilitate public face-to-face communication). These seven functions are presented not as mutually exclusive but rather as overlapping concepts, ranging from remedial, remedial and supportive, to supportive in discourse. The author also cites Kumagai, Kumatoridani, Coulmas, and others to account for the concept of indebtedness that emerges from the shift of point of view from the speaker (the benefactor) to the listener (the provider of the benefit) (“debt-sensitive” society). The paper also demonstrates the exchange of *sumimasen* as a metapragmatic ritual activity, an anticipated and habitual behavior in public discourse in Japanese society. The author also reframes the multiple functions of *sumimasen* in accordance with the folk notion of *aisatsu*, which constitutes the ground rules of appropriate and smooth Japanese public interaction. The author notes that historically *arigato* “thank you” was a form of excuse, derived from *ari “exist, have” plus gatashi “difficult,” literally meaning, “it is hard to accept/have.” *Shitsurei shimasu* “I intrude” is a similar expression when leaving or entering one's space in public.

This study used a questionnaire to survey 20 native speakers of Japanese in their 20s to 30s (younger generation) in comparison with another 20 in their 50s to 60s (older generation) regarding their use of apologizing and thanking expressions. The frequency of the expressions and intensifiers (adverbials such as doumo, taihen, hontouni, makotoni) were analyzed in terms of: the semantic categories (apology, or thanks, although sometimes combined), magnitude of thanks and apology, and status of the interlocutors. Among the younger speakers, the prototypical expressions of thanks were variants of arigatou, whereas typical apology expressions (variants of gomen, sumanai, and moushiwake nai) were sometimes used for thanks as well. The larger the magnitude of thanks/apology was and the older the hearer was than the speaker, the more intensifiers were likely to be used and apologetic expressions were preferred (rather than pure expressions of thanks like variants of arigatou).


The article describes the functions of sumimasen, expressing both apology and thanks in everyday Japanese conversation. A database consisting of 10 hours of daily conversation was used, yielding a total of 44 tokens of sumimasen (41 uttered by women, 3 by men). The database had been collected in 1984 and consisted of audiotaped conversation between a housewife in Tokyo and people she interacted with for a week. Five functions of sumimasen were found: request marker, attention-getter, closing marker, regret marker, and gratitude marker. As a gratitude marker, "the speaker, recognizing that s/he is the cause of some trouble for the addressee, attempts to redress the threat to the addressee's face by producing sumimasen. If sumimasen is not uttered by the speaker, the addressee may feel that s/he has lost face through the imposition" (p. 287). The study also relates sumimasen to at least ten other strategies for expressing apology and to eight other ways to express gratitude in Japanese (e.g., arigatou “thank you,” osore irimasu “thank you so much,” and kyoushuku desu “thank you so much.”).

This article deals with how thanks and apologies are not as distinctly different as might be thought. The author compares the usage and functions of two Japanese apologizing and thanking expressions, sumimasen and arigatou, based on: 1) 140 collected interchanges including naturally occurring gratitude and apology exchanges; 2) findings from the questionnaire give to 189 native speakers of Japanese; and 3) the intuitions of the author as a native speaker. Thanks in Japanese can be conveyed by apologizing: Shouyu o totte moraemasen ka. “Please pass me the soy sauce.” Hai douzo. “Here you go.” Doumo sumimasen. “(lit.) I’m very sorry.” Although sumimasen can replace the gratitude expression arigatou, the two are not completely interchangeable. The author first accounts for the applicability of alternation, and discusses the more formal and thus polite nature of sumimasen as an expression of gratitude. The apology form is in empathy to the hearer (such as when this person is of higher status). The use of sumimasen as a gratitude expression occurs as a result of a shift in the focus (“empathy operation”) from the speaker’s to the hearer’s perspective. This shift is considered a conventionalized strategic device to repair the politeness imbalance between the interlocutors. However, the use of sumimasen tends to be appropriate only in expressing acceptance of the offer combined with gratitude and not refusal, whereas arigatou can be used for both acceptance and refusal of the offer. Use of sumimasen is also inappropriate in response to “affective” speech acts such as congratulations, condolences, compliments, and encouragement. Finally, the author explains the sequential preference in using the two expressions in a single event (sumimasen first, and then arigatou). While sumimasen functions to repair imbalance locally, arigatou has a dual function, both to repair imbalance and to close a conversation.


This is a questionnaire study reporting the occasions in which apologies like sumimasen are likely to be used (as well as non-apologetic occasions in which apologies are used) and the effects of social variables on such occasions. English and Japanese questionnaires were given to 101 British and 122 Japanese participants respectively. The questionnaire presented 36 situations that elicited expressions of gratitude and/or apologies. Closeness and status of
the interlocutors, and severity of the offense/indebtedness (benefits and losses) were manipulated in those situations. The participants first wrote down the responses they were likely to give (most like in speaking, although this is not specified in the article) and indicated on a 5-point scale what their feelings would be (strong gratitude/slight gratitude/neutral feeling neither gratitude nor apology/slight apology/strong apology/others). The paper reports only the idiomatic expressions found in the data, excluding additional expressions. Major findings: 1) the language forms for apology expressions (e.g., *sumimasen*) in Japanese are used not just to express apology but also gratitude; the Japanese form for apology can co-occur with the form for thanking (*arigatou*) where both are intended as part of an apology (thanking apologetically), and as a way of phatic communication (like greetings); 2) Japanese speakers tend to feel apologetic in more situations than British English speakers; 3) Japanese speakers tend to feel the more apologetic when their feeling of indebtedness is greater. However, apologies are often employed when the hearer is relatively older in age and in a *soto* “outside” relationship (e.g., an academic advisor), as opposed to *uchi* “inside” and *yoso* “somewhere else.”


This article is an essay on gratitude and apology expressions in Japanese as a repair strategy in interpersonal communication. The motive for both gratitude and apologies is caused by a psychological imbalance (or a sense of indebtedness) between the speaker and the hearer. Expressions of gratitude and apologies both attempt to adjust that imbalance. An expression of gratitude repairs the sense of imbalance accompanied by a certain benefit on the part of the speaker offered by the hearer. Apologies also repair the offense caused by the speaker. Section 1: conceptual understanding of gratitude and apologies. Section 2: analysis of various expressions of gratitude and apologies. Section 3: *sumimasen* as an expression of gratitude. Section 4: responses to expressions of gratitude and apologies. Section 5: phatic greeting expressions including *gokuro sama*, *otsukare sama*, *omedetou*. 

This study compares English and Japanese apologies and thanks collected in movie and TV drama scenarios (400 apologies and 400 thanks in English and Japanese each). Major differences between the two languages: 1) Japanese were more likely to thank for voluntary assistance offered by the hearer; 2) Japanese more often apologized to someone close to themselves than did English speakers; 3) Japanese thanking expressions included versatile expressions like *sumimasen* that can be used both for apologies and thanks.


This paper investigates formulaic expressions of gratitude, which includes not only the variants of *arigatou* but also those that can also convey apology (such as *sumimasen*). Utilizing a questionnaire containing 19 thanking and 9 apologizing situations, this study surveyed native speakers in their 20s to 80s to reveal their usage of formulaic expressions of thanks and apology. The informants were 221 females and 51 males of similar educational backgrounds who spoke the standard variety of Japanese. The variables manipulated in the survey were high/low status, in-group/out-group, and closeness/distance. The findings suggest that the use of *sumimasen* is not suitable for all thanking situations. Whereas in this study the younger generation of speakers used *sumimasen* to express slight thanks or apology to someone older and/or in out-group (*soto* such as strangers), the older generation used it to friends or those younger than themselves. Younger speakers used more formal apology expressions (such as *moushiwake arimasen*) with someone older (and higher in status) for a major infraction, since *sumimasen* was used to express relatively slight thanks and minor apology.

依頼に関する参考文献

This is a contrastive analysis of Chinese and Japanese performance of requests. The author gives some examples of downgraders in both languages and upgraders in Chinese. With regard to the politeness strategies, Japanese has some linguistic features that do not exist in Chinese (e.g., the perspective difference (*kureru* vs. *morau*), politeness/formality level markers, sentence final particles, and gendered particles), while Chinese often depends on lexical choices such as certain terms of address. In both languages, the choice request forms were usually influenced by closeness between the interlocutors. While the status difference seemed to override age difference in Japanese in determining the politeness level, the opposite was the case with Chinese interactions.


This paper compares a request-refusal interaction in German and Japanese role-played by 34 native Japanese speakers and 26 native German speakers in terms of 1) the request-refusal adjacency pair, 2) response strategies to refusals, and 3) explanation of reasons and hearer’s understanding. Some of the differences between the two languages are: 1) In Japanese, the refuser often used backchanneling and hedging expressions, which prepared the requester for the upcoming refusal. This tendency did not exist in German, where there were twice as many refusal expressions found in the interactions than in Japanese. 2) Japanese speakers sometimes expressed empathy for the requester before actually refusing. 3) In German, the requester suggests an alternative repeatedly and if each alternative is rejected and the requester explains the reasons. 4) In German, accepting the legitimacy of the reasons implies compliance with the request, while in Japanese, showing understanding for the reasons can be a stage before a refusal.

This is a cross-cultural study of requests investigating a common factor, *discernment*, which the authors hypothesize is operating in all sociolinguistic systems of politeness. Quantitative evidence was sought in order to identify and compare common elements and strategies in politeness in making requests in Japanese and in American English. Thirty Japanese and 30 American university students responded to a questionnaire eliciting self-report on their perceived politeness of certain request forms (judgments of the degree of carefulness), perceived distance between the interlocutors, and actual request forms of asking for a pen. The results of the study offer empirical support for the theories of Brown and Levinson and Leech.


The study reports on the realization of requests and apologies using DCTs among four groups -- ESL/EFL respondents in Hong Kong (44), EFL respondents from Japan (100), ESL respondents from Singapore (71), and NSs from the US (100). There were 13 situations on the questionnaire but only four were used for this study -- two requests and two apologies. Thirteen percent of the Japanese respondents in EFL in the situation of breaking a friend's vase asked, "What should I do?" which the researchers saw as a translation of *doo shiyoo?* In the situation of forgetting a meeting with their professor, Japanese infrequently used a mitigator with their repair ("I'll be there if you don't mind..." "I'm afraid I'll be an hour late."). In apologizing they were likely to repeat "I'm sorry. I'm sorry," which US respondents didn't do. The Japanese used significantly fewer words than the other groups. With regard to requests, only the Japanese EFL respondents used either a direct strategy ("Please lend me your notes.") (32%) or a conventionally indirect expression of desire ("I would like you to lend me your notes.") (24%), which were the two most popular responses for this group. This is consistent with behavior in Japanese, according to the researchers. The Japanese used the conventional politeness marker "please" much more frequently (34%) than the other groups and used other softeners much less frequently than the other three groups.
Izaki, Y. (2000). Cultural differences of preference and deviations from expectations in requesting: A study of Japanese and French learners of Japanese in contact situations. *Journal of Japanese Language Teaching* 104, 79-88. This study examines sociolinguistic differences in request behavior in French and Japanese, focusing on supportive move strategies (pre-request moves). Native speakers of Japanese and French role-played three request dialogues, and their performance was compared to that of seven French speakers learning Japanese (three beginners, three intermediates, and one advanced learner). Japanese speakers always used the precommital strategy (e.g., *Jitsuwa onegai shitai kotoga arimashite* “In fact, I have a favor to ask of you”) before making a request. The request can be preceded by another optional pre-request move that provides or asks for relevant information. In French, no precommital strategy appeared in the data; instead a pre-request move and a response to the pre-request are present in all request interactions. Sometimes since the pre-request move functions as a requestive hint, the speaker has no need to make an actual request. French speakers also often use conditional clauses suggesting that the hearer takes an action, which is in French normally considered as requests or negotiations. The author states that there are sociocultural differences in determining distance, power, and the degree of imposition of the request, and this results in differential politeness levels between the two languages.

Kawanari, M. (1996). Irai hyougenno modariti: Shujoshi “ne” to “yo” ni kansuru ninchi goyouronteki kousatsu [Modarity in requests: Cognitive/pragmatic analysis of sentence-final particles “ne” and “yo”]. *Nihon Joshi Daigaku Bungakubu Kyou* [Bulletin of Nihon Women’s College School of Literature], 45, 55-63. This paper analyzes sentence-final participles *ne* and *yo* used in requests in terms of modality. These sentence final particles characterize discourse, reflecting the speaker’s consideration of the hearer. In expressions of requests, *ne* mitigates the force of the request proposition or imply that the speaker’s anticipate the hearer’s compliance (e.g., *Shibaraku issyoni itene* “Please stay with me for a while”). On the other hand, *yo* reinforces the proposition and upgrades the request (e.g., *Onegai desukara, kondo syoukai shite kudasaiyo* “I’m asking you, please introduce [him/her] to me next time”). *Ne* appeared 111 times and *yo* 89 times in 600 request interactions collected from 50 male and 50 female Japanese university students.

This paper analyzes strategies (moves) of the orally elicited requests obtained from 400 native speakers of Japanese in terms of achievement of the goal and consideration for the hearer. The informants were to ask a doctor to immediately come to see their very sick neighbor. The functions involved in the requests include: making a request to come, providing information, expressing apologies, addressing the doctor, and offering to give directions. Request strategies include: prompting the hearer’s action, repeating the request, emphasizing the urgency, and prompting the action by making an offer, along with others to show consideration for the hearer (e.g., apology, hedging, and mitigating expressions). The researcher provides the results of correlational analysis between the number/contents of the moves used and the ages of the informants.


This paper includes analysis of requests 1) in light of speech act theory (Searle, 1969), 2) as communication strategies, and 3) from the perspective of interaction/discourse. Examining requests in the discourse, the author discusses the “remedial interchange” present in the requests in the form of an apology or reasons for the request.


Study of perception of politeness in requests with 77 Japanese English majors and 48 American students in two U.S. universities. Perceptions were similar except that Japanese saw interrogatives with a present tense modal ("May I borrow a pen?") as less polite than those with a past tense modal ("Could I borrow a pen?").

The article discusses in Sections 1) and 2) semantic positioning of requests in relation to other speech acts such as orders, invitations, interrogations, and questions, in Section 3) common expressions of requests (variants of hoshii, kudasai, onegai shimasu, kureru, morau), in Section 4) requests as weak demands of action, and in Section 5) requestive hints.


This paper compares role-play performance of requests by 20 native speakers of Japanese and 20 native speakers of Chinese learning Japanese (intermediate level). Utilizing the data from the previous study (Mizuno 1993), the author seeks to determine whether there is any difference in performance between the advanced and intermediate learners, and if so, whether it can be attributed to negative L1 transfer or limited linguistic proficiency. Only supportive moves are analyzed in this paper (categories and examples pp. 94-5).


This paper analyzes head act strategies used in role-play by 20 intermediate and 12 advanced Chinese learners of Japanese in comparison with those by 12 native speakers of Japanese (same data analyzed in Mizuno, 1996a). Eight semantic categories were determined according to the level of directness/indirectness (pp. 59-60, based on Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). Perspectives include not only those in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) but also the combination of “hearer-oriented (H)” and “speaker-oriented” (S) perspectives (e.g., Kashite (H) itadake (S) masuka?)

The author first analyzes factors of “imprudence” from 4 perspectives: severity of imposition, politeness strategies, interpersonal variables, and degree of necessity, and then examines request expressions written by 10 Japanese college students. The participants were asked to request a paper from a teacher they had never met. The common semantic strategies in the letters were: opening greetings, self-introduction, reasons for the request, the request, and the closing greetings, mostly in this sequence. Request expressions used included: interrogatives, variants of tara saiwai, “wish” expressions (tai), kudasai, and onegaishimasu.


This study compares the questionnaire-elicited request performance from 203 native speakers of Japanese, 24 highly advanced learners of Japanese, and 8 advanced learners of Japanese. Eleven Japanese language textbooks were also analyzed in terms of the request strategies used. Most of the textbooks, with an exception of a few, employ only a few request strategies and their relationships to contextual variables seem to be mostly ignored.


The article overviews ten currently-used Japanese language textbooks to examine how requests are taught and the frameworks that are to be used to teach performatives. In the beginning level, kudasai is taught in all the textbooks, but often as invitations or instructions. Although kudasai is often too direct when used as a request, the textbooks tend to introduce it as a request expression. Kudasai masenka, te itadake masenka, te itadaki taindesuga are also frequently introduced yet differently in beginning level textbooks. One intermediate to advanced level textbook uses video to teach a request-refusal interchange, incorporating gestures and tone. Some other textbooks utilize flow charts to make learners aware of the strategies (moves) involved in the discourse structures of request interactions. The article also describes several steps to perform appropriate requests (i.e., determining request strategy sequence, making linguistic choices, determining the timing to initiate and develop the request, controlling the interaction, and responding appropriately to the hearer). The authors argue that different politeness strategies and contextual variations of requests have not yet been adequately addressed in textbooks.

The analysis of elicited questionnaire judgments and naturally occurring data on Japanese and English requests revealed an apparent contradiction between the perception of decontextualized hints (except for the very formal Japanese hints) as relatively impolite and the high frequency of actual use of hints in a university office setting. It was found that Japanese hints are generally more opaque than English hints. There is a trade off between pragmatic clarity on the one hand and avoiding coerciveness on the other. The researchers found that "off-record" requestive hints may differ from "on-record" hint-like request formulations. They concluded that the use of requestive hint formulations builds solidarity in different ways in the two cultures.

The researchers used a questionnaire with 10 English requests varying in terms of formality levels and degree of directness. The authors describe in detail how they presented the Japanese request material (1177-78). The sample consisted of 145 Japanese subjects (92 university students, 14 teachers, and 30 university office workers or older students) and 95 native English-speaking subjects (40 teachers mainly from North America teaching in Japan and 55 U students in the US). The findings were as follows: Japanese perceptions of linguistic politeness depend heavily on the formality level of the utterance (morphologically encoded honorifics and verb endings). The perception of politeness of hints, however, appears to be affected not only by the form itself, but also by the social information it carries (the speaker's relationship to the hearer). The informal hint, *sono hon mou sunda?* “Are you through with the book yet?” was rated much closer to the informal direct request than the informal conventional indirect requests ("desire" and "willingness"), due at least in part to the plain form *da*-ending, which evokes a close relationship between speaker and hearer in the raters' mind. The very formal hint, *Sono hon mou o-sumini narimashita ka?* “Were you [possibly] to the point of having finished with that book?” gained the highest ratings in terms of perceived politeness because it was marked with the polite honorifics *o* and *nari-*, while the feature of indirectness remained intact. The use of such honorifics is usually associated with people socially higher or psychologically distant. Also, leaving the interpretation of the utterance up to the hearer is very often viewed as polite by Japanese speakers especially when speaking to someone of higher status. English perceptions of
politeness were not affected as much by formality level.

Naturally occurring requestive hints were also collected in Japanese (n=78) and in English (n=67). Here the finding was that Japanese hints generally tended to be more opaque than English hints, particularly in terms of the illocutionary scale. In office situations in Japan where a person of higher status could risk losing face if a person of a lower status reject their request, the use of highly indirect requests (i.e., requestive hints) functions to avoid coerciveness more than the use of conventionally indirect requests. Information-seeking questions give the speaker the possibility of denying it was a request (e.g., "Are there any batteries?"). Also in Japanese they found utterances with the component (reference to some component of the requested act) + zero illocutionary force (no statement of illocutionary intent), (e.g., o-bento “box lunch” used as a request to order a box lunch). There is no need to request it because it is understood from context. Saying more would create a negative impression of verbosity, directness, or aggressiveness. Such preference for implicitness could account for the high level of ellipsis in the Japanese data they collected. In the English data, the component (reference to some component of the requested act) + a grounder (giving a reason why the request is necessary) was most frequently employed (e.g., If she comes around I need to talk to her). This can be interpreted as solidarity building between the speaker where the speaker does not impose the request on the hearer.


A study with 103 Japanese speakers (93 university students and 16 teachers) and 95 English speakers (40 teachers, mostly from North America, teaching in Japan and 55 university students in the U.S.) Respondents were given six request situations and a series of responses which they were to rate from 1 to 3 (low to high) in terms of its level of appropriateness in the given situation, with 1 indicating "unnatural/inappropriate" and 3 "natural/appropriate." The study found that whereas both Japanese and English speakers found formal and indirect forms highly inappropriate with higher status hearers, Japanese speakers, unlike English speakers, rated formal forms highly appropriate with socially close interlocutors and were accepting of direct requests (e.g., lend me) with close hearers. Relatively "safe" semantic formulas for requests in English included questioning "ability" (could you...?), "willingness" (would you mind...?), and "possibility" (can/could I...?). In Japanese, as long as the formality level was appropriate,
the two formulas of "willingness" and "possibility" (...kurenai/kuremasenka/itadakemasenka/dekimasu ka?) were found generally most acceptable. Also, the hint formulation stating a grounder (reason) for the request (e.g., the copy machine isn’t working) was found appropriate in both languages. Potentially dangerous request formulas across the two languages, because of widely differing perceptions of appropriateness, include "desire" (...hoshiin da/desu kedo, I would like you to...), direct requests and perhaps the hint strategy of "questioning feasibility" (e.g., kopi-ki no naoshikata wakarimasu ka, do you know how to fix the copy machine?). The author asserts that raising the level of awareness regarding similarities and differences in request strategies could help avoid misunderstandings across the two cultures.


Some of her analyses include sociolinguistic similarities and differences between Japanese and English requests. For example, Japanese tend to adjust their language based on status of the interlocutors. The author also claims that in Japanese, requests are often considered to be difficult to refuse. The hearer normally attempts to avoid refusing, and the speaker uses negative politeness to minimize the imposition. The author argues that in English it is easier to refuse to comply with a request.

断りに関する参考文献


The authors administered a discourse completion test with 60 participants (20 Japanese-speaking in Japanese, 20 Japanese-speaking in English, and 20 Americans speaking in English) to investigate pragmatic transfer in refusals to requests, invitations, offers, and suggestions directed at higher-, equal-, and lower-status interlocutors. The data were analyzed in terms of the sequence, frequency, and content of semantic formulas. The evidence of pragmatic
transfer was found at least on three levels: the sequence, frequency, and the intrinsic content (or tone) of the semantic formulas used in the refusals. This is an often cited paper in the study of refusals.


This study investigates pragmatic transfer among advanced-level American learners of Japanese (fourth-year students at the University of Hawaii). Ten Japanese native speakers and ten American learners of Japanese performed refusals to requests, invitations, offers, and suggestions based on Beebe et al. (1990) elicited through discourse completion tasks. Three instances of negative transfer identified were that learners: 1) did not provide alternatives as often as native speakers, 2) tended to inappropriately use kekkoudesu “no, thank you” in interactions with friends possibly due to its similarity to an English expression, “No, thank you,” and 3) did not use incomplete sentences fully, which would have assisted in presenting oneself hesitantly and politely especially with those of higher status.


The author investigates five popular publications regarding refusals in American English and Japanese to examine the refusal strategies recommended by the writers from the two cultures and underlying values behind such refusal strategies. The three formal characteristics in Japanese refusals were: 1) avoiding a clear refusal, 2) mentioning a third party as a reason for the refusal, and 3) using a fictitious reason for the refusal. The author contends that in Japanese culture, refusal means not only a “no” to a request but also to personal relationships and that fictitious reasons and other strategies were employed as a social lubricant to reduce the impact of the refusal assertion. Two characteristics of recommended refusals in American English were that the clear and constructive refusal must be articulated and that reasons for a refusal do not necessarily have to be offered.

This study investigated request-refusal interaction between Japanese speakers speaking Japanese (10 M, 10 F JJs - never having lived in English-speaking country) and North American English speakers speaking Japanese (10 M, 10 F AJs – living in Japan for over 10 years) in telephone conversations, focusing on the differences and similarities between native and nonnative speakers in 40 conversations (JJ-JJ and JJ-AJ) with two requests in each (10-15 minutes per conversation). The nature of refusal sequences was examined by four coders. JJs tended to employ delay as their immediate response to the implicative request types, while AJs were found to have a wider variety of refusal types (delay, avoidance, acceptance, positive indication but excuse, excuse). They didn't use formulaic patterns as often as JJs. The AJ variety was attributed to lack of sociocultural and pragmalinguistic ability. The JJs had six types of refusal sequences: excuse, delay-excuse, delay-excuse-alternative, delay-excuse-apology, delay-apology, and delay-promise. AJs had seven: excuse, delay-excuse, delay-avoidance by postponement, avoidance-delay-excuse, avoidance-avoidance, acceptance-delay-excuse, positive indication with excuse-avoidance. Appendix B gives a classification of refusal realization strategies.


The researcher administered a discourse completion test (based on Beebe *et al.*, 1990), with 12 items on refusals to requests given to 40 British English speakers. The magnitude of the request (large and small request), status of the interlocutors (higher, equal, and lower than the speaker), and the closeness of the interlocutors (close or distant) was manipulated in the DCT instrument. The most common strategy was an expression of regret followed by an excuse or reason (30% of the responses). Another 20% of the responses either reversed the order or added another element (such as promising future compliance of the request, or negative willingness). As it is in American English, giving a reason seemed to be central, and the reasons were found to be generally concrete and specific. Expression of regret occurred in more than half of the refusals (especially refusing a small request by those of equal status), although apologies were more often offered in response to a larger request.

Focusing on the refusal itself and the statement of the reasons as core strategies of refusals, the author compares refusals for requests and invitations in ten Japanese language textbooks with those in authentic telephone conversation by native speakers. Most of the textbooks did not carry sufficient information regarding the refusing context (i.e., relationship of the interlocutors, whether the refuser is able to comply with the request/invitation in terms of time and ability, and the degree of importance for acceptance of the request/invitation in the requester’s perspective), although the authentic data showed the refusing context influenced the selection of the refusal strategy or the combination of the refusal strategies. Authentic data found cases where the speakers made refusals even thought they were able to comply with the request/invitation, and several strategies used by the speakers in such a case.


The author uses authentic telephone conversation including refusals from 15 native speakers of Japanese and 11 nonnative speakers of Japanese. The analysis focuses on the refusal itself and the statement of the reasons. Learners’ overall use of sentence-final particles following an excuse (e.g. *noda/kara/node/te/shi*) approximated that by native speakers. However, conversation analysis of the data also revealed that learners generally did not use sentence-final particles (e.g., *kna, na(a), wa*) which serve to soften the refusal assertion and refusal markers (e.g., *chotto, yappari, uun*) which precede a refusal and prepare the hearer for the upcoming refusal. The author contends that these are missing aspects in Japanese language textbooks and research that require more attention.


This article analyzes the speech act of refusals in terms of benefits and imposition, strategies, and reasons behind
using particular strategies. The author administered a questionnaire to 51 male and 40 female Japanese college students, eliciting the refusal strategies that they would use in one refusal situation. The refusal strategies fell into four categories: 1) direct refusal, 2) telling a white lie, saying tsugouga tsukanai “I have a prior engagement that cannot be changed,” 3) postponing response, saying kangaete oku “I’ll think about it,” and 4) making an indefinite response by smiling. The response strategies were also analyzed in terms of closeness, social status, age, and gender of the interlocutors. The direct refusal (Type 1 above) was found to be often directed to close friends (approximately 70%) as the respondents probably perceived no need to conceal true feelings in such a relationship. Telling a white lie (Type 2 above) was perhaps used in consideration for the hearer, behaving as if the hearer’s intentions were more important than the speaker’s or as if the refusal was beyond the speaker’s control. The postponement (Type 3) by a close friend was interpreted as cause for hope by 60% of the participants while only about 30% did so if uttered by someone not very close. The postponing strategy was seldom used with someone of higher status, since it presupposed the importance of the speaker’s intention rather than the hearer’s. With regard to the second refusal in response to the friend’s repeated request, males were likely to make a direct refusal while females tended to tell a white lie.


This paper contains a report dealing with three questionnaires investigating native and nonnative Japanese speakers’ 1) politeness judgment of request expressions in six situations, 2) judgment of the speaker’s intent in two hints, and 3) feelings experienced by the speaker who once again refuses a second invitation made to him/her. The author also lists useful request and refusal expressions that can be taught to learners of Japanese.

This paper examines speech act performance in requests, refusals, and apologies by Chinese speakers of Japanese in Taiwan. Three levels of learners, high-beginners, low-intermediate, and high-intermediate, took a discourse completion test that included 3 situations, eliciting performance on the three speech acts. The results were analyzed in terms of the linguistic form of each core speech act and the language use in the opening and closing of the dialogue. The author also compared the learners’ performance with the expressions included in their textbooks. The learners’ general linguistic performance approximated that of native speakers as their levels became more advanced, although all level learners tended to oversimplify opening and closing statements.


The study compared responses by Japanese and Americans at International Christian University in Tokyo in six situations, 2 apologies, 2 requests, and 2 refusals – in each case, once to a higher status person and once to a person of equal status. While the Japanese were concerned about relative status, the Americans paid more attention to the personal relations or closeness with the person. The Japanese were more ambiguous in their responses. While this is a very short report with no details, the study constitutes a pioneering effort, some seven years before the appearance of what were considered the “initial” empirical studies.


This paper focuses on the use of incomplete sentences in performing refusals in Japanese. Native speakers often use incomplete sentences especially with those of higher status in order to avoid making direct refusals and appear hesitant, which is considered a polite gesture. Based on the same data used in Ikoma and Shimura (1993), learners’
and native speakers’ use of incomplete sentences were analyzed in terms of the syntactic and semantic structures, frequency, correlation with interlocutors of various status. Approximately 24% of the refusal sentences made by native speakers were left incomplete and over half of them (54%) were used with someone of higher status than the speakers. Over half of the incomplete sentences used by natives (61%) and learners (72%) were when providing a reason for a refusal (e.g., ...te/de, ...node/kara), as well as in responding negatively, providing an alternative, and responding positively. More than half of the incomplete sentences (61%) appeared at the end of the refusal sequences. The learners’ use of incomplete sentences was similar to that of natives except that the learners used incomplete sentences less frequently (15%) and more often with someone of lower status, rather than with higher status interlocutors.


The chapter is about not wanting to say no to a boss so as not to hurt the superior's feelings and not to endanger own position at work. A "no" may suggest the junior person is selfish and unfriendly, so this person may have not choice but to accept. The flat "no," ie, is avoided in speaking. A vague "no" is preferred or an expression that could be either yes or no. Silence is also used. Other possibilities: a counter question, a tangential response, leaving the scene, lying, criticizing the question, refusing to answer the question, giving a conditional "no," using "yes, but...," delaying the answer, declining but without giving a direct "no" but rather an expression involving both apology and regret, expressing "I will accept" (to a superior) but with some excuse which warns of likely failure to carry out the request, an apology. An empirical study found that lying was the preferred approach. Younger respondents preferred apologies. The older generation preferred tangential responses and delayed answers. Men used a flat "no" more than women which women avoided.

This study reports on the reliability, validity, and practicality of the same three measures of cross-cultural pragmatic competence that were developed by Hudson *et al.* (1992, 1995) and used in the Japanese FL study by Yamashita (1996). The current study administered these tests to 25 first-year Japanese EFL learners. There was a self-assessment test with 24 situations, 8 requests, 8 refusals, and 8 apologies, with varying degrees of power, social distance, and imposition. Respondents rated themselves on a 5-point scale as to how appropriately they would respond. A role-play self assessment test -- performing 8 scenarios for the speech acts, described in English and Japanese. After performing the role plays, they had to rate themselves on a 5-point scale. Role-play test -- with native speakers of English (as in previous), videotaped and rated by three native speakers on a 5-point scale. All three tests proved to be both reliable and valid in assessing pragmatic competence. In addition, the TOEFL subtest scores did not correlate with the pragmatic measures. A limitation was that this was a homogeneous group of students.


This study reports on the reliability, validity, and practicality of the same six measures of cross-cultural pragmatic competence that were developed by Hudson *et al.* (1992, 1995) and used in the Japanese FL study by Yamashita (1996). The current study administered these tests to 25 first-year Japanese EFL learners. Four of the tests were highly reliable and two less so, and the tests distinguished those with substantial overseas experience from those without any -- a distinction which the TOEFL did not show. The two less reliable tests were the *Open Discourse Completion Test* (24 descriptions of speech act situations to provide written response and rated on 5-point scale) and *Multiple-Choice Discourse Completion Test* (same as OPDCT but MC responses from among 3). Both were take-home tests.
Hayashi, A. (1999). Kaiwa tenkainotameno sutorategi: "Kotowari" to "wabi"no syutsugen jokyoto kaiwa tenkaijono kinou [Strategies for conversation: Analysis and functions of "refusals" and "apologies"]. *Bulletin of Tokyo Gakugei University Section II Humanities*, 50, 175-188.

The author compares German and Japanese refusals (cancellation of an appointment) and apologies but reports only her analyses of Japanese in this study. Fifty-seven native Japanese-speaking university students completed a written questionnaire (but only 48 were analyzed) creating an imaginary dialogue between themselves and an unacquainted professor. Their task was to request the professor for a change of an appointment on the telephone and the participants were free to come up with their own reasons. The paper examines reasons for the cancellation (and the request for the change), and the ways in which the reasons were presented in the discourse. It was found that private reasons were often presented only once if ever. The speaker tended to convey the idea of the refusals first, then provide the reasons gradually as the information was requested by the hearer. Also, the speaker often prepared the hearer for the upcoming special reasons by the use of *jitsuwa* “actually.” With regard to apologies, the semantic strategies, their frequencies, reasons for their use, and the ways in which the apologies were presented in the discourse were examined. Apologies often signaled an upcoming request and were used to close the conversation.


The study examines the social and metapragmatic functions of *sumimasen* (lit., “there is no end” or “it is not enough”), a conventional expression of apology in Japanese that is also used to express the feeling of thanks. Using Goffman’s (1971) notion of “remedial” and “supportive” interchanges as the conceptual framework, the paper first describes seven pragmatic functions of *sumimasen* based on 51 instances of *sumimasen* recorded through ethnographic participant/non-participant observations of discourse in an ophthalmology clinic in Tokyo. The professionals were two female doctors, a female nurse, and a female receptionist. 58 patients participated, males and females of many ages. The seven functions: 1) sincere apology; 2) quasi-thanks and apology; 3) request marker; 4) attention-getter; 5) leave-taking devise; 6) affirmative and confirmational response; 7) reciprocal exchange of acknowledgment (as a ritualized formulas to facilitate public face-to-face communication). These
seven functions are presented not as mutual exclusive but rather overlapping concepts, ranging from remedial, remedial and supportive, to supportive in discourse. The author also cites Kumagai, Kumatoridani, Coulmas, and others to account for the concept of indebtedness that emerges from the shift of point of view from the speaker (the benefactor) to the listener (the provider of the benefit) (“debt-sensitive” society). The paper also demonstrates the exchange of *sumimasen* as a metapragmatic ritual activity, an anticipated and habitual behavior in public discourse in Japanese society. The author also reframes the multiple functions of *sumimasen* in accordance with the folk notion of *aisatsu*, which constitutes the ground rules of appropriate and smooth Japanese public interaction. The author notes that historically *arigato* “thank you” was a form of excuse, derived from *ari* “exist, have” plus *gatashi* “difficult,” literally meaning, “it is hard to accept/have.” *Shitsurei shimasu* “I intrude” is a similar expression when leaving or entering one’s space in public.


The author poses 4 questions to be answered in pragmatics research: 1) for what purpose a speech act is performed; 2) in what situations the speech act is performed; 3) how the repertoire of strategies and linguistic forms are related; 4) what discourse functions the speech act serves. Taking English and Japanese apologies as an interpersonal repair strategy, the author argues that there are differences in speech act realization between the two languages in terms of the situations that require an apology, linguistic forms/strategies used, and responses to apologies. No mention of the data source is given.


This article deals with how thanks and apologies are not as distinctly different as might be though. Thanks in Japanese can be conveyed by apologizing: *Shooyu o toote moraemasen ka.* “Please pass me the soy sauce.” *Hai dozoo.* “Here you go.” *Doomo sumimasen.* “(lit.) I’m very sorry.” The apology form is in empathy to the hearer (such as when this person is of higher status). *Sumimasen* can be used for local management of an event and then
arigato for closing the gratitude exchange. The paper compares usages and functions of two Japanese apologizing and thanking expressions, sumimasen and arigatou, based on: 1) 140 collected interchanges including naturally occurring gratitude and apology exchanges; 2) findings from the questionnaire give to 189 native speakers of Japanese; and 3) his own native speaker intuition. Although sumimasen can replace the gratitude expression arigatou, the two are not completely interchangeable. The author first accounts for the applicability of alternation, and discusses the more formal and thus polite nature of sumimasen as an expression of gratitude. The use of sumimasen as a gratitude expression occurs as a result of a shift in the focus (“empathy operation”) from the speaker’s to the hearer’s perspective. This shift is considered a conventionalized strategic device to repair the politeness imbalance between the interlocutors. However, the use of sumimasen tends to be appropriate only in expressing acceptance of the offer combined with gratitude and not refusal, whereas arigatou can be used for both acceptance and refusal of the offer. Use of sumimasen is also inappropriate in response to “affective” speech acts such as congratulations, condolences, compliments, and encouragement. Finally, the author explains the sequential preference in using the two expressions in a single event (sumimasen first, and then arigatou). While sumimasen functions to repair imbalance locally, arigatou has dual functions both to repair imbalance and to close a conversation.

Miyake, K. (1994). "Wabi" igaide tsukawareru wabi hyogen: Sono tayoukatno jittaito uchi, soto, yosono kankei [Formulaic apologies in non-apologetic situations: A data analysis and its relation with the concept of uchi-soto-yoso]. Nihongo Kyouiku [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching], 82, 134-146. This is a questionnaire study reporting the occasions on which apologies like sumimasen are likely to be used (as well as non-apologetic occasions on which apologies are used) and the effects of social variables on such occasions. English and Japanese questionnaires were given to 101 British and 122 Japanese participants respectively. The questionnaire presented 36 situations that elicited expressions of gratitude and/or apologies. Closeness and status of the interlocutors, and severity of the offense/indebtedness (benefits and losses) were manipulated in those situations. The participants first wrote down the responses they were likely to give (perhaps orally---not specified in the article) and indicated on a 5-point scale what their feelings would be (strong gratitude/slight gratitude/neutral feeling neither gratitude nor apology/slight apology/strong apology/others). The paper reports only the idiomatic
expressions found in the data, excluding additional expressions. Major findings: 1) the language forms for apology expressions (e.g., *sumimasen*) in Japanese are used not just to express apology but also gratitude; the Japanese form for apology can co-occur with the form for thanking (arigato) where both are intended as part of an apology (thanking apologetically), and as a way of phatic communication (like greetings); 2) Japanese speakers tend to feel apologetic in more situations than British English speakers; 3) Japanese speakers tend to feel the more apologetic when their feeling of indebtedness is the greater. However, apologies are often employed when the hearer is relatively older in age and in a *soto* “outside” relationship (e.g., an academic advisor), as opposed to *uchi* “inside” and *yoso* “somewhere else.”


This article is an essay on gratitude and apology expressions in Japanese as a repair strategy in interpersonal communication. The motive for both gratitude and apologies is a psychological imbalance (or a sense of indebtedness) between the speaker and the hearer. Expressions of gratitude and apologies both attempt to adjust that imbalance. An expression of gratitude repairs the sense of imbalance accompanied by a certain benefit on the part of the speaker offered by the hearer. Apologies also repair the offense caused by the speaker. Section 1: conceptual understanding of gratitude and apologies. Section 2: analysis of various expressions of gratitude and apologies. Section 3: *sumimasen* as an expression of gratitude. Section 4: responses to expressions of gratitude and apologies. Section 5: phatic greeting expressions including *gokuro sama, otsukare sama, omedetou*.


The first part of this literature review discusses the semantic strategies in an apology speech act set. The author asserts that in Japanese apologies, the apology realization is centered around the expression of apology and the explanation or excuse, and why Westerners have difficulty understanding this focus by Japanese on apologetic expressions in situations perceived as inappropriate by the Westerners. The last part of the article is on what to
teach about apologies and how to teach it. He gives the results of a questionnaire filled out by 43 female Japanese HS students (ages 17-18) with speech act situations and tasks to perform. He demonstrates that although the students were familiar with three expressions in English, "I'm sorry," "excuse me," and "thank you," they were not in agreement over when to use them in the situations provided. He suggests starting by heightening the awareness of the learners such as by administering a questionnaire to elicit data and to get the learners to think about different realization patterns in the L1 and L2. Then he would explain the universal and language-specific aspects of apologies. Then he would stage role plays among learners and then with native speakers providing the model -- going from less severe to more severe apology situations. Finally he would have learners take a look at the pragmalinguistic side -- the language options such as "I'm sorry" and "excuse me."


General article on apologizing in Japanese. It notes that *sumimasen* is used for both apology and gratitude. The author notes that Japanese prefer intuition and harmony, enjoy emotional dependency and group solidarity, while avoiding direct confrontation for the sake of the group. Ambiguous, indirect, suggestive, euphemistic, and understated discourse is preferred. Brevity is a virtue; silence is preferred to eloquence. Exactness and directed logical exposition is considered impertinent and arrogant.


This study compares English and Japanese apologies and thanks collected in movie and TV drama scenarios (400 apologies and 400 thanks in English and Japanese each). Major differences between the two languages: 1) Japanese were more likely to thank for voluntary assistance offered by the hearer; 2) Japanese more often apologized for someone close to themselves than English speakers; 3) Japanese thanking expressions included versatile expressions like *sumimasen* that can be used both for apologies and thanks.

This study examines written apologies produced by 31 intermediate American learners of Japanese in comparison with 20 Japanese apologies by native speakers of Japanese and 15 English apologies by native speakers of American English. Major findings with learners’ apologies: 1) inaccurate modest verb forms; 2) inappropriate use of ...kara in presenting excuses; 3) lack of regret expressions (...te shimau ; 4) choice of face-threatening excuses without mitigating strategies.


In the paper, the author focuses on some cases of Japanese and American cross-cultural differences based on Hall’s *Beyond culture* (high vs. low-context situations: especially the explicit vs. the implicit, overt vs. covert in the culture). She does a context analysis of some of the typical and atypical interactional situations in both cultures, connecting them with her own experience. She gives an example of how she as a high-context person expected low-context Americans to sense what was bothering her without having to spell it out -- without having to be specific. She points out that Americans rank logic high and feelings low and Japanese vice versa which can explain why Japanese say "I'm sorry" as a way of showing consideration to the interlocutor's feelings even if the speaker is not logically at fault for the problematic situation. Americans, she maintains, do not tend to apologize merely to show consideration for others if the problem is not their fault. In fact, Americans will say, "Don't be so apologetic," "Why did you say ‘‘sorry’’? It's not your fault."


Politeness rules in Japanese. Be polite to persons of a higher social position, persons with power, older persons, to men if a woman, in formal settings, and to someone with whom you do not have a close relationship. The author generalizes that older Japanese and those who have not lived in the U.S. tend to transfer their own sociocultural
rules when they apologize in English. A study was conducted with 70 native English speakers in the US and 234 Japanese speakers, 70 responding in Japanese and 164 in English. Age, gender, position of power, and social distance were varied in four versions of a questionnaire. The research appears to find that his Japanese respondents do not make excuses to a person with higher status, yet the findings here ran counter to that. On bumping into a female, the E1 group expressed an apology, while both the J1 and E2 groups did not, but rather confirmed damage ("Are you OK? "Are you hurt?") Not a gender difference here -- females likely to express an apology (89%) than males (52%). So E2 was more like J1 than E1. An exception: a difficult job to do, J1 utilized expression of apology, while E2 hedged as did E1.


Use of the variants of shitsurei (e.g., Shitruirei shimasu, shitsurei shimashita, shitruirei desuga) was analyzed based on the data from scenarios, novels, conversations and narration on the radio and television, and observations of naturally occurring discourse. Section 1: brief overview of the past research and dictionary definitions of shitsurei.

Section 2: 3 forms of shitsurei- 1) shitsurei shimasu type in reference to a future event; 2) shitsurei shimashita type in reference to a past event; 3) shitsurei desuga type acting as a note/disclaimer for an accompanying action.

Section 3: semantic categories and use of shitsurei – shitsurei used for recognition of: the speaker’s invasion, discrepancy of action between the speaker and the hearer, an inappropriate communication style, an inappropriate content of conversation, an inappropriate action. Section 4: interrelationships among these categories. Section 5: differential degree of rudeness among the 3 forms of shitsurei.

This paper examines speech act performance of request, refusal, and apology by Chinese speakers of Japanese in Taiwan. Three levels of learners, high-beginners, low-intermediate, and high-intermediate, took a discourse completion test that included 3 situations eliciting the three speech act performance. The results were analyzed in terms of the linguistic form of each core speech act and the language use in the opening and closing of the dialogue. The author also compares the learners’ performance with the expressions included in their textbooks. Generally learners’ linguistic performance approximates that of native speakers as their levels became more advanced, although all level learners tended to oversimplify opening and closing statements.


This paper discusses different functions of apology expressions by drawing examples from naturally occurring discourse between female university students. Multiple functions of apology expressions (e.g., sumimasen, gomen(nasai), moushiwake arimasen, shitsurei shimasu) includes: signaling an inquiry, signaling a refusal, thanking, getting attention, apologizing, signaling a request, recognizing the hearer’s favor/the speaker’s troubling the hearer, opening, closing conversation, and interrupting.

Uehara, E. (1993). The role of uptake in speech acts. *The Journal of the Tokyo International University*, 47, 73-83. Austin (1962) defined uptake as the understanding of the meaning and the force of the locution. So while perlocutionary force is whether or not the speech act achieved its purpose, uptake is not just understanding the meaning but also understanding the intent of the speaker. The hearer may understand the message (uptake) but reject it, misunderstand the message (unsuccessful uptake), or not understand it at all (no uptake).

Yanagiya, K. (1992). Investigating communication competence: Contrasting speech acts across cultures -- the case of "apologies." *Bulletin of the English Literature Department, Teikyo University, Tokyo*, 105-128. The author raises the question of whether routine (not "heartfelt") apologies really express regret. When might they
be considered insincere, infelicitous? Or are they not apologies at all but simply share the forms? This is considered exacerbated with Japanese where apologies are not so much an expression of regret as an expression of sumanasa, mooshiwakenasa and oime -- the feelings of inexcusableness and indebtedness. Her point is that speech acts are not clear-cut entities but rather overlap or fade into each other. The features of the core, prototypical cases may be said to be universal. Even though it may seem like dominance, social distance, and severity of offense are universal in defining the character of a situation, the formality of the occasion in Japanese may change the forms of the utterances even when other factors are kept constant (119). The author also points out that in Japanese apologies are frequently nonverbal -- just hanging down one's head without saying a word, possibly with tears in the eyes. The author reminds us of the Hymes grid and would apply it to analyzing the speech act (setting, participants, goals, act sequence (form of the message), tone, language variety, norms of interaction, and genre. She then makes the case that Japanese society which is group oriented, genuinely values apologizing to show that one is indeed indebted, "By showing that one subscribes to the same conventional norms which presupposes role and rank relationship, and thereby proving that one shares the same sense of values and is content with it, one can alleviate the threat towards the other's (weighted) face" (p. 123). Hence, in Japan apologizing generally isn't done so as a strategy for recovering balance among status-equals. She points out that "apologies" and "thanks" overlap in a continuum: yorokobi “pleasure,” arigatasa “gratitude,” oime “indebtedness,” kyooshuku “embarrassment,” mooshiwakenasa “inexcusableness,” jiseki “guilt,” and ikan “regret.” Kinodokuna koto-o shita and variants can be used for both "apology" and "sympathy" (the hearer's misfortune) or consideration (omoiyari). She notes that not everyone can say sumimasen. It is not used towards a child nor from a child to others. To a child we say arigatou and gomenne. With elders, arigatou gozaimashita and moushiwake gozaimasendeshita are appropriate. So with children, persons of higher status, and intimate friends, expressions of gratitude and regret are used. With non-intimate persons of same rank, expressions of indebtedness are used. So the paper is essentially non-empirical, and rather based on native speaker intuitions.
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