



3 1293 01420 2786

THESIS

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE JAPANESE
CONJUNCTION (SORE)DE AS A
DISCOURSE MARKER

presented by

Rika Ito

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in Linguistics

Major professor

Date November 13, 1995

**LIBRARY
Michigan State
University**

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
NOV 08 5X		

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\olr\datedue.pm3-p.1

**THE FUNCTIONS OF THE JAPANESE CONJUNCTION *(SORE)DE*
AS A DISCOURSE MARKER**

By

Rika Ito

A THESIS

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

MASTER OF ARTS

**Department of Linguistics and
Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages**

1995

ABSTRACT

THE FUNCTIONS OF JAPANESE CONJUNCTION (SORE)DE AS A DISCOURSE MARKER

By

Rika Ito

This paper examines the functions of the Japanese conjunction (*sore*)*de* (the most direct counterpart of English '*and*'). Schiffrin describes the functions of *and* as 1) a structural coordinator of ideas and 2) a marker of speaker continuation (1987: 152). The data show that (*sore*)*de* plays the same roles and additional ones: it functions to elicit an interlocutor's continuation and to signal the speaker's request for further information when prefaced to questions.

Some differences are observed between the two forms. *Sorede* seems to prefer coordinating global level of units, while *de* works more on the local level. *De* is more frequently used when signaling continuation and eliciting an other's continuation. Some gender related differences in a male preference for *sorede* are also observed. It seems to be related to what *sorede* connotes: formality, distance and difference; hence, it is a 'men's trait' (Tannen 1990).

Copyright by

RIKA ITO

1995

To my parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Dennis Preston, Chair of my Thesis Committee. Without his insightful comments, suggestions, encouragement, and endless patience, I would not have been able to finish this thesis.

I would also like to thank Dr. Mutsuko Endo Hudson and Dr. Mary Bresnahan for serving as my Committee members and for their variable suggestions and encouragement.

My thanks go to my friends who let me tape-record their conversations, which provided the data for this study. I also wish to thank to my friend, Gabriela Alfaraz who spent so many hours proof-reading.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables		ix
List of Figures		x
CHAPTER I	Introduction	1
1.1	Background: Definitions and assumptions	1
1.1.1	Phenomena to be investigated	1
1.1.2	Goals	2
1.2	Definition of discourse markers	2
1.3	Research Questions	4
1.4	Outline of this study	5
CHAPTER II	Review of the related literature	6
2.1	Properties of the conjunction <i>and</i> in English	6
2.1.1	Logical Connective	6
2.1.2	Conversational Implicature and referential meaning	7
2.1.3	Discourse marker	8
2.2	Property of the conjunction (<i>sore</i>) <i>de</i> in Japanese	10
2.3	Properties of other conjunctions in Japanese	16
2.3.1	<i>Demo</i> , <i>dakedo</i> 'but'	16
2.3.2	<i>Datte</i> 'but, because'	17
2.3.3	<i>Dakara</i> 'so, therefore'	17
CHAPTER III	Method and procedures	19

3.1	Data collection	19
3.2	Participants	20
3.3	units of talk	20
CHAPTER IV	Results	24
4.1	Quantitative results	24
4.2	Qualitative results	27
4.2.1	<i>(Sore)de</i> as dictionary definition: expressing reason & cause	27
4.2.2	In environments shared with other markers	28
4.2.2a	<i>De</i> as <i>demo</i> , <i>dakedo</i> 'but'	28
4.2.2b	<i>(Sore)de</i> to connect two events 'and then'	29
4.2.3	<i>(Sore)de</i> as a discourse marker	31
4.2.3a	Coordinating units	31
4.2.3b	Speaker's continuation	37
4.2.3c	Eliciting other's speech	46
4.2.3d	Coordination, continuation, and involvement	49
CHAPTER V	Analysis of the functions of <i>(sore)de</i> as a discourse marker	51
5.1	High frequency of <i>(sore)de</i>	51
5.1.1	Coordination and continuation	51
5.1.2	<i>Sorede</i> vs. <i>de</i>	52
5.2	Sociolinguistic variables	53
5.2.1	Interactional factors	54
5.2.1.1	Genre	54
5.2.1.1a	Written vs. spoken discourse	54
5.2.1.1b	Narrative vs. non-narrative	55
5.2.1.2	Situations and relations	56

5.2.2	Individual characteristics	57
CHAPTER VI	Conclusion	61
Appendix 1	Transcription methods and conventions	63
Appendix 2	Selected data	65
List of references		71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1	Frequency of conjunctions in causal dyads in Japanese	25
Table 4.2	Frequency of conjunctions (in same-sex & mixed sex pair)	26
Table 4.3	<i>Sorede</i> vs. <i>de</i>	26
Table 5.1	Frequency of <i>sorede</i> & <i>de</i> in 100 words	56
Table 5.2	Frequency of <i>sorede</i> & <i>de</i>	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Summary of the conjunction <i>and</i> in English	10
Figure 2.2	Summary of <i>and</i> in Japanese	11
Figure 2.3	Summary of the definition of <i>sorede</i> , <i>sokode</i> , and <i>de</i>	16
Figure 2.4	Summary of the previous studies on functions of Japanese conjunctions	18
Figure 3.1	Participants and topics in their conversations	20
Figure 4.1	Planes of talk on which <i>(sore)de</i> functions	50
Figure 4.2	Discourse marker as contextual coordinates	50

CHAPTER I

Introduction

1.1 Background: Definitions and assumptions

1.1.1 Phenomena to be investigated

This thesis examines the functions of the Japanese conjunction (*sore*)*de* 'and' as a discourse marker: not only its unique functions but also functions shared with other discourse markers such as *dakara* 'so', *datte* 'but, because' and *demo*, *dakedo* 'but'. The analysis includes whether there are social differences, specifically, gender, in its use in casual conversation.

This study was motivated by the following four factors. First, although research on discourse markers has been done both in English (Blakemore 1987, Fraser 1990, Heritage 1994, Holmes 1986, Romaine and Lange 1990, Schiffrin 1987), and in Japanese (Cook 1993, Karatsu 1994, Maynard 1992a 1992b 1993, Onodera 1993, Saito 1992, Uemura and Tabuki 1994), the functions of the Japanese conjunction (*sore*)*de*, ranked the most frequently used conjunction in Japanese conversation (Onodera 1993:9-11), have not yet been explored. Second, the high frequency of (*sore*)*de* usage may correlate with a wide range of functions. Schiffrin (1987), for example, notes that *and* occurs in various environments shared by other conjunctions such as *but* and *so*. Third, even though gender is one of the most important factors in analyzing Japanese discourse, little research exists on this topic. Only a few studies have focused on how gender differences influence the use of discourse markers (Holmes 1986, Saito 1992); several others have looked at variations in men's and women's use of honorific expressions and final particles to mark politeness (Ide 1982 1991, Loveday 1986, Shibamoto 1985). Fourth, more careful characterization of the functions of discourse markers can be applicable to

language teaching and learning. For instance, such information may enhance understanding of coherence and its role in conversation; it is a potentially important factor in improving proficiency level (Uemura and Tabuki 1993).

1.1.2 Goals

The goals of this study are: (1) to identify and describe the functions of the conjunction *(sore)de* as a discourse marker in casual conversation: specifically, (1a) to identify unique functions and determine; (1b) to examine whether there exist any functions shared with other markers, such as *demo*, *dakedo* 'but', *dakara* 'so, therefore' and *datte* 'but, because,' and (2) to examine whether differences exist in the use and/or frequency of *(sore)de* between males and females.

1.2 Definition of Discourse Markers

Schiffrin's (1987) primary interest lies in the device of coherence in discourse. She sees discourse markers as one of the important devices which contribute to discourse coherence. Schiffrin (p. 31) operationally defines discourse markers as 'sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk.'

Schiffrin (pp. 24-28) proposes a discourse model containing five separate planes, the discourse markers play important roles in these planes. The Exchange Structure is related to the mechanics of turn-taking. For example, *so* and *y'know* work on this plane since both are used at potential 'transition-relevance place (TRP).' The Action Structure reflects the sequence of speech acts; for example, *and* marks speaker's continuation and *but* marks contrast. The Ideational Structure deals with cohesive, topic, and functional relationships between the ideas (propositions) found within the discourse. The

primary functions of all the conjunctions (*and, but, or, so, and because*) as well as temporal adverbs (*now, and then*) are in this structure since their grammatical properties contribute to their discourse functions. The Participation Framework captures both speaker/hearer relations, and speaker/utterance relations. For instance, the primary function of *I mean* belongs here because of its focus on speaker orientation. The Information State focuses on cognitive capacities, including the organization and management of knowledge and meta-knowledge. *Oh* and *y'know* primarily function on this plane.

Schiffrin proposes that the primary function of *and* is in the ideational structure because it marks textual coordination, but it works in the action structure and the exchange structure as well since *and* marks speaker-continuation (pp. 315-316).

The fact that markers function on different discourse planes and provide clues to discourse context leads Schiffrin to propose a theoretical definition of markers. According to her, discourse markers function as 'contextual coordinates,' whose fundamental role is to 'index an utterance to the local context in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted' (p. 326). More precisely, discourse markers are (1) 'participant coordinates,' which index utterances to the speaker (proximal) and/or the hearer (distal), and (2) 'textual coordinates,' which index utterances to prior (proximal) and/or upcoming (distal) text (p. 323). Because of these functions, Schiffrin concludes that discourse markers provide coherence in discourse (p. 330).

Schiffrin (p. 328) summarizes the suggested conditions for a discourse marker as follows:

1. Syntactically detachable from a sentence
2. Commonly used in initial position of an utterance

3. Has a range of prosodic contours

e.g. tonic stress and followed by a pause, phonological reduction

4. Operates at both local and global levels of discourse and on different planes of discourse

i.e. it either has to have no meaning, a vague meaning, or to be reflexive (of the language, of the speaker)

These conditions have also been adopted among other researchers, including Japanese scholars (Maynard 1992a 1992b 1993, Onodera 1993, Saito 1992, Uemura and Tabuki 1994).

1.3 Research Questions

Based on the points above, the following research questions are advanced for this study:

1 Is there any unique function which only (*sore*)*de* performs?

'*And*' in English functions as a structural coordinator of ideas as well as a marker of speaker's coordination. Does the Japanese counterpart also work as a discourse marker? If so, what does it mark uniquely?

2. Is there any functional overlap with (*sore*)*de* and other markers?

Although '*and*' and '*but*' in English signal different effects (continuation and contrasting, respectively), they both function to continue rather than relinquish turns in the exchange structures. Does (*sore*)*de* share some functions with other markers? If so, what functions does it share with others?

3 Is there any difference in the way men and women use (sore)de ?

Japanese has some distinct features in 'women's language,' particularly as regards politeness. If *(sore)de* operates on the action structure which reflects the sequence of speech acts, and/or the exchange structure which is related with the mechanics of turn-taking, how do these functions affect in the way men and women use the marker?

These research questions are examined through both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data.

1.4 Outline of this study

The outline of this study is as follows: Chapter 1 introduces the topic, purpose of this study, and background material; Chapter 2 summarizes previous studies on discourse markers and properties of the Japanese conjunction *(sore)de* ; Chapter 3 outlines the method and procedures; Chapter 4 presents both the quantitative and qualitative results of this study; Chapter 5 analyses the functions of *(sore)de* and discusses the possible reasons for using it; Chapter 6 summarizes the findings, and discusses the limitations of the present study and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Related Literature

In this chapter, first, the properties of the conjunction *and* in English are reviewed from the most restricted interpretation of *and* as a logical connective '&' (2.1.1) to the broadest one as a discourse marker (2.1.3) in order to see . Second, the origins and properties of the conjunction *(sore)de* (2.2) are reviewed. Third, the functions of other Japanese conjunctions which have already studied such as *demo*, *dakedo*, 'but,' *datte* 'but, because' and *dakara* 'so, therefore' are reviewed (2.3) in order to identify the similarity and differences between *(sore)de* and these markers later in this study.

2.1 Properties of the Conjunction *and* in English

2.1.1 Logical Connective

Allwood et al. (1977:26-27) define a sentential/propositional connective as a word or phrase usually belonging to the traditional grammatical category of the conjunctions; only four of them (*and*, *or*, *if...then* and *if and only if*) have been investigated by logicians. The propositional connectives are called 'logical constants' since their meaning and function are permanent, and they determine the truth-value of the sentences in which they occur. The conjunction & closely resembles *and* in everyday language. However, in terms of the function of the conjunction &, Allwood et al. (p. 32) explain:

The conjunction [&] is used in logic to construct a compound sentence which is true only if all the simple sentences (these are called **conjuncts**) from which it is constructed are true. If any simple sentence is false, the compound sentence or the **conjunction** (it is a general custom to use the name of the logical constant for the compound expression it creates) is also false. Thus, (1) is true, while (2) is false.

- (1) George was mad and Pitt was Prime Minister.

- (2) George was mad and Pitt was King. (p. 32, emphasis as in original).

The order of the two phrases has nothing to do with its truth-value since in logic $p \& q$ is always equivalent to $q \& p$.

Allwood et al. (p. 33) illustrate the distinction between the conjunction $\&$ and its natural language counterpart *and* as follows:

- (3) Gunnar lay down on the bed and died.
(4) Gunnar died and lay down on the bed.

Thus, while the propositional connective $\&$ combines sentences atemporally, phrases combined with *and* in natural language often imply sequences of events; the order of the conjuncts thus changes the order of the events. As we see in the next section, this is accounted by Conversational Implicature proposed by Grice.

2.1.2 Conversational Implicature and Referential Meaning

There exists a difference between the logical connective $\&$ and its natural language counterpart *and*. The phenomenon wherein *and* imparts sequential as well as conjunctive meaning is characterized by Grice and Levinson as Conversational Implicature.

Grice (1975) discusses the difference between logical devices and their counterparts in natural language by utilizing the concept of 'implicature,' based on general features of discourse. Cooperative conversation involves the least amount of effort necessary for participants to achieve a common purpose. In other words, language use needs to be efficient and effective. Grice terms this tendency the Cooperative Principle, introducing four maxims of conversation: Quantity ('Don't say more/less than is required'), Quality ('Don't tell a lie'), Relation ('Be clear, be relevant'), and Manner. The fourth maxim, Manner, requires people to 'be perspicuous,' and more specifically:

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly (p. 46).

Levinson (1983:108), building on Grice's work, cites 'be orderly' as the most important of the sub-maxim of Manner since it is this submaxim that accounts for the oddity of (5); in contrast, (6) follows our expectation.

- (5) ??The lone ranger rode into the sunset and jumped on his horse.
- (6) Alfred went to the store and bought some whisky.

Thus, Levinson explains that wherever two events are described, *and* in natural language connotes sequentiality, such as '*and then*' in addition to expressing the truth value of both conjuncts.

And in natural language, however, implies not only time sequence but also reason. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (1981) lists four entries defining the meanings of the conjunction *and* which work on phrasal or sentence levels. One of the definitions relates to time sequence such as '*then*' and '*at the same time*' as in (7) and (8), respectively. The other one relates to a consequence or sequel as in (9):

- (7) They drove five miles and stopped to eat.
- (8) They walked and talked.
- (9) I said go and he went. (Ibid.:80)

Since (9) is given under the definition of 'consequence or sequel,' it can be interpreted as consequence and/or the sequence of two events. However, no further explanation is provided on the difference between consequence and sequel in the dictionary. The interpretation seems to be determined by a particular context in which the utterance occurs.

2.1.3 Discourse Marker

Schiffrin (1987:37) examines the functions of *and* as a discourse marker which work on a 'discourse level,' i.e. markers are not dependent on the smaller units of talk of which discourse is composed. According to Schiffrin, items such as *and*, *but* and *or* are categorized as 'discourse connectives' since these items have grammatical properties in English, and thus function on the ideational structure. She also observes that *and* is the most frequently used item among the three; in addition, *and* is used in environments shared by *so*, *but* and even 'zero' conjunction (pp. 128-129).

She proposes that *and* plays both an ideational role (operating on the ideational structure) and interactional roles (operating on the exchange and action structures) simultaneously. More specifically, *and* is a marker of (1) a discourse coordinator of idea units, signaling the speaker's identification of an upcoming unit which is coordinate in structure to some prior unit (p. 141), and (2) a speaker-continuation, marking the speaker's definition of what is being said as a continuation of his/her own prior talk (p. 147). Schiffrin (p. 152) illustrates these functions as follows:

- (10) (Zelda and Debby are wondering why families don't get together as often as they used to.)

Debby:	I don't know what it is. Maybe- maybe you're forced- y'know there's so many [pressures, like to make] a living
Zelda:	[And you have your-] And you have your- and you have your wi:ves, your husband's family, it's too many.

Schiffrin analyzes that Zelda's turn-initial *and* -- repeated with each successive attempt to state her point-- displays Zelda's point as a continuation of Debby's prior remarks, i.e. it is marking the speaker's continuation. In addition, it marks Zelda's point as an additional reason in what becomes a jointly constructed explanation as to why families are not as close as they used to be. Therefore,

and coordinates the upcoming unit and the previous utterance (in this data, the one uttered by Debby). Schiffrin concludes that *and* serves both ideational and interactional functions simultaneously.

Although *and* is a structural coordinator of ideas which has an interactional effect as a marker of speaker continuation, it does not mean that *and* conveys social and/or expressive meaning by itself. Rather, it is deeply related to planes of discourse in which it plays.

As we have seen, the properties of the English conjunction *and* have been viewed in various ways, from the most restricted one in the field of logic to the most capacious one in the field of discourse analysis. Figure 2. 1 summarizes the properties of the English conjunction *and*.

Logical connective &	Union (Truth-functional)
Conversational Implicature	Sequentiality of the two events
Dictionary definition <i>Webster's Dictionary</i>	Time sequence a) 'and then' (same as Implicature) b) 'at the same time' Reason/cause
Discourse Marker	1) Structural coordination of ideas Ideational structure 2) Speaker's continuation Action & Exchange structure

Figure 2.1 Summary of the properties of the conjunction *and* in English

2.2 The property of the conjunction *(sore)de* in Japanese

In this section, the properties of the conjunction *(sore)de* are reviewed in order to identify the functions of *(sore)de* in spoken discourse.

Some background: while the conjunction *and* in English is used to connect almost any constructions as long as they are of the same type (Kuno 1973:113), its counterparts in Japanese vary depending upon the grammatical

type which is connected, i.e. grammatically coordinate nouns, clauses, or sentences. Figure 2.2 is a summary of Kuno (1973) and Makino and Tsutsui (1986).

Grammatical Form	Grammatical Type which is connect	Examples
coordinating particles	noun + noun	<i>to, ya, ni</i>
<i>te</i> gerundive/ <i>i</i> continuative form of verbs, adj., & copula	clause + clause	<i>ik-I, omosiro-ku,</i> <i>sizuka-de</i> <i>it-tte, omosiroku-te,</i> <i>sizuka-de</i>
conjunctions	sentence. + sentence	<i>(sore)de, sokode</i>

Figure 2.2 Summary of *and* in Japanese (Source: Kuno 1973, Makino and Tsutsui 1986)

The first one is 'coordinating particles'. According to Kuno (1973), *to*, *ni*, and *ya* are used almost exclusively to connect nouns as follows¹:

- (11) a. John *to* Mary *to* Tom (*to*) *ga* kita.
 b. John *ni* Mary *ni* Tom *ga* kita.
 c. John *ya* Mary *ya* Tom *ga* kita.
 and and S came (Kuno 1973:112)

Although *to*, *ni*, and *ya* are all coordinating particles, there are slight differences in nuance. *Ni* is used for listing exclusively and is more restricted in usage than *to*, while *ya* is used to give non-exhaustive examples; thus, (11c) means that John, Mary, Tom and others came. *To*, on the other hand, does not convey any of these additional meanings. Kuno claims that (12) sounds slightly awkward since *ni* usually requires more than two items to be enumerated – the condition is required for neither *to* or *ya*:

- (12) ?John *ni* Mary *ga* kita.

¹The following notation conventions are used (based on Maynard 1989). For example:
 S subject marker T topic marker BE copulative verb, be
 Q question marker O direct object marker LK linker
 The complete list is given in appendix 1.

Japanese, verbs (e.g. *ik-u* 'to go'), i-type adjectives (e.g. *omosiroi* 'interesting'), and na-type adjectives (e.g. *sizukada* 'quite') have the 'gerundive forms' (*it-te*, *omosi-ro-ku-te*, *sizuka-de*, respectively) and 'continuative form' (*ik-I*, *omosi-ro-ku*, *sizuka-de*, respectively). These forms are used when combining predicates such as VPs and APs; the predicate of a first clause needs be changed into either the gerundive or continuative form:

- (13) . John ga Tokyo ni Ik-I, Mary ga Osaka ni iku.
 S to go-ing S to go
 'John goes to Tokyo, and Mary goes to Osaka.'

- (14) . Kono hon wa omosi-ro-ku, wakari-yasui.
 this book T interesting-BE-ing understand-easy
 'This book is interesting and easy to understand.'

- (15) . Koko wa sizuka de, sususii.
 BE-ing
 'This place is quiet and cool.' (Kuno: 112-113)

- (16) a. John ga Tokyo ni It-te, Mary ga Osaka ni iku.
 S to go-and S to go
 'John goes to Tokyo, and Mary goes to Osaka.'

- b. Kono hon wa omosi-ro-ku-te, wakari-yasui.
 this book T interesting-and understand-easy-BE
 'This book is interesting and easy to understand.'

- c. Koko wa sizuka de, sususii.
 this T quite and cool
 'This place is quiet and cool.' (Makino and Tsutsui:464-467)

What is notable about the coordinating particles *to*, *ni*, and *ya* as well as the gerundive and the continuative forms of verbs and adjectives is that they are all translated as *and* in English although they do not satisfy the conditions for discourse markers suggested by Schiffrin (p. 328). As described in (1.2), her criteria for the prospective expressions for markers need to be, for example, (1) syntactically detachable from a sentence, and (2) commonly used in initial position of an utterance. Although the coordinating particles, and the gerundive and continuative forms might have functions in conversation, the present study

focuses on the examination of the conjunction *(sore)de* since it seems to be the most promising candidate for a discourse marker.

Having eliminated the above-discussed elements from inclusion in this study, we now focus on the conjunction *(sore)de* as an appropriate candidate functioning as a discourse marker. In a study of the use of conjunctions in conversation, the National Language Research Institute (NLRI) grouped together the variants of conjunctions. For example, *sorede*, *soide*, *sonde*, *de*, and *nde* are grouped together and translated as 'and' (1955, cited in Onodera 1993:9). Other researchers, for example, Maynard (1989), Onodera (1993), and Saito (1992) listed *sorede* as a counterpart of the conjunction 'and,' however, as mentioned earlier, the functions of *(sore)de* has not yet been studied. For these reasons, the present study focuses on *sorede* and *de*, and not treat other conjunctions, such as *sosite* and *sorekara* even though they are also translated as 'and.'

De is a conjunction which is derived from other conjunctions such as *sorede* and *sokode* by omitting *sore* and *soko*, according to Shogakkan's *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* (1979).

Sorede indicates that what is stated in the preceding sentence is the reason for what follows in the next sentence, as in (17):

(17) a. Ziko ga atta.
 accident S existed
 'There was an accident.'

 b. **Sorede** tikokusita.
 and was-late
 'And I was late.' (*Shinsen Kokugo Jiten* 1981:620)

Another function of *sorede* is to elicit another participant's continuation in conversation, usually accompanying questions, as in (18):

(18) A: Kippu ga nakunatta n desu.
 ticket T disappeared NOM BE
 'My ticket disappeared. (= I couldn't find my ticket.)'

B: **Sorede** doo simasita ka?
 and how did Q
 'So, what did you do about it?' (Endo 1987:60-61)

Speech Act Theorists, such as Searle (1975) argues that questions function as requests. *Sorede* in (18B) marks B's request for further information which works in the action structure in Schiffrin's discourse model. In addition, the question followed by *sorede* seems to be sending a 'meta-message' (Tannen 1989) of speaker's interest and/or involvement toward the another interlocutor's talk; thus, *sorede* also works at the participation framework.

The definition of *sokode* is almost identical to the one of *sorede*; *sokode* also indicates that what is stated in the preceding sentence is the cause for the what follows in the next, as in (19):

- (19) a. Hidoku tukareta.
 terribly tired
 'I was terribly tired.'
- b. **Sokode** hayaku neta.
 and early slept
 'And I went to bed early.' (Shinsen Kokugo Jiten : 612)

In addition, *sokode* is used when changing the topic which works in the ideational as well as the exchange structure, as in (20):

- (20) **Sokode** kore kara doo suru ka?
 so this form how do Q
 'So what should we do from now?' (Ibid.)

Since *de* is an abbreviated version of both *sorede* and *sokode*, it can also indicate the reason/cause. The following excerpt is from the collected data. Here, R is explaining why she could not go to a job interview:

- (21)R: a. Watasi ga nihon e kaetta ato datta kara sore ga
 I S Japan to returned after BE so that G
 maniawanakatta no yo ne?
 make-NEG NOM FP FP
 '(The interview was held) after I went back to Japan so I could not make it.'

- b. **De** peke.
 no good
 'So it was not good.'

Another use of *de* is identical to the second function of *sorede* in conversation. It is used to elicit another participant's continuation, usually accompanying questions:

- (22) A: Ee, moo itta toori tootoo kimasendesita.
 yes already said like after all come-did-NEG
 'Yes, he finally stopped coming after all as I said already.'

- B: **De?**
 and
 'And (what happened)?'
 (*Sabishikereba*, cited in *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*)

Although no question follows after *De?* in (22B), the prosodic contour -- raising intonation -- signal that it is a question, or more specifically, a request for further information.

The definitions given in *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* suggest that the conjunctions *sorede*, *sokode*, and *de* seem to play roles as discourse markers -- each of the first meanings seem to operate on the ideational structure, while the second ones function on the action and exchange structure as well as participation framework. These will be examined in the collected data. Figure 2.3 summarizes the definitions of each conjunction illustrated in *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*.

Conjunction	Definition	Schiffrin's Discourse Planes
S1. <i>Sorede</i> S2.	1 S1: reason for S2	Ideational structure
	2 To elicit another participant's continuation	Action structure
		Participation framework
S1. <i>Sokode</i> S2.	1 S1: cause for S2	Ideational structure
	2 To change the topic	Ideational structure
		Exchange structure
S1. <i>De</i> S2.	1 S1: reason/cause for S2	Ideational structure
	2 To elicit another participant's continuation	Action structure
		Participation Framework

Figure 2.3 Summary of the definitions of *sorede*, *sokode*, and *de* (Source: Shogakkan's *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*)

2.3 Properties of Other Conjunctions in Japanese

In this last section, previous studies on the functions of other Japanese conjunctions (*demo*, *dakedo* 'but,' *datte* 'but, because,' and *dakara* 'so, therefore') are reviewed. This is necessary to identify the unique and overlapping functions of (*sore*)*de* more accurately.

2.3.1 *Demo*, *dakedo* 'but'

Onodera (1993:122-123) analyzes the so-called adversative conjunctions *demo* and *dakedo* 'but' as markers of contrastive action, which she defines as 'contrast between actions, which highlights some contrasting aspect of the speaker-hearer interactional dynamics in the on-going discourse.' Onodera describes four types of contrastive actions which *demo*, *dakedo* mark: (1) point-making such as self-repairs, digressions and interruptions which works in the ; (2) claiming the floor between interlocutors which works in the exchange and the action structure; (3) opening conversation which works in the exchange structure, and (4) changing topic which works in the ideational structure. Thus, *demo*, *dakedo* seem to play roles on the exchange and on the action structure as well as the ideational structure.

2.3.2 *Datte* 'but, because'

The Japanese conjunction *datte* 'but, because' has been described as a logical connector, whose functions are (1) to provide a reason/cause for the preceding statement, i.e. backward reasoning, and (2) to express feelings of opposition toward the other interlocutor's statement, or to offer excuses in conversation (Yokobayashi and Shimomura 1988, cited in Maynard, 1992a:63). Maynard (1992a, 1992b, 1993) claims that *datte* is a marker of (1) self-justification: to self-justify one's position by declaring that the upcoming discourse unit supports one's position (1992a: 84), and sometimes with additional message -- to warn the listener that the upcoming turn contains self-justifying information in the context of opposition -- what Pomerantz's (1984; cited in Maynard, 1992a: 80) calls 'dispreference marker' or what Bilmes (1988; cited in Maynard, *Ibid.*) calls 'reluctance markers'; and (2) the claim of turn and yielding of turn since *datte* often appears at interactionally significant points such as the utterance and/or turn-initial position, at the turn-transitional period, and at hesitation points (p. 76). Therefore, *datte* functions on the participant framework, the action and exchange structures, in addition to the ideational structure.

2.3.3 *Dakara* 'so, therefore'

According to Maynard (1992a, 1992b), although *dakara* 'so, therefore' has been traditionally categorized as a 'cause-and-result' connective (i.e. forward reasoning), it carries additional discourse functions. She points out that the functions of *dakara* are: (1) to signal supplementary explanation starts, i.e. the following utterance provides explanation related to the preceding utterance, and sometimes it expresses additional meaning, such as reluctance or irritation, especially when the speaker is requested to repeat again even though the

speaker has already provided information some time in the previous discourse, and (2) to signal the claim of turn and/or yielding of turn, which is related to participatory control (p. 97). Thus, *dakara* operates on various planes of discourse; the participation framework, the exchange and action structures, and the ideational structure. Figure 2.4 summarizes the functions of *demo*, *dakedo*, *datte*, and *dakara* as discourse markers.

Conjunctions	Functions	Schiffrin's Discourse Planes
<i>demo</i> , <i>dakedo</i> adversative conjunction	Contrastive action (a) point-making (b) to claim the floor (c) to open conversation (d) to change topic	Participation Framework Exchange/Action structure Ideational/Action/Exchange structure Ideational/Action/Exchange structure
<i>datte</i> reason/cause connective (backward)	1. Self justification 2. To claim turn and/or to yield turn	Participation Framework Action structure Action/Exchange structure
<i>dakara</i> cause-and-result connective (forward)	1. To signal supplementary explanation starts 2. To claim turn &/or to yield turn	Participation Framework Action/Exchange structure

Figure 2.4 Summary of the previous studies on functions of Japanese conjunctions

This chapter summarized the properties of *and* in English, its Japanese counterpart *(sore)de*, and other Japanese conjunctions in their roles as discourse markers. The findings of the previous studies suggest that *(sore)de* can play discourse functions in addition to its semantic properties although such functions have not been yet examined.

CHAPTER III

Method and procedures

3.1 Data Collection

Du Bois et al. (1992:9) emphasize the importance of naturally occurring conversation as data for the analysis of discourse as follows:

... the first and most important consideration is to record a speech event which constitutes a naturally occurring interaction. One should start out with a natural context for interaction, in which the talk takes place for its own sake rather than for the benefit of the investigator.

This concern with analyzing naturally-obtained conversation is considered very seriously in the present study since, as Du Bois found, 'it represents the most challenging, and perhaps the most rewarding, kind of data' (pp. 9-10).

Six dyadic conversation between relatively close friends (four same-sex pairs and two cross-sex pairs) of native speakers of Japanese were audio-taped and transcribed for examination. Most of the participants (eight out of ten) are graduate students at a large university in the Mid-West of the United States, but two participants are school teachers in Japan. Prospective participants were asked permission to audio tape an hour-long informal conversation, which would have occurred anyway, with their relatively close friends (including the researcher). No specific topics nor tasks were assigned. The conversations were took place in various places such as in a dorm room, a cafeteria, a coffee shop, and at home over the telephone. Twenty minute sections of each conversation were transcribed, using the transcription conventions of Schiffrin (1987) and Maynard (1987) as models. (See Appendix 1)

3.2 Participants

Six men and four women participated in this study. They are all native speakers of Japanese and eight of them are currently students at Michigan State University. Their ages range from mid-twenties to late-thirties. One of the conversations was collected in December, 1994 while the researcher was in Japan, and two were tape-recorded over the telephone. Figure 3.1 summarizes the participants and the topics covered in their conversations.

	Participants	Setting (& Time)	Topic
M-M 1	M (G) A (G)	In A's room in the dorm (May, 1995)	Plans for summer (travels, study etc.)
M-M 2	T (G) K (G)	At a cafeteria in the dorm (June, 1995)	T's part-time job Plans for summer (travels)
F-F 1	R (G) O (T)	At a coffee shop in Sapporo, Japan (December, 1994)	Work situation job searching Travels
F-F 2	R (G) S (G)	Telephone conversation (February, 1995)	R's request for borrowing S' book TAship
M-F 1	Y (T) R (G)	Telephone conversation (May, 1995)	Weekend Previous coworkers
M-F 2	B (G) N (G)	At a coffee shop (June, 1995)	Good food and restaurant N's hometown

Figure 3.1 Participants and topics in their conversations
(M = male, F = female, **B** = male, G = graduate student, T = school teacher)

3.3 Units of talk

The notion of 'units of talk' is crucial to the analysis of discourse markers. Schiffrin's (1987) operational definition of discourse markers is 'sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk' (p. 31). However, Schiffrin does not offer a concrete definition of what 'units of talk,' are. She deliberately

left it a vague expression which would allow researchers' flexibility: 'sometimes those units are sentences, but sometimes they are propositions, speech acts, tone units' (p. 35).

Some researchers define the units of talk in terms of pauses in the stream of speech instead of propositions or speech acts. For example, Chafe proposes (1980:13) 'idea unit.' Maynard (1989:20) summarizes three features which Chafe's idea unit displays (Chafe 1980,1985)²

1. It is spoken with a single, coherent intonation contour, ending in what is perceived as a clause-final intonation.
2. It is preceded and followed by some kind of hesitation, ranging from a momentary break in timing to a filled or unfilled pause lasting several seconds.
3. It is a clause, that is, it contains one verb phrase along with whatever noun phrases, prepositional phrases, adverbs, and so on, are appropriated.

However, Maynard (Ibid.: 23-24) points out the disadvantage of Chafe's 'idea unit' when analyzing Japanese as follows:

In Japanese a syntactic clause is frequently broken into a number of smaller units bounded by pauses or skipped beats, and these units are mostly marked by intonation contour. These smaller units, which display phonological features similar to idea units in that they are pronounced in one continuous flow, often do not contain verbs and may best be described as phrases rather than clauses. Although these are defined by the phonological feature of pause, they mostly coincide with morphological units of independent lexical items plus junction words such as particles .

Hence, to analyze Japanese discourse, Maynard proposes 'Pause-bounded Phrasal Units' (PPUs) which are bounded by pauses and, as a result, are smaller than Chafe's idea units. PPU's seem to be identical to what Du Bois et al. (1992: 17) call an 'intonation unit' which is defined as 'a stretch of speech uttered under a single coherent intonation contour.' Using this smallest unit as

² In more recent work, however, Chafe uses an 'intonation unit' which is identical to Maynard's Pause-bounded Phrasal Unit (PPU). For more detail, please consult chapter 5 in Chafe (1994).

a unite of talk has advantages. For instance, Maynard points out that listener back-channel responses and final particles, such as *ne*, which functions as a tag question, or *yo*, which conveys emphatic sense, are often observed at the end of many PPUs. This means that PPUs are not arbitrary units divided by pauses, but important units in terms of the progress of conversation. The occurrence of listener back-channel reveals that interlocutors recognize the existence of the boundary between two units and that it is an acceptable place to signal listener's response and more generally, TRP. The role of the sentence final particles is to 'monitor the progress of the conversation by confirming a statement, by calling for hearer's attention, etc' (Shibatani 1990: 386). In other words, the use of sentence final particles shows us that the speaker is breaking down his or her talk into smaller units and sending an interactional message at the same time. This observation is well illustrated in the example (1). Here, M is talking about an air conditioner which he finally bought..

(1) (MA/8/15-17)³

M: a. Kuuraa nee/
air conditioner FP
'Air conditioner,'

(A1: Ee.)

yes

'Uh huh.'

b. iroiro ano te kono te de/
various that way this way by
'(I used) various ways,'

(A2: Ee.)

yes

'Uh huh.'

c. isya no sindansyo toka tukete-moratte/
doctor LK note like have-attach-and
'I asked a doctor to attach a note for me.'

(A3: Ee.)

yes

'Uh huh.'

³ (MA/8/15-17) means that the conversation is between participant M and A, and the excerpt is from page 8, lines 15-17 in the original transcription. More contextualized data are given in Appendix 2.

- d. **Sorede** kyoka o totta n desu yo./
 and permission O got NOM BE FP
 'And I got a permission (from the office), you know.'
- e. Totta wa ii n da kedo/
 took T good NOM BE but
 'It went well up to that point (= getting a permission) , but...'
- f. **Sorede**/
 and
 'And then.'
 ((M's story continues))

Back-channeling by A is observed after (a) and (b), even though both phrases are smaller units than Chafe's 'idea units,' as Maynard pointed out. And more importantly, the fact that Japanese speakers use back-channeling without any overlap suggests that participants recognize this pause as significant. In addition, (d) and (f) start with the conjunction *sorede* , which is a candidate for discourse marker status in Japanese. If PPUs are not adopted, there is no way to identify these two items.

As described above, there are three reasons for adopting PPUs as units of talk. First, PPUs are the smallest units in which interactional functions are observed (e.g. the occurrence of back-channeling, and the use of sentence final particles). Second, PPUs properly allow us to identify prospective conjunctions. Third, they are relatively easy to identify. Therefore, PPUs are used as a unit of talk in this study.

CHAPTER IV

Results

In this chapter, the results of the data examination are illustrated in both quantitative (4.1) and qualitative (4.2) terms.

4.1 Quantitative Results

The coordinate conjunction *and* (Schiffrin 1987) and *(sore)de*, its counterpart in Japanese (the National Language Research Institute 1955, cited in Onodera 1993:8-9) were the most frequently used conjunctions in both studies. Schiffrin reports that 1002 clause-sized idea units in her data were prefaced by *and*, compared to 440 prefaced by *but*, and 206 by *so*; NLRI reports that in ten hour-long tape-recorded conversations, *(sore)de* 'and' and its variants such as *soide*, *sonde*, and *nde* were used 417 times out of 1558 (or 27%), followed by *demo*, *dakedo* 'but' (196, or 12.6%), and *dakara* 'so, therefore' (188, or 12.1%). The same tendency is observed in the present study. A total of 413 uses of all conjunctions were identified within 120 minutes (20 minutes for each dyad) and *(sore)de* was the most frequently used conjunction among the six. Of 413 tokens, 179 (43.4%) were *(sore)de* 'and,' followed by *dakara* 'so, therefore' 118 (28.6%), *demo*, *dakedo* 'but' 96 (23.2%), and the least frequently used conjunction was *datte* 'but, because' 20 (4.8%). The use of *sokode* 'and' was not observed at all. The frequent occurrence of *(sore)de* 'and' suggests that it plays important roles in discourse. The close examination of the use of *(sore)de* will be illustrated in (4.2). Table 4.1 illustrates the frequency of the conjunctions with respect to each participant.

Table 4.1 Frequency of conjunctions in causal dyads in Japanese

	<i>de (sorede)</i>	<i>dakara</i>	<i>demo</i> <i>dakedo</i>	<i>datte</i>	Total
M-M 1					
M	28(14)	16	14	1	59
A	4 (0)	9	4	0	17
M-M 2					
T	18 (2)	19	8	4	49
K	5 (0)	0	3	0	8
F-F 1					
O	1 (0)	4	5	0	10
R	14 (0)	8	10	3	35
F-F 2					
S	8 (1)	10	11	0	29
R	17 (2)	15	8	2	42
M-F 1					
B	24(11)	6	8	1	39
N	25 (0)	14	12	1	52
M-F 2					
Y	24 (6)	11	9	1	45
R	11 (1)	6	4	7	28
TOTAL	179(37)	118	96	20	413
	(43.4%)	(28.6%)	(23.2%)	(4.8%)	(100%)

Based on six 20-minute long conversations

M = male, F = female, **Bold** = male

28 (14) represents that 14 are *sorede* out of 28 tokens of *de* and *sorede*

In terms of the frequency of conjunctions, there are three facts which are related to the gender of the participants and that of their partners. First, both men and women used conjunctions more frequently with an opposite-sex partner than with a same-sex partner. The mean score of conjunctions for men was 33.25 in twenty-minute long conversation when talking to another man, but 42 with a female partner; women used 29 conjunctions with another woman, but 40 when talking to a man. Second, both men and women used (*sore*)*de* more frequently with an opposite-sex partner than with a same-sex partner. Specifically, the percentage of use of (*sore*)*de* among all the uses of conjunctions increased when talking to an opposite-sex partner. When talking to another male-partner, 55 out of 133, or 41.4% of the use of the conjunctions

are of *(sore)de* among men. The percentage increased to 57.1% when talking to a woman. The same tendency is observed among female participants: 40 out of 116, or 34.5% of women's use of conjunctions are *(sore)de* with a same-sex partner, while the number increased to 36 out of 80, or 45% when talking to a man. Third, unexpected but very interesting result was observed: the choice between *de* and *sorede* were asymmetrical: between these two alternatives, men used *sorede* more often with a female partner than with another man (29.1% and 35.4%, respectively), while the use of *sorede* among women became less frequent when talking with a man than with another female (7.5% and 2.8%, respectively). This leads to an assumption that there are some difference between these two forms although *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* (1979) defines *de* as derived form of *sorede* by omitting *sore*.

Table 4.2 Frequency of Conjunctions (in same-sex and mixed pair)

	<i>de (sorede)</i>	<i>dakara</i>	<i>demo</i> <i>dakedo</i>	<i>datte</i>	Total
M-M	55(16) 41.4%	44 33.1%	29 21.8%	5 3.7%	133
F-F	40(3) 34.5%	37 31.9%	34 29.3%	5 4.3%	116
M-F	48(17) 57.1%	17 20.2%	17 20.2%	2 2.5%	84
F-M	36(1) 45.0%	20 25.0%	16 20.0%	8 10.0%	80
TOTAL	179	118	96	20	413

Table 4.3 *Sorede* vs. *de*

	<i>de (sorede)</i>	Percentage of <i>sorede</i>	Percentage of <i>de</i>
M-M	55(16)	29.1%	70.9%
F-F	40 (3)	7.5%	92.5%
M-F	48(17)	35.4%	64.6%
F-M	36 (1)	2.8%	97.2%
TOTAL	179(37)	20.7%	20.7%

4.2 Qualitative results

In this section, a close examination of the use of *(sore)de* is presented, based on its dictionary definition and semantic properties (4.2.1), its use shared with other markers (4.2.2), and its use as a discourse marker (4.2.3). Between the two items *de* and *sorede*, *de* was used more frequently than *sorede* (142 and 37 tokens, respectively). It is observed that the difference reflects the functional differences between these two items, i.e. *de* occurred in more various environments than *sorede*; moreover, *de* displayed more functional flexibility than *sorede*.

4.2.1 *(Sore)de* as dictionary definition: Expressing Reason and cause

As *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* (1979) defines it, the fundamental function of *(sore)de* is to conjoin reason and result just as *dakara* 'so, therefore' does. In the following example, T is explaining why he decided to come to the States.

(1) (TK/1/35-37)

- T:
- a. Syakaigaku mo... /
sociology also
'(Conversation Analysis is) also (developed in) sociology,'
 - b. **D e**/ watasi wa/ sono-/ sooitta atarasii/
so I T that such new
 - c. taipu no syakaigaku o/
type LK sociology O
 - d. maneejimento no sosiki riron no hoo ni
management LK organization theory LK to
 - e. ooyoo sitakutte/
applied want-to-and
 - f. **n de**/ Amerika ni kita n desu yo.
and America to came NOM BE FP
'So I wanted to study such a kind of new sociology and apply it
to organizational management theory. That's why I came to
the States.'

The conjunction *de* and its variant *nde* are used in initial position in (b) and (e), respectively, and both of them conjoin the reasons and the results: (a) is the motivation (reason) for T to study a new type of sociology and apply it to organizational management theory, as stated in (b-e); moreover, due to all the reasons described in (a-e), he came to the States, as stated in (f), which is preceded by *nde*.

Sorede is also used to indicate reason. In the following excerpt, B is talking about why Disneyland became an undesirable place for Disney:

(2) (NB/5/1-3)

- B: a. *Sorede* saa/ mawari ni saa/
and FP neighborhood at FP
- b. *Dizunii ga kangaetenakatta yoo na/*
Disney S was-thinking-NEG like BE
- c. *kankyoo ga dandan dekitekite saa/*
environment S gradually have-built-and FP
'And the neighborhood has changed in a way Disney has never thought about.'
- d. ~~*sorede*~~/ *zibun no risoo to hodotooi tokoro ni natta to.*
so self LK ideal far from place became QT
'So (the Disneyland) became far from his ideal place.'

Since the environment around Disneyland has changed a lot after Disneyland was built, the place became far from Disney's ideal place. The explanation given in (a-c) provides reason for the following sentence; thus, *sorede* is used to signal that the following is the reason.

4.2.2 In environments shared with other markers

4.2.2a *De* as *demo*, *dakedo* 'but'

De also occurs in environments in which the adversative conjunctions *demo*, *dakedo* might be used although such a usage was not often. *Sorede* was not observed in such environments in the collected data. In the following

excerpt, M and A are trying to find an inexpensive place to stay in Detroit. A shows a leaflet of a youth hostel to M:

(3) (MA/3/27-30)

- M: a. E?! Aa! Kore nee/ kore-/ kore nee/
 what Oh this FP this this FP
 'What?! Oh, this one, this one,'
- b. Nara-san kara kiita desyo?/
 Mr. Nara from heard TAG
 'Did you hear it from Mr. Nara, didn't you?'
- A: c. Ee ee ee ee./
 Yes
 'Yeah yeah yeah yeah.'
- M: d. De hora/ hurui desyoo./
 look old TAG
 '(But) see, it's old, isn't it?'
- A: e. Aa hai./
 oh yes
 'Oh, yes.'

Even though A thought information which he got from one of their mutual friends was very useful, M already knew about the place as stated in (a-b). Moreover, M knew the place is not good since it is old, as stated in (d). Therefore, *de* seems to be working as the adversative conjunctions such as *demo*, *dakedo* 'but' in this context since *it's old, isn't it?* is a negative comment and thus contradicts A's suggestion.

4.2.2 b (Sore)de to connect two events: 'and then'

According to Labov (1972:359-360), a narrative is defined as 'one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred.' In English, narrative clauses are usually connected by *and*. Schiffrin (1987:131) illustrates that *and* functions at a local level to link clauses into

sections of a story. In Japanese discourse, *de* seems to assume that role. In (4), Y is telling a story about his weekend.

(4) (YR/1/4-7)

R: a. Huun./ De higaeri?/
uh huh day trip
'Uh huh. Was it a day trip?'

Y: b. Uun./ Ippaku site./
No one night did-and
'No, we stayed a night.'

c. Nde Furiipooto e itte/
Freeport to went-and
'And (on the following day), we went to Freeport!'

d. de Aakeezia kokuritukooen tte aru n da yo ne./
Arcadia national park QT exist NOM BE FP FP

e. Soko itte/
there went-and
'And we went to a place called Arcadia National Park,'

f. un/ de kaette kite/
yes return-and-came
'and we came back,'

g. kinoo no yonaka no itii zi goro kaette kita./
yesterday LK midnight LK 1 o'clock around return- and came
'we came back around one o'clock last night.'

This example illustrates a very simple story about where Y and his family went to on a weekend. First they stayed a night somewhere, as in (b), sometime on the following day, they went to Freeport, as in (c), they went to a place called Arcadia National Park, as in (d-e), and they came back home, as in (f). Thus, *de* and its variant *nde* at the initial position of (c), (d), and (f) function to link narrative clauses, which are the most local level of idea units, in the sequence of order within a story as English *and* does.

4.2.3 (*Sore*)*de* as a discourse marker

As illustrated in the previous sections, (*sore*) *de* connects two adjacent units of talk (the most local level of talk), identifying a reason/cause and result relation, and time sequence. However, the examination of the collected data reveals that (*sore*)*de* is sometimes used to express more than the semantic properties outlined above; it plays important roles in the action and the exchange structures and sometimes in the participation framework as well as in the ideational structure. Through the examination of the data, three roles which (*sore*)*de* plays in discourse are identified: it coordinates units (4.2.3a), it signals the speaker's continuation (4.2.3b) as its English counterpart *and* does, and it elicits the other interlocutor's continuation and signals the speaker's request for further information when prefaced to questions (4.2.3c). In many cases, (*sore*)*de* displays these roles simultaneously (4.2.3d).

4.2.3a Coordinating units

Schiffrin (1987:141) observes that *and* marks structural coordination of idea units: *and* links structurally equivalent units at the local level as well as the global level. The Japanese counterpart, (*sore*)*de* also plays the same role. However, the data suggests that there are some differences between *de* and *sorede*. *De* connects rather local level of ideas such as narrative clauses as examined in (4.2.2b), while *sorede* seems to bracket more global level of ideas when these two are used together. In (5), M is telling a story about having some trouble when he was installing the air conditioner that he had just bought:

(5) (continuation of (1) in (3.3))

(MA/8/17-21):

a. *Sorede kyoka o totta n desu yo./*
 permission O took NOM BE FP

'So I finally got a permission from the housing office.'

b. Totta wa ii n da kedo/
 took T good NOM BE but
 'It went well up that point (=getting a permission), but...'

c. **Sorede**/ konoaida anoo/ take ni kite nee/
 the other day uh came-to-install-and FP
 'The other day, a man came to install it '

(A4: Ee.)
 Yes
 'Uh huh.'

d. **De**/ sositara/ anoo/
 and what happened was uh
 'And, what happened was, uh-.'

e. sore yuzuttemoratta kuuraa nan da kedo/
 that bought air conditioner NOM BE but
 'Well, that's the one I bought from somebody else.'

(A5: Ee.)
 Yes
 'Uh huh.'

f. **de**/ kaette/ kore zya tukanai tte./
 left this install-NEG QT
 'and he said "I can't install it!", and he left.'

M tells that a man came to install the air conditioner the other day, but he could not do it. *Sorede* in (c) marks where the story starts, while *de* in (f) signals that the following narrative clause is connected to some prior local level unit, namely, (c), *The other day, a man came to install it*. This type of use of *de* seems to be different from the one of (4), in which *de* links two adjacent narrative clauses. However, there are not so many differences between these two uses of *de* for the following reason: although the utterances in (d-e) look odd, they need to be said before the narrative furthers because it is crucial background information for the upcoming talk of why the man could not install it. Thus, *de* connects the most local level of units such as narrative clauses which are adjacent to one another as in (4), as well as ones that are not adjacent as in (5).

The local level of units which *de* coordinates are not restricted to narrative clauses. In the following excerpt, Y starts explaining what other co-workers have been doing since R left:

(6) (YR/2/44-45)

a. **Sonde** nee/ o- omosiroi yo/ mada./
 FP interesting FP besides
 'There are some more interesting things.'

b. **De** kono haru nee/
 this spring FP
 'In this spring.'

c. Yoshida-sensee ga Meizi ni modottekita no./
 Yoshida-teacher S Meiji to returned FP
 'Mr. Yoshida came back to Meiji Junior High.'
 ((Y talks about Mr. Yoshida.))

Prior to (6), R and Y were talking about the teachers they know, and the conversation leads Y to tell more about other teachers. *Sorede* in (a) signals that the upcoming is somehow a higher level unit than the adjacent unit; thus, it marks a topic shift. *De* in (b), on the other hand, marks the following as the lowest level of the units within the domain which *sorede* brackets, i.e. gossip on Mr. Yoshida. After talking about Mr. Yoshida, Y now starts talking about another teacher as in (7):

(7) (YR/3/9-12)

Y: a. **Nde** nee/ mada aru yo./
 and FP besides exist FP
 'And I know some more.'

b. Hada-sensee ga nee/ Keesee no kyootoo na no./
 Hada-teacher S FP LK assistant principal BE NOM
 'Mr. Hada is an assistant principal of Keesee Junior High.'

R: c. Nani?/
 what
 'What?!'

Nde precedes gossip about another teacher, Mr. Hada; hence (7a-b) which are preceded by *nde* parallel to (6b-c) which are preceded by *de*. Thus, *de* is

coordinating the local level within the domain which *sorede* bracketed as higher level.

In the previous two examples, *sorede* is used to mark the global level of units: it occurs when the story starts as in (5), as well as when the topic shifts as in (6). Other evidence that *sorede* coordinates a somewhat global level of units, rather than linking purely local units is observed when a speaker wants to return to the original topic from a digression:

(8) (NB/3/24-27)

B: a. Demo/ konkai nee/ Amerika ni kite nee/
but this time FP America to come-and FP

b. aisukuriimu wa nee/ anmari kangekisinakatta./
ice cream T FP much impressed-NEG
'But this time, I wasn't impressed much with ice cream.'

N: c. Mae wa kangekisita n desu ka?
last time T impressed NOM BE Q
'So, were you impressed last time?'

B: d. Soo./ Mukasi nee/
Yes old days FP

f. hazimete Amerika ni kita toki saa/
for the first time America to came when FP
'Yes! When I came to the States for the first time,'
((B's story continues.))

After (f), B explains why he thinks that ice cream in the old days tasted much better than the one in present day because he thinks daily products used to be much richer than the one of present. However, this leads N to talk about milk in Japan. Then B finally says as in (9):

(9) (NB/3&4/43-2)

B: a. **Sorede** saa/ ano- saisyo ne?/
so FP uh- at the beginning FP

b. Saisyō Honoruru ni tuita wake./
first Honolulu at arrived case
'So anyway, we arrived at Honolulu at the beginning.'

- c. **De/** minna ni sa/
and every one to FP
((B's story continues.))

Sorede in (a) marks the following as not related to the local level of unit, i.e. N's talk about milk in Japan, but related to B's original story about the first ice cream he ate in the States. *De* in (c), in contrast, is functioning within the frame of the story, i.e. at a local level.

Although the data illustrated above contains both *de* and *sorede*, co-occurrence of these two are not obligatory. In (10), N's story begins without any observable markers of transition:

(10) (NB/3/3-6)

- N: a. Atasi/ ano-/ kyanpasu no/ konaida/
I uh- campus LK on the other day
- b. anoo aisukuriimu no kappu no katta n desu yo.
uh- ice cream LK cup NOM bought NOM BE FP
'Uh-, on the other day, I bought ice cream the one in a cup on campus.'
- c. Ikura ka zenzen siranakute/
how much Q not at all knew-NEG-and
'I did not know how much it is,'
- d. **dee- dee/** ano- hazimete kattemitara/ 1.5?
and uh- for the first time bought-and-try-when
'And-, I bought it for the first time but it was a dollar fifty.'
- e. Kekkoo yasui na toka omotte.
quite cheap BE like thought-and
'I thought it's quite cheap.'
- f. Tiisai yatu ne?
small thing FP
'I mean the small one.'
- g. **De/** dekkai/ 2 bun no 1 garon?
and big part LK gallon
'And the big one, the half gallon one?'
- h. 2 bun no 1 garon de 2 doru 75?
part LK gallon per dollar
'the half gallon one is two dollars and 75 cents.'

- i. Dakara/ maamaa da to omotte.
 so decent BE QT think-and
 'So, I thought it's reasonable.'

N starts her story on buying ice cream in (a) without any transition markers.

Dee- dee in (d) signals that the following is linked to some prior units; in this context, the following is linked to (a-b). The background information (c) intervenes between these two units. Other units (d-f) and (g-i) are coordinated by *de*, the price of the small cup and the one of half gallon. N continues her story as follows:

(11) (NB/3/9-10)

N: a. *D e/ demo nee/ kono aida ittara nee/*
 and but FP on the other day went-when FP
 'But when I went there a few days ago,'

b. *bataapiikan ga nakutte/*
 butter pecan S exited-NEG-and
 'they didn't have butter pecan!'

c. *kanasikute/ okasii naa/ nande nai n daroo tte/*
 sad-and strange FP why exist-NEG NOM BE QT
 'It made me sad and I wondered why there's no butter pecan.'

De in (a) coordinates the following not with a part of (10), but the whole story of (10), the first visit to the dairy store.

As examined in this section, *(sore)de* plays an important role as a discourse coordinator in Japanese, in a similar way that its English counterpart *and* does. By using *(sore)de*, the speaker points out that an upcoming unit needs to be coordinated with some prior unit in the previous discourse. As *and* works at both global and local levels in English discourse, *(sore)de* also functions at both levels. However, there are some differences between *de* and *sorede* in terms of the domain in which they operate: *sorede* prefers to work at a global level, i.e. when starting a story, shifting the topic, while *de* tends to function at a local level, i.e. when connecting narrative clauses and other units which are usually within the domain bracketed by *sorede*. Thus, the distinction

between *sorede* and *de* provides us with key information to understand the organization of discourse. However, the use of contextual information is still needed to identify what is coordinated

4.2.3b Speaker's continuation

(*Sore*)*de* plays an important interactional role as well: (*sore*)*de* signals the speaker's continuation, which operates on the action and the exchange structure, as its English counterpart *and* does. This type of function is most clearly illustrated in environments such as (A) co-occurrence with other markers, and (B) in combination with fillers.

(A) Multiple usage of conjunctions

De, but not *sorede*, sometimes occurs in environments in which it immediately precedes other markers. In (12), B is explaining why Disney World was built in Orlando after Disneyland in Los Angeles.

(12) (NB/5/3-13)

- B:
- a. *Sorede/ zibun no risoo to hodotooi tokoro ni natta to./*
so self LK ideal far from place became QT
'So Disneyland became far from his ideal place.'
 - b. *Nanka koo hora/ huriwei o orite saa/*
like this look freeway O get out FP
 - c. *nanka koo-/ isi no/ ne?/*
like this stone LK FP
 - d. *Nanka hokorippoi miti o zuuto hasitteiku to/*
like dusty road O throughout drive-and-go if
 - e. *Dizuniirando ga aru tte yuu no wa/*
Disneyland S exist QT say NOM T
 - f. *doomo risoo ni husawasikunai kara saa.*
somehow ideal appropriate-NEG so FP
'Like, you know, it's not appropriate for an ideal place if

Disneyland is in a place where people need to drive through dusty roads with stones after the freeway exit.'

g. Sonzyaa nee/
if so FP

h. kondo atarasiku Dizuniiwaarundo o tukutte saa/
this time new Disney World O make-and FP

i. sono mawari ni-/ sono mawari o zenbu/ ano-/
that around that around O all well

j. zibun no omoidoori ni sityau./
self LK to one's satisfaction do
'If that is the case, construct Disney World this time and as
for the neighborhood, do just the way he wants to do.'

(N1: Huun.)
uh huh
'Uh huh.'

B: k. De sorede/ kekkyoku/ Dizuniiwaarudo o tukuru toki ni/
so after all Disney World O make time at
'So, after all, when they built Disney World,'

l. Dizuniiwaarudo no toti no mawari ni/
LK property LK around at

m. sono Dizuniiwaarudo no sikiti no 10 bai no toti o katte/
that Disney World LK site LK times LK land O buy-and
'they bought the property around Disney World 10 times as big
as Disney World itself and,'

n. de sore o zenbu sono-/ nante yuu no?/
and that O all well what say FP
'and all of them uh... what should I say?'

p. Sono sikiti nai o katteni sasenai./
that site inside O freely do-CAU-NEG
'won't let anybody do anything inside the property.'

In the previous talk, B explained that Disney and his company could not do anything about the neighborhood although they could control the environment inside Disneyland -- many unexpected and undesirable buildings were constructed after Disneyland was made. Therefore, *Disneyland became far from his ideal place*, as in (a). B gives background explanation as in (b-f). In

order for Disney and his company to overcome the previous problem, a new plan, Disney World, was developed, as in (g-j). *Sorede* in (k) indicates that all these previous statements in (a-j) are the reason for the following (k-o): why *they bought the property around Disney World 10 times as big as Disney World itself*. On the contrary, *de* in (k) is void of semantic content: it just signals B's intention to continue his turn.

In the following example, N is explaining that people in her hometown do farming as a side business:

(13) (NB/6/21-24)

N: a. Al uti wa anoo-/ kengyoo nooka ooi?/
oh home T uh side business farmer many
'Oh! There are many people who do farming as side business
in my hometown.'

B: b. Maa koozyoo ooi n dattara nee./
well factory many NOM BE-if FP
'Well, it's understandable if there are many factories (around
there).'

N: c. Soo. **Dee**-/ dakara/
yes so

d. hatake toka tanbo toka wa/ kisetu dake./
field or rice field or T season only
'Yes. Uh...so, vegetables and rice farming are (available)
only during the crop season.'

In (a), N tells that neighbors in her hometown do farming as a side business, then B comments that the fact is understandable since there are many factories around the area. *Dakara* in (c) signals that a supplementary explanation starts: farm work is done only during crop season, which connotes that people put minimum effort into their farm since they have full-time jobs in the factories. *Dee* in (c) is simply used to signal the speaker has something more to say; the way *de* is pronounced, i.e. lengthened way shows her intention to keep the floor.

(B) Combination with fillers

Other evidence that *(sore)de* shows the speaker's continuation is the use of *(sore)de* in combination with fillers. Brown (1983:12-13) defines fillers as expressions used to fill in pauses, such as *well*, *erm*, and *so on*. Maynard (1989:30) categorizes fillers into two groups according to the motivation for their use: (1) language-production-based fillers which are used when smooth speech is either cognitively or productively hindered, and (2) socially motivated fillers which are used to fill a potential silence and avoid potential embarrassment. She lists *uuunto*, *are*, and *hora* 'Uhh...that,' as part of the first group, and *nanka* 'well,' in the second group. Thus, the use of fillers is one of the devices to show the speaker's intention to talk rather than to stop talking. As examined previously, *(sore)de* signals speaker continuation as well. Therefore, the combination of *(sore)de* and fillers is an understandable strategy for the speaker to signal his or her intention to continue.

In (14), M talks about a story when he called one of their acquaintance:

(14) (MA/2/39-40)

M: a. **Sorede** anoo/ nee/ ree no/ anoo- *nanka*/
uh that LK uh well

b. imooto to ootoo ga anoo/
younger sister and younger brother S uh

c. kookoo no sotugyoosiki de nee/ hora
high school LK graduation day BE FP uhh
'Uh-, I called that person... it was a graduation day for her
brother and sister, uhh...'

((M continues))

Sorede at initial position in (a) marks M's intention to talk. If he did not have the desire to talk, he would not need to fill empty slots with fillers such as *anoo*, and *nanka* while he was trying to find words

***De* also occurs in similar environments. (5) is repeated:**

(5) (MA/8/17-21):

c. Sorede/ konoaida anoo/ take ni kite nee/
on the other day uh came to install-and FP
'A man came to install it on the other day.'

(A4: Ee.)
Yes
'Uh huh.'

**d. De/ sositara/ anoo/
and then uh
'And, then, uh-,'
((M continues his story.))**

M's story starts at (c); *de* in (d) marks M's intention to keep the turn in order to tell the story.

The excerpt in (15) is a continuation of (13). After (13), B asked N how much land the average farmers owns. The question led N to digress from B's original question to talk about some related historical fact -- how the tenant farmers got land for free from the landlords by a policy called the Agricultural Land Reform after World War II .

(15) (NB/7/4-8)

N: a. De/ dakara/ so

b. mukasi no zinusi mitaina no ga otibureta tte./
old days LK landlord like NOM S fell low QT
'So the landlord in old days went down in the world, they say.'

c. Demo/ ano-/ nan desyoo ne?/
but well what BE FP
'But, what it would be?'

d. Dore kurai desyoo ne?/
how much about BE FP
'How much would that be?'

e. Metyakutya arimasen yo?
a lot exist-NEG FP
'Not much.'

- f. Ano-/ sukosi zutu./
 well little by little
 'Well, everybody owns little.'
- g. Maa/ dakara./
 well so
 'well, so,'
- h. Demo/ minna/ sono tanbo to hatake dake de wa
 but everyone that ricefield and field only by T
- i. zettai seekatu sitekemasen yo?/
 definitely living do-can-NEG FP
 'but nobody can support their living only with their farm.'
- j. Dakara/ kekkyoku kengyoo nooka bakkari...../
 so after all side business farmer only
 'so that's why everybody does farming as side business,'
- k. Un/ de.. un-/
 uh- uh-
 'yeah, yeah.'

Although N is knowledgeable about the digressed topic in (a-b), N does not provide a clear answer for the original question raised by B; all N could do is give information which might help B to get some rough idea, as in from (d-j). Finally, N can not offer any further information in (n): *de*, connecting two filler expressions *nnn* signals N's intention to continue to talk and hold her turn even though she ends up failing to do so.

(16) is another example of *de* usage which is adjacent to two fillers. M asked A whether it is hard to get a ticket for a baseball game in Chicago:

(16) (MA/2/27-30)

M: a. Toremasu? Ken./
 get-can ticket
 'Can you get a ticket?'

A: b. Ken-/ dakara/ ima are ga-/ konmae itta toki nii/
 ticket so now that S last time went time at

c. nakatta n desu yo/ siai ga./
 existed-NEG NOM BE FP game S
 'Ticket.. well there was no game when I went there last time.'

- d. **De/** anoo/ henna kaado dake moratte/
and well strange card only got-and
- e. sukezyuuru dake moratte./
schedule only got-and
'I only got a strange card, only got a schedule.'
- f. **Dakara/** ato denwa de kiite/
so later telephone by ask-and
'So I'll call later and ask,'
- g. n **de** nnn./
hm hmm
'hmmmm.'

A explains what happened last time when he tried to watch a game in (b-e) so that he knows what he needs to do, in (f), *So I'll call later and ask*. Since A has not yet answered M's question *Can you get a ticket?*, it seems that A tried to answer in (g); thus, *de* in (g) marks the speaker's continuation. However, the answer is understandable, i.e. A call the place, and if they have a ticket, he'll buy it, if they don't have any, he can't get it. Since it is too obvious, it seems that A simply did not continue to give redundant information although he was originally planning to talk.

In contrast to the expression *nnn de nnn*, other markers are never followed by the filler *nnn* in the collected data. In addition, there is further supporting evidence which illustrates *de* as a marker of continuation, while other markers do not play such a function. Other markers may appear at 'transition-relevant place (TRP)' (Sacks et al. 1974). Thus, it seems to be acceptable to yield a turn as in (17), (18), and (19):

(17) (TK/6/1-3)

K: a. Aa. **Demo-/**
oh but
'Oh, but,'

T: b. **De/** sore ni hikooki o take temo 100 doru de sunzyau tte
and that airplane O add though dollar for enough QT

- c. yuu koto wa/ kanari yasui desyo?/
 thing T quite cheap BE
 'Isn't it quite cheap that \$100 is enough (to go to Mexico)
 including the air fare?'

(18) (TK/6/13-14)

- T: a. 100 doru-/puremiamu ni nattyau n desu yo./
 dollar premium become NOM BE FP
 'Air fare goes up \$100 more, you know.'

- b. **Dakara-**
 so
 'So.'

- K: c. Nanka hantai ka to omotta./
 somehow opposite Q QT thought
 'I thought it's the other way around.'

(19) (YR/3/17-19)

- Y: a. Soo./
 right
 'Right.'

- R: b. **Datte-**
 because
 'Because-'

- Y: c. Hayasi-sensee mo da yo?/
 Mr. Hayashi also BE FP
 'Mr. Hayashi, too.'

Other markers are sometimes situated in simultaneous speech as in (20):

(20) (BN/6/24-26) (continuation of (15))

- N: a. **Da[kara-**
 so
 'So-'

- B: b. [Dakara da yoo./ Kengyoo da kara./
 so BE FP side business farmer BE so
 'So they are side business farmers, that's why.'

Only one incident of *de* is found in simultaneous speech as in (21). However, it is a case of a 'false start,' in which the participants start talking at the same time:

(21) (TK/6/41-45)

- T: a. Zyaa/ soide-/ mukoo ryokoo site/
 well then and over there travel do-and
 'Well then, you (are going to) travel over there,'

b. sorede/
and
'and,'

c. Nihon ni mo kaerazu kotti ni/
Japan to NEG go back-NEG here at
'(you stay) here without going back to Japan,'

(K1: Un.)
yes
'Yeah'

T: d. sono mama-/
leave-as-it-is

K: e. Un. [De so-
yes and
'Yes, and-'

T: f. [Santafe itte/ Gurando kyanion-
Santa Fe go-and Grand Canyon
'(You are going to) Santa Fe and go to Grand Canyon-'

K: g. Un. Gurando kyanion itte/
yes Grand Canyon go-and
'Yes, (I'm going to) Grand Canyon and,'

h. de/ Ransingu modottekite/
and Lansing return-and
'and then come back to Lansing,'
((K continues))

K uses a back-channel expression between (c) and (d), so T seems to have misunderstood K's attempt at his turn in (e) as another instance of back-channeling even though K is trying to continue. Thus, (e) and (f) are a case of a 'false start,' not a turn-yielding attempt.

Other markers can be used at the end of units, whereas in the collected data, (sore)de is never used in such a position.

(22) (MA/9/14-15)

A: a. Kotti no hoo wa suusuu desyo./
this LK T cool TAG
'This side is cool, isn't it?'

M: b. **Dakara...ne./**
 so TAG
 'So.'

(23) (MA/10/1-2)

M: a. Ee/ soredee/ nee/ koko ni irete/
 yes and here at put
 'Yes, and I put (a computer desk) here.'

b. soidee/ ato nimotu o irete-/ panpan desita yo./
 and other stuff O put stuffed BE FP
 'and I put other stuff, it was full.'

c. **Dakara- (5)/**
 so
 'so.'

Thus, *(sore)de* seldom appears at a TRP while other markers may. This distributional difference between *(sore)de* and other markers tells their functional difference; while *(sore)de* signals speaker's continuation others do not.

4.2.3c Eliciting other's speech

In addition to functioning as a structural coordinator of ideas and a marker of speaker continuation, *(sore)de* has another role. As described in *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*, *(sore)de* is used to signal one's request for further information, especially when prefaced to questions. Although Heritage (1994) observes *and* as a feature of questions, he claims that it is typically used in 'institutional' settings such as law courts and certain types of medical encounter, but is rare in ordinary conversation between peers or acquaintances (p. 1). However, these data reveal that the Japanese counterpart *(sore)de* functions even in ordinary conversation. This use of *(sore)de* operates on the action and exchange structure as well as on participant framework. Here, (4) is repeated.

(4) (YR/1/4-5)

R: a. Huun. **De** higaeri?/
uh huh day trip
'Uh huh. Was it a day's trip?'

Y: b. Uun./ Ippaku site./
No one night did-and
'No, we stayed a night.'

Before this excerpt, Y only mentioned that he went to an outlet mall on the weekend. *De* at the initial position of R's question in (a) signals R's request for more information, at the same time, showing R's personal interest and/or 'involvement' (Tannen 1989) in Y's story. In fact, Y provides not only the answer for R's question (*No, we stayed a night*), but he further describes where he and his family visited in detail in (4c-g). Thus, *de* in (a) signals not only R's request which is related to the action structure, but also R's involvement which operates on the participation framework.

(24) is a continuation of (7). Y is explaining what all the other co-workers have been doing after R left.

(24) (YR/3&4/42-1)

Y: a. Uun/ Minato sensee/ sitteru tokoro de ieba nee/
no teacher know-ing part at say-if FP

b. Mori sensee desyoo/ Nisi sensee desyoo../
teacher BE teacher BE

c. Naka sensee mo detyatta si/
teacher also left also
'No, the teachers you know (who are still there) are Mr. Minato, Mrs. Mori, Mr. Nishi. Mr. Naka has transferred to another school, too.'

R: d. A hontoo./
oh true
'Oh really.'

Y: e. Kooryoo itta n daa./
went NOM BE
'He transferred to Kooryoo Junior High school.'

- R: f. **De** kyootoo?/
 assistant principal
 'So is he an assistant principal?'
- Y: g. Uun/ iyaa tigau tigau./ ((laughter))
 no no wrong wrong
 'No, no, he is not.'

Prior to this exchange, Y was saying that many senior co-workers now work as assistant principals in various schools. As Mr. Naka, who is mentioned in (c) is about the same age as the other teachers who became assistant principals, R really wants to know whether he also got the position. Thus, the initial *de* in (e) signals R's intention to elicit more information from Y.

Sorede also functions as an elicitor. In (25), Y asks R about her plan after the graduation:

(25) (YR/5/11)

- Y: a. Aa/ **sorede** kekkyoku nani? Natu ni sotugyoo?
 oh after all what summer in graduate
 'Oh, so... Are you going to graduate in summer?'

Sorede functions as an elicitor, but at the same time, it sends a 'meta-message' (Tannen 1989) -- Y's personal interest in and care for R.

As illustrated in (4), (24), and (25), *(sore)de* is a marker of a speaker's request for further information. In addition, *(sore)de* seems to have another function besides playing as an elicitor, i.e. it sometimes signals the speaker's personal involvement and interest in the upcoming information, the other participant's talk. The speech act of request for more information conveys positive interpersonal effect between the speaker and the hearer. Thus, *(sore)de* works on the participation framework which deals with speaker/hearer relations, as well as speaker/utterance relations.

4.2.3d Coordination, continuation, and involvement

Sometimes (*sore*)*de* plays roles of coordination, speaker's continuation, and eliciting an other's talk, simultaneously. Here, (4) is repeated below.

(4) (YR/1/4-7)

- R: a. Huun./ **De** higaeri?/
uh huh day trip
'Uh huh. Was it a day trip?'
- Y: b. Uun./ Ippaku site./
No one night did-and
'No, we stayed a night.'
- c. **Nde** Huriipooto e itte/
Freeport to went-and
'And (on the following day), we went to Freeport/'
- d. **de** Aakeezia kokuritukooen tte aru n da yo ne./
Arcadia national park QT exist NOM BE FP FP
- e. Soko itte.. /
there went-and
'And we went to a place called Arcadia National Park,'
- f. un/ **de** kaette kite/
yes return-and-came
'and we came back,'
- g. kinoo no yonaka no iti zi goro kaette kita.
yesterday LK midnight LK 1 o'clock around return- and came
'we came back around one o'clock last night.'

This is a simple story about what Y and his family did on a weekend. Before this excerpt, Y only mentioned that he went to a outlet mall on the weekend. *De* in (a) plays multiple functions: it marks the speaker's intention to continue the turn as well as the speaker's request for further information. In addition, *de* brackets the prior talk (Y's story) and the upcoming talk (R's question). Thus, *de* functions on the action structure (speaker continuation and request), the exchange structure (continuation), as well as participation framework (personal interest and involvement). *De* and its variant *nde* in (c), (d), and (f), on the other hand, coordinate more local level of units, which Schiffirin (1987: 135)

describes as the 'most local level of idea structure.' Again, these *de*, signal the speaker's intention to continue his or her turn simultaneously.

As illustrated above, the Japanese conjunction (*sore*)*de* works as a discourse marker. It marks structural coordination of ideas and speaker's continuation, which function on the action and the exchange structures. The data reveal that there are some difference between *sorede* and *de* in terms of the level of units they coordinate. *Sorede* tends to coordinate global level of units, while *de* tends to connect local level of units such as narrative clauses. In addition, (*sore*)*de* functions to elicit the other interlocutor's continuation and to signal the speaker's request for further information when prefaced to questions. In the collected data, this type of use of (*sore*)*de* operates on participation framework as well since it displays the speakers positive attitude toward the another participant. Figure 4. 1 and 4.2 summarize the functions of (*sore*)*de* as a discourse marker

Information state	Participation framework	Ideational structure	Action structure	Exchange structure
	(<i>sore</i>) <i>de</i>	(<i>sore</i>) <i>de</i>	(<i>sore</i>) <i>de</i>	(<i>sore</i>) <i>de</i>

Figure 4.1 Planes of talk on which (*sore*)*de* functions

	Participation Coordinates speaker/hearer	Textual Coordinates prior/upcoming
(<i>sore</i>) <i>de</i>	speaker/hearer	prior/upcoming

Figure 4.2 Discourse marker as contextual coordinates

CHAPTER V

Analysis of the functions of *(sore)de* as a discourse marker

This section analyzes the reason why *(sore)de* is the most frequently used discourse marker (5.1); and how sociolinguistic variables affect the use of *(sore)de* in (5.2). The difference between *sorede* and *de* is also discussed.

5.1 High frequency of *(sore)de*

As described in the previous chapter, *(sore)de* was the most frequently used mode of connection in the collected data. This is the same as the results reported in the literature on English *and* (Schiffrin 1987) as well as on Japanese (NLRI 1955, cited in Onodera 1993). Frequent use of *(sore)de* seems to be related to the nature of the functions it plays since the functions of *(sore)de* are less marked than other discourse markers, such as *demo*, *dakedo* 'but,' *datte* 'because,' and *dakara* 'so, therefore.'

5.1.1 Coordination and continuation

Compared to other markers, *(sore)de* plays more fundamental roles as a discourse marker: it coordinates ideas and marks speaker's continuation. The data suggest that *(sore)de* seems to be a less marked mode of connection. Schiffrin (1987: 128), for example, explains that the frequent use of *and* correlates to its relatively less restricted distribution when contrasted to other connectors, such as *but* and *so*. The same tendency is observed in the Japanese counterpart: *(sore)de* occurred in the environments in which *demo*, *dakedo* 'but,' and *dakara* 'so, therefore' might be used. However, the roles which *(sore)de* plays are distinct from the ones of other markers. Since the

functions of other markers are more specific (*demo*, *dakedo* 'but' mark contrastive action, *datte* 'but, because' expresses reason with the tone of self-justification, and *dakara* 'so, therefore' expresses reason while signaling supplementary explanation follows), it seems to me that speakers select these discourse markers in order to maximize what he or she wants to say. For example, a unit in which a speaker expresses a reason of self-justification is most likely preceded by *datte* 'because.' On the other hand, *(sore)de* seems not to have such restrictions since it marks more basic functions in interaction, such as structural coordination and speaker's continuation. Thus, *(sore)de* does not have to be as sensitive to the content and context in which it may occur as other markers need to be. That *(sore)de* brackets the discourse units in more general ways than the other markers, and that it signals speaker's intention to continue, which is a crucial task in simultaneous speech, seem to indicate why *(sore)de* is used more frequently than any other markers.

5.1.2 *Sorede* vs. *de*

Although *sorede* and *de* have been treated as variants in this study, this section focuses on the difference between the two. When I started this study, I assumed that *de* was simply a variant of *sorede*. However, the results of this study suggest that there are differences between them.

First, there exists asymmetrical distribution between *sorede* and *de* as mentioned in (4.1, see Table 4.1): *de* is more frequently used than *sorede* (142 and 37 tokens, respectively). For example, nine out of twelve tokens of elicitor usage were *de*, while only two were *sorede*; *de* seems be a more preferred marker to function when eliciting an interlocutor's continuation.

Second, the distributional difference reflects the functional difference between these two markers when they signal coordination and continuation. As

described in (4.2.2a), the domains which *sorede* and *de* coordinate seem to be different; for example, *sorede* seems to prefer coordinating global level of units, while *de* seems to prefer coordinating local level of units such as narrative clauses and other smaller units. When *sorede* and *de* mark continuation, *de* seems to be the first choice. This is well illustrated when these two are adjacent, in other words when they co-occur. (1) is repeated here from (4.2.3c):

(1) (NB/5/10) (repetition of (12) from (4.2.3c))

B: I. *De sorede/ kekkyoku/ Dizuniiwaarudo o tukuru toki ni/*
 so after all Disney World O construct time at
 'So, after all, when they construct Disney World,'
 ((B continues his explanation))

Here, *sorede* is indicating 'reason/cause' as its main semantic property, while *de* is functioning as a marker of speaker continuation. There are no sequences such as *sorede de* observed in the collected data. Moreover, there are no multiple usage starting with *sorede*, whereas several other examples starting with *de* were found in data. This seems to indicate that *de* is a more established marker to signal speaker's continuation than *sorede*.

These observations reveal that *sorede* and *de* serve distinct functions. Thus, in spite of the fact that *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* (1979) defines *de* as an abbreviated form of *sorede*, *de* needs to be recognized independently from *sorede*.

5.2 Sociolinguistic variables

In this section, the use of *sorede* and *de* are examined in terms of the sociolinguistic variables: interactional factors (5.2.1), such as genre (5.2.1.1), situation and relations (5.2.1.2); and individual characteristics (5.2.2), focused on the sex of the participants.

5.2.1 Interactional factors

5.2.1.1 Genre

5.2.1.1a Written vs. spoken discourse

The characteristics of spoken and written discourse provide an explanation for the frequent use of *de*. Brown and Yule (1983: 14-19) summarize the differences in structures between spoken and written language. According to them, some of the characteristics of spoken language are: (1) it tends to be much less structured, i.e. it typically contains rather little subordination, and (2) the largely paratactically organized chunks are related by *and*, *but*, *then*, and, more rarely, *if*. In addition, Clancy (1982, cited in Maynard 1989) points out that in Japanese the tendency for fragmentation seems to be expressed to an even greater degree than in a comparable American English situation. Since spoken discourse prefers simplified structures, *de* is chosen to coordinate these relatively less structured and simplified units; at the same time, the speaker can signal his or her intention of continuation.

Because of the difference in structural organization between spoken and written discourse, some lexical items are preferred in one but not the other. *De* seems to be preferred in spoken discourse, but not *sorede*. NLRI's research (1955, cited in Onodera 1993: 9-11) reports that *de* ranks twentieth in written language (in a journal) even though it ranks first in spoken language; items used frequently in spoken Japanese are used infrequently in written Japanese. For example, *demo* and *dakedo* 'but' are commonly used in spoken discourse, while *sikasi* 'but' is used in written discourse. It seems that the distributional difference between *de* and *sorede* might be parallel to the differences between *sikasi* and *demo*, *dakedo*.

5.2.1.1b Narrative vs. non-narrative

The characteristics of spoken language are further realized in condensed fashion in narratives as opposed to non-narratives, especially, the use of simple structures. As mentioned in (4.2.2b), a narrative is defined as 'one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred' (Labov 1972:359-360). According to Labov (p. 363), a fully formed narrative may display the following:

1. Abstract.
2. Orientation.
3. Complicating action.
4. Evaluation.
5. Result or resolution.
6. Coda.

In the collected data, however, such a fully formed narrative is rare. Instead, most of the narratives contain only some of the elements which Labov proposed. Some of the narratives consist of one 'narrative clause.' As Labov suggests, the structure of narrative clauses is simpler than non-narrative spoken segments. As discussed in (4.2.2b), narrative clauses are usually connected with *de*, while global level of units, such as topic shift and return from a digression, are marked by *sorede*. Thus, *sorede* and *de* are used more often in narrative segments than in non-narrative segments. In addition to the structural need in narratives for *sorede* and *de*, there are other motivations arising from an interactional need, namely, speakers must demonstrate their intention to talk. Since speakers need to sustain longer turns in narrative segments than in non-narratives, *sorede* and *de* seem to have a dual roles: signaling the speaker's continuation as well as connecting clauses. For these two reasons, *sorede* and *de* seem to be used more frequently in narratives

than non-narrative text. The data support this tendency. Table 5.1 summarizes the frequency of *sorede* and *de* in a 100 word segment of the data.

Table 5.1 Frequency of *sorede* and *de* in 100 words

participant	narrative	non-narrative
M (male)	5 (2)	1
N (female)	4 (0)	2

5.2.1.2 Situations & Relations

According to Ide (1991), there is no neutral expression to say 'go' in Japanese; it depends on situations and relations between the speaker and the addressee. She states that 'we can easily list a few dozens of variants of a word, say "go," which show some difference of polite level' (p. 78). Some of the factors that determine the levels of speech in Japanese are (1) the nature of the addressee (e.g. social status, age, power, and the formality of participants), (2) the formality of the occasion, and (3) the nature of the topic (Ide 1982: 366-77). The use of *sorede* and *de* might to be influenced by the situation: either formal or informal.

Shibatani (1991: 359) describes that a speech-writing continuum along the formality parameter. As discussed in (5.2.1.1a), *de* is frequently used in spoken discourse, but it is rarely used in written text. As opposed to *de*, *sorede* is not frequently used in spoken data. This result seems to follow Shibatani's formality parameter.

The data were collected among relatively close friends who are mostly graduate students, and, as a result, their conversations were casual. Although the present study does not include other situations such as student-professor interaction, it is assumed that students talk differently when talking to a professor since it is recognized as a more formal situation because of the nature

of the addressee and the situation, as Ide points out. Students may try not to use *de* when addressing a professor since it sounds too casual. *De* seems to be inappropriate in business situations as well since it sounds very unprofessional. Since *de* belongs to the lexical items for informal situations, it was used much more frequently than *sorede* in the present study. In contrast, *sorede* would be used more often in more formal settings.

5.2.2 Individual characteristics

Although individual characteristics such as age and region may be other variables which might effect the use of *sorede* and *de*, these factors were not controlled in the present study. In this section, the examination focuses on the gender of the participants.

First, there exists a distributional difference between males and females in the use of *sorede* and *de*. As mentioned in (4.1), there was a difference in the occurrence of *sorede* between males and females (33 and 4, respectively). However, the occurrence of *de* was symmetrical between males and females (70 and 72, respectively). Table 5.1 summarizes the frequency of *sorede* and *de*.

Table 5.2 Frequency of *sorede* and *de*

	<i>de</i>	<i>sorede</i>	TOTAL
MALE	70	33	103
FEMALE	72	4	76

Second, the difference is observed not only in the frequency, but also in the manner that *sorede* was used by males and females. Among females, three out of four uses of *sorede* were to show a reason/cause relation, which is the traditional usage. On the other hand, males used *sorede* in various ways

(e.g. elicitor, continuation, and coordination as well as reason/cause). For example, as examined in (4.2.3a), *sorede* coordinates units at the global level; men used *sorede* when starting a story, returning from a digression.

Nevertheless, no such usage was observed among women. Among women, both global and local units are coordinated by *de*. Thus, the status of *sorede* as a discourse marker seems to be more established among men, but not among women.

These differences seem to be very interesting since in sociolinguistic literature, it is women who are more likely to use the prestige 'standard' forms than men (Trudgill 1972). However, it seems that it is men who use *sorede* as a discourse marker in the collected data although it is supposed to be a more standard form than *de* which women preferred. This parallels to Reynolds (1991: 136) analysis of *sikasi* and *demo*:

...the use of *sikasi*, the conjunction 'however/but' commonly used in male speech/public discourse, instead of *desukere-do*, *kere-do*, *kedo*, *demo*, conjunctions with the same semantic function as *sikasi* but more commonly used in female/ conversational discourse.

One of the possible reasons for this may be that *sorede* may connote some formality and, as a result, it also displays distance because *de* is exclusively used in spoken discourse whereas *sorede* can be used both spoken and written discourse. Tannen (1990: 77) points out that men's style of talk is 'report-talk,' talk is a means to preserve independence and negotiate and maintain status in a hierarchical social order. While women's style of talk is 'rapport-talk,' language is for rapport. If the use of *sorede* connotes formality and therefore, distance and difference, it does not show closeness or involvement. As a result, it does not sound 'soft.' Women's tendency not to use *sorede* might be related to its use by men. This might be one of the reasons

why *sorede* is used as a discourse marker among male speakers but not among female speaker.

There are two more questions which have not been answered yet: (1) why both men and women used more discourse markers in cross-sex pairs than same-sex pairs, and (2) why men used more *sorede* in cross-sex dyads, while women used less in the same situation.

It has been argued that males and females belong to different sub-cultures, hence they use different strategies in discourse (Maltz and Borker 1982, Tannen 1982). As mentioned earlier, men's talk is 'report-talk,' while women's talk is rapport-talk.' Tannen (1990) suggests men and women misunderstand each other due to their differences in 'conversational style.' In order to avoid misunderstanding, both men and women need to put extra energy and devices to communicate effectively when talking to opposite-sex partners. I think the use of discourse markers may be one of the devices used to maximize communicative effect. As Schiffrin suggests (1987:323), discourse markers provide information on the relation between the prior text and upcoming (textual coordinates) as well as speaker and hearer (participation coordinates). By using *sorede* and *de* frequently, interlocutors are signaling cues for their intention of continuation as well as marking textual coordination.

The choice of discourse markers, especially *sorede*, might be signaling an additional message. Saito (1992) argues that an overuse of *dakara* 'so, therefore' gives the impression that the speaker is very aggressive. The use of *sorede* might be perceived as more formal (since it is more likely to be used in written form), and as a result, connotes some difference and distance, which is related to 'men's talk.' It is interesting that men displayed their 'masculinity' by using *sorede* more in the cross-sex pairs, while women displayed less

masculinity (or more 'femininity') by avoiding the use of *sorede* in the same situation.

As discussed above, the use of *sorede* and *de* as discourse markers may vary depending on sociolinguistic variables such as genre, situations, relations, and individual characteristics (e.g. gender of the interlocutors). This seems to be deeply related to the Japanese culture.

CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

This section summarizes the findings, and discusses the limitations of the present study as well as suggestions for future study.

Schiffrin (1987:152) describes the functions of *and* as (1) a structural coordinator of units of talk and (2) a marker of speaker continuation. The data reveal that the Japanese counterparts *sorede* and *de* play the same roles and additional ones: *sorede* and *de* also function to elicit the other interlocutor's continuation and to mark the speaker's request for further information when prefaced to questions. Although both *sorede* and *de* play these three roles, there exist some difference between these two items. First, in terms of coordination, *sorede* and *de* seem to have preferences for the domains in which they coordinate. *Sorede* seems to prefer coordinating the global level of units, whereas *de* seems to prefer the local level of units. Second, with respect to the continuation and elicitor usage, *de* seems to be a more preferred item as a discourse marker than *sorede*. These results suggest that *de* is not just an abbreviated item of *sorede*.

Sorede and *de* share properties as markers of continuation with other markers, such as *demo*, *dakedo* 'but' and *datte* 'but, because' rather than relinquishment of turns. However, other markers signal more specifically what follows next: *demo*, *dakedo* 'but' signal contrasting action, and *datte* 'but, because' marks self-justification. Since *sorede* and *de* mark continuation, they did not occur at the 'transition-relevance place (TRP)' or at the end of the units.

There exist differences in terms of the gender of the participants in the use of *sorede* and *de*. Men's use of *sorede* reveals that *sorede* has status as a discourse marker, but it does not have that status among women. Men

distinguished the function of *sorede* and *de* when coordinating units: *sorede* for global level of units and *de* works more on the local level. Women's use of *sorede*, on the other hand, was rare. Women used *de* to coordinate both global and local levels of units. In addition, women seems to prefer using *sorede* to express the 'reason/cause' relation.

In terms of the frequency, both men and women used *sorede* and *de* more frequently with an opposite-sex partner. In addition, men's use of *sorede* increased more when talking to a female partner, than with another male, while women's use of *sorede* decreased in the same setting. Since *sorede* is supposed to be used more often in written discourse than in spoken discourse, the use of *sorede* connotes formality, distance, and difference. Tannen (1990: 77) argues that men's style of talk is 'report-talk,' talk is a means to preserve independence and negotiate and maintain status in a hierarchical social order. While women's style of talk is 'rapport-talk,' language is for rapport. If this is the case, then *sorede* is a lexical item which reflects men's talk. This might be one of the reasons why *sorede* was used more often by men, but not by women. Furthermore, the use of *sorede* increased when men talked to women, .

As discussed above, the Japanese conjunctions *sorede* and *de* play important roles as discourse markers which contribute to better understanding of textual cohesion while serving interactional tasks. In addition, in Japanese, sex-related differences are observed between *sorede* and *de* .

The present study examined only one genre of spoken discourse -- causal conversation between graduate students. Future study needs to consider other factors such as gender, age, situation, and relation and how they interact each other, in order to understand more clearly the roles of the discourse markers among Japanese.

APPENDICES

B: Oh! yeh!

Back-channel expressions in narratives are indicated in the parenthesis

8. When transcribing, not all morphemes are separated. Only those morphemes relatively important to the present study are separated with glosses given. when glossing, hyphens are used only when overt indication of the connection between grammatical and lexical elements is useful.

9. Following abbreviations are used:

BE copulative verb, be

CAU causative morpheme

FP final particle, such as *ne*, *yo*, and *saa*.

IO indirect object

LK linker (linking nominals and nominal adjectives)

NEG negative

NOM nominalizer

O direct object marker

Q question marker (assigned to final particle *ka* only)

QT quotative marker

S subject marker

T topic marker

TAG tag-question-like auxiliary verb forms (including *zyan*, *zya-nai*, *desyo*, *daroo*, etc.)

APPENDIX 2

Selected data

(MA/8/12-29)

M: Un un un un./ Soo ne./ (2) Iyaa boku mo/ atukute.. nee/ iyaa-/ moo taimai hataityaimasita yo./

A: Nani ga?/

M: Kuuraa nee/ iroiro anote konote de/ isya no sindansyo toka tukete=

A: Ee./ Ee./

M2: =moratte/ Sorede kyoka o totta n desu yo./ Totta wa ii n da kedo/=

A: Ee./

M3: =Sorede/ konoaida anoo/ tukenikite nee/ De/ sositara anoo/ sore

A: Ee./

M4: =yuzuttemoratta kuuraa nandakedo/ de/ kaette/ kore za tukanai tte.

A: Ee./ A

soo./

M: Iyaa/ moo sekkaku koko made kogituketa noni tte omotte/ MOO koko made yattara tuku sika nai tte/ kaini itta n desu yo./

A: Ee ee./ A! ((laughter))

M: Ee/ moo/ taimai/ 500 doru mo kakatta./

A: ((laughter))

M: Tukattyaimasita yo./

A: ((laughter))

(NB/4&5/35-13)

B: Dizuniwaarudo ga dekuru to saa/ kankyoo ga hozen sarerun da yo/ are./

N: Aa soo desu ka./

B: Are saa/ Dizuniwaarudo tte doo site tatta ka sitteru?/ Are sa/ kekkyoku/ Dizuniirando o tukutte saa/ anoo-/ Dizunii ga Dizuniirando o tukutte/ kekkyoku/ Dizuniirando no naka tte yuu nowa/ jibun de sukina yoo ni koo/ sekkee ga dekiru wake da yo ne?/

N: Hai./

B: Dakedo/ kekkyoku asoko no-/ Anahaimu no atari tte saa/ anoo-/ dotti ka tte yuu to/ sonnani anmari fansiina tokoro za nai za nai./ Ano kinpen tte saa./

N: Un un./

B: Sorede saa/ mawari ni saa/ sonoo-/ nante yuu no?/ Dizunii ga kangaete nakatta yoo na/ kankyoo ga dandan dekite kitate saa/ ((unclear)) Sorede/ jibun no risoo to hodotooi tokoro ni natta to./ Nanka koo hora/ furiwei o orite saa/ nanka koo-/ isi no/ ne?/ nanka hokorippoi michi o zuuto hasitteikuto/ Dizuniirando ga aru tte yuu nowa/ doomo risoo ni fusawasikunai kara saa./ Sonzyaa nee/ kondo atarasiku Dizuniirando o tukutte saa/ sono mawari ni-/ sono mawari o zenbu/ ano-/ jibun no omoidoori ni sityau/

N: Fuun./

B: De sorede/ kekkyoku/ Dizuniwaarudo o tukuru toki ni/ Dizuniwaarudo no toti no mawari ni/ sono Dizuniwaarudo no sikiti

no 10 bai no toti o katte/ de sore o zenbu sono-/ nante yuu no?/ Sono sikici nai o katteni sasenai./

(YR/1-12)

- Y: De autoretto no omise ippai aruno./ Honde nee/ soko itte kita no./
 R: Soo kaa./
 Y: Un. soo./
 R: Fuun./ De higaeri?/
 Y: Uun./ Ippaku site./ Nde Furiipooto e itte/ de Aakeezia kokuritukooen tte arun da yo ne./ Soko itte/. un/ de kaette kite/ kinoo no yonaka no itii zi goro kaette kita./
 R: Samuku nakatta?/
 Y: N to nee/ kyoo-/ itiniti me sugoku samukutte/ demo kinoo sugoku hare te/ un sugoku yokatta./
 R: A honto. Soo ka./ Kotti wa sugoku samukatta./
 Y: ((laughter))

(YR/2,3&4/32-2)

- Y: Kyonen nee/ Sakagami sensee to nee/ issyo ni nee/ ututta no./
 R: Issyo ni ututta no?/ Aryaa./ li nee/ futari pea de./
 Y: Sosite saa/ uti no gakkoo no ongaku no sensee mo nee/ kono haru sotti ni ututta no./
 R: Uti no gakkoo tte?/
 Y: Meiji no./
 R: Anoo otoko no hito?/
 Y: A sitteru?/ Tuzuki sensee tte./
 R: Nanka hen na hito desyo?/ ((laughter))
 Y: ((laughter))
 R: Nanka myoo ni saa/ seeto no koto/ bakobako tataku toka saa./
 Y: A soo soo/ soo soo./ Sono hito/ (1) Ga ututte nee/ Meizi no rutubo to kasite iru no./ Sonde nee/ o- omosirai yo/ mada./ De kono haru nee/ Yosida sensee ga Meien ni modotte kita no./
 R: Usoo?!/ Nani/ kyootoo de?/
 Y: Soo./
 R: Doko itteta no./
 Y: To- to
 R: Kurisawa ka dokka?/
 Y1: Iya./ Takada syoogakkoo no kyootoo da tta no./ Un, dakara sinai idoo=
 R: Aa!/
 Y2: =bakkari./
 R: Demo-/ hee./
 Y1: N de nee/ mada aru yo./ Hada sensee ga nee/ Keesee no kyootoo=
 R: Nani/
 Y2: =nano./
 R: USOO!/
 Y: Honto./
 R: U-/ Tyotto taimu./ Kyootoo na no./
 Y: Soo da yo./ Ima made Tukizi no kyootoo da tta no./
 R: A hontoo ni./ Zaa ano nendai wa minna/ kyootoo ni natte simatta no ne?/

Y: Soo./
 R: Datte-/
 Y: Hasimoto sensee mo da yo?/
 R: Hasimoto sensee-/
 Y: Hasimoto sensee/ Hokusee-/ kana?/ Un/ Hokusee no kyootoo./
 R: Sugoi ne./
 Y: Un./ Sorekara-/
 R: Isogasii ne/ Meizi no sensee datta hito./
 Y: Tagawa sensee/ ninna taisyoku sita si./ Site Furuno sensee ga nee/ nnn
 Akagawa no kyootoo?/ Un/ soo./ Ano zidai wa dakara sugoi n da/
 dakara./nnn/ Meizi o tukkuta hitotati ga nee/
 R: Soo kaa./
 Y: Soo soo./ Dareka kikitai hito iru?/
 R: Dareka?/
 Y: Ato-/ Ato nee/ Kita san Isiyama ututta n da./ Un daa Meizi dare mo inai
 moo./ Ore no sitteru hito inai./
 R: Are itu ututta no?/
 Y: Ore?/
 R: Tigau tigau tigau./
 Y: Kita san?/
 R: Un/
 Y: Kita san kono haru./ Un soo/ Minato sensee ga ichiban furui n datte ima./
 R: A hontoo ni./
 Y: Un./
 R: Sika inai no?/
 Y: Uun/ Minato sensee/ sitteru tokoro de ieba nee/ Mori sensee de syoo?/
 Nisi sensee de shoo?/.Naka sensee mo detyatta sii/
 R: A hontoo./
 Y: Kooryoo itta n daa./
 R: De kyootoo?/
 Y: Uun/ iyaa tigau tigau./ ((laughter))
 R: ((laughter)) Tyo- tyotto yabai ne./

(NB/2,3&4/31-2)

N: Demo/ kono aida syabette ita no wa/ nanka/ Kyooto de kurumi
 aisukuriimu o tabetan desu yo./ De/ konna-/ konna tte ittatte/ tyokkee-/
 B: Sore tte-/
 N: 3 senti/ 5 senti mo nai./ 3 senti gurai/ no aisukuriimu no yama ga/ 500
 en./
 B: Takai yo./
 N: Un./ De/ kotti dato 5 doru?/ Honto wa motto/ 6 doru gurai desu yo nee/
 moo ima./ 6 doru aisukuriimu o saatiwan de-/ za nakutemo ii kedo/
 kyanpasu de-/
 B: Sore yori saa/ hora/ baketu no yatu kau to sugoi./ ((laughter))
 N: 6 doru bun kattara/ dore dake tabereru kanaa toka omotte./ Dee/ soo
 suru to nanka/ nihon ni kaettara nanimoto taberarenai naa tte omotte./
 B: Are wa nee/ baketu de kattara/ hito tuki taberareru./
 N: Baketu tte anoo/ kore gurai no yatu desho?/ Anoo-/ syaabetto toka
 haitteru yoo na./

- B: Soo soo soo./
- N: 3-/ 3 pondo no yatu?/
- B: Are-/ dakedo/ syaabetto dake za naku te/ aisukuriimu nomo aru yo?/
- N: Atasi/ ano-/ kyanpasu no/ konaida/ anoo-/ aisukuriimu no kappu no kattan desu yo./ Ikura ka zenzen siranakute/ dee-/ dee/ ano-/ hazimete katte mitara/ 1.5?/ kekkoo yasui na toka omotte./ Tiisai yatu ne?/ De/ dekkai/ 2 bun no 1 garon?/ 2 bun no 1 garon de 2 doru 75?/ Dakara/ maa maa da to omotte./ Motto takai imeezi ga atte./ Dee-/ kedo are/ konnan kattara nee/ anoo-/kondo kara sore ni siyoo kana tte omotte/ maiyaa toka de ironna no kau yori wa./ De/ demo nee/ konoaida ittara nee/ bataapiikan ga nakutte/ kanasikute/ okasiinaa/ nande nain daroo tte/
- B: Noriko san bataa suki nano?/
- N: Iya/
- B: Kekkoo/ kekkoo kau za nai./
- N: Bataapiikan wa./ Iyaa/ sore made wa tabeta koto nakute/ aru toki made/ bataapiikan./ De-/ mae nee/ ano-/ Rituko san ga/ anoo-/ waffurukoon ni/ bataapiikan to banira to ryooohoo irete/ tabesasete kureta toki atta desyo?/
- B: Aa/ atta nee./
- N: Minna de./ Antoki hazimete tabeta n desu yo./
- B: Aa hontoo./
- N: Un/ are kara KORE WA OISII toka omotte./ Sorekara bataapiikan sika kawanai tte./ A banira wa tokidoki kau kedo./
- B: Ore/ banira no hoo ga suki./
- N: Aa hontoo./ Mae wa nee/ tyokominto?/ bakari datta no./
- B: Demo/ konkai nee/ Amerika ni kite nee/ aisukuriimu wa nee/ anmari kangeki sinakatta./
- N: Mae wa kangeki sitan desu ka?/
- B: Soo. Mukasi nee/ hazimete Amerika ni kita toki saa/
- N: Aa...soo./
- B: Ano toozi nee/ ano toozi saa./ kekkoo mukasi no hanasi da kedo saa/ anoo-/ nante yuu no?/ Nihon ho gyuunyuu ga mada sugoku usukutte saa/
- N: Aa./
- B: Amerika no-/ Amerika no gyuunyuu ga mada/ unto kokatta zidai de saa/ de/ ima kattara sore koso/
- N: Gyaku desu yo nee?/
- B: De/ mae no saa/ mukasi no Amerika no gyuunyuu tte saa/ eraku kokatta no./ Nanka nikibi ga dekiru gurai kokatta no./
- N: 4.-/ 2 gurai?/
- B: Ai/ sonna tokoro za nai yo?/
- N: Motto?/
- B: Motto hidokatta yo?/
- N: Nihon de nookoo gyunyuu de/ 4.5 gurai desu yo ne?/ Seezee./ Nihon no nookoogyunyuu./
- B: Sorede saa/ ano-/ saisyo ne?/ Saisyo Honoruru ni tuita wake./ De/ minna ni sa/ mazu Honoruru ni tuitara nani suru?/ mazu aisukuriimu o kue tte./ Sorede/ nani ga umai tte kiitara/ painappuru ga umai tte./ Sorede saa/

tukunari itiban saisyo ni saa/ aisukuriimu o tabeta/(2) Kangeki simasita/
boku wa./

(NB/6&7/13-8)

- N: Soo./ Dakara/ (1).nanka uti no choo wa/ kekkoo anmari-/ yuuzyuufudan
tte yuu ka/ anmari toti ni sonna ni syuutyaku aru hito/ sonnani inai za nai
kana/ tte ittara are da kedo./
- B: Demo/ are desyo?/ Ano-/ uun to.. nani?/ daitai are?/ Anoo-/
- N: Sorekoso-/
- B: Hatake yatteru toka/ soo yuu hito?/
- N: Tanbo bakkari./
- B: Tanbo?/
- N: Ai/ uti wa anoo-/ kengyoo nooka ooi?/
- B: Maa koozyoo ooin dattara nee./
- N: Soo./ De...dakara/ hatake toka tanbo toka wa/ kisetu dake./ Demo/ uti de
taberu okome to/ aru teedo uru okome wa aru n desu yo ne?/ Da[kara-
[Dakara
- B: da yoo./ Kengyoo da kara./
- N: Un...Demo/ uti-/ uti mo soo desu kedo/ anmari-/ uruttatte seezee nee./
Hoondo-/
- B: Kengyoo tte mo saa/ hora-/ nante yuu no?/ Zissai niwa noosagyoo no
hoo ga syu de saa/ sorekara/ betu no hoo ga zuu tte yuu no to saa/ futuu
no/ maa/ nante yuu no?/ Koozyoo zutome nanka no ga syu de saa/
noosagyoo no hoo ga zyuu tte yuu no mo aru desyo?/ Dotti no hoo ga
ooi n desu?/
- N: Koosya./
- B: Dakara da yo./
- N: Dakara/ sigoto ga aru kara betu ni toti ga...nee./ Sore to/ uun.../ Doo nan
desyoo ne?/ Iya/ mukasi/ sono-/ watasi no-/
- B: Kibo wa ookii no?/ Kibo tte yuu ka/ toti no kibo./
- N: Hitori?/ 1 kken zutu no?/ Kekkoo aru to omoimasu yo?/ Ai/ tte yuu ka
Hokkaidoo hodo zya nai desu kedo./ Inaka-/ kinkoo noogyoo desu kara
nee./ Demo/ watasi/ tubo ga wakaranai n de/ sirimasen kedo/....doredake
nan de syoo ne?/ Nootikaikaku ga-/
- B: Nootikaikaku?/
- N: Arimasita yo ne?/ Sengo./ Are de/ daibu/ ironna hito ga/ toti motta kara/
- B: Naomi san/ oboeteru?/
- N: Oboetemasen yo./ Kiita hanasi ni yoru to/ anoo-/ zenbu-/ ne?/ Kosaku
noo hito ga zenbu/ toti o te ni ireta desyo?/ Tada de./
- B: Un..Tada?/
- N: Un/ tada./
- B: Hmmm. Soo yuu zidai ni umareteoku beki datta./
- N: De/ dakara/ mukasi no zimusi mitaina no ga otibureta tte./ Demo/ ano-/
nan desyoo ne?/ Dore kurai desyoo ne?/ Metyakutya arimasen yo?/
Ano-/ sukosi zutu./ Maa/ dakara./ Demo/ minna/ sono tanbo to hatake
dake dewa zettai seekatu sitekemasen yo?/ Dakara/ kekkyoku kengyoo
nooka bakkari..../Un/ de.. un-/

(YR/4&5/40-18)

- R: Iru./ Watasi nee/ natsu no aida ni nee/ sotugyoo suru yotee datta n
desu kedo/
Y: Un./
R: Nobimasita./ ((laughter))
Y: Nasita?/ Are wa?/ Siisasu wa?/
R: Siisasu wa nee/ natsu no aida ni kaku./
Y: A hontoo ni./
R: De nee/ natsu no aida ni sotugyoo-/ sotugyoo suru tumori da to-/
Y: Un./
R1: Anoo/ fanaru dorafuto o nee/ 6 gatu 30 nichi ni dasanakya nan na=
Y: Un./
R2: =katta n da.
Y: Un.
R1: De difensu o 7 gatu no gejun made yatte/ 8 gatu 5 ka ni anoo/ fainaru=
Y: Un./
R2: =baazyon o offisu ni teesyutu na no ne./ Watasi nee/ nan tta kke naa/
puroopoozaru o dasita no ga/ 4 gatu no sue datta kara-/
Y: Ara/ osokatta n daa./ ((laughter)) Aa/ sorede kekkyoku nani?/ Natsu ni
sotugyoo tyuu ka-/
R: Iyaa natsu ni-/ natsu no aida ni nee/ 8 gatu no atama gurai made ni
kaityatte/
Y: Un.
R: De ooraru difensu wa-/ Anoo/ aki gakki ni nobasu kedo-/
Y: Un./ Un./
R: Un...dakara/ osoku natyatta no./
Y: Un./ Un un un./ Aa/ honto ni./

LIST OF REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Allwood, Jens, Lars-Gunnar Andersson, and Östen Dahl. 1977. *Logic in Linguistics*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blimes, Jack. 1988. The concept of preference in conversation analysis. *Language in Society* 17. 161-181.
- Blakemore, Diane. 1987. *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. (Cambridge textbooks in Linguistics) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1980. The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative. *The pear stories*, by Wallace Chafe, 9-50. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- _____. 1985. Linguistic differences produced by differences between speaking and writing. *Literacy, language, and learning: The nature and consequences of reading and writing*, ed. by David R. Olson, Nancy Torrance, and Angela Hildyard, 105-123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Clancy, Patrica. 1982. Written and spoken style in Japanese narratives. *Spoken and written language*, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 55-76. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Cook, Haruko M. 1993. Functions of the filler *ano* in Japanese. *Japanese Korean Linguistics* (Vol. 3), ed. by Soonja Choi, 19-38. Stanford: SLA.
- Du Bois, John W., Susanna Cumming, Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, and Danae Paolino. 1992. *Discourse transcription*. (Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics Vol. 4). Santa Barbara, CA: Department of Linguistics, UC Santa Barbara.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1990. An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14.383-395.

- Grice, P. H. 1975. Logic and conversation. Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts, ed. by P. Cole and J. Morgan, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, John. (ed.) 1982. Language and social identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John. 1994. Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: *And-* prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society* 23. 1-29.
- Hinds, John. 1978. Conversational structure: An investigation based on Japanese interview discourse. Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics, ed. by John Hinds and I. Howard, 70-121. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Holmes, Janet. 1986. Function of '*you know*' in women's and men's speech. *Language in Society* 15.1-22.
- Ide, Sachiko. 1982. Japanese sociolinguistic: politeness and women's language. *Lingua* 57. 357-385.
- . 1991. How and why do women speak more politely in Japanese? Aspects of Japanese women's language, eds. by Sachiko Ide and Naomi Hanaoka McGloin, 63-79. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- Ide, Sachiko and Naomi Hanaoka McGloin.(ed.) 1991. Aspects of Japanese women's language. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- Karatsu, Mariko. 1994. A functional analysis of DEWA, DAKARA, and SIKASI in conversation. Paper presented at ATJ/MIT conference. University of Minnesota.
- Kindaichi, Kyoosuke, Umetomo Saeki, and Hatsutaro Ooishi. (ed.) 1974. *Shinsen Kokugo Jiten*. Tokyo: Shoogakkan.
- Kuno, Susumu 1973. The structure of the Japanese language. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Labov, William. 1972. Language in the inner city: studies in the black English vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Loveday, Leo. 1986. Japanese sociolinguistic.(Pragmatics and beyond VII: 1) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Makino, Selichi and Michio Tsustui. 1986. A dictionary of basic Japanese grammar. Tokyo: Japan Times.
- Maltz, Daniel N., and Ruth A. Borker. 1982. A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. Language and social identity, ed. by John Gumperz, 196-216.

- Maynard, Senko Kumiya. (1989). Japanese conversation: self-contextualization through structure and interactional management. Norwood, NJ: Abex.
- _____. 1992a. Speech act declaration in conversation: functions of the Japanese connective *datte*. *Studies in Language* 16(1). 63-89.
- _____. 1992b. Discourse modality: subjectivity, emotion and voice in the Japanese language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- _____. 1993. *Kaiwa bunseki* [Discourse analysis]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- National language Research Institute (Kokuritu Kokugo Kenkyuujo). 1955. *Danwago no Jittai* (The current situation of the language of discourse). (NLRi report 8). Tokyo: Shuei Shuppan.
- Nihon Kokugo Daijiten. 1979. Tokyo: Shogakkan.
- Onodera, Noriko Okada. 1993. Pragmatic change in Japanese: conjunctions and interjections as discourse markers. Unpublished dissertation. Georgetown University.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, ed. by Maxwell J. Atkins and John Heritage, 57-101.
- Reynolds, Katsue. Akiba. 1991. Female speakers of Japanese in transition. *Aspects of Japanese women's language*, ed. by Sachiko Ide and Naomi Hanaoka McGloin, 129-145. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- Romaine, Suzanne and Deborah Lange. 1991. The use of *like* as a marker of reported speech and thought: a case of grammaticalization in progress. *American Speech* 66(3). 227-279.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50. 696-735.
- Saito, Makiko 1992. A study of the discourse marker *nanka* in Japanese. Unpublished MA Thesis. Michigan State University.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. Discourse markers. (*Studies in interactional sociolinguistics* 5) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1994. *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

- Searle, John R. 1975. Indirect speech acts. *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3): speech acts, ed. by P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, 59-82. New York: Academic Press.
- Shibamoto, Janet S. 1985. *Japanese women's language*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, Mutsuko E. 1986. Supplementary grammar notes to An introduction to modern Japanese Part 1. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1982. Ethnic style in male-female conversation. *Language and social identity*, ed. by John Gumperz, 217-231.
- _____. 1989. *Talking voices: repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. (Studies in interactional sociolinguistics 6) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1990. *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1972. Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society* 1.179-195.
- Uemura, Kooichi and Masatoshi Tabuki. 1994. Hypermedia corpus and Japanese Conversational Analysis. *Proceedings of the Second Princeton Japanese Pedagogy Workshop*, ed. by Seiichi Makino, 184-200. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Webster's third new international dictionary 1981. Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Company.
- Yokobayashi, Hisayo and Akiko Shimomura. 1988. *Setsuzoku no hyoogen*. [The expressions of connectives] Tokyo: Aratake Shuppan.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293014202786