Exploring a Systematic Method for Analyzing and Selecting Japanese Requests in Experimental Pragmatics Research

Takahashi, Satomi
The Faculty of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University

https://doi.org/10.15017/6796396

Exploring a Systematic Method for Analyzing and Selecting Japanese Requests in Experimental Pragmatics Research[1]

Satomi Takahashi

INTRODUCTION

In experimental pragmatics research, as done in the area of interlanguage pragmatics, we often provide L2 learners (as subjects) with their L1 speech acts and the comparable L2 speech acts as the experimental targets. For instance, in the study of perceived transferability of L1 requests to L2 contexts, researchers require learners to compare the L1 request expressions with the equivalent L2 expressions and to judge the similarity between them in terms of communicative functions (e.g., Takahashi, 1995, 1996). In an experiment of this kind, the important research procedure is to provide subjects with L1 and L2 expressions which precisely reflect their use of those expressions. If subjects are required to examine the L1 or L2 expressions which do not constitute their everyday use, the obtained results for the experiment do not make any sense in relating them to the subjects' actual performance in communication. Hence, it is essential to select L1/L2 expressions which are empirically validated as those reflecting subjects' real performance *prior to* the experiment in question (see Takahashi (1998) for the similar claim as to the selection of situational variables). In interlanguage pragmatics research, however, such an effort has not been made substantially; researchers are more likely to provide subjects with experimental expressions based on their own intuition. In this study, by focusing on the *speech act of request* made in *L1 Japanese*, I will attempt to establish a more rigid and systematic methodology for selecting Japanese requests to be treated in the subsequent main experimental tasks.

In so doing, I will first try to establish a coding scheme for analyzing Japanese requests. The coding scheme for requests has already been provided by the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project) researchers and has substantially been applied to requests made in English, German, Danish, and Hebrew (see Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). However, their coding scheme fails to precisely assess Japanese requests, in particular, hinting strategies and final verbal phrases which encode the politeness levels in Japanese. In this study, then, I will propose a more specific

---

[1] This paper is based on Chapters Five and Six of my doctoral dissertation (Takahashi, 1995).

coding scheme for Japanese requests, which examine the requests from the following three perspectives: "request strategies (manifesting the directness levels)," "request modifiers and alerters," and "final verbal phrases."

Subsequently, I will attempt to apply the above coding scheme to the actual data of Japanese requests elicited from college students in low vs. high imposition contexts. The purpose here is to show how target Japanese request expressions should empirically be selected for the main experiment which involves L1 Japanese requests to be assessed by the comparable Japanese college students in the comparable imposition contexts. In so doing, special attention will be paid to the following questions for each of the request situations to be examined:

(1)   What kinds of strategies (i.e., conventions of usage) are most frequently employed in making requests?
    a)   What kinds of conventional indirect request strategies are most frequently used?
    b)   What kinds of nonconventional indirect request strategies are most frequently used?
(2)   What kinds of modifiers and alerters are most frequently   adopted in making requests?
(3)   What kinds of final verbal phrases (containing politeness markers) are most frequently favored in making (conventional indirect) requests?

Based on the answers to the above questions, an effort will be invested in idendifying the request expressions which are most frequently used by the college students and thus constitute the representative sample of their request performance to be incorporated into the subsequent main experiment.

CODING SCHEME OF JAPANESE REQUESTS

The coding scheme consists of the following three categories: (1) request strategies; (2) request modifiers and alerters; and (3) final verbal phrases (containing politeness markers).   The coding category of "request strategies" is for the purpose of examining which strategy a given request "head act" manifests.   In the taxonomy of request strategies shown in Table 1, Part I (Explicit reference to requested act) is based on my 1987 study and Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) (CCSARP).   Part II (Implicit reference to

requested act) is developed based on Weizman (1985, 1989, 1993). Each strategy represents the level of directness/indirectness realized by the convention of usage.[2]   The directness levels in Part I are mutually exclusive.   In Part II, two substrategies, one from the "illocutionary opacity" dimension and one from the "propositional opacity" dimension, help us capture the nature of the elicited nonconventional request strategies.

The coding of "request modifiers and alerters" is used to identify internal modifiers (lexical and phrasal downgraders), external modifiers (supportive moves), and alerters (opening elements preceding the request) in making Japanese requests.[3]   As shown in Table 2, 15 elements were established for this category by adapting the CCSARP request coding scheme (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).   Some of the elements were newly established solely for Japanese requests (e.g., Uptaker, Ref, APO, UPG-Int, UPG-CM, UPG-RE, etc.).   None of the CCSARP syntactic downgraders (one type of internal modifiers) are included because of the different approach taken here for establishing the directness levels.[4]

In Table 3, the coding category of "final verbal phrase (final verb choice)" is presented.   The examination of final verb choices is essential to grasp the nature of Japanese request expressions.[5]   The majority of Japanese conventional requests

---

[2] In Part 1, following Takahashi (1987), the level of directness or the convention of usage is primarily determined by Leech's (1980, 1983) Tact Maxim.   The Tact maxim stresses the role of the literal meaning of a request which is conveyed through both its semantic and formal devices.   Within this framework, I set up the "optionality in response" as the criterion in determining the level of (tactfulness and) indirectness. Let's take an example of "Could you possibly VP?" versus "I was wondering if you could VP."   The former is indirect because it gives the hearer freedom to refuse compliance due to the unavailability of his/her "ability."   The latter is, however, more indirect in that the hearer does not have to respond as to whether he/she will do the desired action but only needs to provide his/her response to the idea realized by the main verb of the statement, i.e., "wonder."   Additionally, the verb "wonder" here characterizes the speaker's apparent "doubt" about the hearer's doing the action.   Hence, the "I wonder" statement provides the hearer with more chances for justifying his/her not fulfilling the requested action at all.   In consequence, those two request forms belong to different levels of indirectness.

[3] The notions of internal and external modifications were proposed by Faerch and Kasper (1984). Internal modifiers are the elements which modify the request internally with mitigating or aggravating modality markers.   Two types of internal modifications are identified: syntactic downgraders (e.g., interrogative, subjunctive, aspect, etc.) and lexical and phrasal downgraders (e.g., politeness marker "please," downtoner "perhaps, possibly," etc.)   On the other hand, the external modifiers modify the requestive force externally with supportive moves which precede or follow the head act (e.g., grounder--reason/explanation, etc.) (see Blum-Kulka, 1985; House & Kasper, 1987; Faerch & Kasper, 1989)

[4] The "syntactic downgraders" are considered here as the elements determining the directness levels.

[5] For instance, some studies indicated that the gender difference in making Japanese requests is reflected in the choice of final verbal phrases.   Boyle (1991) and Smith (1992) demonstrated that Japanese female speakers are more likely to employ an honorific auxiliary verb "itadaku" in the final verbal phrase than Japanese male speakers.

normally end with a verbal phrase which contains an (honorific) auxiliary verb followed by a honorific morpheme (-mas-) with or without a negative particle and with a question particle in this order (see Boyle, 1991; Kuno, 1977; Smith, 1992). In the data analyzed in the next section, other types of final verbal phrases were also found; and these were added to the category in the process of coding the data.

SELECTION OF JAPANESE REQUESTS

Method

Subjects

Twenty-five Japanese male college students (mean age: 19.8, ranging from 19 to 22) were recruited for this study. All the subjects were human science majors at one of the private universities in the Kyushu area. At the time of the experiment, all of them were freshmen or sophomores and thus were taking general English courses as one of their credit requirements. None of them had stayed in an English-speaking country.

Materials

The data were collected by means of discourse completion tests (DCT) (see Johnston, Kasper, & Ross, 1994; Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989; Rose, 1994, for discussion of the DCT as a data eliciting instrument). Two forms of questionnaires with four items (situations) were prepared: Form 1 and Form 2. In each form, two items represent the request situations manifesting high imposition (H) and the remaining two realize low-imposition (L) situations. Each of the situations was randomly assigned to either Form 1 or Form 2. Each form contained the following situations (see Appendix A for the description of each situation):

Form 1: 1) Borrowing Book (L)   Form 2: 1) Thesis (L)
2) Paper Due (H)   2) Dictionary (L)
3) Marking Problem (L)   3) Feedback (H)
4) Make-up Exam (H)   4) Appointment (H)

It should be noted here that the "Paper Due (high imposition)," "Marking Problem (low imposition)," "Thesis (low imposition)," and "Appointment (high imposition)" were already empirically validated as the situations manifesting either the highest or the lowest degree of requestive imposition in my previous study (Takahashi, 1995, 1996, 1998). Hence, it was decided that the requests made in those situations should be treated as the

targets for the present analysis, and those attempted in the remaining four situations should function as fillers.

Each situational description ended with the instructional question, "What would you say to your professor?" For each situation, at the beginning of the blank space for filling out with a request, the term "YOU" was marked to ensure that the subject had to provide his request strategy from his own point of view. Two versions were prepared for each form. The presentation order of the four request situations in each form was counterbalanced across the two versions (see Appendix B).

Procedure

The data were collected in one of the subjects' general English classes. The subjects were asked to read the instructions carefully and to provide the appropriate *colloquial* Japanese request expression for each of the four situations. No time limitation was set for this task. On average, the majority of the subjects completed the task in 20 minutes.

Data Analysis

In order to identify the most frequently used request strategies, modifiers/alerters, and final verbal phrases in the four target situations, the selection criteria for the Japanese request were established as follows:

(A) the request strategies which appeared in all of the four situations. (When nonconventional strategies were chosen with the above criterion, the choice of their substrategies was further based on the following criterion: the substrategies (semantic features) which appeared in all of the four situations.)

(B) the modifiers and alerters which appeared in all of the four situations.

(C) (exclusively for conventional indirect requests) the final verbal phrases which either appeared in all of the four situations or achieved the highest total frequencies for the four situations.[6]

Using the coding scheme established earlier, the data from the four request situations were coded by this researcher and the other linguist (to obtain an inter-rater reliability). An attempt was then made to find out the Japanese request expressions most frequently used by the Japanese college students.

---

[6] The criterion of "highest total frequency" was intended either (1) to avoid including as many final verbal phrases as met the first criterion or (2) to select the most relevant final verbal phrases in case none of them satisfied the first criterion.

Results

Request Strategies

For this category, 98-percent inter-rater reliability (percentage of agreement) was attained. The frequency distributions for the request strategies made by the subjects are summarized in Table 4. Of a total of seven strategies elicited here, the following three strategies *appeared in all of the four situations* (Criterion A): "preparatory questions," "want statement," and "nonconventional." Hence, it was concluded that these three were most frequently used by the Japanese college students.

The contents of the three request strategies were also analyzed. For the conventional indirect request strategies, only the propositional contents which were judged to be most reasonable to the request contexts were chosen from the data. The results are summarized in Table 5.

With regard to the nonconventional request strategies, the most frequently used semantic features on the illocutionary and propositional opacity dimensions were further examined. The results are presented in Table 6. As indicated in the table, of the substrategies on the two dimensions, only the "stating potential grounders" on the illocutionary opacity dimension *appeared in all of the four situations* (Criterion A). Hence, this substrategy was selected as the representative semantic feature of the Japanese requestive hints. The semantic contents of those nonconventional strategies were thus exactly the same as the "grounders" selected for the conventional indirect requests (see below).[7]

Request Modifiers/Alerters

The inter-rater reliability (percentage of agreement) for this category reached .94. Only the components whose head acts were realized by the preparatory questions, want statements, and nonconventionals were examined. Table 7 shows the results of the frequency distributions of the request modifiers/alerters of those three strategies.

As indicated in Table 7, of the 14 request elements (except "Multiple APO," "Multiple UPG-Int," and "Multiple Grounder"), the following six were identified as those which *appeared in all of the four situations* (Criterion B): Address, Uptaker, Ref (reference), APO (apologetic expression), UPG-Int, and Grounder (reasons/

---

[7] It seems that the requestive hints characterized by "Stating potential grounders" (on the illocutionary opacity dimension) simultaneously *refer to related components,* which is the most frequently used semantic feature on the propositional opacity dimension. For example: "saiten misu (grading mistakes)" for the "Marking Problem" situation; "sotsuron (thesis)" for the "Thesis" situation; "onaji jikantai ni (at about the same time as my appointment with you)" for the "Appointment" situation; and "hokano kimatsu-shiken (some other exams)" for the "Paper Due" situation.

explanations). Consequently, we could claim that they are the essential elements constituting the Japanese requests made by the Japanese college students.

With regard to the semantic contents of those six elements, for the "Address" and "Uptaker," a single semantic content was identified across the four situations: "sensei (=professor)" for the "Address," and "anou (= well)" for the "Uptaker." As far as the remaining elements were concerned, some varieties in their semantic contents were observed in the subjects' responses.[8] As in the case of the selection of contents of the conventional strategies (head acts), therefore, only the semantic contents which were judged to be most reasonable to the contexts were chosen from the data. The selected semantic contents for the elements "Ref/APO" and "Grounder" in each situation are summarized in Tables 8 and 9.

Final Verbal Phrases

The choice of the final verbal phrases, in particular, honorific auxiliary verbs, is exclusively concerned with the conventional indirect requests. Hence, an effort was invested in examining the types of final verbal phrases for the preparatory questions and want statements only. The results of the frequency distributions for the types of final verbal phrases are shown in Table 10.

The verbal phrase of "itadak-e-nai-deshoo-ka" for the preparatory questions *occurred in all of the four request situations* (Criterion C). As for the want statements, the verbal phrase "itadaki-tai-n-desu-kedo" attained the *highest total frequency* (Criterion C). Consequently, those final verbal phrases were claimed to represent the most frequent use by the Japanese college students.

Selection of Japanese Requests for the Main Experiment

Based on the previous results, the exact wordings of the Japanese request expressions to be used in the subsequent main experiment will be determined. The order of each element is based on the elicited data (for "Grounder") and on my own intuition as a native speaker of Japanese (for the remaining elements).[9]

---

[8] As an internal modifier, the "UPG-Int" was observed inside the external modifiers. Hence, the semantic contents for this particular element were incorporated into the semantic contents of the related external modifiers.

[9] Shimamura (1993) showed that, in the low imposition contexts, the order of "head act --> grounder" was preferred by Japanese native speakers, Japanese EFL learners, and American-English native speakers. Conversely, those subjects favored the order of "grounder --> head act" when the degree of imposition was

Order of elements for conventional indirect request strategies:

Uptaker --> Address --> Ref --> Grounder --> APO --> Head Act

Order of elements for nonconventional indirect request strategies:

Uptaker --> Address --> Ref --> Head Act (Grounder)

Note that the "APO" was not included for the nonconventional request strategies because it *followed* the "Grounder."

In consequence, the Japanese indirect requests for the four situations to be assessed in the main experiment take the following forms and wordings:[10]

Conventional Requests:

Marking Problem (before Final Verbal Phrases):

Anou,]	sensei,]	furansu-go no	shiken no	tooan	no	koto
well	professor	French	CON exam	CON answer	CON	matter
'well'	'professor'	'it's about some of the answers on the French exam'				

na	n	desu	kedo,]	san-ka-sho	ni saiten misu	ga
COP	NOM	COP-polite	but	three portions	in grading mistakes	SUB
				'because there seem to be three grading		

aru yoo	na	n	de,]	sumimasen ga,]	moo ichido
are seem	COP	NOM	because	sorry but	one more time
mistakes'				'I'm sorry, but'	'look over them again'

minaoshite]
look over

---

high.   However, the observed difference in order according to the degree of imposition was found not to be statistically significant.

[10] In order to provide a morphological translation, the following abbreviations were used, which were adapted from Matsumoto (1988) and Ikuta (1988):

CON = connective;   COP = copula;   DO = direct object;   NEG = negation/negative;   NOM = nominal;   POTEN = potential;   QUES = question;   SUB = subject;   TOP = topic marker; perf. = perfective.

<u>Thesis</u> (before Final Verbal Phrases):

Anou,]	sensei,]	kono	mae	no	marukusu no	repooto	na
well	professor	this	before	CON	Marx CON	paper	COP
'well'	'professor'	'it's about my Marx paper I submitted to you before'					

n	desu	kedo,]	moo,	sotsuron	ni	torikakari	tai	node,]
NON	COP-polite	but	soon	thesis	on	start	want	because
			'because I'd like to start writing my thesis soon'					

sumimasen ga,]	dekireba,	hayaku	kaeshite]
sorry but	if you can	soon	return
'I'm sorry, but'	'if you can, return my paper soon'		

<u>Appointment</u> (before Final Verbal Phrases):

Anou,]	sensei,]	asu	no	juuji-han	no	soodan	no
well	professor	tomorrow	CON	10:30	CON	discussion	CON
'well'	'professor'	'it's about our discussion tomorrow at 10:30'					

ken	na	n	desu	ga,]	ha	no	itami	ga	hidoku,
matter	COP	NOM	COP-polite	but	tooth	CON	pain	SUB	severe
					'because I have a severe toothache				

onaji	jikantai	ni,	haisha	ni	ika	nakute	wa	nara	naku	natte
same	time	at	dentist	to	go	NEG	TOP	become	NEG	becoming
and need to see my dentist tomorrow at about the same time as my										

shimatta	node,]	sumimasen ga,]	nichiji	wo	kaete]
completed (perf.)	because	sorry but	date and time	DO	change
appointment with you'		'I'm sorry, but'	'change the time and date'		

<u>Paper Due</u> (before Final Verbal Phrases):

Anou,]	sensei,]	repooto	no	koto	na	n	desu	ga,]
well	professor	paper	CON	matter	COP	NOM	COP-polite	but
'well'	'professor'	'it's about my term paper'						

hokano	kimatsu-shiken	no	benkyoo	to	kasanari,	dooshitemo
other	final exams	CON	study	with	coincide	by any means
'because I won't be able to finish it by tomorrow as I also have some other						

asu	madeniwa	maniai	soo-mo	nai	node,]
tomorrow	by	able to finish	seem	NEG	because
exams to prepare for'					

sumimasen ga,]	shimekiri-bi	wo	ato	ni-san-nichi	nobashite]
sorry but	due date	DO	more	two or three days	extend
'I'm sorry, but'	'extend the due date for two or three more days'				

<u>Final Verbal Phrases</u> (for all the situations):

```
+ itadak            e       nai  deshoo            ka.
  receive (honorific) POTEN NEG COP-uncertainty QUES
```

    ==> For Preparatory Questions

```
+ itadaki          tai  n   desu      kedo.
  receive (honorific) want NOM COP-polite but
```

    ==> For Want Statements

Nonconventional Requests:

<u>Marking Problem</u>:

```
Anou, ] sensei, ]   furansu-go no   shiken no   tooan   no    koto
well   professor   French   CON exam CON answer CON matter
'well' 'professor' 'it's about some of the answers on the French exam'
```

```
na   n   desu      kedo,] san-ka-sho   ni saiten misu      ga
COP NOM COP-polite but    three portions in grading mistakes SUB
                                       'there seem to be three grading mistakes'
```

```
aru yoo na   n    desu ga...
are seem COP NOM COP  but
```

<u>Thesis</u>:

```
Anou, ] sensei, ]   kono mae   no    marukusu no     repooto na
well   professor   this before CON Marx      CON paper     COP
'well' 'professor' 'it's about my Marx paper I submitted to you before'
```

```
n    desu      kedo, ] moo, sotsuron ni torikakari tai   n
NON COP-polite but     soon thesis    on start       want NOM
                       'I'd like to start writing my thesis soon'
```

```
desu      ga...
COP-polite but
```

<u>Appointment</u>:

```
Anou, ] sensei, ]   asu      no   juuji-han no   soodan    no
well   professor   tomorrow CON 10:30     CON discussion CON
'well' 'professor' 'it's about our discussion tomorrow at 10:30'
```

```
ken    na   n   desu      ga, ] ha    no   itami ga hidoku,
matter COP NOM COP-polite but   tooth CON pain SUB severe
                                'I have a severe toothache and
```

onaji jikantai ni, haisha ni ika nakute wa nara naku natte
same time at dentist to go NEG TOP become NEG becoming
need to see my dentist tomorrow at about the same time as my

shimatta no desu ga...
completed (perf.) NOM COP-polite but
appointment with you'

Paper Due:

Anou,] sensei,] repooto no koto na n desu ga,]
well professor paper CON matter COP NOM COP-polite but
'well' 'professor' 'it's about my term paper'

hokano kimatsu-shiken no benkyoo to kasanari, dooshitemo
other final exams CON study with coincide by any means
'I won't be able to finish it by tomorrow as I also have some other exams

asu madeniwa maniai soo-mo nai no desu
tomorrow by able to finish seem NEG NOM COP-polite
to prepare for'

ga...
but

CONCLUSION

In this paper, an attempt was made to show how L1 Japanese requests should be selected for some kinds of experiments in pragmatics. There has been a tendency that researchers select the target expressions to be included in the experiment by relying on their own intuition, rather than adopting a more scientific method. Under this circumstances, there might be more chances of subjects' perceiving such expressions differently from experimenters. This might then result in difficulties in interpreting the results. In order to avoid such potential misinterpretation, I suggest that researchers empirically select the target expressions from the population comparable to the experimental subjects *prior to* the experiment. In so doing, this study first emphasized the establishment of a relevant coding scheme for the target speech act. Subsequently, I showed the way of analyzing the data using the coding scheme. Following the specific selection criteria, the target request expressions were then selected. Though it is hard to claim that the selected request expressions are identical with those to be used by prospective subjects for the main experiment, it could be argued that they would

maximally reflect the experimental subjects' performance in the particular request contexts. In experimental pragmatics research, prior validation of experimental variables to be involved ought to be undertaken in every possible manner. Such a research procedure should really be encouraged because only through such experiments could we reach precise pragmatic assessments.

REFERENCES

Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). Modifiers as indicating devices: The case of requests. *Theoretical Linguistics, 12,* 213-229.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Boyle, M. P. (1991). *Variation in levels of language: A study of politeness patterns in Japanese.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984). Pragmatic knowledge: Rules and procedures. *Applied Linguistics, 5,* 214-225.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 221-247). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. In W. Loerscher & R. Schulze (Eds.), *Perspectives on language in performance* (pp. 1250-1288). Tübingen: Narr.

Ikuta, S. (1988). *Strategies of requesting in Japanese conversational discourse.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Johnston, B., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1994). Effect of rejoinders in production questionnaires. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL, 13,* 1, 121-142.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13,* 215-247.

Kuno, S. (1977). Eigo-ken ni okeru keigo [English honorifics]. In S. Ohno & T. Shibata (Eds.), *Iwanami koza: Nihongo 4* (pp. 301-331). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Leech, G. (1980). *Explorations in semantics and pragmatics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12,* 403-426.

Rintell, E. M., & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 248-272). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rose, K. R. (1994). On the validity of discourse completion tests in non-western contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 15,* 1-14.

Shimamura, K. (1993). *Judgment of request strategies and contextual factors by Americans and Japanese EFL learners.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI.

Smith, J. S. (1992). Women in charge: Politeness and directives in the speech of Japanese women. *Language in Society, 21,* 59-82.

Takahashi, S. (1987). *A contrastive study of indirectness exemplified in L1 directive speech acts performed by Americans and Japanese.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL.

Takahashi, S. (1995). *Pragmatic transferability of L1 indirect request strategies perceived by Japanese learners of English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18,* 189-223.

Takahashi, S. (1998). Quantifying requestive imposition: Validation and selection of situations for L2 pragmatics research. *Studies in Languages and Cultures, 9,* 135-159.

Weizman, E. (1985). Towards an analysis of opaque utterances: Hints as a request strategy. *Theoretical Linguistics, 12,* 153-163.

Weizman, E. (1989). Requestive hints. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 71-95). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Weizman, E. (1993). Interlanguage requestive hints. In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 123-137). New York: Oxford University Press.

Table 1.
Coding Category of "Request Strategies"
(adapted from Blum-Kulka et al. (1989a), Takahashi (1987), and Weizman (1993))
<Directness Levels Represented by Conventions of Usage>

(direct --->indirect)

S = Speaker, H = Hearer, A = Act/Action

Part I. *Explicit reference to requested act*

1. **Mood derivables:** The speaker states a direct, imperative request to the hearer. [e.g., V-shite kudasai ((please) VP)]

2. **Performatives:** The speaker explicitly states the request illocutionary force by using a performative verb ("negau," "ask"). [e.g., V-te kudasaru yoo onegai shimasu (I ask you to VP)]

3. **Obligation (expectation) statements:** The speaker states that the hearer is under some obligation to perform the desired action. [e.g., V beki desu (You should VP)]

4. **Want statements:** The speaker states his/her want or wish that the hearer will perform the desired action. [e.g., V-shite itadaki tai no desu ga (I would like you to VP)]

5. **Preparatory questions** (without mitigated forms): The speaker asks a question concerning the hearer's will, willingness, ability, or possibility to perform the desired action (preparatory conditions). [e.g., V-shite kudasai mase-n ka (Will you VP?)/ V-shite itadake mase-n ka (Would you VP?)]

6. **Suggestion questions:** The speaker asks a question concerning a reason why the hearer will or will not perform the desired action. [e.g., V-shite wa doo desu ka (How about VP?/ Why don't you VP?]

7. **Permission questions:** The speaker asks if the hearer grants permission for the speaker to have his/her request fulfilled. [e.g., V-shite mo ii desu ka (May/Can I VP?)]

8. **Mitigated-preparatory questions:** The speaker asks a question concerning preparatory conditions or a permission question by embedding it within another clause. [e.g., V-suru koto deki mase-n (deshoo) ka (Do you think that you can VP?/ Would it be possible to VP?)]

9. **Mitigated-preparatory statements:** The speaker states a preparatory condition by embedding it within another clause. [e.g., -ka doo ka to omoi mashi te (I was wondering if you could VP)]

10. **Mitigated-want statements:** The speaker states his/her want or wish that the hearer will perform the action in hypothetical situations. [e.g., V-shite kudasaru to arigatai no desu ga (I would appreciate it if you would VP)]

Table 1. (Continued)
Coding Category of "Request Strategies"
(adapted from Blum-Kulka et al. (1989a), Takahashi (1987), and Weizman (1993))
<Directness Levels Represented by Conventions of Usage>

Part II. *Implicit reference to requested act*

11. **Nonconventional (Hints)** (Choose one from Illocutionary Opacity and one from
Propositional Opacity)

    a) Illocutionary opacity:

        (1) Questioning hearer's commitment to comply.
            [e.g., chotto tetsudatte kure masu ka (Are you going to give me a hand?/Will you
            help me?)]

        (2) Questioning hearer's availability/feasibility.
            [e.g., sumimasen ga, kaeru michi, onaji hookoo deshoo ka (Excuse me, but are you
            going my way? --> Give me a ride)]

        (3) Stating potential grounders (reason/explanation, etc.)
            [e.g., daidokoro, chotto yogorete iru yoo desu ne (The kitchen seems to be in a bit of
            a mess. ---> Clean the kitchen)]

        (4) Stating/questioning zero illocutionary components.
            [e.g., (anoo) chotto ii desu ka (Attention!)]

    b) Propositional opacity:

        (1) Reference to the requested action (but there is no reference to the effect that the hearer
            is responsible for its performance).
            [e.g., daidokoro wo katazukete iru hima nante nakatta-n desu yo (I haven't got time
            to clean up the kitchen. ---> Clean the kitchen)]

        (2) Reference to hearer's involvement.
            [e.g., daidokoro, yogoshita mama desu ne (You've left the kitchen in a mess. --->
            Clean the kitchen)]

        (3) Reference to related components.
            [e.g., sugoi daidokoro desu ne (The kitchen is in a terrible mess. ---> Clean the
            kitchen)]

        (4) No reference to propositional components.
            [e.g., tetsudatte kure masu ka (Will you help me?)]

12. **Unclassifiable**

Table 2.
Coding Category of "Request Modifiers/Alerters" (adapted from
CCSARP Coding Scheme)

---

1. Address (= Address Term) : name, title, etc. [e.g., *sensei* (professor)]
   \<Alerter\>

2. ID (= Identification) : [e.g., *watashi wa --- desu* (I am ---.)]
   \<Alerter\>

3. Uptaker : a hesitation phrase or any signal before performing request. [e.g., *anou; ano* (well,)]
   \<Alerter\>

4. Ref (= Reference) : a phrase referring to a topic. [e.g., *--ni tsuite nan desu ga; --no koto nan desu*
   \<EM\>   *ga* (it's about--)]

5. PM (= Politeness marker) : An optional element added to a request to bid for cooperative
   \<IM\>   behavior. [e.g., *doozo; dooka* (please)]

6. Hedge (= Understater) : Adverbial modifiers by means of which the speaker under-
   \<IM\>   represents the state of affairs denoted in the proposition. [e.g.,
            chotto; sukoshi (a little)]

7. DT (= Downtoner) : Sentential or propositional modifiers which are used by a speaker in
   \<IM\>   order to modulate the impact his or her request is likely to have on the
            hearer. [e.g., *tabun, osoraku* (perhaps); *--dato omoeru no desu ga* (It seems to
            me that ---.)]

8. APO (= Apologetic phrase) :
   \<EM\>

        APO 1 = Upgraded/polite apology [e.g., *kyoushuku desu ga; shitsurei desu ga; mooshiwake
            arimasen ga* (I am terribly sorry, but)]

        APO 2 = Non-upgraded apology [e.g., *sumimasen; sumimasen ga* (I'm sorry (but))]

9. UPG (= Upgrading) :
   \<IM\>

        UPG-Int (= Upgrading-Intensifier) : [e.g., *hayame ni, sugu ni* (as soon/early as possible);
            sugoku, totemo (very much)]

        UPG-CM (= Upgrading-Commitment indicator) : [e.g., *kanarazu* (I'm sure)]

        UPG-RE (= Repetition of request) : [e.g., *(yoroshiku) onegai shimasu*]

Table 2 (Continued)
Coding Category of "Request Modifiers/Alerters" (adapted from
CCSARP Coding Scheme)

10. Prep (= Preparator) : The speaker prepares his or her hearer for the ensuing request by
    <EM>   announcing that he or she will make a request by asking about the
                          potential availability of the hearer for carrying out the request, or by
                          asking for the hearer's permission to make the request—without
                          however giving away the nature or indeed the content of the request.
                          [e.g., *onegai ga aru no desu ga* (could you do me a favor?)]

11. Grounder : Reason or explanation for the requested act.
    <EM>   [e.g., –– *nano de* (because ––)/ –– *nano desu*; –– *nano desu ga*]

12. Disarm (= Disarmer) : The speaker tries to remove any potential objections the hearer might
    <EM>   raise upon being confronted with the request. [e.g., –– *wa yoku shoochi*
                           shite imasu ga (I really understand that –––.)]

13. Promise (= Promise for future action) : [e.g., *kanarazu* ––– *shimasu* (I am sure that I will –––.)]
    <EM>

14. Mini (= Imposition minimizer) : The speaker tries to reduce the imposition placed on the
    <EM>   hearer by his request. [e.g., *yoroshi kere ba* (if you don't
                                    mind); *dekire ba* (if possible)]

15. Uncl. (= Unclassifiable) : phrases which cannot be classified into any of the categories above.

Note: <IM> = internal modifier; <EM> = external modifier

Table 3.
Coding Category of "Final Verbal Phrase"
(Final Verb Choice)

1. Illocutionary verb (incl. "do") + :

    a) (honorific) auxiliary verb (statement or question)
        - with or without a negative particle.
        - with or without a tentative/uncertainty aux. "deshoo."
        - with or without a desiderative aux. "-tai."

      Examples :
      i) mado wo ake-te itadaki tai/mado wo ake-te itadake masu ka/mado wo ake-te itadake mase-n deshoo ka
      ii) mado wo ake-te morai tai/mado wo ake-te morae masu ka/mado wo ake-te morae mase-n deshoo ka
      iii) mado wo ake-te kudasai masu ka/mado wo ake-te kudasai mase-n deshoo ka
      iv) mado wo ake-te kure masu ka/mado wo ake-te kure mase-n deshoo ka

    b) ability/possibility aux. verb "dekiru" (question).
        - with or without a negative particle.
        - with or without a tentative/uncertainty aux. "deshoo."

      Examples:
      hayaku renraku deki masu ka/hayaku renraku deki mase-n ka/hayaku renraku dekimase-n deshoo ka

    c) desiderative aux. verb "hoshii" (statement).

      Examples:
      mado wo ake-te hoshii no desu ga/hayaku renraku shite hoshii no desu ga

    d) Permission question.

      Examples:
      kono hon wo kari-temo ii desu ka

    e) honorific auxiliary verb + appreciation statement.

      Examples: hayaku renraku shite itadakeru to arigatai no desu ga

2. Non-use of illocutionary verbs:

    a) "onegai" verb (statement or question)
      onegai su(ru) /shi-masu (with or without a desiderative aux. verb)
      onegai deki(ru) /deki-masu (with or without a negative particle and/or a tentative/uncertainty aux. "deshoo")

Table 3. (Continued)
Coding Category of "Final Verbal Phrase"
(Final Verb Choice)

Examples:
onegai shimasu/onegai shitai no desu ga/onegai deki masu deshoo ka/onegai deki nai deshoo ka

b) Independent ability/possibility verb "dekiru" (question) :
dekiru /deki-masu (with or without a negative particle and/or a tentative/uncertainty aux. "deshoo")

Examples:
(sore) deki masu ka/(sore) deki mase-n ka/(sore) deki nai deshoo ka

c) Independent permission question: "yoroshii"
- with or without a tentative/uncertainty aux. "deshoo"

Examples:
(sore) yoroshii desu ka/(sore) yoroshii deshoo ka

3. Others/Unclassifiable

Table 4.
Frequency Distributions for Request Strategies[*]

Strategies	MP	TH	AP	PD
Preparatory questions	7	5	19	10
Want statements	2	1	1	1
Nonconventional	4	1	2	1
Total	13	7	22	12
Mood derivables	0	3	0	0
Permission questions	0	2	0	0
Mitigated-ability questions	0	0	0	1
Unclassifiable	0	0	1	0
Total	0	5	1	1
Grand Total	13	12	23	13

Note: [*] The repetition of request, such as "(yoroshiku) onegai shimasu (please take care of it)," is excluded. / MP = Marking Problem, TH = Thesis, AP = Appointment, PD = Paper Due

Table 5.
Propositional Contents of Head Acts
(for the conventional indirect request strategies)

MP: moo ichido minaosu
(to look over them again)

TH: dekireba, hayaku kaesu
(to return my paper soon, if you can)

AP: nichiji wo kaeru
(to change the time and date (for an appointment) / to reschedule our appointment)

PD: shimekiri-bi wo ato ni-san-nichi nobasu
(to extend the due date for two or three more days)

Note: MP = Marking Problem, TH = Thesis, AP = Appointment, PD = Paper Due

Table 6.
Results for Nonconventional Indirect Request Strategies

Situation/gender	Illocutionary opacity	Propositional opacity	Freq.
MP	Stating potential grounders	Reference to related components	8
TH	Unclassifiable	Reference to related components	1
	Stating potential grounders	Reference to related components	1
	Stating potential grounders	Reference to the requested action (S's involvement)	2
AP	Stating potential grounders	No reference to propositional components	1
	Questioning hearer's availability/feasibility	Reference to related components	4
PD	Stating potential grounders	Reference to the requested action (S's involvement)	1

Note: MP = Marking Problem, TH = Thesis, AP = Appointment, PD = Paper Due

Table 7.
Frequency Distributions of Request Modifiers and Alerters
(for Preparatory questions, Want statements, and Nonconventional)

Elements <# of subjects>	MP <13>	TH <7>	AP <22>*	PD <12>	
Address <Alerter>	4	4	10	2	<---
Uptaker <Alerter>	4	2	4	5	<--
Ref <EM>	2	2	5	4	<---
APO <EM>	4	5	16	4	<---
(Multiple APO)	0	0	3	0	
UPG-Int <IM>	2	1	10	4	<---
(Multiple UPG-Int)	1	0	5	2	
Grounder <EM>	12	6	17	9	<---
(Multiple Grounder)	0	0	3	2	
Disarm <EM>	0	0	4	2	
Mini <EM>	0	0	4	0	
Hedge <IM>	0	0	0	3	
DT <IM>	2	0	0	0	
ID <Alerter>	1	0	0	1	
Promise <EM>	0	0	1	0	
Prep. <EM>	0	0	0	2	
UPG-RE <IM>	0	0	1	1	

Note: * combined frequencies obtained from Form 1 and Form 2.
<IM> = internal modifier; <EM> = external modifier
MP = Marking Problem, TH = Thesis, AP = Appointment, PD = Paper Due

Table 8.
Semantic Contents of Ref (reference) and APO (apologetic expression)

Ref (reference):

MP: furansu-go no shiken no tooan no koto nan desu kedo,
   (it's about some of the answers on the French exam,)

TH: kono mae no marukusu no repooto nan desu kedo,
   (it's about my Marx paper, which I submitted to you before,)

AP: asu no juuji-han no soodan no ken nan desu ga,
   (it's about our discussion tomorrow at 10:30,)

PD: repooto no koto nan desu ga,
   (it's about my term paper,)

APO (apologetic expression):   sumimasen ga (I'm sorry (to bother you))

MP: frequency of 3 (out of 4)	TH: frequency of 5 (out of 5)
AP: frequency of 9 (out of 19)	PD: frequency of 3 (out of 4)

Note: MP = Marking Problem, TH = Thesis, AP = Appointment, PD = Paper Due

Table 9.
Semantic Contents of Grounders

MP: san-ka-sho ni saiten misu ga aru yoo nande,
   (there seem to be three grading mistakes,)

TH: moo, sotsuron ni torikakari tai node,
   (I'd like to start writing my thesis soon,)

AP: ha no itami ga hidoku, onaji jikantai ni, haisha ni ikanakutewa naranaku natte shimatta node,
   (I have a severe toothache and need to see my dentist tomorrow at about the same time as my appointment with you,)

PD: hokano kimatsu-shiken no benkyoo to kasanari, dooshitemo asu madeniwa maniai soo mo nai node,
   (I won't be able to finish it by tomorrow because I also have some other exams to prepare for,)

Note: All of them precede the head acts.
   MP = Marking Problem, TH = Thesis, AP = Appointment, PD = Paper Due

Table 10.
Frequency Distribution for Final Verbal Phrases
(for the conventional indirect requests)

Final verbal phrase	MP (minaoshite-) look over	TH (kaeshite-) return	AP (kaete-) reschedule	PD (nobashite-) extend	
For preparatory questions:					[total]
itadak-e-nai-deshoo-ka*	2	1	4	4	[11]
itadak-e-mase-n-deshoo-ka	0	0	2	2	[4]
itadak-e-mase-n-ka	0	2	2	0	[4]
mora-e-nai-deshoo-ka	0	0	3	2	[5]
mora-e-mase-n-deshoo-ka	0	0	1	0	[1]
mora-e-mase-n-ka	1	0	3	1	[5]
kure-mase-n-ka	1	2	0	0	[3]
For want statements:					
itadaki-tai-n-desu-kedo	1	0	1	1	[3]
hoshii-n-desu-kedo	1	1	0	0	[2]

Note: * See Appendix C for the morphological translation of each final verbal phrase.
MP = Marking Problem, TH = Thesis, AP = Appointment, PD = Paper Due

Appendix A

Descriptions of the Situations

(1) Borrowing Book:
You are now writing a term paper for the psychology course. You need to read a book entitled "Perception" to complete this paper. So, you went to the library to see if this book is available. Unfortunately, someone had already checked it out. Since the paper is due in four days, you have to obtain this book today. Fortunately, you have heard from your friend that Professor A has this same book. So, you have decided to visit Professor A to ask him to lend the book to you.

(2) Marking Problem:
Today, Professor C returned the graded French exam to you. After the class, you and your classmates were talking about the grades obtained. You found out that Professor C incorrectly marked your exam for Questions 1, 3, and 6. Since you studied hard for this exam, you cannot accept these inaccuracies. So, you have decided to ask Professor C to correct your grade on the French exam.

(3) Dictionary:
You are now thinking of learning Russian for yourself. So, you need to buy Russian/Japanese and Japanese/Russian dictionaries. But you have no idea which dictionaries are good. Since none of your friends and senior students studies Russian, you cannot get good advice from anybody in this regard. However, the other day, you happened to learn that Professor G, from whom you took a German course before, has good knowledge of Russian as well. So, you have decided to ask Professor G to recommend which dictionaries are good.

(4) Thesis:
You submitted your paper entitled "Rethinking Marx" to Professor F about one month ago. This paper was for his economics seminar. You have been thinking of writing your thesis based on this paper. Professor F knows your intention; and, in fact, he promised you that he would return the paper as soon as possible with his comments on it. However, Professor F has so far failed to give it back to you. You need to start writing your thesis in a few days; otherwise, you may not be able to make the deadline for thesis submission. So, you have decided to ask Professor F to return your paper with his comments on it as soon as possible.

(5) Feedback:
You are now thinking of submitting your paper for publication in "Student Bulletin." This paper was written for the Japanese history course offered by Professor S last semester. For this purpose, you had already made a lot of revisions. You really want Professor S to read your revised paper again, to check the revised portions and to give you more detailed comments. Professor S is very busy this semester because he has a lot of classes to teach. But you would really like to submit your revised paper for "Student Bulletin." So, you have decided to ask Professor S to read your revised paper again.

(6) Appointment:
You have an appointment with Professor H, whose seminar you are now taking, at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow. You are supposed to talk with him about a topic for the term paper for his seminar. However, you suddenly need to go to the dentist around the same time tomorrow. It is very hard to change the appointment with the dentist: you cannot take any other time slot for treatment and you are now feeling a great deal of pain in your teeth. So, you really want to go to the dentist tomorrow. You well understand that Professor H is a very busy person; and, in fact, you had a hard time getting an appointment with him. But you have decided to ask Professor H to change the appointment.

(7) Paper Due:
You are now writing a term paper for your sociology course. You have been making utmost effort to write this paper by staying up late every night. But you cannot proceed with this paper as you had expected because you also must prepare for the final exams for your other courses. The paper is due tomorrow; but it seems that you need a few more days to complete this paper. You well understand that professors have to submit grade reports as soon as possible and that it takes a while to evaluate a paper. But you have decided to ask Professor B to extend the due date for the paper anyway.

(8) Make-up Exam:
Since you had a bad cold, you could not take a final exam for the English grammar course. At your university, professors are required to submit students' grades as soon as final exams are over; and thus they hesitate to give their students make-up exams. But you want to take a make-up exam for the course because you have an excusable reason: you could not take it due to your bad health. So, you have decided to ask Professor E (in charge of the course) to give you a make-up exam for the course.

Appendix B

Questionnaires for Eliciting Japanese Requests
(Excerpt)

Instructions: In this form, you can find four Japanese campus situations in which "you" as a student ask "your male Japanese professor (in his 40s)" to do something.   You are not so familiar with the professor (i.e., you know him just because you have taken a course from him or you are currently taking his course for credit). In each situation, what would you say to your professor?   Please write down a most appropriate Japanese colloquial expression in the space provided after "YOU." (original: Japanese)

Situation 1
　あなたは心理学のコースのレポートを書いています。このレポートを完成させる為に、『知覚』という本を読む必要がでてきました。図書館にあるかどうかチェックしてみましたが、誰かが既に借り出していました。レポートの提出は４日後なので、今日中に手に入れなければなりません。幸いに、同コース担当のＡ先生がこの本を持っているということを友達から聞いたので、Ａ先生に借りにいくことにしました。あなたは、先生にどのようにお願いしますか。

あなた）

(Situation 1 - "Borrowing Book" situation)

Appendix C

Translation of the Japanese Final Verbal Phrases

For preparatory questions:

itadak   e   nai deshoo   ka
receive (honorific) POTEN NEG COP-uncertainly QUES

itadak   e   mase n   deshoo   ka
receive (honorific) POTEN POLITE NEG COP-uncertainty QUES

itadak   e   mase n   ka
receive (honorific) POTEN POLITE NEG QUES

mora e   nai deshoo   ka
receive POTENT NEG COP-uncertainty QUES

mora e   mase n   deshoo   ka
receive POTEN POLITE NEG COP-uncertainty QUES

mora e   mase n   ka
receive POTEN POLITE NEG QUES

kure mase   n   ka
give POLITE NEG QUES

For want statements:

itadaki   tai n   desu   kedo
receive (honorific) want NOM COP-polite but

hoshii n   desu   kedo
want   NOM COP-polite but

COP = copula; NEG = negation/negative; NOM = nominal;
POTEN = potential; QUES = question