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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The Japanese language allows for many non-overt arguments, which raises the question: when and why are some arguments overtly expressed, especially when it involves first person pronouns? Given that overt arguments expressed with pronouns are not always seen in Japanese, we can hypothesize that such pronouns are used “for cause,” which means they occur when it involves a specific meaning or function, in a specific environment. First-person singular pronouns in Japanese are special in the way that they are used not only to clarify the referent in an utterance, but they also have other interactional purposes in certain contexts. There have been a number of studies conducted on Japanese personal pronouns, and they have revealed that Japanese personal pronouns are different from Indo-European languages in many ways (Kanzaki, 1994; Shibatani, 1990; Suzuki, 1973; Uehara, 2001). For example, there are a number of forms of first-person singular pronouns that are dependent upon the context, including the level of formality (Kataoka, 2002; Shibatani, 1990; Suzuki, 1973). Because of this, they express not only referential but also non-referential indexicalities (Silverstein, 1976). Some scholars argue there is no pronoun system in Japanese that corresponds to the Indo-European languages (Kanzaki, 1994; Suzuki, 1973). The reasons behind the uniqueness of Japanese first-person singular pronouns could potentially be traced back to their historical usages and the interesting semantic shifts they have undergone over the centuries. The uniqueness is seen in the actual usage today, given the fact that the first-person singular pronouns in conversations are not often overtly expressed, due to sociocultural considerations. This study tries to investigate the functions of first-person singular pronouns in actual conversational usage.

While there have been numbers of studies done on the first-person singular pronoun in Japanese, there are few studies which look at the first-person singular pronoun in actual language use. As conversation, or “talk-in-interaction,” is dynamically co-constructed by multiple participants (Mori, 1999, p. 7), the interactive use of the first-person singular pronoun has
different characteristics that are not seen in invented examples. Furthermore, this study takes an Interactional Linguistics perspective, focusing on the moment-by-moment unfolding interaction, with its “sequential” environment, grounded in action. The sequential analysis is a methodology originated from Conversation Analysis (CA), which analyzes conversation as sequences of turns that reflect social order in our everyday life (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018). More specifically, CA analyzes sequences in “mundane” conversation to see how people do things that are “taken for granted” (Raymond, 2016, slide 4). Taking sequential analysis as one of their main ways of analyzing interactions, Interactional Linguistics tries to find “a realistic reconstruction of the linguistic structures and practices that participants themselves deploy and orient to in the conduct of social interaction” (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018, p. 16). By taking an Interactional Linguistics perspective, this study investigates the functions of the first-person singular pronouns in actual conversation.

The goal of this thesis is to try to understand when and why first person pronouns are used in Japanese conversation. The organization of the thesis is as follows: in Chapter 2, the theoretical background of personal pronouns, especially first-person singular pronouns, in Japanese will be shown. The relevant previous studies are introduced in the following three sections: 1) the diachronic studies of personal pronouns, including the first-person singular pronoun; 2) the sociocultural nature of the overt and non-overt subject for the first-person in Japanese, and 3) the functions of the overt first-person singular pronouns in interactions. In Chapter 3, the description of the data analyzed in this study will be shown, followed by the explanation of the methodology used in this study, namely Interactional Linguistics. Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the interactional functions of first-person singular pronouns. Chapter 5 will show a newly-discovered interactional use that is observable through sequential analysis. Based on the discovery, some implications of socio-cultural issues will be discussed at the end of this chapter. Finally, the conclusion and future issues are presented in the last chapter.
CHAPTER II

Theoretical Backgrounds

In this chapter, literature regarding first-person singular pronouns in Japanese is presented in three sections. The first section concerns personal pronouns in Japanese from a diachronic perspective. The second section introduces overt and non-overt first-person singular pronouns from a sociocultural perspective. The final section discusses previous literature concerning the functions of the first-person singular pronouns in Japanese interactions, which will be the basis for the analysis in Chapters 4 and 5.

2. 1. Personal Pronouns in Japanese

It is often claimed that the Japanese language does not have the same concept of “pronouns,” as is seen in Indo-European languages (Kanzaki, 1994; Shibatani, 1990; Suzuki, 1973; Uehara, 2001). This is partially because of the nominal origin of the possible pronoun forms (Ishiyama, 2008), which may create a meaning beyond simple reference. Japanese has multiple pronouns for the first, second, and third persons, depending on the pragmatic context, which includes the gender identity of the speaker and the relationship between the speaker and the listener (Kataoka et al., 2002). Shibatani (1990, p.371) offers the table below, showing the system in relation to the formality of each pronoun choice:
Table 1: The system of personal pronoun in Japanese in relation to the formality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Derogatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male speaker</td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>watashi</td>
<td>boku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female speaker</td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>watashi</td>
<td>atashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male speaker</td>
<td>anata</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>omae/anta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female speaker</td>
<td>anata</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>omae/anta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kare ‘he’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kanojo ‘she’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The historical semantic shift seen in Japanese personal pronouns relates to degeneration/pejoration and elevation/amelioration (Cambell, 2013, pp. 222-231). Degeneration refers to the sense that “a word takes on a less positive, more negative evaluation in the minds of the users of the language – an increasingly negative value judgement” (p. 227). For example, the English word disease for “illness” formerly meant “discomfort” (dis- + ease, like un-easy today) (Cambell, 2013, p. 229). On the other hand, amelioration “involves shifts in the sense of a word in the direction towards a more positive value in the minds of the users of the language – an increasingly positive value judgement” (p. 229). For example, the English word nice originally meant “foolish, stupid, senseless,” borrowed from the Old French niï(s)ce for “foolish, stupid.”

Regarding semantic shift in the meanings of personal pronouns in Japanese, there are two types: 1) lexical and 2) spatial. For the first-person pronouns, the lexical shift includes watakushi, watashi, and atashi, which comes from “private,” boku from “servant,” and ore from “self.” For the spatial shift, we have pronouns such as konata, which originally meant “this way,” sonata from “that way (near addressee),” and anata “that way (near neither speaker nor addressee).”
Several types of semantic change can be seen in Japanese personal pronouns: “personalization” (Whitman, 1999) and “intra person pronoun shift” (Whitman, 1999) or interpersonal, as well as semantic and pragmatic shift (Ishiyama, 2008, pp. 6-7). According to Whitman (1999), Japanese first-person pronouns have resulted from “personalization,” which is “the development of first/second person markers from third person markers” (Ishiyama, 2008. p. 6). This is particularly common in Asian languages, including Japanese, Korean, and Thai, as they do not have morphological person agreement on the verb (Whiteman, 1999). Intrapersonal pronoun shift, on the other hand, is a shift between first and second-person markers that results from the “reflexive” function of pronouns (Whiteman, 1999). An example of personalization is the first-person boku, which came from a lexical item, meaning “servant.” Boku as a lexical item was not used as one of the speech role markers. On the other hand, the first person use of ore in Modern Japanese is a result of intrapersonal pronoun shift, because it was used as a second-person marker before the shift.

As shown in Table 1, Japanese pronouns have undergone semantic and pragmatic changes (Ishiyama, 2008, p. 7). Their literal meanings have been weakened to a considerable degree and their pragmatic use has shifted, that is completely opposite from the original meaning. For example, boku, “I,” which literally meant “servant” and was originally used as a humble form, is now an informal form used when speaking to social equals or subordinates by males. Other forms have also followed a similar pathway, that is, a loss of literal meaning and a change in pragmatic meaning. For example Shibasaki (2005, p. 60) points out that watakushi is a polite form of watashi in today’s usage, but, in the past, each of them had different usage and meanings. Kindaichi et al. (1993) show that watakushi was found in fixed expressions in the past, as seen below, suggesting that watakushi did not have the function of the first-person pronoun until sixteenth century:
(1) Selected idiomatic expressions with *watakushi* before 16th century

(Taken from Shibasaki, 2005, p.65 [Kindaichi et al., 1993]):

- *watakushi goto*  “individual or private affairs”
- *watakushi no uta*  “songs of daily lives”
- *watakushi no tera*  “temple for a given clan”
- *watakushi ariki*  “walking (somewhere) on private business”
- *watakushi ikusa*  “private war”
- *watakushi wo su*  “do as one wants to do” (i.e. “ego-trip”)
- *watakushi suru*  “do as one wants to do” (i.e. “ego-trip”)

Before the first-person usage of *watakushi* was established, in Late Old Japanese, it had involved various meanings, including “‘personal affairs’ (11C?-13C?), ‘illegal possesion’ (16C?-20C), confidential (15C?-18C?), ‘selfishness’ (16C- early 20C), and ‘private business’ (?18C)” (Shibasaki, 2005, p. 65). Those meanings have gradually disappeared and the first-person usage emerged. Today, *watakushi* is generally used only as a first-person pronoun (c.f. Kindaichi et al., 1993; Miwa, 2000; 2005).

Shibasaki (2005, p. 65) notes that several fixed expressions with *watakushi* before the sixteenth century (Kindaichi et al., 1993) suggest that “*watakushi* had not fully semanticized first person reference before the sixteenth century, even though it was sporadically used to refer to the first person.” On the other hand, several idiomatic expressions established after the sixteenth century, as shown below, suggest that *watakushi* started to indicate the first-person (Shibasaki, 2005, p. 66).

(2) *watakushi-gi* “I” (*watakushi* “I” + -gi “about”)

(3) *watakushi kata* “our place” (*watakushi* “I” + kata “direction”)
Therefore, as seen above, Japanese pronouns, including first-person singular pronouns, have undergone interesting semantic and pragmatic shifts, which might be one of the reasons why Japanese pronouns are different from Indo-European languages. The historical semantic shift seen in Japanese may be a reason why Japanese does not often use overt first-person singular pronouns, according to Suzuki (1973), which will be discussed later.

2. 2. Overt and non-overt subject in Japanese

Why Japanese has such a high percentage of non-overt subjects is unknown, but it would probably be because of something sociocultural. However, there are a few grammatical factors that should be mentioned here.

One of the factors that relates to the occurrence of subject is the particles that attach to it: when certain postpositional particles are used (such as wa, ga, o, ni, mo, etc), their first-person pronouns must be overtly expressed. According to Iwasaki (2002, p. 44), particles are “postpositional words attached mainly to noun phrases. They supply various kinds of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic information.”

Since such particles are important to the investigation of overt first-person pronouns, here I present a brief discussion of them. The following types of Japanese particles are what Iwasaki (2002, p. 44) shows, as seen in Table 2: 1) case particle; 2) topic marking particles; 3) highlighting particles; 4) conjunctive particles; and 5) quotative particles.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Iwasaki (2002) presents seven types of particles, which are the five types shown above and pragmatic and sentence final particles. Since sentence pragmatic and final particles do not relate to the overt and non-overt first-person singular pronoun, I excluded it from the argument in this chapter.
Table 2: Particles in Japanese (extracted from Iwasaki, 2002, pp. 44-45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of particles</th>
<th>Particles included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case particle</td>
<td><em>ga</em> (nominative), <em>o</em> (accusative), <em>ni</em> (dative), <em>de</em> (locative/instrumental), <em>to</em> (comitative), <em>kara</em> /<em>yori</em> (ablative), <em>e/made</em> (allative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic marking particles</td>
<td><em>wa</em>, <em>nara</em>, -<em>ttara</em>, and -<em>tte mau</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting particles</td>
<td><em>mo</em> (“also”), <em>sae</em>, <em>demo</em>, <em>sura</em>, <em>datte</em>, <em>made</em> (“even”), <em>dake</em>, <em>bakari</em>, <em>nomi</em>, <em>shika</em> (“only”), <em>koso</em> (“emphatically”), <em>nado</em>, <em>nanka</em>, <em>nante</em>, <em>kurai</em> (“exemplary”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive particles</td>
<td><em>to</em> (“and”), <em>ya</em> (“and so forth”), <em>mo</em> (“both…and…”) ni (“in addition”), <em>ka</em> (“or”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotative particles</td>
<td><em>to</em>, <em>tte</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case particles are used to “supply information about the relationship between a noun phrase and the predicate”. Iwasaki continues to explain how topic marking particles show that a noun phrase in a sentence has the special pragmatic status of topic. When the topic function overlaps with a nominative or accusative noun phrase (and sometimes a dative noun phrase), the topic marking particle replaces these case particles; otherwise it follows the case particles (Iwasaki, 2002, p. 44). He also explains that highlighting particles are also called “adverbial particles” in traditional grammar, and that these particles foreground one part of a proposition described in a sentence. Highlighting particles can add contrast (contrastive *wa*), as well as other meanings, such as “also,” “even,” “only,” “emphatically,” “exemplary.” Conjunctive particles conjoin either two noun phrases or two predicates/ clauses. Quotative particles follow quoted material with verbs of speech and thought.

In terms of the case particles *ga* and topic making particle *wa*, Kuno (1973) provides an analysis. For *ga*, he explains that it shows new information and classifies the function into three types: 1) exhaustive listing; 2) neutral description; and 3) object marking. Exhaustive listing is used when one wants to convey the sense of “it is X that…” or “X and only X…” The following is an example of exhaustive listing:
(8) *watashi ga yarimashi ta*

“I did (it).”

(Kuno, 1973, p. 81)

Neutral description is when a speaker brings an observable fact to a listener’s situation, as the examples below exemplify:

(9) *ame ga hu tteimasu*

‘It is raining.’

(Kuno, 1973, p. 81)

(10) *otoko no hito ga ta tteimasu*

‘A man is standing.’

(Kuno, 1973, p. 81)

Finally, *ga* can also mark an object, as the following example shows:

(11) *tenisu ga suki desu*

“I like tennis.”

In terms of *wa*, Kuno (1973) shows that it indicates old information and has two types: contrastive and topic. Additionally, according to Kuno, *wa* in a negative sentence usually indicates contrast, as in the example below:

(12) *Biiru wa nomima sen*

‘I don’t drink beer. (But, I drink something else.)’

(Kuno, 1973, p. 80)
*Ga* can also shows the topic, as in the sentence below:

(13) *kore wa watashi no hon desu*

‘This is my book.’

(Kuno, 1973, p. 79)

Another point that relates to the expression (or not) of arguments in Japanese relates to context. Many studies, such as Hasegawa and Hirose (2010), Hinds (1986), and Ide (2006), show that Japanese is a “high context” language and depends more on context for interpretation than does English, and therefore does not always indicate arguments overtly.

For instance, Hinds (1982) points out that Japanese often omits the subject and listeners understand what the speaker means based on any background knowledge, the sharing of expectations, reasoning, and so on. What’s more, Hasegawa and Hirose (2010, p. 44) argue that, in Japanese, “say no more than you must” is appreciated, and the hearer usually needs to infer what the speaker means, while in English “say as much as you can” is valued.

In addition, Ide (2006, p. 219) and Fujii (2016) points out that, in Japanese, the speaker is grounded in the context as one of the elements of conversation and assumes each element involving the listener in the field is shared knowledge. Thus, the speaker decides what needs to be stated, depending on the field of talk, and utters from the internal perspective of the context. A reference to the speaker, for instance, does not need to be indicated because the person now speaking is understandable for the listener. Ide (2006) further points out that the speaker needs to recognize his or her status and role in the field to indicate that he or she is aware of the relationship with the listener. That consideration is expressed by modality expressions, including personal pronouns, honorifics, and final particles (Ide, 2006, p. 219). This internal perspective that is shared by Japanese people thus is another critical factor in the non-expression of arguments in Japanese.
2. 3. Functions of first-person singular pronouns

Based on the fact that overt subjects or pronouns are not always necessary in Japanese and are thus marked, several studies show that first-person singular pronouns are considered to have functions of their own.

In one particular study by Ono and Thompson (2003), it is suggested that first-person singular pronouns are not only used to make reference to the speaker clear, but they also have non-reference functions, which include “frame-setting” and “emotive” functions. When a first-person singular pronoun is used with a frame-setting function, this “provides a subjective framework for, or stance towards, the rest of the utterance, as suggested by Li and Thompson’s (1976) and Chafe’s (1976) definition of ‘topic’” (Ono & Thompson, 2003, p. 332), and this type of first-person pronoun is used “because she or he knows in general that the utterance is going to have something to do with him/herself, but she/he has not formulated the morphosyntax (or even the trajectory) of the utterance itself” (Ono & Thompson, 2003, pp. 336-337). What’s more, another characteristic about this usage is that it “tends to occur in a separate intonation unit from the predicate, suggesting that it is not planned together with what follows” (Ono & Thompson, 2003, pp. 336-337). An example of the first-person pronoun with the frame-setting function is in the following:

(14) *atashi dakara kakkoii to omo*

1SG so good:looking QT though-
*otokonoko no supootsu de kakkoii to omotta no wa*
boy of sports in good:looking QT thought NOM WA
*juudo to Kendoo*
judo and kendo

“So I thought- cool, what (I) thought (were) cool in boys’ sports (are) judo and kendo.”

(Ono & Thompson, 2003, p.332)
Emotive function of the first-person singular pronouns, on the other hand, involves a predicate which “expresses the emotion/feeling of the speaker” (Ono & Thompson, 2003, p. 331), and “these utterances would be perfectly acceptable in their contexts without 1SG?” (Ono & Thompson, 2003, p. 331). Ono and Thompson 2003 (p. 331) also add that this usage “appears to be a grammaticized use, similar to the postpredicate elements in conversational Japanese discussed in Ono and Suzuki (1992).” In addition, the emotive function “may be a gender-linked use. The emotive function is only seen in (w)atashi, which is strongly correlated with female speakers” (Ono & Thompson, 2003, p. 331). An example of emotive function of the first-person pronoun is shown in the following:

(15) sugoi warukute watashi
    terrible bad 1SG
    “I (feel) terrible.”
    (Ono & Thompson, 2003, p. 330)

Lee and Yonezawa (2008) also describe functions of first-person pronouns in Japanese, which they label as “contrastiveness” and “emphasis.” The first-person singular pronoun’s usage in contrastiveness is supported by Chafe (1976), who indicates that “in languages in which the subject is sufficiently identifiable by the verbal morphology, independent pronouns are used for contrastiveness” (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 739). Contrastiveness “involves two or more elements which are in contrast with regard to certain action, event or state” (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 741). According to the data shown in their study, contrastiveness can be seen with some focus particles, such as wa, which is widely recognized as being used to show that the noun preceding the particle contrasts with others (Kuno, 1973), and ga, which is known as “exhaustive listing” (Kuno et al., 1973), which lists the members who are responsible for the action or state.

2 1SG refers to first-person singular pronouns.
expressed by the predicate, in contrast to others who do not have such responsibility (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 740). In addition to these two particles, *shika* “only” and *dake* “only” are also used with the first-person singular pronoun in order to make a contrastive function (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 740). The following examples include the first-person singular pronoun with contrastive function:

(16) *Minasan wa gakkoo no jugyoo dake shitara sorede ii tte iu ka...*  
everyone TOP school study only if.do that’s.enough how.to.say  
dakara nanimo nai toki wa oshaberishite sugoshitari shitemo  
in.other.words nothing when TOP chat spend.time even.though  
iיב kamoshirenai kedo watashi wa n, motto benkyooshinakya na tte...  
good maybe CN I TOP well more have.to.study FP QT  
“As for undergraduates, it’s OK just to do course work...how to put (it)...  
in other words, when they have nothing to do, maybe it’s OK for them to chat or to do something else, but, as for me, I feel, mm, (I) have to study more...”  
(Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 739)

In example (16), the speaker contrasts undergraduate students, who are referred to as *minasan* (“everybody”) and spend their free time on chatting, are different from her, who is a graduate student and needs to study instead. Lee and Yonezawa (2008, p. 740) explains that the first-person singular pronoun *watashi* and the particle *wa*, as well as *minasan* and *wa* are necessary in order to convey the intended meaning; the contrastive meaning would not be sustained without the overt first-person pronoun *watashi* and the particle *wa*. As seen, first-person singular pronouns can be contrastive, and the overt usage is essential for indicating the contrastive relationship with others (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 741).

In addition to the contrastive function, Lee and Yonezawa (2008) demonstrate the function of “emphasis,” given that the overt specification of a subject can be seen as “extra” or
“additional,” “especially when the intended meaning is already well conveyed without such specification” (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 741). In this perspective, the overt first-person singular pronoun is seen as adding an extra emphasis on the specification of the subject, which becomes more salient. Lee and Yonezawa (2008, p. 741) show that this type of first-person singular pronoun “is often employed as an effective strategy to assist the discourse management,” which includes “personalising a discourse topic.” In using this type of first-person singular pronoun, “the speaker refers to him/herself, and hence subsequent personalised contents of the utterance are to be expected,” as seen in the example below (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, pp. 747-748):

(20) A: Tashikani. Shibikku aruite temo zenzen iwakan nai shi ne.

Certainly Civic even.is.walking at.all strange.feeling absent FP

Maa, demo inakamachi ni itte miru to chotto uiteshimau tteiu no ga

well but country.town to if.try.to.go a.bit stand.out QT SUB

wakaru to omou kedo.

know QT think CN

“Certainly. (We) don’t feel strange when walking in Civic, right? Well, but if (one) goes to a country town, (one) will know that (he/she) stands out.”

B: Aa, soodesu ka. Aa.

ah that.is QU ah

“Ah, is that so, ah.”

A: Un. Boku ga Meruboron ni iku tochuu ni, tomodachi to kuruma de

yeah I SUB Melbourne to go.on.the.way friend with car by

itta n desu kedo, ...

went BE CN

3 The function of "emphasis" also includes giving and taking floor and maximizing the speaker’s feeling or emotion associated with the utterance, which for some extent overlap with Ono and Thompson's categories.
“Yeah. When I was on my way to Melbourne, (I) went (there) with my friend by car, and ...”

B: *Hai.*

yeah

“Yeah.”

A: *de, tochuu no inakamachi ni tomatta toki ni, anoo hirumeshi kuoo to, so on.the.way country.town stopped when well lunch intend.to.eat.*

“So, on the way (to Melbourne), when I stopped in a country town, well, (I) wanted to have lunch ...”

B: *Hai.*

yeah

“Yeah.”

A: *chotto ginkoo de kane oroshite kuru tte komonwerusu ni haittara a.bit bank money draw come Commonwealth.Bank enter minna miru n desu ne.*

everyone look BE FP

“So, (I) went to the Commonwealth Bank to get some money, and when (I) entered the bank, all the people there looked at me.”

(Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, pp. 747-748)

Speaker A says first that they would be likely to attract attention if they were to be in more rural areas. Then A talks about his personal experience in a small town on the way to Melbourne. In this telling, as the speaker begins his storytelling, he uses the overt first-person singular pronoun, *boku*, and narrows down the general topic into a personalized one, that is, one about himself.

As seen in the previous studies of overt first-person singular pronouns by Ono and Thompson (2003) and Lee and Yonezawa (2008), the first-person singular pronouns themselves are considered to have certain functions. The data analyses shown in Chapter 4 and 5 will be
based on the findings from these previous studies. Starting from their findings that overt first-person singular pronouns in Japanese interactions are used for semantic and pragmatic reasons, the current study expands the domain of function to include interactional functions.
CHAPTER III
Data and Methodology

3.1. Data

The analyzed data in this study consists of four naturally-occurring dyadic conversations that were video-recorded by the author in Tokyo and Kanagawa in Japan in 2018. Among the four conversations, two of them are between two female speakers (Conversations 1 and 2) and the other two conversations are between a female speaker and a male speaker (Conversations 3 and 4). The female speaker in Conversation 3 and 4 is the same person. In each conversation, the participants talk freely; in other words, there was no topic given to the participants. They talked about whatever they wanted to talk about for the entire conversation. The purpose of this method of collecting data is to have interactions that are as realistic as possible by minimizing the potential interference that researchers have the potential to create. The participants names, as well as personal names and proper names in the conversations, have been kept anonymous. The conversational data is described in the following table:

Table 3: Conversational data used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Length of the conversation</th>
<th>Places of the conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Toshi (female), Mika (female)</td>
<td>16:24</td>
<td>At an apartment in Kanagawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nao (female), Kana (female)</td>
<td>32:10</td>
<td>In a room at a university in Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maya (female), Taka (male)</td>
<td>31:29</td>
<td>In a public room in Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maya (female), Yuu (male)</td>
<td>36:20</td>
<td>In a public room in Tokyo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among all the participants, only two male participants, Yuu and Taka, speak a non-Tokyo variety of Japanese. Yuu is originally from Gihu prefecture and has lived in Aichi prefecture for the past four years. These two regions are different from the Tokyo dialect, but his accent and word choice are mostly the standard one. Taka, on the other hand, is originally from Osaka prefecture and uses a Kansai variety of Japanese for the entire conversation.

The first-person singular pronouns analyzed in this study are *watashi*, *atashi*, *ore*, *jibun*, and *uchi*. *Watashi* and *atashi* are used only by the female speakers, while *ore* is used only by the male speakers. *Jibun* and *uchi* are used by men and women. *Jibun* is also the so-called “reflexive pronoun,” and the current study only takes into account the cases that are replacable by other first-person singular pronouns, that is, non-reflexive uses. In the data in this study, *jibun* was used without particles, as in *jibun konnani dekinaide akke te omotta kara* (‘I was like, oh I really cannot do this’), with the genitive *no* as in *jibun no koto* (‘things about myself’), or with *de* as in *jibun de yaritai* (‘I want to do by myself’). *Uchi* was mostly used with the genitive *no*, as in *uchi no dannasan* (‘my husband’) and *uchi no okaasan* (‘my mother’), or *uchi no douki* (‘my colleague’).

3.2. Convention

The conversational data used in this study has been transcribed roughly based on Jefferson’s (2004) transcription, but the data does not fully have Conversation Analysis style’s level of detail. Each transcription utilizes the following conventions:

- `[Overlap]
- `= Latching
- `{laugh} Laughter accompanied with speech
- `, Continuing intonation
- **He says** Underlining indicates stress or emphasis
- £ Oh okay £ British pound signs indicate talk produced while smiling
(i.e. 'smile voice').

° hello° Talk appearing within degree signs is lower in volume relative to surrounding talk

? Rising intonation

. Falling intonation

(0.8) Numbers in parentheses indicate periods of silence, in tenths of a second. A period inside parentheses is a pause less than two-tenths of a second.

H Head-movement (vertical, up to down)

As indicated above, the transcript convention includes head-movement, which is a vertical movement, up to down, as transcribed by “H.” The convention “H” is placed where it was produced, for example, just under a specific word, as shown below:

01  Nao :  chikai shi,
      H near and
      Because it is near
02  Kana:  H
03  Nao :  demo supiido wa deru, shi- (...) de naito ikenai shi
      but speed TOP expose CONJ expose NEG must CONJ
      But (we) need to have high speed

The example above includes two head-movements: one is by Nao, the speaker, and the other by Kana, the recipient. As seen on line 1, Nao’s head-movement is observed when she produces the morpheme shi, which means “and.” As for Kana’s head-movement, it is observed without any verbal utterance, as seen on line 2.

Head-movement is produced, not only the recipients, but also by the speaker. The recipient’s head-movement is important to note, because it indicates not only the recipient’s alignment but also affiliation, which is mostly agreement, or “affirmation” (Maynard, 1987, p. 19).
According to Stivers (2008, p. 32), to align is to acknowledge the information provided in the telling and support the progress of the telling. To affiliate, on the other hand, is defined as “claiming access to and understanding of the teller’s stance,” and, through doing this, “story recipients show themselves to endorse the teller’s perspective” (Stivers, 2008, p. 32). Head-movement is also important for the speaker’s side: it indicates “clause boundary, emphasis, affirmation, turn-end marker, transition period filter, and (pre-) turn claim” (Maynard, 1987, p. 601).

For the translation, two types of conventions, “( )” and “[ ],” are used for the purpose of showing the data more precisely. As the Japanese language often does not have overt pronouns, the pronouns that are non-overt in the original utterance, but are still needed for the English translation, are indicated in parentheses ( ). In addition, because of the structural difference between Japanese and English, there are some cases that need free translation, rather than literal translation. The free translation is indicated in brackets [ ].

3.3. Methodology

In this paper, all overt first-person singular pronouns were extracted from the data and their functions were analyzed in two ways: 1) categorizational analysis based on Ono and Thompson (2003) and 2) sequential analysis by taking the perspective of Interactional Linguistics. The methodology of Interactional Linguistics (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018) approaches linguistic phenomena by incorporating the methodology of Conversation Analysis (CA). By investigating the language used in naturally occurring interaction, Interactional Linguistics aims to discover how “the linguistic structures and practices that participants themselves deploy and orient to” are reconstructed (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018, p. 16). Therefore, Interactional Linguistics (IL) approaches interaction by looking at the sequential organization as CA does, as well as the linguistic resources, including rhetorical, lexico semantic, morpho-syntax, and vocal-prosodic means (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018, pp. 15-17).
In addition to taking the perspective that Ono and Thompson (2003) take, the sequential analysis brings interactional considerations of the first-person singular pronouns. The sequential analysis shows the relevancy between the action sequence and the function of the first-person singular pronouns in interaction. By looking at the larger interaction, rather than looking at just the utterance by itself, we can identify some functions that can only be discovered in sequential context. As the dyadic conversations (or talk-in-interaction) are co-constructed by two participants moment-by-moment, this paper attempts to discover how first-person singular pronouns are at work in actual conversations in Japanese daily life.

Finally, in terms of analyzing first-person singular pronouns, the current paper focus on only the overt cases. At a first glance, it would seem to provide greater insight if overt first person pronouns could be compared to the cases of non-overt first-person singular pronouns to see when and why first singular pronouns occur. However, as we do not even know how many arguments a sentence has, as indicated in Ono and Thompson (1997), it is not possible to determine when precisely a first singular pronoun could have been overt but wasn’t. I therefore decided to look only at the overt cases.

3.4. Sequential analysis of conversation

As written above, IL has a link with CA methodology in terms of adopting sequential analysis in naturally occurring talk in everyday and institutional interaction. Before moving onto the analysis section, this section briefly shows the structural organization of conversation, which is going to be discussed in the next analysis chapters.

In sequential analysis, conversational data is observed as sequences of turns, which are collaboratively co-constructed by the participants. The sequential analysis is concerned with how a turn is composed, as well as where that turn is produced as part of a sequence of turns/actions. In this perspective, speakers are considered to build courses of action through talk, and these are done through sequence (Clift, 2016). As actions are implemented through sequence, sequential analysis is able to show what kind of actions are performed in the course of
an interaction. The action types, which are going to be discussed in the following chapters in this study, include accounts, consensive repair, agreement, disagreement, affiliation, and disaffiliation. These action types are revealed by considering the unit called “adjacency pair,” in which a first turn makes relevant a particular kind of second turn.
CHAPTER IV

Interactional Categorization

Given that the overt first-person singular pronouns are marked in Japanese, they are analyzed as involving functions by themselves. Based on the discovery of Ono and Thompson (2003), the analysis below shows four functions that the overt first-person singular pronouns exhibit in interaction and demonstrates that first-person singular pronouns are used in cases where no disambiguation, with regard to reference, is needed.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Ono and Thompson (2003) classify the overt first-person singular pronouns into three different functions: (1) referential; (2) frame-setting; and (3) emotive. While the classifications in Ono and Thompson (2003) are based on utterances in everyday language use, their primary focus was not interactional usage of the first-person singular pronoun. As the current study concerns interactional usage of first-person singular pronouns, it will use a new system of categorization that is based on Ono and Thompson (2003). The first-person singular pronouns will be categorized into the following four types: (1) disambiguation; (2) frame-setting; (3) personalization; and (4) contrast. Although Ono and Thompson (2003) did not discuss the co-existence of multiple functions in a single first-person singular pronoun, the current study proposes that one first-person pronoun can have multiple functions at the same time. The sections below show examples of the first-person singular pronoun with the three functional types: (1) only a disambiguating function, (2) disambiguating and additional pragmatic function(s), and (3) only additional pragmatic function(s). Despite these categorizations, we need to note that the functions are fuzzy: the boundary between each category is difficult, because they share some similar characteristics.

4.1. Only disambiguating function

First-person singular pronouns with a disambiguating function are those that are semantically required in order to clarify the referent. Disambiguating function encompasses the
“referential” function (Ono & Thompson, 2003); this study considers first-person singular pronouns as having a disambiguating function if they are used when there are characters that “potentially interfere” with the reference (Givon 1983). In the conversation data in this study, only 36 out of 128 first-person singular pronouns involve the disambiguating function.

An example of first-person singular pronouns with disambiguating function is displayed in the conversation below, which is between Yuu and Maya. The disambiguating first-person singular pronoun in this example clarifies the information in the interrogative utterance. In the excerpt below, Yuu and Maya are talking about marriageable age, which is the “appropriate” age to get married, by its literal translation. In line 1, Yuu asks Maya if her marriageable age will be postponed. Maya then seeks to clarify whether Yuu is asking about “Maya’s” marriageable age on line 6; here she uses the first-person singular pronoun *watashi*.

**Excerpt (1): Marriageable age**

01  Yuu : kekkonki, jyaa no-, nobi chau jyan ((gesture of extension))
       marriageable age then extended ASP COP
       Marriageable age will be postponed then

02  Miya: [konki?
       marriageable age
       Marriageable age ?

03  Yuu : [mukou ni gone n m e iru n dat tara ((laugh))
       there LOC five years stay NOM COP if
       If (you) are going to be there for five years

04  Miya: kekkonki?= marigable age
       Marriageable age?

05  Yuu : =un
       yeah
       yeah
       H

06  > Miya: watashi? I
       Me?

07  Yuu : un
       H
       yeah
       yeah

08  Miya: aaa un ((laugh))
       oh yeah
       oh yeah
The next three examples of the first-person singular pronoun have the particle ga. As discussed in Chapter 2, the first-person singular pronoun with disambiguating function involves the particle ga, which is described as “exhaustive listing” (Kuno, 1973). Kuno argues that ga, with exhaustive listing, is used when the speaker “wants to convey the sense of ‘it is X that…’ or ‘X and only X...’”(p. 81). Therefore, the particle ga itself involves a sense of disambiguation. In the next example, the first-person singular pronoun is also used for clarification after other-initiated repair. In this conversation, Kana’s utterance on line 1, “.hhh kanzen ni wasureteru to omou yo,” which means ‘I will definitely forget about him,’ does not include the subject of the verb wasureru (“to forget”), nor its object.

Excerpt (2): I will definitely forget about him

01  Kana:  .hhh kanzen ni wasure teru to omou yo, ((pointing to Kana, herself))
       perfectly  forget   ASP  CONJ think FP
       (I) will definitely forget [about my feeling about him]
02  Nao :   e dare ga?
       Who?
03 > Kana:  watashi ga.
       I      SUB
       I
04  Nao :   a, sono ima no kimochi wo?= ((indicating herself))
       oh  this current GEN feeling  ACC
       [You mean, you will forget] (your) current feeling [about him]?
05  Kana:   =sou ((still putting her hand on herself))
       H
       yeah
       yeah

After Nao asks e dare ga?, which initiates repair to clarify who was the subject of the previous utterance on line 2, Kana says watashi ga, which clarifies that she is the subject.

The example below includes first-person singular pronouns with a disambiguating function that is related to topicality.

Excerpt (3): Line

01  Kana:  sore wa...kanpekini..
On line 4, Kana says "watashi ga meccha, mou pusshu shi ta kara," which means “because I pushed him a lot.” The first-person singular pronoun %watashi% in this utterance is considered to have a disambiguating function, because she disambiguates that she is the subject of the proposition %meccha, mou pusshu shi ta kara%, which means “because I pushed him a lot.” This is especially because there is another character, Iori, stated on line 2, and the speaker has to disambiguate the subject of the proposition on line 3 as herself and not Iori.

As seen in these three last examples, the first-person singular pronoun with disambiguating function involves the particle %ga%, which itself involves a sense of disambiguation. However, the fact that the first-person singular pronoun without particle also has this disambiguating function suggests that the first-person singular pronoun itself has this function.

4.2. Disambiguating function plus another type of function

In this section, first-person singular pronouns with both disambiguating and additional pragmatic function(s) will be shown. In the conversation data in this study, 57 out of 128 first-person singular pronouns have both disambiguating function and additional function(s). Disambiguating function appears with three types of other functions: frame-setting,
personalization, and contrast. These functions will be shown one by one in the following subsections.

4.2.1. Disambiguating function with frame-setting function

Five examples of the first-person singular pronouns have a frame-setting function as well as disambiguating function. The frame-setting function of first-person pronouns, according to Ono and Thompson’s (2003) definitions, shows the speaker’s subjective framework and stance towards the utterance that follows. (Ono & Thompson, 2003,). With this type of first-person singular pronoun, the speaker starts the utterance knowing that it is related to themselves, although they have not formulated the morphosyntax or the trajectory of the utterance itself (Ono & Thompson, 2003). Because the speaker has not yet formulated the morphosyntax of the utterance, he or she struggles with how to formulate it, and, as a result, he or she “often ends up producing an utterance which could be called ‘well formed’ but just as often, she/he does not” (Ono & Thompson, 2003, p. 337).

The excerpt below displays an example of a first-person singular pronoun with a frame-setting function and a disambiguating function. The following conversation is between Maya and Yuu. Maya talks about her video recording of the conversations for her research.

Excerpt (4): Video recording

(Context: In order to do the video recording, Maya sets up her video camera and then comes back to her seat. While doing that, Yuu is drinking.)

01   Maya:   Yoshi… ((looking at the camera, and then sitting at the seat))
          Alright
02  > Maya:   watashi, bideokamera nikaime desu, jibun no deeta ni utsuru no
          (videocamera: eyegaze towards the camera)
           This is the second time for me to be video-recorded,
[video camera] twice COP_HNR self GEN data LOC be taken NOM
[I mean] to be recorded for the data for my research
03 Yuu: a, sou
   oh I see
   Oh really
04 Maya: sou, zenzen utsuru ki na katta n da kedo
   yeah not at all being video recorded intention NEG PST NOM COP but
   Yeah (I) didn’t intend to be video-recorded though
05 Yuu: demo, are nare teru yan mou
   but that get used to ASP FP already
   But then (you) are now used to (it) huh?
06 Maya: mou nare teru, nare teru ne
   already get used to ASP get used to ASP FP
   Yeah, (I) am used to it.

On line 2, Maya says *watashi, bideokamera nikaime desu, jibun-no deeta-ni utsuru-no*, which means “This is the second time for me to be in my data, I mean, to be video-recorded.” This utterance includes the first-person singular pronoun *watashi*, which has the function of frame-setting as well as disambiguation. It is frame-setting function because it “provides a subjective framework for, or stance towards, the rest of the utterance” (Ono & Thompson, 2003, p. 332). In addition, this also involves the disambiguating function, because the utterance, which has the structure of the topic and comment, does not semantically make sense without this overt first-person singular pronoun *watashi* in the topic spot. In other words, we would not necessarily know the topic of the comment without the overtly stated topic in this case. This is especially because the utterance without overt first-person pronoun does not make sense; the utterance would be *bideocamera nikaime desu* without the first-person singular pronoun *watashi*, which literally means “this is the second time video camera.” If there is a topic *watashi*, indicating the speaker, it literally means something like “this is the second time videocamera for her (the speaker),” which could be inferred that the speaker actually means something like “this is the second time for her to be videorecorded.” Because of the omission of the information in this utterance, the speaker noticed it as a potential trouble source for meaning so that she made self repair or corrected herself just afterby saying *jibun no deeta ni utsuruno*, meaning “I mean to be video-recorded for the data for my own.” For this reason, the first-person singular pronoun works toward disambiguating the subject as well.
4.2.2. Disambiguating function with personalization function

Six examples have a disambiguating function with a personalization function. When the first-person pronouns display personalization function, this is how the speaker personalizes the topic about which they have been talking. After talking about some general ideas about a topic, a speaker then makes some utterances about her personal experience relating to that topic. Thompson (1993), who analyzes the overt usage of the first-person pronoun, argues that the first-person pronoun has a similar function as outlined in the example, which she refers to as “the function of personalizing a given utterance” (Lee & Yonezawa, 2008, p. 747).

The example below displays the first-person singular pronoun with disambiguating function as well as personalization function. Yuu and Maya talk about how expensive the tuition fees are at American universities. Yuu then asks how much the scholarship, which Maya obtained, pays toward the grantees’ schooling, and Maya answers the question by giving her personal information.

Excerpt (5): Scholarship

01 Yuu : ee ? sonnna takai no amerika tte huh such expensive Q America CONJ
What? Is American universities’ tuition fees that expensive?
02 Maya: de, seikatsuhi ga, nihyakuman kurai suru and living expenses SUB 2 million about do
And, for the living costs, it is about 2 million yen
H
03 Maya: H
04 Yuu : e shougakukin ikura deru?
  oh scholarship how much pay
Wait, so how much the scholarship (you obtained) pays?
05 Maya: shougakukin zengaku de teru kara,
scholarship total amount pay ASP so
(The) scholarship program pays total amount (for us) so
06 Yuu : un yeah yeah
07 > Maya: ’watashi ima roppyakuman ka nanahyakuman kurai morat teru’ I now 6 million or 7 million about receive ASP
I am currently receiving 6 or 7 million yen
08 Yuu : nenni?
  annually
[Do you mean] annually ?
On line 4, Yuu asks how much Maya’s scholarship program pays its grantees. In response to that question, Maya answers that her scholarship program pays the total amount for the grantees on line 5. Then, on line 7, she gives her personal information on how much she receives from that program as an example, by saying *watashi ima roppyakuman ka nanahyakuman kurai morat teru*, which means “I am currently receiving 6 or 7 million yen.” This utterance includes the first-person singular pronoun *watashi*, which is categorized into both disambiguating and additional pragmatic function, namely the personalization function. The *watashi* here is disambiguating the fact that she is talking about her situation. Without this *watashi*, the sentence does not necessarily convey the subject of the verb “receive;” the subject could be people in general who receive the same scholarship or the general amount of the scholarship program can pay. In addition, *watashi* is considered as a personalizing function, because this *watashi* personalizes that she is talking about her case, after providing the general information of the scholarship program: they pay the grantees the whole amount. Therefore, this *watashi*, the first-person singular pronoun on line 7, is considered to have both a disambiguating function and a personalizing function.

4.2.3. Disambiguating function with contrastive function

The last additional pragmatic function of the first-person pronoun is the contrastive function. Forty examples of the first-person singular pronoun involve disambiguating function and contrastive function at the same time. The first-person singular pronoun that has contrastive function is used to directly or indirectly contrast with other(s), including the listener, the character(s) of the talk and people in general. The most frequently seen examples with disambiguating and contrastive function are first-person singular pronouns with the particle *wa*, with nine examples, as the particle itself has contrastive function (Kuno, 1973). We then have
ga, no, and non-particle, each of which has six examples. The following example from the conversation between Mika and Toshi illustrates the case of the first-person singular pronoun accompanied with wa, which displays both disambiguating and contrastive function at the same time. Before this excerpt, Toshi expresses that she does not have any preference regarding her wedding dress.

Excerpt (6): Wedding dress

01 > Mika: watashi wa nanka bakuzen too..
     I TOP well roughly
     In my case

02 Mika: nanka kacchiri kei ni shi tai mitaina imeeji [ga
        well formal type LOC do want like image SUB
        (I) roughly thought that (I) wanted to do formally

03 Tosh: [unun
         H H
         yeah yeah

04 Mika: at te, de ato ki tai doresu no kanji mo, nanka kima tte te,=
        exist ASP and then wear want dress GEN image also well decide ASP CONJ
        And (I) knew what types of dress (I) wanted to wear

On line 1, Mika explains her preference of her wedding dress by using the first-person singular pronoun watashi. Without watashi, which is the topic of the utterance, we do not know the meaning of the utterance. In other words, without watashi, the utterances on lines 1 and 2 do not necessarily convey that the speaker is talking about her own situation. At the same time, the first-person singular pronoun watashi has a contrastive function, since Mika displays herself as someone who had a preference on her wedding dress as opposed to Toshi, who does not have any preference on her dress.

While the example above includes the first-person singular pronoun with the contrastive marker wa, there are also cases of this type without the particle wa. The following example displays the first-person singular pronoun with the particle ga, having both disambiguating and contrastive function. This conversation is between Yuu and Miya, and they are talking about a
professor named Ding. Before this excerpt, Yuu, who just finished writing his dissertation on Chinese languages, explained that he would like to study more at an American university with a professor who studies Chinese languages. After this exchange, in this excerpt, as seen on line 1, he says that Professor Ding is the only one who is famous in that field in the United States, and Maya’s agreement follows on line 2. However, after her agreement, she repairs the utterance by expressing that she thought he was famous only because she knows him (lines 3 and 5). On line 3, Maya expresses the overt first-person singular pronoun, in order to indicate that she is the person who knows it, not the others. Therefore, the first-person singular pronoun in this example serves as a disambiguating function. In addition, this first-person singular pronoun also involves a constrastive function, as Maya means it might be the case that she knows only that person, but Yuu, who researches Chinese languages, might know more professors. Therefore, Maya, who only knows this professor, compares herself with Yuu, who might know more professors.

Excerpt (7): Professor Ding

01 Yuu :  Ding sensei kurai da yone, yuumeina no
Ding professor and so on COP FP famous NOM
Professor Ding is the only famous professor right?
02 Miya:  un
Yeah
03 > Miya:  un, a yuumei tte iuka watashi-
Yeah well famous QT say I
well [I mean] rather than that (he) is famous,
04 Yuu :  [ko-, kore ne, ore ra no bunya de wa
this FP I PL GEN field LOC TOP
yeah in our field
05 Miya:  [-ga shit teru ( )
-SUB know ASP
I know him

As seen in the examples in this section, although the particle ga, itself is used in pragmatically highly marked situation(Ono, Suzuki and Thompson, 2000) the fact that contrastive use of the first-person singular pronouns, either with a different particle or without a
particle at all, are seen in the data in this study suggests that not only the particles themselves, but also the first-person singular pronouns, can carry contrastive function.

4.3. Only additional pragmatic function

In this section, we turn to an examination of first-person singular pronouns with only a additional pragmatic function. In other words, these pronouns do not serve to clarify the referent of the argument. This type of first-person pronoun is mainly seen with a frame-setting function and a contrastive function.

4.3.1. Frame-setting function

Ten out of twenty-one examples of the first-person singular pronoun with only additional pragmatic function involve a frame-setting function. Below are examples of the first-person pronoun having frame-setting function.

Excerpt (8): Ideal weddings

01 Mika: jyaa sa kekkonshiki no hanashi then FP wedding ceremony GEN story [Why don’t we talk about] (your) wedding story?
02 Tosh: suo da ne kekkonshiki no hanashi yeah COP FP wedding ceremony GEN story Yeah [let’s talk about] (it)
03 Mika: kyou ikkaime na nn de today first COP NOM so Today is the first day of preparation, right?
04 Mika: nanka douiu, ahaha (laugh) H like what kind So, what kind of...
((Toshi is laughing))
05 Tosh: [un H yeah
06 Mika: [douiu shiki ni suru ka toka H H what kind of ceremony LOC do Q and What kind of ceremony (you) are planning,
07 Tosh: aa ununun= H H H oh yeah yeah
Oh, yeah...

08 Mika:  =zentaikeki ni kousoutoka deki teru no?

overall LOC organization do ASP Q
or have (you) already decided the overall organization of the ceremony?

09 Tosh:  zennzen [deki te naku te
not at all do ASP NEG CONJ
No, (I) haven’t at all

10 Mika:  [a, sokka sokka it te ta yone

oh I see I see say ASP PST FP
Oh (I) see. (I) think (you) told (me) that

11 Tosh:  H

12 > Tosh: so:u. zennzen.. nanka watashi, ((gesture))

Yeah, not at all Well I
Yeah, not at all. I ...

13 Mika:  [un

yeah yeah

14 Tosh:  [kou kekkonshiki ni taishite no,
like wedding ceremony LOC toward GEN
Like for wedding

15 Mika:  un

yeah Yeah...

16 Tosh:  kou risou mitaina no ga
like idea like NOM SUB
Like ideal weddings...

15 Tosh:  hontoni tabun mot te naku te=
really maybe have ASP NEG ASP
(I) seriously don’t have any

16 Mika:  =a, sou na n da. ((bending forward))

oh yes NOM NOM COP
Oh really

In this conversation, Mika and Toshi are talking about the preparations for Toshi’s wedding. On line 12, Toshi starts talking about her story. Toshi knows that “the utterance is going to have something to do with (…) herself, but she (…) has not formulated the morphosyntax (or even the trajectory) of the utterance itself,” which is the explanation of the frame-setting function in Ono and Thompson (2003, p. 336). In other words, Toshi knows that her utterance is going to be about her weddings, but she has not formulated the morphosyntax at this line. The first-person singular pronoun *watashi* in this utterance is not disambiguating, because the first-person
singular pronoun is not necessary in order to convey that the speaker herself is the subject of the proposition. This is because the predicate *risou wo motteiru* meaning “having the idea” can only be expressed in terms of the speaker herself and cannot be said for the other person. This is supported by the fact that in Japanese, when the utterance involves speaker’s physiological and psychological factors internal to the speaker, overt expression of the subject is not necessary, as it is understandable (Ikegami 1982). The *watashi* in this utterance is accompanied with the expression *nanka*\(^4\), which can be translated as the discourse marker “well.” A first-person singular pronoun, accompanied with *nanka*, is one of the most typical expressions seen in the frame-setting function according to Ono and Thompson (2003), so this example matches with the Ono and Thompson (2003)’s findings.

Below is another example of the first-person singular pronoun having frame-setting function:

Excerpt (9): Bruises

(Context: Maya was talking about recreation center, but Taka suddenly interrupts.)

01 Taka: hehe, aza sugoi ne ((pointing at Maya’s bruise))
       haha bruise amazing FP
       Wow, (your) bruises look really bad
02 Maya: yabai de [shou!
         bad COP Q
         Too bad, right?
03 Taka: [do shi ta n? [koro nda n?
          how do PST NOM fall down PST NOM
          What happened? Did (you) fall down?
04 > Maya: [e, atashi kono hanashi shi ma sen deshita kke?
          Hey I this story do COP.Rsp NEG COP.Rsp Q
          Hey haven’t I told you this story before?
05 Maya: sou JITENSHA de, yonkai koro nda no de, ichi ni, ..san...

\(^4\) *Nanka* is originated from the noun *nani* and the question marker *ka*, which shows uncertainty and ambiguity (Nihonkokugo daijiten, 1975). The use of *nanka* functions in a number of ways in a number of different contexts, including as a filler (Takubo & Kinsui, 1997; Iio, 2008), as expectation or emphasis of the utterance (Suzuki, 2000), initiating or developpping the topic, making it into a quotation, concretizing the content of the utterance, and so on (Uchida, 2000).
((counting her bruises))
yeah bicycle LOC four times fall down PST NOM so one two three
Well, yeah (I) fell down from (my) bike four times and one, two, three...

06 Taka: a sonna nn? ((laugh))
oh such NOM
Wow, that many?

07 Maya: [ato doko da tta ka naa
and where COP PST Q FP
Where else do (I) have them?
((Maya is looking at her knees))

08 Taka: [korobu tabini
fall down every time
So, everytime (you) fell down

09 Maya: kocchi gawa ni mo atta ka naa (?)
this side LOC also exist PST Q FP
(I) might have one on this side
((Maya is looking at her other knee))

10 Maya: ato nanka chigau...aza ga aru n desu yoneee...
and well different bruise SUB exist NOM COP_HNR FP terrible COP_HNR
(I) also have another one though.

11 Miya: ° yabai desu yone°
terrible COP FP
Isn’t (it) terrible?

11 Taka: [a sore saikin no hanashi?
oh that recent GEN story
Hey, are they recent?

12 Maya: [‘chotto yoku nat te ki ta ka na°
little better become ASP come PST Q FP
((Maya is seeing her bruises on her knees))
Looks like they are getting a little bit better

13 Maya: iya...itsu dat ta [ka na
no when COP PST Q FP
When did (this) happen?

14 Taka: [amerika de no hanashi?
America LOC GEN story
Was (that) the story back in the US?

15 Maya: amerika de no hanashi desu mochiron mochiron.
America LOC GEN story COP_HNR of course of course
(It) was the story back in the US, of course.

On line 4, Maya initiates talk about her bruises, asking if she had already told Taka about this story on line 4. When she says this, she overtly mentions the first-person singular pronoun watashi on line 4. This watashi is not semantically required, as it is understood that the subject of this utterance is the speaker herself. It is more likely that watashi here is used to show that she is going to tell a story about herself, which she does later on in the conversation. Therefore, the first-person singular pronoun in this example is frame-setting.
As seen in the examples above, one of the characteristics of first-person singular pronouns with frame-setting function is that the utterance involving it initiates the speaker’s storytelling, which consists of multiple Turn Constructional Units (TCU) and describes events in a temporal sequence. In other words, the speaker who utters the first-person singular pronoun with the frame-setting function projects a multi-unit turn. This characteristic is shared by all the examples found in the data. This function can only be identified by looking at the larger interaction, rather than looking at just the utterance by itself. Therefore, one of the crucial interactional functions of the overt first person singular pronoun is the frame-setting function with which the speaker starts to talk about something related to his or herself with multiple TCUs.

4.3.2. Contrastive function

There are ten examples of first-person singular pronouns that are classified into only contrastive function. As mentioned previously, the contrastive first-person singular pronoun contrasts the speaker him/herself with the listener, or the person(s), in the conversation. As the first example given below will show, some of the examples having contrastive function show the contrast by “distinguishing” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, Hall 2014) the speaker from the other with stance-taking or the use of relevant descriptors.

The conversation below, for example, displays a first-person singular pronoun with a contrastive function. In this excerpt, Maya talks to Taka about her experience of ballet in Colorado. In the context of Colorado, where the majority of people are Caucasian, she explains her minority status as an Asian.

Excerpt (10): Ballet

01 Maya: hutsuu no...nanka hakujin..no hito.. toka dato kireru isyou to, normal GEN well Caucasian GEN people etcetra if wearable costume and costumes, which are suitable for normal people, (I) mean Caucasians,
02 Maya: a zen-..dame de saizu teki ni
On line 1 and 2, Maya talks about the costumes in her dance performance, which do not fit her because of the available sizes. She then suggests that she might have been the shortest of all of the dancers (line 9). The utterance at line 9 includes the first-person singular pronoun watashi, which involves contrastive function. This is the contrastive function, because watashi here contrasts with the other people, who are Caucasians. Back to the beginning of the conversation, she establishes that the majority are “Caucasians,” and they are different from her, who is “Asian.” By taking the stance that she is different from them as well as using this contrastive function of watashi, she distinguishes herself as an Asian from the Caucasians.

The next conversation below is another example of only contrastive function with the particle wa. Maya talks about her friend who always asks about the college cheerleaders who use the university’s gym. The excerpt starts with Maya’s explanation of what the friend asked her.
Excerpt (11): Cheerleaders

01 Maya: de, dakara anokotachi wa ittai doko de rensyuu shi teru no, oh so those people TOP by the way where LOC practice do ASP Q
And so, (he) asked (me) a question like “where do those girls practice?”

02 Maya: doko de ki-, kigae teru n da rou< ((imitating his voice))
where LOC change ASP NOM COP Q
Or like, “where do (they) change?”

03 Maya: mitaina koto wo,= like thing ACC
(He) asked (me) such questions

04 Taka: =[hahahahaha
hahahahaha

05 Maya: =[hahahahaha
hahahahaha

06 Taka: sore hahaha
that hahaha
That’s...haha

07 Maya: sou, zutto it te te, yeah for a while say ASP CONJ
Yeah, so (he) was like that all the time

08 Taka: haha

09 > Maya: iyaa sore wa wakan nai desu watashi wa, ((troubled face??))
Well that TOP understand NEG COP_HNR I TOP
Well I have no idea about it

10 > Maya: nando ki-kare te mo watashi wa wakara nai desu,
How many times ask-PSS even if I TOP understand NEG COP_HNR
I don’t know even if you ask me again and again

11 Taka: un
yeah

12 Maya: -tte nanka it te ta n desu kedo,
-QT well say ASP PST NOM COP but
I told him like that several times

In response to the question of the friend, on line 9, Maya answers iyaa sore wa wakan nai desu watashi wa, which means “well, I have no idea about it.” Then on line 10, Maya repeats and emphasizes the answer by saying nando ki kare te mo watashi wa wakara nai desu, which means “I don’t know even if you ask me again and again.” The first-person singular pronoun, watashi, in these two utterances is classified into the constrastive function, because the speaker means that she does not know something compared to others. In addition, this first-person singular pronoun is not using a disambiguating function, because the verbs of the two utterances are the cognitive verb wakaranai, which consists of wakaru (“to know” or “to understand”), and the negative marker nai. In Japanese, we do not need an overt subject for physiological and psychological
expressions, because the evidential suffix indicates the non-overt subject: when the predicate is for non first-person experiences, an evidential suffix is added. Therefore, in general, we do not need an overt subject nor an evidential suffix for wakaru when the subject is the first-person. Thus, the first-person singular pronoun for this verb is not necessary, which is why watashi is not initiating a disambiguating function.

We have seen the interactional categorizations of the first-person singular pronouns in these Japanese conversations, which include only disambiguating function, both disambiguating and additional pragmatic function(s), and only additional pragmatic function(s). There are also some examples that do not fit into any of the categories mentioned. By considering the sequential organization of the conversation more, the next chapter will present new interactive uses of the first-person singular pronouns, which have not yet discussed.
CHAPTER V

New Interactional Use

We are now moving to a different level, to look at the actions the first person singular pronouns do. An interesting environment in which the first person singular pronouns frequently occur, which has not been discussed before, is an account utterance of some event and/or person. This is investigated by taking an interactional linguistic perspective. When analyzing overt first-person singular pronouns in terms of their sequential location, it was discovered that 24% of the first-person singular pronouns are in accounts for an dispreferred or negative statement. According to Heritage (1988), speakers treat their action-in-progress as accountable or as requiring explanation if it is dispreferred, or potentially face threatening act. For this current study, I have defined the term “account” more generally: the reason for the speaker having a certain (negative) opinion or standpoint.

The use of first person pronouns in accounts is an important finding that has not been previously discussed. As we saw in Chapter 4, multiple functions can co-occur, and as a result, some of the functions in the previous chapter occur with the accounting function. However, interestingly, some of the examples in accounting utterances do not involve any functions established in Chapter 4. This is interesting because it shows that the first-person singular pronouns have their functions in the sequence of conversation.

Analyzing the overt use of first-person singular pronouns by their sequential location in conversation, I have categorized 128 first-person singular pronouns by their sequential location in interaction:
Table 4: First-person singular pronouns in sequential location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequential Location</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other functions</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One striking characteristic is that first-person singular pronouns in an accounting utterance are most frequently seen with the disambiguating and contrastive function, as shown in the table below.

Table 5: Functions of the first person singular pronouns in accounting utterance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disambiguating</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame-setting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalizing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples of the accounting function are categorized into five types: accounts for stated or unstated unpreferred answer, accounts in topic and stance shifts, accounts in concessive repair, accounts in background information and expansion, and accounts in storytelling. Although these sub-categories are fuzzy and more research is needed in order to determine the importance of this subcategorization of the accounting cases, a striking pattern is found: almost

---

5 Other functions include the following (the number in parenthesis indicate the number of examples observed): offering information (24), agreement (7), offer (7), other initiated repair (3), insertion (3), request for information (3), affiliation (2), disagreement (2), concessive repair (2), sequence closing third (2), trouble source (1), assessment (1), self-repair (1), place of possible completion (1), and decline of request (1). The rest of them are not categorized into any of the sequential locations as labelled.

6 N/A means not applicable to any of the functional categorizations established, which include disambiguation, frame-setting, personalization, and contrast.

7 Because one first-person singular pronoun can involve multiple functions at the same time, the total number of the first-person singular pronoun is less than the total number of each function.
all of these examples have negative meanings. I will show in my data collection that dispreferred responses are a negative action type, that accounting in topic and stance shifts follows the utterance displaying a different stance from the one previously shared by the participants, background information involves unexpected or unwanted results, and accounts in storytelling express the speaker’s inability to do something. Below, I give examples of each of these categories.

5. 1. Account for dispreferred answer

The most frequently seen examples of accounting utterances, with the first-person singular person, is in accounts for “dispreferred” answers; 40% of the accounting instances are found in this environment. Dispreferred answers are intimately related to sequence organization, namely the adjacency pair, which consists of the first action by the first speaker and the second action by the next speaker (Clift, 2016, pp. 140-141; Raymond, 2017, slide 2). In this framework, the term “preference” describes the treatment of certain actions as non-equivalent, or “preferred” over the other, according to Raymond’s (2017) explanation of this concept. Raymond (2017) points out that “preference” means that some responses build social solidarity with the speaker of the first pair part, while others threaten that social solidarity. Responsive actions that build social solidarity are referred to as “preferred,” while responsive actions that threaten social solidarity are referred to as “dispreferred.” Table 6 below, which is taken from Raymond (2017, slide 7) and Mori (1999, p.113), shows the preference organization for some selected action types:
Table 6: Preference Format of Some Selected Action Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>1st action</th>
<th>Preferred Response</th>
<th>2nd action</th>
<th>Dispreferred Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer/invitation</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-deprecation</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusation/blaming</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the preferred response is typically delivered in a prompt and unqualified manner and is not accountable, dispreferred responses are produced in a delayed and qualified manner and are accountable. For example, when recipients decline a request, an invitation, or an offer made by the prior speaker, the responses tend to be delayed, and the responders provide an account for their dispreferred action. Heritage (1984, p. 266) illustrates a typical example of dispreferred responses:

Example (1) (SBL: 10: 14)

B: Uh if you'd care to come over and visit a little while this morning I'll give you a cup of coffee.
A: hehh Well that's awfully sweet of you, I don't think I can make it this morning
   → .hh uhm I'm running an ad in the paper and
   → and uh I have to stay near the phone.

A’s turn above firstly shows hesitation, followed by appreciation of the offer. Then, declination and account for the declination is demonstrated. By referring to a circumstance preventing them from performing an affiliative action, speakers avoid threatening the “face” of either party or the relationship between the two (cf. Levinson, 1983, p. 337; Heritage, 1984, pp. 269-273; Mori,
Mori (1999:79), which investigates how speakers negotiate disagreements in Japanese, reveals that most of the time the recipients provide an account for their disagreement or noncompliance.

In the data of this study, among these 13 examples, only one of them are accounts for an overt dispreferred response, while 12 are for an unexpressed but inferrable dispreferred response. Each of them has characteristics as discussed in the sections below.

5. 1. 1. Account for overt dispreferred response

The example in this section shows the use of the first-person singular pronoun in accounts for overt dispreferred responses. In other words, in these conversations, a speaker asks a question and the recipient gives a dispreferred response with an account that uses the first-person singular pronoun. The overt dispreferred response observed is an insert expansion, which delays production of a response, as shown in the following example. The excerpt is taken from the conversation between Maya and Yuu, who were both Ph.D students. Just before the excerpt, Maya expresses her admiration for Yuu, who already finished his dissertation and is ready to apply for jobs. Maya is worried about herself because she has started her second Master’s program which will delay her graduation. The excerpt starts with Yuu’s utterance “you are all good” on line 1, which is probably uttered for the purpose of making Maya feel better, and is a compliment. After this utterance, on line 2, Maya says daijyoubu kanaa, which means “am I really ok?” From this line to the end are statements considered to be an insert expansion, seeking confirmation. As this delays production of a response to line 1, it is considered to be a dispreferred response.

Excerpt (12): Master’s student

01    Yuu :   madamada..daijyoubu de-[syo ((laugh)) ((pointing at Maya))
          still still alright      COP-Q
          (You) are all good
02    Maya:                          [daijyoubu kanaa ((laugh))
                                alright      Q
                                Am (I) really ok?
Maya’s account for the utterance 2 starts by line 3, *nanka saa kono* which means “well this.” On lines 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12, Maya expands her account. The utterance on line 10 includes the first-person singular pronoun *watashi*, which is part of her internal monologue. The first-person singular pronoun *watashi* is not categorized into any of the categories that are discussed in Chapter 4, namely, disambiguating nor additional pragmatic functions, including frame-setting, personalization, and contrast. This point suggests that we need to have a new categorization, one that is part of an accounting utterance.

5. 1. 2. Account for a “non-overt” dispreferred response

While there is only one case of an account for overt dispreferred responses, nine cases are accounts for “unstated” or “non-overt” dispreferred responses. That is, in these cases the
recipient does not give an overt, direct response but offers an account for an unexpressed response, which thereby indicates that a dispreferred response is to be inferred. The examples show that accounts for non-overt dispreferred responses include expressions that indicate negative senses, such as the interjection ya or iya, and the conjunction demo, which mean “but,” or nanka, which often translated as “well.” The examples of the first-person singular pronouns in the accounting utterances for non-overt dispreferred responses have either a disambiguating function, a contrastive function, or no other function.

The excerpt below shows an example of the first-person singular pronoun that is used in an account for a non-overt dispreferred response, which is not categorized into any of the categorizations in Chapter 4. In this conversation, Kana and Nao are talking about a message that Nao received from a store manager. Kana asks Nao to show the message to her, but Nao ends up declining. Although, the decline of the request, which is a dispreferred action, is not verbally stated, Nao’s account for the unstated decline indicates that it was declined.

Excerpt (13) Store manager’s LINE

01 Kana: ゜ jyaa”
well
Well

02 Kana: e __ tenchou-no rain...mi tai  wait store manager-GEN LINE see want
(I) want to see the store manager’s text^8 message

03 Nao :  a rain?
oh LINE
What? text?

04 Kana:  un
H
yeah
yeah

05 Nao :  a demo rain mishi te ta no dake da yo
oh but text show ASP PST GEN only COP FP
Oh but (I) have already shown you all the text messages and there is no more

06 Kana:  e are dake?
oh that only
Oh were they all?

07 Nao :  un.

---

8 LINE is an application to exchange messages/texts.
Kana asks Nao to show her the message she received from the store manager for the first time on line 2. From line 3 to 9, there are exchanges where Nao says that she thinks she does not have the message anymore. Then after the exchange, Nao searches messages on her cellphone and Kana says mitai mitai which means “(I) want to see (it)” on line 10, which requests Nao to show the message. On line 11, Nao verbally complies with Kana’s request by saying un iiyo iiyo (“yeah ok ok”). However, on line 12, Nao says nann attake demo watashi keshita kana, which means “well (it) was there? I have erased (it),” which indicates, again, that she might not be able to show the message. Although Nao did not verbally decline Kana’s request of showing the message, the utterance on line 12 works as an account for the non-overt decline. Because of the
fact that Kana requests Nao to share the message twice (as on line 2 and 10), and Nao verbally complied with them on line 11, her eventual rejection to the request would be dispreferred. Given this circumstance, Nao does not verbally reject the request but, instead, verbalizes the account on line 12, by which she presents herself as unable to show the message to Kana, rather than being unwilling to show it to her. Nao’s account, which focuses on the external circumstance rather than internal desire, is a polite way to avoid threatening Kana’s positive face (Raymond, 2017, slide 20). However, in this case, even though the verbalized rejection is not seen, the account starts with the negative conjunction demo (“but”), that projects a negative utterance will follow. Therefore, by these linguistic resources, Kana can assume that her request was indirectly rejected. The first-person singular pronoun watashi in this example cannot be categorized into disambiguating nor additional pragmatic functional categories established in Chapter 4; therefore, this example also shows that the accounting is a new function of overt first-person singular pronouns.

Below is another example of a first-person singular pronoun being used in an accounting sequence for a non-overt dispreferred response. The conversation below is, again, between Kana and Nao, and they are talking about the occurrence of accidents in rivers. Kana has an opinion that there are too many accidents in rivers (as seen on line 11). In order to support the claim that people easily get involved in accidents in rivers, she says that she thinks she will die if she plays at the local river. In a response to this, Nao laughs on line 12 and shows her doubt on line 13. After that, on line 14, Nao accounts for her non-overt disagreement with Kana by saying that she has not been to rivers often enough to judge whether they are dangerous or not. Though avoiding an overt disagreement, Kana still makes an account for the fact that she disagrees with Kana. In this accounting utterance, she displays her inability to make a judgement, which is a polite way of expressing a dispreferred response (Raymond, 2017, slide 20). In this accounting utterance on line 14, the interjection ya appears, which shows her negative attitude toward the opinion which Kana holds.
Excerpt (14) : Accidents in the river

01 Kana: kawa toka ikita i da kedo saa river and so on want NOM COP but FP
(I want to go to the river or that sort but
02 Nao : aaa oh
Oh yeah
03 Kana: kawa no jiko mo saikin ooku nai? river GEN accident also recently a lot NEG
There are so many accidents in the river, aren’t there?
04 Nao : e kawa no jiko? huh river GEN accident
Huh? Accidents in the river?
05 Kana: [kawa de shinu- [kawa de shin jyau mitai na river LOC die river LOC die ASP like FP
Dying in the river
06 Nao : [aaa nanka oh well Oh um
07 Kana: obore sugi jya nai? drown too much COP NEG
Too many people drown, don’t they?
08 Nao : tasuke ni it te, [nanka help LOC go CONJ well
[Some people try to] help those who drown and
09 Kana: toka toka (?) H H etcetra etcetra
Yeah those sort of cases and so on
10 Nao : tashikani definitely Yeah that’s true
11 Kana: hutsuuni watashi kawaasobi de shinu jishin ga aru usuall I playing at river LOC die confident SUB exist
I am confident I will die by playing in the river
12 Nao : ehhehehe ((laugh)) ((putting her hand on her mouth)) hahahaha hahahaha
13 Nao : uso ? lie
Seriously?
((Kana is putting her hand on her mouth and probably open her mouth to say something, but nothing is heard/ audible))
14 > Nao : ya watashi sonnna kawa it ta koto nai, no I such river go PST thing NEG
Well I haven’t played in the river that much

The first-person singular pronoun on line 14, seen in the example above, displays the function of contrast; it is used to contrast Kana with Nao, who has not been to a river often enough to judge
them, as opposed to Kana who Nao thinks probably has. As written above, instead of making an overt disagreement with Kana’s utterance, by saying something like “I don’t think you will die that way,” Nao gives an account for her lack of knowledge, which only implies a possible disagreement with Kana.

As seen in the examples above, there are cases of accounts with an overt first-person singular pronoun for both stated and non-overt dispreferred responses. For the unstated account, the first-person singular pronouns in this utterance have the functions of disambiguating, contrast, or none of the categorizations established in Chapter 4.

5.2. Account in topic and stance shifts

The second classification is first-person singular pronoun in an accounting utterance, in which a speaker in a conversation introduces a different stance for a slightly shifted topic. In this type of example, two speakers establish an affiliation with a topic they are talking about and then one of them brings in a slightly shifted topic from the original and shows her stance on this new position, which is different from the shared stance toward the original topic. There will be three examples shown of this type, and all of these examples will share the fact that the second speaker will display a negative stance towards the slightly shifted topic. The stance will be considered to be negative in the way that the second speaker expresses the different stance (toward the slightly shifted topic).

An example of this type of accounting utterance is seen in the excerpt below. In this conversation, which is between Kana and Nao, the speakers talk about a financial challenge that college seniors face in the gatherings of a social club9, in which the seniors are normally expected to buy food for the younger students. On line 3, Nao says it is a pity for seniors to have

9 "Social club" here is translated from a Japanese word saakuru. Japanese universities mostly have club activities so called saakuru ("circle"), ranging from sportive to cultural, and many college students take part in one or more of them. The culture of Japanese circles reflects the tradition of Japanese hierarchical relationships, in which the younger should show their respect to the seniors in many ways. At the same time, the seniors are expected to treat younger people when they go out to eat.
to pay for food for the rest of the members. From then on, until the line 12, Nao and Kana establish a shared affective stance (negative) toward the system of the club in which older students have to pay for food for younger students.

Excerpt (19): Social club

01 Kana: tabun saishono uchi wa saa, maybe at first TOP FP

02 Kana: hotondo senpai ga hara tte kure te ta n da kedo mostly seniors SUB pay CONJ give ASP PST NOM COP CONJ senior students always paid for the most part

03 Nao: ununun..are kawaisou da yone yeah that pity COP FP

04 Kana: kawaisou da yone pity COP FP

05 Kana: atoni natte kanjiru after become feel (I) feel this way later

06 Nao: aa yeah yeah

07 Kana: sore wa minna mou.. byoudou de yoku nai? tte [omou that TOP everyone already equal LOC good NEG CONJ think (I) think like everyone should pay the equal amount

08 Nao: [un H yeah yeah

09 (2.5)

10 Nao: ne nanka ohiru toka mo nanka ogotte kureru shi ne. H yeah well lunch and also well treat give CONJ FP Yeah (they) treat lunch also right?

11 Kana: ne H yeah yeah

12 Nao: ano seido nan dat ta [n da rou that system what COP PST NOM COP Q (I) wonder what that system was

13 Kana: [ano seido wakan nai yone that system understand NEG FP

14 > Nao: de atashi ichinen..ichinen han..toshi kurai de yame ta kara, And I one year one year and half about LOC quit PST so And I quit it within one year and half, so

15 Kana: H
Nao’s utterance on line 14, which is an account for the utterance on line 16, includes the first-person singular pronoun *atashi*. According to Nao’s words, Nao did not have to treat anyone, because she quit the club after one year, while still a younger student. The utterance on line 14 functions as a shift of the topic, as the sequence just before is closed, and the new sequence begins from the line that includes the first-person singular pronoun. The utterances that work as a sequence closure are on lines 12 and 13, which are a concluding assessment of the topic they are talking about, namely, the system of the social club’s gathering. According to Couper-Kouhen and Selting (2018, p. 338), a “summary assessment, a valenced resume of what the sequence has dealt with so far” is one of the formats that can be deployed to propose sequence closure. In addition to this, the shift in their stance toward the system of the club’s gathering, or the senior students, is seen. Although both participants share a stance “pity,” as they say *kawaisou* (“pity”) on line 3 and 4, for the seniors who need to treat younger students at circle gatherings, as well as showing their doubt for the circle’s system itself, Nao’s utterance on line 13 indicates that it was actually not relevant for herself. Since she laughs upon making this remark, she no longer shows a pity stance, nor a doubtful stance, toward this topic. Instead, she finds humor. The first-person singular pronoun in this accounting example has a frame-setting function as the speaker. Nao knows that she is going to talk about things that are related to herself, and Nao’s utterance projects more to come to talk about her experience.

The same type of example is seen in the next conversation between Kana and Nao. They talk about how scary it is to drive on the metropolitan express way. After they share the stance of being afraid of driving on the metropolitan express way (line 1 to line 14), Kana brings up an episode that shows that she does not act afraid while driving at line 16. Here she uses the first-person singular pronoun *watashi*. The topic shifts and a new stance toward that topic is demonstrated from line 15.
Excerpt (16) Driving

01 Nao: nanka honttoni sugoi to omou n da kedo
well really amazing CONJ think NOM COP CONJ
(I) think that is amazing really

02 Kana: "shutokou kowai yone?"
metropolitan express way scary FP
Isn’t the metropolitan express way scary?

03 Nao: datte mazu kuruma ga ooi shi ((pointing at something))
because first car SUB a lot and
Because, first of all, there are so many cars

04 Kana: ooi
a lot
yeah

05 Nao: kousoku no reberu jya nai, se-, ..ano ((gesture))
high way GEN level COP NEG ? that
It is beyond the usual high ways

06 Nao: [shakan
vehicular gap
spacing

07 Kana: [shasen henkou?=
lane change
[Do you mean] lane change?

08 Nao: sou sou
yeah yeah
yeah

09 (1.0)
10 Nao: chikai shi,
H
near and
Because it is near

11 Kana: H

12 Nao: demo supiido wa deru, shi- ... [de naito ikenai shi
but speed TOP expose CONJ expose NEG must CONJ
But (we) need to have high speed

13 Kana: sou sou supiido dasa nai to sa, puu dashi ((gesture))
yeah yeah speed expose NEG CONJ FP MIM COP CONJ
(We) need to have high speed

14 Nao: sou
yeah
yeah

15 Nao: anmna kowai michi zettai [dekinai ((moving her head))
that scary road absolutely impossible
(I) can’t do on that scary road!

16 Kana: [mechha __ ao rare teru kedo
Very much pressure PSS ASP but
(I) was pressured by other drivers but

17 > Kana: >watashi ao rare temo kini shi nai taipu dakara<
I pressure PSS even mind do NEG type so
I don’t mind being pressured by other drivers

18 Kana: >zutto kouyatte<
Properly this way do-CONJ
(I) do this properly
The utterance on line 15, which expresses an assessment of the topic on which they have been talking, works as a closure of the story. Kana’s utterance at line 17 slightly shifts the topic of the conversation, and the next begins a different topic in terms of the highway. While the participants shared a fearful stance toward driving on the metropolitan highway, Kana’s utterance on line 17 shows that she does not “mind being pressured by other drivers” on the highway. Although the topic, toward which the stance is displayed, slightly shifted, Kana’s words on line 17 could be interpreted as an opposite stance from the one originally shared by the speakers. Therefore, this excerpt shows a slight topic shift as well as a stance shift. The first-person singular pronoun watashi works as a frame-setting agent, as it is used when the speaker knows that she is going to talk about herself, which is a criterion for being categorized into a frame-setting function according to Ono and Thompson (2003).

As seen in the examples above, accounts with a first-person singular pronoun in topic and stance shift are placed after a topic ends. They are used when the topic changes slightly from the previous topic, as well as when a speaker reveals a different stance toward a topic that was related to the topic before. The first-person singular pronouns used in this type of account display a wide range of other functions: frame-setting, personalization, contrast, or those doing disambiguation.

5.3. Account with concessive repair

Similar to the topic and stance shift cases discussed above, there is an example of a first-person singular pronoun in an accounting function that is produced when the topic and the speaker’s stance slightly shift from the original, but in a different way than previously discussed,
namely, with a “concessive repair” (Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson, 2005). Concessive repair is a type of repair when the speakers “retract their own overstatements and exaggerations” (Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson, 2005, p. 257). By Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson’s (2005) definition, concessive repair “makes an explicit display of the reasons for revising a prior formulation and by displaying rationality accomplishes ‘being accountable’” (257). As seen in the following examples, the organization of the concessive repair sequence begins with a concession like (1) and then a revised statement as in (2):

(1) They’re both very good.

(2) I mean Melinda is inclined to spend more than she’s got.

(Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson, 2005, p. 257)

The example below exhibits concessive repair with a first-person singular pronoun. Maya displays that she knows a professor that Yuu is interested in, but then, later on, says she does not know him very much. The excerpt below begins with Yuu’s information seeking utterance on line 1 and 2, which is followed by Maya’s offering information utterance on line 3. Miya answers Yuu’s questions, but, then, later in this excerpt, she says she only knows a little about him about little, with concessive repair, having the overt first-person singular pronoun watashi in the accounting utterance.

Excerpt (17): Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Yuu:</th>
<th>Maya:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>nanka hawaii de..</td>
<td>nihonjin no sensei dareka i nai ka naa toka tte omo tte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>well Hawaii LOC</td>
<td>Japanese GEN professor so exist NEG Q FP etcetera CONJ think CONJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>well at a university in Hawaii</td>
<td>I wonder if there is any Japanese professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iru yo. Sasagawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exist FP Sasagawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is. Prof. Sasagawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(26 lines omitted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30 Maya: nanka ta-. tekisasu...no daigaku de watashi gakkai happyou shi te,
(looking at her phone for searching the information)
Well ? Texas GEN university LOC I conference presentation do CONJ
Well (I) did a conference presentation at a conference in Texas
(5 lines omitted)
36 Maya: shiriai ni nari
acquaintance LOC become
(I) got to know

(20 lines omitted)

((Maya shows Yuu his facebook on her cellphone))
56 Maya: daa, soudane, chainiizu de deteru kara
yeah right Chinese LOC graduate ASP so
Oh yeah (he) got a degree with Chinese so
57 Yuu : un ((back to the original position from drinking))
yeah
58 Maya: sou chuugokugo ya tte
yeah Chinese do ASP
Yeah (he) researched into Chinese languages and...
59 Yuu : un
yeah
60 Maya: [kono sensei no watashi nanka happyou kika na katta kara
((laughing while putting her left hand on her mouth))
This professor GEN I well presentation listen NEG PST so
I didn’t listen to this profesor’s presentation so
61 Yuu : [?? ((Reading the information on Maya’s phone))
62 Maya: chotto waka ranai n da kedo ne ((laugh))((Yuu is smiling))
a little know NEG NOM COP though FP
(I) don’t know him very much though

Maya says that she knows the professor in whom Yuu is interested on line 3 and makes
descriptions of him in the multiple turns, including on lines 56 and 58 in this excerpt (most of the
utterances have been omitted for the purpose of shortening the excerpt), showing her epistemic
authority with regard to the professor. However, she then says on lines 60 and 62 that she does
not actually know the professor very much in terms of what he is currently researching, because
she missed the presentation he gave at the conference she attended recently. The utterances on
lines 60 and 62 together work as a concessive repair. Maya explains on line 60 that she missed
his presentation in order to account for the fact that she later says, on line 62, that she actually
does not know him very much. The first-person singular pronoun in this utterance has both
disambiguating and contrastive functions, in addition to serving as an account. The word *watashi*
distinguishes from the different reference *kono sensei* (‘this professor’), and, at the same time, it
contrasts the speaker herself, who missed his presentation, with the other people who did not miss the presentation. The two lines together make the repair for the overstatement that had been stated previously.

5.4. Account in background information/expansion

First-person singular pronouns in accounts also occur when the speaker provides background information regarding the opinion that he/she holds, specifically if that opinion is negative. In this type of account, the speaker displays a negative stance toward something, and he/she expresses an unwanted or unexpected result of the topic about which the speaker is talking. There are nine examples in the data, and seven of them occur in an account before the opinion is stated. These accounting utterances mostly begin with the particles *nanka, ano,* and *sokka.* The other two examples show an accounting that takes place after an opinion is stated. First is an example of an account which precedes the opinion, and then one which follows the opinion.

The first example is an excerpt from the conversation between Mika and Toshi. In this conversation, Mika describes how she needed to take care of her newborn baby after she and her husband left the hospital.

Excerpt (18): Newborn

01 > Mika:  *nanka uchi no danna san mo,*
           well my GEN husband HT also
           Well my husband,
02     Tosh:  un
           yeah
           yeah
03     Mika:  *yokka kan shika yasumi ga zutto tore naku te,*
           four days only break SUB for a while take NEG CONJ
           (He) could only have four days off
04     Tosh:  un.
           yeah
           yeah
05     Mika:  *dakara, sore da to chotto...hitori de muri kana to omo tte*
           so that COP if little alone LOC impossible Q CONJ think CONJ
           So in that case, (I) would not be able to make it by myself
06     Tosh:  un
On lines 1 and 3, Mika explains that, after she gave birth to their new baby, her husband could only have four days off of work, which was the reason why she thought she needed to have her mother’s help, as stated on lines 5 and 8, even though it had not been part of the original plan. Therefore, this is an example of the unexpected result which is accounted for by the utterance with a first-person pronoun.

The next example, a conversation between Kana and Nao, involves accounting utterances that give background information for an utterance which was made before. In this conversation, Kana talks about a guy she likes and says that he messaged her only because his friend, whose name is Iori, encouraged it. This opinion is stated on lines 1 and 2, and the account is described on line 5. The utterance on line 5 reveals that Kana thinks she pursued him too strongly, which is an action that is not very desirable for a woman to take. The first-person singular pronoun in utterance on line 5 is classified into a disambiguating function because her utterance before includes Iori, who could be a character that is established in the recipient’s mind as a main character. Kana then needs to disambiguate herself as the subject of the proposition. The first-person singular pronoun *watashi* here is followed by the particle *ga*, an exhaustive listing (Kuno 1973), which supports that this disambiguates the subject.

Excerpt (19): The guy she likes

01 Kana: sore wa...kanpeki ni..  
That TOP Perfectly  
that is all because

02 Kana: iori ga osekkai yaite kure ta ndato omouno,  
Iori SUB care give PST NOM COP CONJ think-FP
Iori cared about me I think

03 Nao: soukana..

(I) don’t know

04 (1.8) ((Kana’s noddings are seen)

05 Kana: watashi ga meccha, mou pusshu shi ta kara, ((gesture of pushing))

Because I pushed him a lot

As seen above, this type of accounting, involving the overt first-person singular pronouns, provides background information of the stated or future-stated opinion, and the account demonstrates unexpected or unwanted results for the speaker. The first-person singular pronouns found in this type have mostly disambiguating or contrastive functions, but, as seen in the last example, there is one case with a personalizing function.

5.5. Accounts in storytelling

The remaining six examples of accounting are found in storytelling. Storytelling is a speaker’s activity of producing multi-unit turns to construct a story. In this type of account, the speaker’s opinion/fact comes first and then the account follows in the speaker’s storytelling. In other words, after the speaker’s utterance of his/her opinion or fact, the interlocutor aligns to the production of a multi-unit telling. The alignments include un, unun, and haa. Four out of six examples include an utterance of the speaker’s inability to accomplish an action. Meaning, in these examples, the speaker utters their opinion, and then feels the need to account for their inability to do something by telling a story. In addition, in terms of the function of the first-person singular pronoun, all the examples exhibit a disambiguating function.

The excerpt below shows an example of a first-person singular pronoun in an account in storytelling. In this conversation, Yuu talks about the fact that he has to learn English, followed by an account for that. The utterance on lines 1, 3, and 5 states that Yuu realized the necessity of brushing up on English.
Excerpt (20): English

01 Yuu : cha-, demo-nee, konomae ipura-ni it-te saa no, but-FP last time IPrA-LOC go-ASP and
Well but, recently, when (I) went to IPrA
02 Maya: aa kyonen ((scratching her head))
oh last year
Oh last year
03 Yuu : airu rando ni itte
(I) went to Ireland and
04 Maya: ununun
HH
yeah
yeah
05 Yuu : eigo no kowasa wo jikkan shi ta wake yo ((clap))
English GEN fear ACC notice do PST so FP
(I) realized how (I) am scared by English
(how English is difficult for me)
06 Maya: un
yeah
yeah
07 Yuu : imamade eigo ? yare ba dekiru de syo, mitaina
until now English do if can COP Q like that
So far, (I) was like, “English? (I) can do it if (I) study”
((Eigo:gesture, Mitaina: gesture of showing himself))
08 Maya: un
yeah
yeah
09 Yuu : chotto...genjitsu touhi shi te ta n da kedo,
little reality escape do ASP PST NOM COP but
(I) was kind of procrastinating
10 Maya: unun
yeah
yeah
11 Yuu : iza, asoko ni tata sare te,
once there LOC stand CAUS CONJ
But once (you) were made to stand up for your presentation
12 Maya: haa
yeah
yeah
13 Yuu : shitsumon ga kuru to kou urotaeru no ne,
question SUB come and this flustered NOM FP
And when (you) were asked some questions from the audience,
(you) got completely flustered. Don’t you think so?
14 Maya: haaaa
H H H
Oh I see
15 Yuu : happyou wa,
presentation TOP
Presentation is
16 Yuu : ((gesture))
17 Yuu : ei-, genkou yomu da ke da kedo saa
English paper read only COP but FP
Ok because (I) just need to read the paper but
After Yuu states his opinion from lines 1 to 5, Maya aligns with un or uun (line 6, 8, 18 and 20), unun (line 10), haa (line 12 and 14), all of which promote Yuu’s multi-unit telling. Yuu expands his telling on lines 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17, and then states the account on line 22 with the overt first-person singular pronun jibun. Similar to the utterance on line 22, four of this type of example express the speaker’s inability to do something as the account for the previously stated opinion or fact.

5.6. Summary and implication

As seen in this chapter, one-third of my instances of first person pronouns are produced in an account. The use of first person pronouns in accounts in Japanese is a new finding that has not been discussed before in the literature on Japanese linguistics. Since most of the first-person singular pronouns seen in my data have a disambiguating function - either only disambiguating or both disambiguating and additional pragmatic functions- it is not surprising that many of the accounting cases discussed in this chapter also include disambiguating function. However, it is more interesting to be able to see many contrastive functions in an accounting

---

10 jibun is a reflexive pronoun, which syntactically takes the subject as its antecedent and/or logophorically takes for its antecedent the participant whose consciousness, or point-of-view, is expressed (Iwasaki, 1991, pp. 267-268). However, in this example, jibun is used in neither way and is substituted with the first-person singular pronoun. Therefore, this jibun is treated as a first-person pronoun.
sequence without the disambiguating function. This implies that the speaker tends to overtly expresses themselves when they think their opinions are different from the other speaker.

This study makes a further contribution in noting that most of these examples are negative in some ways. Dispreferred response is a negative action type, as are topic and stance shifts when they display a stance that is different from the one previously shared. Additionally, background information/expansion involves unexpected or unwanted results, and accounts in storytelling include a confession as to an aspect of the speaker’s incapability. The fact that the speakers in the data feel the need to make accounts for negative utterances relates to this nature of accounts, which are “most extraordinary” (Sacks, 1992, p. 4 [Clift, 2016, p. 41]), and used to avoid potential threat to face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In this respect, the speakers in the data make an account to constitute “remedial exchange” (Goffman, 1971 [Raymond, forthcoming, p. 4]) for the purpose of continuing to engage in polite interaction, a way of reflecting the social order.

Finally, the use of first-person singular pronouns in accounting utterances, specifically in order to express negative elements, holds interesting implications. The fact that the use of overt first-person singular pronouns is marked in Japanese could be traced back to the origin of their usage in history. The personal pronouns’ semantic shift in relation to the politeness, as shown in Chapter 2, suggests that the use of overt personal pronouns in Japanese has been regarded as “taboo,” according to Suzuki (1973, p. 145). Because the use of overt personal pronouns has not been desirable in Japanese, personal pronouns tend to be used only when it is necessary (Suzuki, 1973, p. 145). These points relate to the accounting cases we have seen in this study, which are generally used for dispreferred actions or negative statements and recognized as an “extraordinary” action type (Sacks, 1992, p. 296 [Clift, 2016, p. 41]). That is, accounts are necessary in order for the speaker to “save face,” and the first-person singular pronouns with disambiguating and contrastive functions are also necessarily presented to convey the speaker’s meaning in the account.
By looking at the linguistic resources that are overtly shown, particularly the first-person singular pronoun cases, the study reveals an interesting use from the perspective of Interactional Linguistics. However, more research is needed in order to verify conclusively that this is the most prevalent tendency of the use of the first-person pronouns, as well as the connection with the sociocultural consideration.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

In this study, overt first-person singular pronouns in interactions were analyzed. The analysis is based on the idea that overt first-person singular pronouns are marked in interaction and, therefore, have their own meaning. The study found that first-person singular pronouns have interactional functions, which fall under the following categories: only disambiguating function, disambiguating and additional pragmatic function, and only the additional pragmatic function(s). There are also some examples that do not fit into any of the categorizations mentioned, which are found in accounting sequences. Many of the accounting cases, however, overlap with other functions as well, mostly with disambiguating and/or contrastive functions.

This study makes a further contribution in noting that most of these examples are negative in some ways: dispreferred response is a negative action type, topic and stance shifts following the initial utterance that is different from the one previously shared by the participants, background information/expansion that involves unexpected or unwanted results, and accounts in storytelling which express the speaker’s incapability.

Considering the fact that accounting cases are mainly seen in negative circumstances, the avoidance of overt personal pronoun usage (Suzuki, 1973) seems to relate to that. Disambiguating is necessary for semantically conveying the speaker’s meaning, so, in that context, uttering the overt first-person singular pronoun is necessary. When accounting is necessary for the dispreferred action or negative proposition, the overt first-person singular pronoun is used in a way that is motivated. The speaker tends to overtly express him- or herself, when their opinions or standpoint are different from the other speaker, by referring to oneself with a disambiguating function. In this sense, while overt usage is marked, speakers use overt pronouns for a purpose. However, despite these interesting findings about the functions, what meaning is added by using overt first-person singular pronouns is a future topic. While we have
seen the examples in accounting sequence, more data and research is required to conclude why overt pronouns are seen in such environments.

By looking at the linguistic resources that are overtly shown in the sequence of conversation, the study reveals interesting usages of the first-person singular pronoun in Japanese that had not previously been discovered. The findings were shown by adopting an Interactional Linguistics perspective, which investigates grammar and language use in interaction, emphasizing “unmotivated looking” for observing the naturally occurring interactional data (Couper-Kuhlen & Seltic, 2018, p. 13). In spite of these interesting findings, more research is required to understand why accounting is one of the tendencies that is seen in the use of the first-person pronouns in interaction; perhaps it relates to sociocultural issues in interaction. More research will be needed to explore this and other questions raised by this study.
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Title of research study: An analysis of morpho-syntactic features in Japanese conversations
Investigator: Miyabi Ozawa
IRB Protocol Number: 18-0348

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study is to investigate morpho-syntax in Japanese conversations and try to reveal how it is dynamically constituted throughout the interaction. The collected data forms a valuable linguistic resource and will be used in a range of academic research projects in linguistics, psychology, and speech and language processing. We invite you to take part in this research study because you are native Japanese speakers. We expect that you will be in this research study for 30 minutes to an hour in July in 2018 in Japan. We expect 2-3 people will participate in each of the conversation for this research study.

Explanation of Procedures
The data collection will take place at the researcher’s apartment, the researcher’s friend’s apartment, Japan Women's University, a café, or restaurant with two to three participants. The participants can eat and drink while having a conversation, which will be recorded on videotape.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal
Whether or not you take part in this research is your choice. You can leave the research at any time and it will not be held against you. If you are a CU Boulder student or employee, taking part in this research is not part of your class work or duties. You can refuse to enroll, or withdraw after enrolling at any time, with no effect on your class standing, grades, or job at CU Boulder. You will not be offered or receive any special consideration if you take part in this research.

Confidentiality
Information obtained about you for this study will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. Research information that identifies you may be shared with the University of Colorado Boulder.
compliance with laws and regulations related to research, including people on behalf of the Office for Human Research Protections. The information from this research may be published for scientific purposes; however, your identity will not be given out.

**Questions**
If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to the research team at miyabi.ozawa@colorado.edu
This research has been reviewed and approved by an Institutional Review Board (IRB). You may talk to them at (303) 735-3702 or irbadmin@colorado.edu if:
• Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
• You cannot reach the research team.
• You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
• You have questions about your rights as a research subject.
• You want to get information or provide input about this research.

**Signatures**
Your signature documents your permission to take part in this research.

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of subject Date

________________________________________________________________________
Printed name of subject

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of person obtaining consent Date

________________________________________________________________________
Printed name of person obtaining consent
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APPENDIX

List of abbreviations used in the inter-linear gloss:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>final particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNR</td>
<td>honorific marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>honorific title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>interjection particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>quotative particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>