

# Interactional expectations and linguistic knowledge in academic expert discourse (Japanese/German)\*

CHRISTIANE HOHENSTEIN

## Abstract

*This article deals with the relation of linguistic knowledge and interactional expectations in spoken professional discourse, more specifically, academic expert presentations in Japanese and German, L1 and L2. It argues that crucial pragmatic differences between L1 Japanese and L1 German corpus data concern linguistic means which process interactional expectations on the part of the hearer in language specific manners. Because of differing discourse procedures in Japanese and German, as hearers, German and Japanese L1 speakers hold differing expectations toward what a speaker is doing and how s/he is going about it. The significance of these ‘interactional expectations’ is in that they facilitate processes of understanding on the part of the hearer (H) by enabling H to anticipate illocutionary and/or propositional relations between utterances in discourse. After a short discussion of the concept of “interactional expectations” in section 1, the data and research context are described section 2. Drawing on corpus data, some of the characteristics and distinct language specific constructions in L1 Japanese academic expert presentations are outlined and contrasted with L1 German in section 3; in section 4 a comparison of an L1 Japanese example with L2 German by an L1 Japanese speaker reveals “pragmatic transfer” based on differences in the pragmatic patterns of L1 Japanese and L1 German discourses, specifically discussed with regard to aspects of social deixis/politeness. In section 5 supplementary evidence of a general difference between (inter-)actional and propositional organization in Japanese and German academic expert presentations is discussed with regard to fillers/speaker’s exotheses and prefatory actions, and in section 6 modals and connectives as linguistic means organizing discourse structures. In section 7, a conclusion is drawn focusing on the need to reflect on interactional expectations in multilingual settings, in order to enable L1 interactants to link non-L1 like linguistic realizations to actually shared discourse purposes in multilingual constellations.*

## 1. The notion of interactional “expectations”

The idea, that expectations shape how we interact has been discussed in various studies in discourse and conversation analyses, among the earliest being Galtung (1959), Garfinkel (1967), and Ehlich and Rehbein (1972). With regard to frames, it has been taken up by Tannen (1979); more recently, *interactional expectations* have been discussed with regard to intercultural communication, e.g., by Clyne (1996)<sup>1</sup> in a field study on intercultural workplace communication, and in casual/homileic discourse by Günthner and Luckmann (2001) and Rehbein and Fienemann (2004), focusing on their divergence and its consequences on L2 speakers. There is a general understanding that expectations are correlated to routine patterns of interaction, to factors of situational context, and constellation, which are part of the speakers’ knowledge. Moreover, in a contrastive study on Japanese and German telephone conversations, Sugita (2004) finds a correlation of interactional expectations to particular linguistic resources the individual languages provide. Since these are sequential discourses, the question arises as to how linguistic means operate on interactional expectations in concatenative discourse, particularly in academic expert presentations, where turn taking and direct response to breached expectations is systematically precluded.

Considering the impact linguistic realizations of specific patterns in academic communication may have on L2 academic writing in closely related languages like English and German — e.g., modal verb constructions (Redder 2001; Fandrych and Graefen 2002), advance organizers, justification (Thielmann 1999, 2003) —, it is to be expected that readers and hearers hold different genre and discourse-type related expectations in typologically distant language pairs such as Japanese and German.

On the basis of shared knowledge, speakers (S) and hearers (H) make tacit assumptions about what is to be said or done, especially in recurring speech situations (standard situations), and even more so in institutional discourses. These tacit assumptions are presuppositions which hearers and speakers — by their knowledge of discourse forms, standard (speech) situations and standard constellations — relate unquestioningly to ongoing interaction. Assumptions are reciprocal. The shared knowledge of S and H consists of historically and socioculturally developed information, bound by language and connected to a society’s practices, acquired in the course of L1 acquisition, school and professional training, and often referred to as knowledge of ‘genre’ (e.g., Günthner and Luckmann 2001; Mayes 2003: §2; Yotsukura 2003: 63–74). Differences in that knowledge may result in asymmetric expectations and unexpected utterances. Only when discrepancies occur as breaches or irritations in interaction, can

interactional expectations be made explicit. However, as Günthner and Luckmann (2001: 79) observe, even though the danger of asymmetries and consequential expectation breaches is “more pronounced” in intercultural than in intracultural communication, there often is a lack of willingness in intercultural constellations to acknowledge and resolve that basic sociocultural asymmetry. Instead, the interactant breaching interactional expectations will, as an individual, be evaluated negatively (cf. as well Rehbein and Fienemann 2004). In professional settings this may have grave consequences, up to the point that an (L2) S breaching (L1) H’s expectations may lose the attention of H or may not be taken seriously by H. At the very least, L2 speakers may find it difficult to achieve their communication purpose. As Ehlich and Rehbein state (1972: 105, translation by C.H.): “The (inter-)actional presuppositions or expectations an interactant holds with regard to a specific interaction vis-a-vis an interactant establish an action system. And the interactional presuppositions (expectations) shared by both, S and H, constitute that action system.”<sup>2</sup>

Thus, an action system, i.e., a basic cooperation in order to achieve a joint goal, is built on interactional expectations, which enable H to anticipate the actions of S and vice versa. The significance of these “interactional expectations” is in facilitating understanding. This article departs from the assumption that interactional expectations are closely related to L1 knowledge of a hearer/speaker, and are therefore difficult to overcome when an L2 is used in interaction. However, if pragmatic knowledge is related to linguistic knowledge, it should be possible to overcome interfering interactional expectations by reflecting the different linguistic means related to specific interactional expectations in L1 and L2. This article attempts to outline a few such linguistic means with regard to Japanese and German academic expert presentations.

## **2. Data and method**

The research project “Japanese and German Expert Discourse in mono- and multilingual constellations” (JadEx) focuses on spoken expert communication in L1 and L2 Japanese and in L1 and L2 German. A large part of the corpus consists of L1 expert discourses, aiming at *contrasting* German and Japanese spoken by L1 speakers in professional settings. As a medium of comparison, linguistic means of verbal interaction, and domains of interactional purposes are used. Findings on professional L1 discourse are then compared to case studies of professional settings, where L2 German is spoken by L1 Japanese speakers and L2 Japanese by L1

German speakers, respectively.<sup>3</sup> As exemplary forms of expert discourse *presentational discourses* and *planning discourses* are examined, since each of these forms of oral discourse represent an interaction type carrying specific features: Whereas planning discourse is characterized by frequent turn taking and alternating speaker and hearer roles, presentational discourse is organized concatenatively, i.e., organized predominantly in one extended turn uttered by a single speaker, who links utterances to one another.<sup>4</sup> The hearer's turn is institutionally suspended and formally restricted to the discussion after the presentation. This institutional setting concurs with the discourse purpose of (i) publicly presenting complex matters of expert knowledge on the part of S that are (assumed to be) unknown to H; and (ii) offering H an opportunity to react to, question or acclaim what has been presented.<sup>5</sup>

The data considered here consist of about 110.000 words produced by 37 speakers. They are transcribed according to HiAt conventions and examined from a functional-pragmatic perspective, i.e., the purposes of S and H in interacting are interpreted in relation to linguistic constructions and singular language specific means.<sup>6</sup> L2 data from both German and Japanese matching the L1 German and L1 Japanese academic conference presentations in our corpus allow for a case based comparison of L1 and L2 data. From an applied linguistics perspective, academic presentations constitute a discourse type of some relevance for advanced and professional L2 speakers, which has received little attention up to now.<sup>7</sup> Since structurally, academic conference presentations are quite a homogenous discourse type — even though types of argumentation and presentation may differ considerably —, differences between Japanese and German present themselves fairly clearly. Contrasting L1 discourse data from Japanese and German reveals language specific differences in discourse structure providing a basis for inferring differing interactional expectations via deduction of interactional needs condensed in language specific forms of expression. Using the Japanese data as our point of departure, contrasts will be highlighted and related to L2 data.

### 3. Contrastive aspects in L1 Japanese and L1 German data

By contrasting L1 Japanese and L1 German data, common structures and aspects as well as characteristic differences become evident. In both Japanese and German academic expert presentations the concatenation of utterances is not uniformly structured by assertions transmitting specialized knowledge. At least three types of verbal action are to be distinguished: (i) verbalizations concerned with organizing *propositional*

content, expanding H's knowledge on a shared topic (or 'theme of knowledge', cf. Ehlich and Rehbein [1977]) based on S's expert knowledge; (ii) verbal actions *accompanying practical tasks* on S's part, like commenting on OHP films etc. ("empractical" verbal actions, cf. Bühler 1934); and (iii) verbalizations where *verbal action itself in relation to H* becomes the subject of linguistic interaction.<sup>8</sup> The latter type, related to means of hearer addressing, presents itself in greater variety and to a greater extent in the Japanese data when compared to L1 German academic presentational discourse. From the angle of interactional expectations this difference is particularly interesting, since it concerns verbal actions and linguistic means that verbalize aspects of the interactional constellation and the speech situation shared by S and H. Table 1 captures interactional domains, action types, and tokens in question based on contrastive analyses of L1 Japanese and L1 German corpus data.<sup>9</sup>

The linguistic means cited in Table 1 have in common that they organize linguistic interactions. They are directed at mental actions on the part of H. In different manners, in the course of a progressing academic expert presentation, they enable H to relate S' speech actions to the interactional context of the actual speech situation and constellation.

Point 1 regards a linguistic action which is peculiar to the Japanese presentational data and missing in German L1 data. Since in this case, pragmatic contrast most clearly exerts an influence of "pragmatic transfer" (Rehbein and Fienemann 2004) on L2 use, interactional expectations of

Table 1. *Distinct characteristics in L1 Japanese academic expert presentations*

Interactional domain	Action type	L1 Japanese corpus examples	L1 German corpus examples
1. social deixis/politeness	routinized speech formulae	<i>yoroshiku onegai-shimasu</i> and <i>sasete itadaku</i> construction	—
2. linguistic means 'prompting' H	speaker's exotheses (speech action augments and inserted 'fillers')	<i>ano, ee, eeto</i> , vowel lengthening, <i>ma/maa, desu ne</i>	<i>äh/öh, ja, nun</i> , vowel lengthening
3. preparational, prefatory actions	announcements of subsequent actions	<i>setsumei-shimasu</i> [I will explain]	<i>ich zeige</i> [I will show]
4. 'action modality'	assessments e.g., <i>I think</i> constructions	<i>to omou</i>	{ <i>ich glaube, denke, meine, (dass)</i> }
5. 'action connectivity'	utterance-initial, and utterance-final connectives	<i>kara, wake; keredomo, ga</i>	{ <i>weil, da, denn; (zwar) aber, obgleich</i> }

an L1 hearer are most clearly deducible based on that contrast. Implications of this action type will be discussed with the help of L1 and L2 data in greater detail in section 4.

Points 2 and 3 concern linguistic means typical of spoken discourse which are used by S to help H process aspects of utterance-internal online planning and to anticipate successions of speech actions in the actual speech situation (section 5).

Points 4 and 5 regard specific linguistic means of modality and connectivity in academic expert presentations that occur frequently in the Japanese data. However, if compared to approximating modal and connective expressions in the German data, differences of frequency and function are observable. In particular, modal and connective expressions in the Japanese data often process parts of the course of action, that is, they operate on interactional expectations regarding aspects of the action line (“Handlungslinie” cf. Rehbein 1977), whereas German modals and connectives are used more often to process H’s mental reconstruction of propositional relations in the utterance.<sup>10</sup>

In all the interactional domains mentioned, the interactional expectations regarding the functions as well as the occurrence of the expressions will differ between L1 hearers and L2 hearers because of the differences existing in L1 Japanese and L1 German, which are part of their respective linguistic knowledge. In the following section, drawing on L1 and L2 discourse data, an attempt at reconstructing the functionality of linguistic means of social deixis is made in order to draw conclusions about the interactional needs of S and the interactional expectations held by H.

#### 4. Aspects of social deixis<sup>11</sup>/politeness

In about one third of the Japanese academic conference presentations, the speaker uses the speech formula *yoroshiku onegai-shimasu* or a variant thereof at an early point in the presentation, after introducing her/himself and the subject of the talk. This formula has no equivalent in German and is, therefore, difficult to translate — an approximation being “I beg your benevolence”. Used routinely in interactional constellations after introducing one’s name to interactants one is not acquainted with, its function is to establish a frame for future interaction. In academic expert presentations, at first sight, and from a normative point of view, the formula could be interpreted as a conventionalized politeness routine for “attuning” oneself to H. However, that interpretation cannot explain how this particular formula operates, what it does in terms of the cooperative

action system between S and H, and exactly why it is used. Example (1) illustrates its use in academic expert discourse.

(1) 0513: L1 Japanese expert speaker

9				1004	
YK	<b>arimasu</b>	<b>kedomo</b> .	<b>Ano:</b>	<b>kore kara ee</b> ,	<b>fukai</b>
IT		though	this	from	deep
AU			Uh,	and in order to	deepen our research

10					
YK	<b>kenkyuu o okonau</b>	<b>tame ni wa</b> ,	<b>ma,</b>	<i>(fuoro-)</i>	<i>appu-</i>
IT	research	carry out	sake	for TOP	(follow-up)
AU	from now on,				well, we will have to do

11					
YK	<b>teki na koto o e</b> ,	<b>yananakereba</b>	<b>ikenai to iu koto de</b> ,		
IT	matter ACC	if we don't do	cannot go as named matter being		
AU	(follow-up) studies,				and

12					1005
YK	<b>ano</b>	<b>[kou'en-sasete itadakimashita]</b> .	<b>Ee</b> ,	<b>kore</b>	
IT	lecture-telling me do	I/we received from you	yes, this		
AU	uh so I was	invited for a lecture.			Uh, hereafter

[lit.: 'you kindly let me/us give a talk']

13					1006
YK	<b>kara mo</b>	<b>[yoroshiku onegai-shimasu]</b> .	<b>De</b> ,	<b>etto</b> ,	
IT	from as well well/convenient	I beg you			Und jaäh
AU	as well, I beg your benevolence.				Und ja äh,

[routine formula]

In example (1), the L1 Japanese speaker starts with several introductory utterances identifying himself, his institutional affiliation and the title of his presentation, and goes on, in scores (9–12), to account for his imminent talk (“we have to do (x) and so I am giving a presentation”). Only after he had uttered, in score 13, “*yoroshiku onegai shimasu*”, did he move on to his subject proper, executing by that speech formula a kind of caesura between introduction and subject-oriented talk. In pragmatic terms then, that formula carries a discourse structuring function, which goes beyond what concepts of “politeness”, or of “face”, respectively,

Table 2. *Construction and morphology*

kou'en	-sase.te	itadaki.mashi.ta
N- [talk/presentation-]	-VKs.IK [-(you) causing (me) to do]	Vho. Vhm.Pt% [I gratefully received from you]

carry.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, the speech formula *yoroshiku onegai-shimasu* bears a close connection to a preceding deferential-polite causative predicate (cf. score 12; Table 2). This kind of causative predication is used by 64% of the Japanese speakers in the corpus, even if they do not use the *yoroshiku* formula and by all except one of the speakers using the *yoroshiku* formula in our corpus.<sup>13</sup> However, such a causative predication does not appear in our L2 Japanese data, whereas the *yoroshiku* formula is made use of. Actually, it is the causative construction that expresses the speaker's respect toward his audience, by recognizing the occasion as a favour granted by H/the audience (“*Koen-sasete itadakimashita*” [literally: I kindly received (your favour) that you let/make me give a talk]).

Literally, the predicate in Table 2 is an assertion stating that (i) S has been caused by the hearer to give the presentation under way; and (ii) H has granted this as a favour to S. That is, the institutional constellation which entitles a speaker to a conference presentation by granting S expert status is reinterpreted by S within the speech situation as a constellation between hearers and speaker *made possible by H*. By verbally acknowledging the interactional power of H (granting, causing S' speech actions), S establishes a cooperative action system with H, which sets an interactional footing for his presentation. The subsequent speech formula “*yoroshiku onegai-shimasu*” (~ “I beg your benevolence”) in example (1), combined with a deixis pointing to the current speech situation (“*kore kara*” [from now on, hence], score 13), is actually a request for a *continued goodwill* from H to S, adjoined to the utterance of respectful recognition of H.

In our data, L2 Japanese speakers tend to use the *yoroshiku* speech formula *without* a preceding causative predication acknowledging the hearer's role. That is, the *yoroshiku*-speech formula hits upon the L1 H without an interactional precedent that sets the basis for the hearer's goodwill. Consequentially, these L2 Japanese speakers omit that part of the speech action which brings about a compliance of L1 Japanese hearers in establishing a cooperative action system.

Thus, findings in the Japanese data suggest a pragmatic correlation between the *yoroshiku* formula and a causative predication which is not realized by L2 speakers. Even though this pragmatic correlation may not be taken in the sense of a ‘norm’ of interaction — and not verbalizing



either may well go unsanctioned — the plain use of a causative predication as well as its combined use with the *yoroshiku* formula may be conceived of as a part of the linguistic knowledge of L1 Japanese speaker–hearers. And it is a linguistic means expressing a specific interactional relation between S and H in a conference presentation in order to create a cooperative action system. Thus, even if they may not normatively expect that S *verbally* has to establish the joint action system in this manner when entering an extended turn of an academic presentation, L1 hearers of Japanese may withhold interactional compliance and respond less cooperatively if S fails to acknowledge by means of a causative predication their part in establishing the speech situation. Moreover, Japanese speakers do comply with this interactional expectation to varying extent even in L2 German, as example (2) illustrates, where in utterance segment 4d a verbalization is made, the type of which is not found in the L1 German data.

(2) 0202: L2 German by L1 Japanese expert speaker

*The speaker verbalizes his gratitude for a detailed introduction given by the inviting Professor immediately before the utterance segments 3–5.*

[Utterance segment 3]

*Äh ich freue mich überhaupt sehr, bei Ihnen zu sein.*

‘Uh, I am altogether very much delighted to be here, at your institute.’

[Utterance segment 4a]

*Und ich bin äh ziemlich kurzfristig hier*

And I am EX quite on short notice here

*eingesprungen,*

jumped in

‘And I uh stepped in here rather on short notice,

[Utterance segment 4b]

*[weil], äh wie äh Herr Professor \*\* vorhin äh*

because EX as EX Mr. Prof. \*\* just before EX

*erwähnt hat,*

mentioned has

[because] uh, as uh Professor \*\* has just uh mentioned,

*äh ich bin jetzt an der Japanologie der*

EX I am now at the Japanology of the

*Universität \*\* tätig, als äh Gastprofessor,*

university of \*\* working as EX guest professor

uh at the moment I am working in the Japanese department of the

university of \*\*, as a visiting professor,

[Utterance segment 4c]

*und [weil ich aber] etliche Leute von/  
and because I yet/ but a few people of  
and [but because I] already knew a few people of/  
also etliche Leute, die hier tätig sind, schon  
well a few people who here working are already  
gekant habe,  
acquainted have  
well, a few people who are working here,*

[Utterance segment 4d]

*[bin ich äh zum Glück dazu gekommen, hier,  
have I EX fortunately to that happened upon here  
also bei Ihnen,  
well at yours*

→ [I uh fortunately happened upon the chance here, well at your institute,

→ *mich/ dass ich mich bei Ihnen • äh etwas  
me that I me/myself at yours EX a little  
präsentieren darf].*

present may/am allowed

myself/that I may present myself, uh a little here.]’

[Utterance segment 5]

*So, äh ja, ich möchte heute über sogenannte “unpersönliche Konstruktionen” sprechen.*

Well, uh yes, I would like to speak today about so called “impersonal constructions”.

In example (2) an L1 Japanese expert speaker with a high proficiency of L2 German introduces his presentation in L2 German. Several aspects in his complex utterance segment 4 are reminiscent of L1 Japanese presentations: the prominent use of speaker-exothetical “äh” (underlined above, cf. section 3); the embedded causal subclauses with *weil* [because], segments 4b and 4c; the use of particle *aber* [but], segment 4c (cf. section 3); and in particular the utterance-final predication in segment 4d, “*bin ich zum Glück dazu gekommen (... ) dass ich mich bei Ihnen äh etwas präsentieren darf*” [“I fortunately happened upon the chance that I may present myself a little here at your place/institute”].

The complete utterance 4 is untypical of our L1 German corpus — not a single instance of a similar utterance in terms of proposition or illocution can be found in the L1 German data. However, in light of a comparison with the Japanese constructions discussed above, it is clear that this utterance constitutes an attempt to express what is not usually

verbally expressed in German academic presentations, carrying out a speech action which establishes the joint action system between S and H.<sup>15</sup> In particular, segment 4d employs a construction “*ich bin dazu gekommen, dass*” [“I happened upon”], where the agent is expressed as not actively involved in the creation of a (speech) situation that he assesses positively (“zum Glück” [fortunately]). In combination with the modal verb *darf* [may/be allowed], which expresses an action potential of S rendered possible by an interactant/H,<sup>16</sup> these linguistic expressions achieve a likeness to the *sasete itadaku* causative construction, in that they verbalize the speaker’s position as someone receiving the opportunity of being allowed to give a talk. As there is no directly related expression of the *yoroshiku* formula (the request for a hearer’s benevolence during the presentation), example (2) demonstrates that actually the causative construction is the more prominent verbal means in a Japanese speaker’s mind for the verbalization of constellational features in order to establish a joint action system.

By contrast, in L1 German academic expert presentations, speakers introduce the subject of their talk fairly quickly without verbally considering the role H takes in the creation of the speech situation. Thus, constellational factors regarding the hearer’s role remain tacit in the German data; rather, the action system is taken for granted by virtue of the institutional constellation: Since a speaker has been selected institutionally in the interactional prehistory, and turn allotment has been carried out by the institution, the constellation and speech situation of the actual presentation is taken as an established action system of which institution and audience are a part.<sup>17</sup>

Summarizing some findings reported elsewhere, I will now briefly discuss the interactional domains (2) through (5) mentioned in Table 1 in section 3.

## 5. Fillers/speaker’s exothesis, and prefatory actions

### 5.1. Fillers/speaker’s exothesis

“Fillers” (cf. Yamane 2002) and “speech action augments” (cf. Rehbein 1979) belong to the group of *linguistic means ‘prompting’ H* to an immediate mental, physical and/or emotional response. Linguistic means like vowel lengthening, insertion of *ano, sono, desu ne, ma/maa*, and *ee, eeto/etto* are common and well used fillers in the L1 Japanese data. Compared to the L1 German data, where mostly *äh/ähm/öh/öhm* and some occurrences of *ja, nun* and vowel lengthening are observed, they

exist in greater variety and are used more often in the Japanese academic presentations. In Examples (1) and (2) in section 4, instances of *ano*, *ee/e* and *ma* (example [1], scores 9, 10, 11, 12), and *äh*, *äh ja* (example (2), underlined) occur. Fillers like these have been analyzed in functional-pragmatic terms as *speaker-exothetical* means (Hohenstein and Kameyama 1996; Hohenstein 1999). *Speaker exotheses* are characteristically uttered in a lower voice and with proгредиant intonation contour, addressed partly to H, and partly to S oneself. Their specific interactional function is (i) to express a mental search process regarding the verbal realization of an action plan on the part of S, which involves relating different action types of mental, verbal, empractical, and nonverbal-practical actions to each other while interacting; (ii) to indicate this mental process to H and prompt H to partake mentally in it. H thus is forced to cooperate mentally even though the verbalization is ruptured at that very moment and interactionally no progress is made. By this twofold functionality, a speaker's exotheses help constitute a coherent path of action, in spite of the ruptured performance of the speech action as parts of the speech action plan are not readily available to S.<sup>18</sup> As means of the 'prompting field of language'<sup>19</sup>, they expedite H's coordination with S's mental processes pertaining to the interaction and thus constitute a rather direct access to H's action field (cf. Rehbein and Fienemann 2004). This may be a reason why, under normative aspects, it is considered 'bad style' to use Japanese *ano*, *eeto* or German *äh* in expert presentations. Nevertheless, these means are used in *all* L1 presentations in the corpus, which clearly shows that L1 speakers feel a certain need to use them — if subconsciously or even against their own normative notions of expert discourses. Moreover, speakers and hearers usually do not register speaker exotheses being used, that is, during perception and mental reconstruction of what has been said, H filters them out from the linguistic material that is processed propositionally. While they 'chunk up' the utterances between constituents in order to gain planning time for S, they also enable H to gain a better subsequent reception of complex utterances in discourse. Their ubiquitous occurrence in the data allows for the inference that these linguistic means are functional means in academic expert presentations, and as such are subject to interactional expectations as well.

## 5.2. Prefatory actions

Under point 3 in Table 1 (cf. section 3), preparational and prefatory actions were captured. These are speech actions preorganizing the internal structure of academic expert presentations, by announcing imminent

speech actions or an entire planned course of action. *Announcements*, as illustrated by example (3), fulfill the task of preparing H to expect a particular subsequent action on the part of S, in that case, an explanatory speech action.

(3) 0510, (s3): L1 Japanese expert speaker

((preparing OHP film, 10s))

*Etto mazu, koko de iu han'you-shisourasu to wa nani ka • ni tsuite setsumei-shimasu.*

yes uh first here says multi.purpose-thesaurus as TOP  
what IR regarding explanation-make[polite]

'Yes, uh, at first, I (shall) explain what a 'multi-purpose-thesaurus'  
— as it is called here — is.'

In extended speaker turns, where H has no control over the course of action S is taking, *announcements* of subsequent actions help H to anticipate S' line of action, develop an action focus adapted to the imminent action on the part of S, process mentally and understand what is being verbalized by S (cf. Rehbein 1977; 1981). In the Japanese data, in addition to announcements as in example (3) at least two more types of prefatory actions are discernible: (a) announcements, where a speaker's subsequent action is verbalized as an assessment of the interaction process by means of the *-tai to omou* construction, which combines a matrix construction of thinking with a modal of speaker's volition ("I think that I want to do ~", cf. Hohenstein 2004a, forthcoming, section 6 below); (b) utterances ending in a (*desu*) *ke(re)do(mo)* construction, which serve as a prefatory statement to immediate explanatory or elucidating elaborations (cf. Hohenstein 2004b, 2004c, forthcoming, section 6 below).

In the German corpus, on the other hand, announcements and prefatory verbalizations — though they do occur — are much less frequent than in the L1 Japanese data. The linguistic means mostly used to achieve an illocution of announcement or prefatory statement are (a) assertion of an imminent action (comparable to the Japanese example [3]) and (b) a specific progredient intonation contour. Announcements using an infinitival verb of action in a modal verb construction with *mögen* [to like] in conjunctive mode, as shown in example (4), taken from an L2 German academic expert presentation, are rare in the L1 German data.

(4) 0202, (s6): L1 Japanese/L2 German expert speaker

[Utterance segment 6c]

[und ä:hm ja, ich möchte jetzt anfangen].

and uh yes I would like now to start

'[and now uh, I would like to start].'

Once again example (4) demonstrates that a Japanese speaker realizes a particular speech action in L2 German at a certain point in discourse, where a comparable speech action is used in L1 Japanese, while at that point L1 German speakers proceed without verbalizing an announcement. A difference in interactional expectations with regard to the verbal processing of the course of action can thus be deduced.

## 6. Modality and connectivity

Finally, some differences in the use of modal constructions and connectives in the L1 Japanese and L1 German data allow us to infer differences in interactional expectations, which may have repercussions on the processing of propositions, and hence, of knowledge between S and H in expert presentations.

A comparison of *I think* constructions in German and Japanese expert discourses (Hohenstein 2004a, forthcoming.) reveals that Japanese *to omou* constructions are used more than three times as frequently and at points in discourse differing from German *I think* constructions employing the verbs *glauben*, *denken* and *meinen*. This is due to differences in the respective verbs (their “symbol field”, cf. Bühler 1934; Rehbein and Fienemann 2004), as well as to the internal structure of the complementizers. Whereas the Japanese complement construction may combine with various subordinate modalities and is used mostly to evaluate points of the interactional process in order to make them accessible to H (“action modality”) the German complement construction is used for the assessment of knowledge (“knowledge modality”), that is, processing of propositional aspects as facts to be accessed by H. Derivative German constructions without a complementizer are closer in use to the Japanese construction in that they may express action modality, yet at the same time, their evaluative force is weakened. In both L2 Japanese and L2 German academic presentations, pragmatic transfer from L1 is observable where L2 uses are not in line with L1 interactional expectations because of functional divergences.

The use of connectives in Japanese and German displays similarly diverging functions. Both causal as well as adversative-concessive connectives are used with lower frequency in the German data. Thus, more than 0.2% of all words in the L1 Japanese data and less than 0.1% of all uttered words in the L1 German data are causal connectives; in the L1 Japanese data, about 25% of all utterances employ an adversative-concessive connective, whereas it is only 6.5% of all utterances in the L1 German data. In part this divergence is due to the fact that Japanese

connectives when used utterance-finally, take on modal functions, operating on the illocutionary force of an utterance, which is not possible in German (cf. Hohenstein 2004b, 2004c, forthcoming). Also, causal *no de* constructions are used almost exclusively to justify or account for S's actions, which again is a speech action much less frequent expressed in the German data. Repercussions of this may be seen in example (2), where the L2 German speaker uses two causal subordinate constructions, in scores 7 and 9, in order to explain the institutional connection of the talk.

## 7. Conclusion

In this article I have discussed characteristic differences between L1 scholarly presentations in German and Japanese involving two domains of interaction and linguistic means that differ systematically with regard to interactional purposes.

In the the institutional setting of academic expert presentations, turn taking is suspended. S has an extended exclusive turn, while H's is restricted to the mental reconstruction of S's verbal and nonverbal actions. In order to understand the propositional content of the presentation, the hearer has to process a succession of the speaker's speech actions. In the L1 Japanese data, many of S's speech actions are devoted to facilitating interaction with H.

It is precisely this aspect of the speech situation, restricting the action field, and especially the control field of H,<sup>20</sup> which is being dealt with when S adjoins the speech formula "*yoroshiku onegai-shimasu*" (~"I beg your benevolence") to an utterance that deferentially expresses S's recognition of H's yielding the shared interaction space and parts of his control field to S. Even though not all Japanese L1 speakers use this speech formula, the deferential recognition of an interactional constellation where giving a presentation happens at the expense of H's action field becomes verbalized in polite-deferential predication addressing the hearer in most cases, thus establishing a cooperative action system.<sup>21</sup> By using exotheses and prefatory speech actions S helps H to process portions of his/her verbalization and to anticipate subsequent actions. By relating modal aspects of the interaction, S enables H to establish illocutionary connections between utterances.

With regard to all of these linguistic means, L2 speech actions are shaped subliminally by pragmatic needs carried over from L1. It does not constitute a breach of norms or a mistake, to verbalize a speech action or parts of speech actions, which are not usually verbalized or verbalized less frequently in L1 German. This kind of "pragmatic transfer"

(cf. Rehbein and Fienemann 2004) from L1 Japanese to L2 German though slightly out of line with an L1 German hearer's interactional expectations, will in most cases not lead to grave misunderstandings. Still, it requires a higher amount of processing on the part of an L1 H. These surplus linguistic means intervene in Hs perception and reconstruction process and, if employed with high frequency, can be perceived as disturbing in German expert discourse by L1 hearers. What is more, by overusing fillers, exotheses, connectives etc. the speaker may come across as incompetent.

On the other hand, in contradistinction to their L1 Japanese counterparts, L1 German speakers do not usually verbalize aspects pertaining to the cooperative nature of the action system established between S and H. In the event, pragmatic transfer from German to Japanese typically has the effect that, in the ears of Japanese listeners, something is missing in the speech of a German S delivered in Japanese. This is especially the case in “social deixis” taken as mere “politeness formulae” when the functions of forms in establishing and maintaining the action system are not clear. Also, L1 German speakers of L2 Japanese tend to use too little prefatory actions and announcing, which means an L1 Japanese H cannot easily process the succession of speech actions. Furthermore, the means of connectivity are often adapted to German utterance initial patterns of connectivity and make too little use of modalizing utterance-final constructions such as the extended predicate-predication (*no de arimasu*, *mono de arimasu* etc.). Thus, an L1 Japanese H will have difficulties understanding, for example, explanatory utterances.

In this manner, pragmatic transfer can be interpreted as evidence of interactional expectations, in that they are carried over into an L2 as a need to realize certain speech actions, speech formulae, linguistic constructions or expressions particularly connected to discourse patterns of the speaker's L1. An interactional asymmetry then arises from preset interactional needs which do not correlate with the interactional expectations of L1 hearers. This may lead to a rupture in interactional expectations and impede propositional and/or illocutionary understanding on the part of an L1 hearer.

Usually, in German–Japanese encounters, we find multilingual settings where one participant's L2 is the L1 of all or most of the other interactants. Within the same speech situation some, or sometimes all, of the hearers may have an L1 command of the language being spoken, yet possibly no L2 knowledge of the speaker's L1. This creates a typical setting characterizable as a “multilingual constellation” wherein hearers and speaker draw not only upon different kinds of linguistic knowledge (L1 competence versus L2 knowledge), but also upon differing knowledge



regarding the realization of discourse patterns, associated with partially different interactional expectations of S and H. As differences like these, pertaining to action systems in a society's institutions, have developed over the course of time, their repercussions are to be found in the language a society uses. For that reason, complete speech actions, which pertain to the action system in L1 Japanese, are absent from L1 German. Thus, though much can be said about Japanese culture with regard to concepts of "tacit understanding" of the needs of an interactant (e.g., *sashi, ki, omoiyari* and *kikubari*, cf. e.g., Yotsukura 2003), actually crucial parts of these concepts do require explicit verbal forms and characterize types of cooperative action systems.

If we take seriously what is increasingly shown in studies of intercultural communication, one way of overcoming the difficulties and insecurities entailed in asymmetrical interactional expectations is a comparative reflection of the interactional purposes of linguistic means and patterns in the involved L1s of the interactants. In Japanese–German multilingual constellations of academic presentations, central parts of speech, where different interactional expectations may arise because of L1 differences are the introductory part, where action systems are established in different ways, prefatory, preparative, as well as explanatory and evaluative speech actions handling H's mental response and co-construction. All of these differences are coded linguistically. "Changing language regimes" (Coulmas 2004), then, may be expected to involve the reflective intercultural knowledge of L1 speakers as hearers, educated to a tolerance of various interactional expectations.

*Hamburg University*

## Notes

- \* Elaborated version of the paper "Interactional expectations and linguistic knowledge in multilingual settings: The subliminal shaping of L2 German by L1 Japanese in academic expert discourse" given at the Symposium on *Changing Language Regimes in Globalizing Environments, Europe and Japan*, 31.03.–02.04.2004, University Duisburg-Essen. This work was funded in the framework of the SFB 538 Mehrsprachigkeit (Collaborative Research Center No. 538 Multilingualism) by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG [German Research Foundation]). I am grateful to Florian Coulmas and Patrick Heinrich for organizing and making possible the occasion and to all the discussants for their comments. The responsibility for the contents of this study lies with the author.
- 1. In particular, with regard to "contextualization", e.g. the setting of a basic style via the Japanese differentiation between "polite" *desu/masu* and "neutral" *da* as comparable to German differentiation in address terms. "Contextualization", in Sugita (2004), in the sense of linguistically establishing a setting adapted to the requirements of the

speech situation, seems closely connected to the establishment of a cooperative interaction system.

2. The original reads: “Handlungspräsuppositionen ode Erwartungen, die ein Interaktant in Bezug auf eine bestimmte Handlung einem anderen Interaktanten gegenüber macht, bilden also ein *Handlungssystem*. Diese Handlungssystem wird durch die beiden gemeinsamen Handlungspräsuppositionen konstituiert.”
3. For details on methodological aspects, see Hohenstein and Kameyama (2000), and the project website (Japanese and German expert discourse in mono- and multilingual constellations).
4. The required competence in *listening* as well as *speaking* differs considerably between both discourse forms, since concatenative and sequential discourse involve different speech actions and illocutions in order to help build up discourse knowledge and to draw on shared knowledge; in addition, presentational discourse involves interactional expectations on the part of the interactants (S; H) differing from planning discourse.
5. The structure of academic presentational discourse, especially *academic expert presentations* aimed at an *expert audience* is to be distinguished from university lectures set in a discourse of teaching and learning. Being a communicative medium emerging with growing academic communities and the need to interrelate ongoing research and research results with each other, conference presentations fulfill the task of orally pre-publicizing, confronting, discussing, criticizing and accrediting newly established knowledge in expert fields in order to expand the viable consensual knowledge stock of a discipline (cf. e.g., Räisänen 2002; Rowley-Jolivet 2002).
6. For detailed accounts of functional-pragmatic methodology cf. e.g., Ehlich (1999) and Rehbein (2001).
7. With the exceptions of Ventola et al. (2002), Kotthoff (2001) and some studies in English for Academic purposes. In addition, some data from academic expert presentations have been included in Yamane (2002). However, contrastive studies are still not much in focus.
8. This plurifold intersection of verbal, nonverbal and verbally commented actional tasks and purposes is also termed the “multimodality” of conference talks (cf. Ventola et al. 2002).
9. Research results of corpus studies carried out within the SFB538 project “Japanese and German expert discourses in mono- and multilingual constellations” have been presented on various occasions (Hohenstein 2004b, 2004c) and the results referred to in this paper have been partially published elsewhere (Hohenstein 1999, 2002, 2004a, forthcoming).
10. Because of the functional differences between the expressions found in L1 Japanese as compared to L1 German, the German counterparts under points 35 in Table 1 are set in curved brackets.
11. The term “social deixis” is introduced in Fillmore’s *Lectures on Deixis* ([1971] 1997: esp. 106ff) and is used frequently to refer to Japanese politeness forms. It was coined to comprise linguistic means expressing the factors of “internal analysis” of conversation: S–H relation, the type of illocution carried out by a speech action, social aspects etc. Actually, the category is not very clearcut and does not differentiate e.g., between deictic and phoric means; on the other hand, it has the power to include the verbal and lexical means used in Japanese to differentiate between S, H, third person and objects in deferential, honorific or polite manner, which are mostly symbolic field means with deictic functionalization. The term “politeness” in the sense of qualifying linguistic actions “in which an underlying social measure of courteous goodwill in reference to the needs of the other person is chosen and employed” (Rehbein and Fienemann 2004:

267, following *Metzler Lexikon Sprache*), does not fully account for the deictic qualities within a speech situation associated with Japanese linguistic means of politeness, even though it captures the basic function of politeness, to expressly relate one's actions within a speech situation to socially established notions of consideration towards one's interactants.

12. This discourse structuring function with regard to Japanese politeness forms has been noted and commented on within Japanese linguistics in various accounts (cf. Wetzel 2004: §2).
13. One speaker uses *happyou-itashimasu* instead, which is deferential as well, but verbalizes the speaker's accomplishing something in favor of the hearer, instead of the causative relation, where the hearer is the agent causing a speaker's action (giving a talk/presentation).
14. The speaker has living and working experience in Germany of more than three years and uses written as well as spoken German as one of his languages of science in his work on a regular basis.
15. The attempt to express parts of the constellation not normally expressed in German also leads to a certain complication in the argument structure, as the speaker is verbalized as an agent and as the reflexive object (*I-myself*) of the action, which itself is modalized and specified locally to include a hearer-deictic element (*a little-at your place*).
16. Based on the functional-pragmatic analyses of German modal verbs (cf. Redder [1984], with regard to German and English academic discourse cf. Redder [2001]).
17. Cf. a similar account of the preconditions and factors constituting the speech situation of a presentation from a didactic point of view in Grabowski (2003).
18. In Hohenstein and Kameyama (1996) and Hohenstein (1999) the process of mentally relating and linking different types of action with action plan elements and with each other in order to create a linear succession adapted to the requirements of verbal action on the part of S was termed a "calibration" of different types of action and elements of planning on the action line (*Handlungslinie*, cf. Rehbein [1977]).
19. The term "prompting field" is based in the theory of linguistic fields introduced by Bühler (1934) and elaborated by Ehlich (1987). By that term, "linguistic prompting", linguistic procedures are captured which expedite interactional coordination between S and H by urging H to turn her/his attention to an aspect of mental processing of the interactional process. As has been shown in the case of interjections (Ehlich 1987; Liedke 1994; Rasoloson 1994), a linguistic procedure of prompting directed at S by H may e.g., cause a speaker to yield her/his turn or to start an interactional repair process. In the case of prompting procedures on the part of S directed at H, as e.g., by imperative forms or vocative, an intervention in H's action field is carried out.
20. For an account of the control field as part of the interaction space between S and H see Rehbein (1977); its particular eminence in polite interaction is discussed in Rehbein and Fienemann (2004).
21. Even though in the L1 Japanese data both speech actions do not show in all academic expert presentations, they are closely interconnected and occur at the place of transition from introduction to thematic subject proper in the course of presenting. In cases where they are not used in an academic expert presentation, this may be attributed to systematic conditions in the interactional constellation, e.g., that S is one of a group of speakers working together, where the group and its participants have been introduced and the speech formulae have been uttered by the first speaker of that group, extending to co-speakers. Another reason may be that less formal polite utterances addressing H are preferred by some speakers (intersubjective variation).

## References

- Bühler, Karl (1934). *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Stuttgart: UTB Gustav Fischer.
- Clyne, Michael (1996). *Inter-cultural Communication at Work. Cultural Values in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, Florian (2004). Changing language regimes. Paper given at the Symposium on *Changing Language Regimes in Globalizing Environments, Europe and Japan*, 31.03.2004–02.04.2004, University Duisburg-Essen.
- Ehlich, Konrad (1987). Kooperation und sprachliches Handeln. [Cooperation and linguistic action]. In *Kommunikation und Kooperation*, F. Liedtke and R. Keller (eds.), 19–32. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- (1999). Funktionale Pragmatik — Terme, Themen und Methoden. *Deutschunterricht in Japan* 4, 4–24.
- Ehlich, Konrad; and Rehbein, Jochen (1972). Erwarten. [Expecting]. In *Linguistische Pragmatik*, D. Wunderlich (ed.), 99–115. Frankfurt/M: Athenäum.
- Fandrych, Christian; and Graefen, Gabriele (2002). Text commenting devices in academic articles. *Multilingua* 21, 17–43.
- Fillmore, Charles J. ([1971] 1997). *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Galtung, Johan (1959). Expectation and interaction processes. *Inquiry* 2, 213–234.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Grabowski, Joachim (2003). Kongressvorträge und Medieneinsatz: ein Plädoyer für Professionalität. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik* 39, 53–73.
- Günthner, Susanne; and Luckmann, Thomas (2001). Asymmetries of knowledge in intercultural communication: The relevance of cultural repertoires of communicative genres. In *Culture in Communication: Analyses of Intercultural Situations*, A. Di Luzio, S. Günthner and F. Orletti (eds.), 55–85. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hohenstein, Christiane (1999). Sprecherexthesen im Japanischen (I): Vokallängung und ‘ano’. [Speaker’s exotheses in Japanese (I): lengthened vowels and ‘ano’]. In *Sprachtheorie und sprachliches Handeln, Festschrift für Jochen Rehbein zum 60. Geburtstag*, K. Bühlig and Y. Matras (ed.), 265–279. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- (2002). Erklärendes Handeln in der Diskursart ‘Wissenschaftlicher Vortrag’: Ein Vergleich des Deutschen mit dem Japanischen. [Explanatory (inter-) action in academic presentational discourse: a German-Japanese comparison]. P.h.D. thesis, University of Hamburg. [To appear, Munich: Iudicium.]
- (2004a). A comparative analysis of Japanese and German complement constructions with matrix verbs of thinking and assessing: ‘to omou’ and ‘ich glaub/e’. In *Multilingual Communication*, J. House and J. Rehbein (eds.), 303–340. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (2004b). ‘Kausale’ Konnektivität in der deutschen und der japanischen Wissenschaftssprache. [‘Causal’ connectivity in German and Japanese academic discourse]. Paper given at the 35. Jahrestagung der GAL *Mehrsprachige Individuen—vielsprachige Gesellschaften*, 23.09.2004–25.09.2004, Wuppertal. [To appear in *Forum Angewandte Linguistik*. Frankfurt: Lang.]
- (2004c). Aspects of connectivity in German and Japanese expert presentations. Paper given at the International Colloquium on Connectivity in Multilingual Settings, 18.11.2004–20.11.2004, Hamburg.
- (forthcoming). Causal and concessive connectivity in Japanese and German expert presentations. In *Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse*, J. Rehbein, C. Hohenstein, and L. Pietsch (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Hohenstein, Christiane; and Kameyama, Shinichi (1996). Exothesen. *VerbMobil-Memo* 105. Hamburg: University of Hamburg. [To appear in *Bausteine diskursanalytischen Wissens*, J. Rehbein und S. Kameyama (eds.). Münster: Waxman.]
- (2000). Zur kontrastiven Analyse von sprachlichen Ausdrucksmitteln in Expertendiskursen. Am Beispiel japanischer und deutscher Vortrags- und Planungsdiskurse. [On contrastive analysis of linguistic means in expert discourses: Japanese and German discourses of presentation and interactional planning]. In *AZM Series B, 11*, Hamburg: SFB 538 Mehrsprachigkeit, 26–44.
- Japanese and German expert discourse in mono- and multilingual constellations*. <http://www.rrz.uni-hamburg.de/SFB538/k1/index.html>
- Kotthoff, Helga (2001). Vortragsstile im Kulturvergleich: zu einigen deutsch-russischen Unterschieden. In *Perspektiven auf Stil*, E.-M. Jakobs and A. Rothkegel (eds.), 321–350. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Liedke, Martina (1994). *Die Mikro-Organisation von Verständigung. Diskursuntersuchungen zu griechischen und deutschen Partikeln*. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
- Mayes, Patricia (2003). *Language, Social Structure, and Culture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rasololon, Janie N. (1994). *Interjektionen im Kontrast. Am Beispiel der deutschen, modagasischen, englischen und französischen Sprache*. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
- Räisänen, Christine (2002). The Conference Forum: a System of Interrelated Genres and Discursive Practices. In *The Language of Conferencing*, E. Ventola, C. Shalom and S. Thompson (eds.), 69–93. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
- Redder, Angelika (1984). *Modalverben im Unterrichtsdiskurs. Zur Pragmatik der Modalverben am Beispiel eines institutionellen Diskurses*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- (2001). Modalverben in wissenschaftlicher Argumentation — Deutsch und Englisch im Vergleich. [Modal verbs in academic argumentation]. In *Jahrbuch DaF* 27, 313–330.
- Rehbein, Jochen (1977). *Komplexes Handeln. Elemente zur Handlungstheorie der Sprache*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- (1979). Sprechhandlungsargumente. Zur Organisation der Hörersteuerung. In *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*, H. Weydt (ed.), 58–74. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- (1981). Announcing — On formulating plans. In *Conversational Routine*, F. Coulmas (ed.), 215–258. The Hague: Mouton.
- (2001). Das Konzept der Diskursanalyse [The concept of analysis]. In *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. HSK 16*, K. Brinker, G. Antos, W. Heinemann, and S. F. Sager (eds.), 927–945. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Rehbein, Jochen; and Fienemann, Jutta (2004). Introductions: being polite in multilingual settings. In *Multilingual Communication*, J. House and J. Rehbein (eds.), 223–278. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rowley-Jolivet, Elizabeth (2002). Science in the making: Scientific conference presentations and the construction of facts. In *The Language of Conferencing*, E. Ventola, C. Shalom and S. Thompson (eds.), 95–125. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
- Sugita, Yuko (2004). *Gesprächserwartungen. Eine kontrastive Studie über die Gesprächsführung in deutschen und japanischen Telefonaten*. [Conversational expectations. A contrastive study on German and Japanese telephone conversations]. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
- Tannen, Deborah (1979). What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In *New Directions in Discourse Processing*, R. O. Freedle (ed.), 137–181. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Thielmann, Winfried (1999). Begründungen versus advanced organizers — Zur Problematik des Englischen als lingua franca der Wissenschaft. *Deutsche Sprache* 4, 370–378.

- (2003). The problem of English as the lingua franca of scholarly writing from a German perspective. In *Perspectives on Europe. Language Issues and Language Planning in Europe*, T. Liddicoat and K. Muller (eds.), 95–108. Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Ventola, Eija; Shalom, Celia; and Thompson, Susan (eds.) (2002). *The Language of Conferencing*. Frankfurt/M: Lang.
- Wetzel, Patricia J. (2004). *Keigo in Modern Japan. Polite Language from Meiji to the Present*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Yamane, Chie (2002). *Nihongo no danwa ni okeru Fira*. [Fillers in Japanese conversation]. Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Yotsukura, Lindsay Amthor (2003). *Negotiating Moves: Problem Presentation and Resolution in Japanese Business Discourse*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.