1-1-1986

Discourse analysis and second language pedagogy : a study of reported speech in Japanese as a first and a second language.

Osamu Kamada
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

Kamada, Osamu, "Discourse analysis and second language pedagogy : a study of reported speech in Japanese as a first and a second language." (1986). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 4096.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/4096

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

312066014554092

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND SECOND LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY;
A STUDY OF REPORTED SPEECH IN JAPANESE
AS A FIRST AND A SECOND LANGUAGE

A Dissertation Presented

By

OSAMU KAMADA

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 1986

©

Osamu Kamada

1986

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND SECOND LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY
A STUDY OF REPORTED SPEECH IN JAPANESE
AS A FIRST AND A SECOND LANGUAGE

A Dissertation Presented

By

OSAMU KAMADA

Approved as to style and content by:

Dr. Judy W. Solsken, Chairperson

Dr. Catherine E. Walsh, Member

Dr. Jean-Pierre Berwald, Member

Dr. Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

For Mayumi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special thanks go to the following people.

First, to Judy Solsken, my chairperson: Without her presence and intellectual stimulation my dissertation would never have reached its present form. I am very grateful for the invaluable assistance I received from the other members. Catherine Walsh guided my interest to the most current area of second language learning research. I used a great deal of Jean-Pierre Berwald's valuable time discussing second language pedagogy.

Probably without an encounter with Professor Seiichi Makino of the University of Illinois in 1981 and without his encouragement and moral support of my research in discourse analysis and Japanese as a second language, I would never have been able to develop my career as a pedagogical linguist. My appreciation also goes to Professor Chisato Kitagawa of the University of Arizona, who diligently read through each page and extended insightful comments, criticism and support. I owe greatly what I am today to Professor Hideo Teramura of the University of Tsukuba, who kindled my interest in Japanese linguistics and has supported my study leading to this dissertation. I wish him a speedy recovery.

Many of my friends deserve my sincere thanks. Bonnie and Lucien Miller greatly helped me to accomplish my graduate study while teaching. Elaine Vine's support and friendship have always been immeasurable. Also deeply appreciated are Heizo Nakajima's

encouragement of my linguistic research and Tadashi Sakamoto's insights into second language pedagogy.

I would like to thank my wife, Mayumi, for her day-to-day emotional support and my children, Mari and Koji, who had to find their father at the desk more often than beside them.

Last, but not least. My study was fully funded by Amherst College. I am particularly grateful to Dean Dick Fink and my colleague Matthew Mizenko. I should hasten to thank the students of Amherst College and Middlebury Summer Japanese School who offered invaluable data for my study.

A B S T R A C T

Discourse Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy:

A Study of Reported Speech in Japanese as a First and a Second Language

Osamu Kamada

September 1986

B.A. Osaka University of Foreign Studies

M.A. University of Pittsburgh

Ed.D. University of Massachusetts

Directed by Professor Judy W. Solsken

Reported speech inevitably involves one's comprehension of a message and its reproduction for conveying the message to another, reflecting the major function of language and the major purpose of second language learning. This study presents an examination of reported speech in Japanese as a first and a second language within the framework of discourse analysis and second language pedagogy. Questions are raised as to: (1) What is the structure of reported speech in Japanese? (2) What is the principle governing the selection of styles of reported speech? (3) What is the structure of reported speech in Japanese as a second language? (4) What are the pedagogical implications of this study? First a survey of the literature is presented pertaining to the historical background of discourse analysis and second language pedagogy in terms of their theoretical foundations. Then an analysis of problem (1) is presented in which, unlike the conventional treatment of reported speech in Japanese, four different types of reported speech are proposed: Direct Quotation, Semi Direct Quotation, Semi Indirect Quotation and Indirect Quotation. Question (2) is then pursued and a generalization is obtained, which presents two hypotheses: "The Correlation between Communicative Orientation and Reported Speech" and

"The Correlation between Information Structure and Reported Speech." Question (3) is treated in the framework of the interlanguage hypothesis. Learner's utterances are observed to be generated as an outcome of testing hypotheses which manifest processes of "transfer," "developmental difficulty," "risk-avoidance strategy" and "self-correction." Finally pedagogical implications are discussed which create strong links between formal learning environments and informal learning environments, so that learners can test hypotheses optimally. To materialize such a need, a methodological framework is proposed, which aims to develop an "i + 1 comprehensible input/output" from the outset of teaching and learning a second language.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii
 Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE	7
2.1. Functionalism	7
2.2. Discourse Analysis	8
2.3. Second Language Learning	14
III REPORTED SPEECH IN JAPANESE	22
3.1. Indirect Quotation	25
3.2.1. Semi Indirect Quotation	39
3.2.2. Directional and Giving/Receiving Verbs in Quoted Clause	48
3.3. Semi Direct Quotation	58
IV SELECTION OF THE STYLE OF REPORTED SPEECH IN JAPANESE	72
4.1. Communicative Orientation and Quoted Clause	74
4.2.1. Notion of Important Information	88
4.2.2. Prince's Notion of "Given" and "Known"	92
4.3. Other Factors	98
4.3.1. Inversion, Dramatization and DQ	98

V	REPORTED SPEECH IN JAPANESE AS A SECOND LANGUAGE	107
	5.1. Introduction: Interlanguage Hypothesis	107
	5.2. The Data	112
	5.3. Analysis	116
	5.3.1. Unacceptable Utterances	119
	5.3.1.1. Transfer	119
	5.3.1.2. Intralingual problems	127
	5.3.2. Acceptable Utterances	135
	5.3.2.1. Avoidance	135
	5.3.2.2. Self-correction	139
VI	PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS	148
	6.1. Contradiction in current communicative approaches	149
	6.2. Justification For Output	152
	6.3. Methodological Framework	157
	6.4. Implementation	164
	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	175
	APPENDICES	181

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Features of Reported Speech in Japanese	71
2.	Communicative Orientation and Quoted Clause	79
3.	Information Structure and Quoted Clause	92
4.	Distribution of Acceptable Utterances	136

LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Three Approaches in Current Discourse Analysis	12
2.	Reported Speech in Japanese as a Second Language	118
3.	Role of Self-Correction	144
4.	Interlanguage	145
5.	A Methodological Framework	158

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Distribution of Unacceptable Utterances	181
2. Try Japanese Report: Sample 1	182
3. Try Japanese Report: Sample 2	183
4. Try Japanese Report: Sample 3	184

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Language functions as a means of communication. Communication is carried out, through language, by one's conveyance of information and another's reception of that information. In this dissertation I will make an attempt to better understand how human communication is performed verbally, how one learns to communicate in a second language and how the teaching of a second language should be designed to facilitate the learning of communication. To that goal I will conduct a study of one aspect of Japanese, reported speech, within the framework of discourse analysis and second language learning.

Discourse analysis is a relatively new area of research in linguistics although its origin can be traced back to the philosophy of the Prague Linguistic Circle in the 1920's. The recent movement within linguistics against generative grammar's strict exclusion of pragmatic contexts from linguistic analysis led to the current work in discourse analysis. Viewing language as a means of communication, rather than an expression of propositions, discourse analysis aims at linguistic explanations in functional terms (as opposed to formal terms), and provides significant implications for any discipline involving language, such as second language learning. Reported speech, by definition, consists of what Fillmore (1981) calls, "embedded discourse", and cannot be explained without taking the discourse-level context into account.

In this background of discourse analysis the following questions are addressed in this dissertation: (1) What is the structure of reported speech in Japanese as a first language? (2) What is the principle governing the selection of styles of reported speech in Japanese? (3) What is the structure of reported speech in Japanese as a second language? (4) How should the teaching of Japanese as a second language be designed so that learners can become competent in communication, particularly in reporting? Following the presentation of a survey of the relevant literature in Chapter II, each of these questions are treated in the subsequent chapters, respectively.

Thus, Chapter III discusses the issue of the structure of reported speech in Japanese as a first language. Unlike English, the structure of reported speech in Japanese is syntactically less clear. The study of this speech style did not begin until the late 1960's, when the influence of transformational generative grammar spread over the study of many languages. However, reported speech, by nature, always involves pragmatic factors such as viewpoint and cannot be described only in formal terms, which has made linguistic analysis of this style difficult. In this chapter I make an attempt to examine reported speech by employing both functional and syntactic notions in order to lead to an overall view of its structure. My analysis in this methodology not only clarifies the syntactic difference between the conventionally acknowledged types, direct and indirect reported speech, but also uncovers two additional types, semi direct and semi indirect reported speech.

In Chapter IV the issue of reported speech is brought one step further in discourse analysis. An inquiry of "when and how" one particular type of reported speech is chosen in a given discourse is pursued; that is, the structure of reported speech in terms of "communicative competence" (Hymes, 1972). Functional notions such as "given/known" (Prince, 1978), "important/less important" (Kuno, 1983), and "communicative orientation" (Makino, 1984) are found to greatly help clarify the variables surrounding the utterances containing the reported speech in question. Two correlations are formulated then: (1) The more inwardly the speaker communicates when conveying a message, the more likely the indirect version of reported speech is to be chosen, and (2) The more communicatively important the information contained in reported speech is (i.e. the information needs to be shared by the hearer), the more likely the direct version of reported speech is to be chosen. In addition to these findings, some of the other relevant factors such as "dramatization" and "inversion" are also discussed.

Based on the observation and analysis of reported speech in Japanese as a first language, that of Japanese as a second language is then presented in Chapters V and VI. Unlike "error analysis" which typically focusses on errors of learners' utterances, an analysis of both acceptable and unacceptable utterances is presented within the framework of the interlanguage hypothesis in Chapter V. Data were collected from informal conversations with six "intermediate" and "advanced" learners of Japanese as a second language, which were tape-recorded and then transcribed. Kamio's (1985) "territory of

information and sentence forms" plays an important role in explaining negative transfer in discourse, by which learners subconsciously produced unacceptable utterances that need to be reported with a reportive verb in the Japanese norm. Acceptable utterances are found to be very intriguing, too, in that they expose learners undergo when developing interlanguage. Learners with limited experience of informal learning (no living experience in Japan) sharply contrasted with those with such experience. The former constantly chose indirect speech, whereas the latter showed no such inclination. That is, the more experience one has in informal learning environments, the more frequently one uses direct speech, and the more limited one's informal experience is, the more frequently he/she relies on a risk-avoidance strategy of avoiding direct speech. The latter phenomenon is an example of "over-compensation" due to formal learning. Finally an examination of the processes of self-correction reveals that, unlike the claim made in Krashen's "Monitor Model", self-correction (conscious or subconscious) is a manifestation of the process of hypothesis-testing and actively evokes initiation of output. Then, the suggestion is made to create strong links between formal and informal learning so that learners can test their hypotheses optimally and develop competence in the comprehension and production of various types of reported speech appropriately.

The need for links between formal and informal learning is pursued in the last chapter and an attempt is made to construct a methodological framework in which this need can be met. This framework aims to

develop, from the outset of teaching and learning, learners' competence in comprehension and production in terms of "comprehensible input" and "comprehensible output" of " $i + 1$ " (Krashen, 1981 and Swain, 1985, respectively), which is the basic requirement for performing reported speech. First, to justify the early development of output, recent studies by Swain (ibid.) and Gibbson (1985) are reviewed. On the basis of that justification for output, a framework is constructed which consists of two components linked together: one the formal learning component and the other the informal learning component. All of the activities of the formal learning (i.e. structural, functional and social activities) are made meaningful by maintaining a discourse as the minimum unit for the material used in them. Of course, this is naturally the case with the informal learning. Ways to implement this methodological framework are then suggested, some of which are activities which I call "Try Japanese" and "Interactive Role-plays".

Some clarification of the terminology used in this study is now in order. First, throughout this dissertation no attempt is made to distinguish "learning" from "acquisition" in Krashen's (1981, 1982) sense: "learning" in this study denotes any process of development of a second language. Neither is it attempted to differentiate "second language" and "foreign language" in this dissertation unless such intention is clearly stated: "second language" denotes here any language one speaks besides his/her mother language regardless of the situation

where the language is used¹.

Lastly, a word on the scope of this study is needed. I have confined myself here only to the oral aspect of reported speech in Japanese as a first and a second language. While its written counterpart shares some characteristics, it is not the focus of this study. Secondly, the data from learners of Japanese as a second language was collected only as a cross-sectional sample of second language learning and not on a longitudinal basis. The latter type of study must be conducted on a different occasion. Finally, the study of second language learning in this dissertation only represents that of adults. The study of child second language learning is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

1. See Richards (1978) for the discussion of "second" and "foreign" languages.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. Functionalism

When one deals with language, there are roughly two approaches; one is the approach represented by Chomskyans which intends to describe and explain the structure of language through formal representation, and the other approach, represented, for example, by Halliday, aims at describing language in terms of its function in a given context. The former is called "formalism" and the latter "functionalism". Formalism views language as "a set of structural descriptions of sentences, where a full structural description determines (in particular) the sound and meaning of a linguistic expression" (Chomsky, 1977:81). In the functional approach, on the other hand, "a language is conceived of in the first place as an instrument of social interaction between human beings, used with the primary aim of establishing communicative relations between speakers and addressees" (Dik, 1978:1).

While the formal approach is focussed on deriving structural descriptions from hypothesized rules, the functional approach always "directs its attention to the context-dependent nature of units" (Foly and Van Valin, 1984:4). Thus, most areas in applied linguistics which deal with linguistic context, such as sociolinguistics and pragmatics, have theoretical foundations in functionalism. Functionalism aims for

descriptions of linguistic phenomena beyond a single sentence and for explanations of the human ability to understand and produce coherent discourse. The background of discourse analysis thus lies also in the functional view of language stated above. The study of reported speech entails a careful examination of pragmatic contexts as well as of the linguistic forms of the speech, for it inevitably involves deictic factors such as "who said what to whom". It is thus supported by the functional view of language as well. Finally, as Brown (1980:189) aptly states, "the pragmatic purpose of language ... the use of signs and symbols of communication ... is the final and ultimate object of the second language learner." And so it is functionalism that the study of second language learning is grounded on, too.

2.2. Discourse analysis

Though the relation between language and its context has intrigued many linguists from many centuries ago, it was not until the 1920's that an important attempt was made to establish a linguistic school which focused on the functional aspect of language. In 1926 under the theme that "any item of language (sentence, word, morpheme, phoneme, etc.) exists solely because it serves some purpose because it has some function (mostly that of communication) to fulfill" (Vachek, 1966:7), Mathesius gathered a number of linguists such as Jakobson and Trubetskoy and formed the Prague Linguistic Circle. The notions of "theme" and "rheme", or "the functional sentence perspective" were developed by them and are inherited by present-day linguistics. The notion of "communicative competence" (Hymes, 1969), which plays a significant role

in the current study of language, is also derived from the concepts developed in the Circle.

After the death of Mathesius in 1939 the activities of the Circle were overshadowed, first, by the influence of structural linguistics (particularly American structuralism) in the 1940's and, then, by the advent of generative grammar in the 1960's and after. While they take radically different standpoints in their approach to linguistic analysis, structuralism and generativism have in common the strict exclusion of pragmatic and sociolinguistic context from their analysis. In fact, the reason why many of Chomsky's students left the realm of formalism in the late 1960's and the early 1970's was due to their frustration with that characteristics of transformational generative grammar. For example, Robin Lakoff (1972:926fn) states as follows.

"But the idea (that contextual factors must be taken into account in linguistic analysis) has not merely been forgotten by transformational grammar; rather, it has been explicitly rejected. ... I have shown that contextual factors cannot be avoided by the linguist of any theoretical view, if he is to deal honestly and accurately with the facts of language."

Thus, since the early 1970's the importance of context in linguistic analysis has been acknowledged again and has played an important role. It was also in those years that the so-called hyphenated schools of linguistics such as sociolinguistics started to receive due attention. While agreeing with the "innovative" view (as opposed to the "rote-memory" view) of language acquisition, functional linguists were not only frustrated by the formalists' negligence of context but also by their way of collecting data for linguistic analysis

and of judging the grammaticality of the data. Notions like "competence", "performance" and "intuition" were put into careful scrutiny with regard to whether the analysis reflected the context in which an utterance in question is located. As a result, the notion of "grammaticality," which is intended to be used to judge the well-formedness of utterances without context, has been replaced by a discourse notion of "acceptability" to distinguish whether or not an utterance is not only grammatical but also contextually acceptable.

Furthermore, contrary to the claims made by Chomsky (1965) concerning "performance" and "intuition," sociolinguists (Labov, 1971 and Gumperz 1972) proposed that "performance" is rule-governed and that "intuition" based on non-contextual data is not a trustworthy basis for linguistic analyses. In Japanese discourse analysis, John Hinds (1976:1-9) bluntly argues for his heavy reliance on actual data as follows:

(1) The study of performance, or actual data, rather than being a counterproductive measure may be the only method to achieve a completely adequate grammar of a language.

(2) Data collection through introspection rather than through observation very often leads to ... the problem of analyzing a "non-language."

(3) A general criticism against data-based analysis that the scope of the analysis is bound to a description of those features which are present in the corpus the researcher happens to have applies to all research since potentially any research is incomplete unless there is an effort to make it as complete as possible.

The term "discourse analysis" started to appear in such contexts in the early 1970's. In 1976 Coulthard's An Introduction of Discourse,

Halliday and Hasan's Cohesion in English and Hinds' Aspects of Japanese Discourse Structure came out and made significant contributions to the development of discourse analysis. Since then a great number of articles and books have been published and many courses on discourse analysis have been created in many universities.

However, despite the popularity of discourse analysis in the 1980's it is still the case that the term "discourse analysis" is a kind of cover-term referring to any research dealing with the description of discourse. Admitting the criticism frequently made by the formalists that discourse analysis lacks any models or frameworks, Bruce Fraser urged in a recent conference (1985 TESOL Annual Convention) that models be made for discourse analysis. Dillon, et al (1985) describe the past ten years for discourse analysis as a "time of excited searching for the right conceptual tools and methods to investigate the relation of utterances to contexts and situations ..." In an extensive survey of current literature on discourse analysis, they suggest three different approaches to the methods of gathering and analyzing data. To facilitate the discussion, I will schematize them in Figure 1 below.

Three Approaches in Current Discourse Analysis Summary from Dillon, et al 1985 Survey

	Data	Situation	Purpose of Analysis	Method of Analysis	Researchers
The Philosophers	made-up, ordinary conversations	no description of situations	theory of inference	Introspection heavily used	Austin Searle Grice
The Data Gatherers	Conversation Analysts	real data	casual conversation chatting	no recourse to intuition of well-formedness or deviance	Sacks
	Experimenters	real data	performance of many subjects at a set task	interpret in cognitive form	Osgood Brown & Yule Chafe, etc.
	Consultants	real data	actually occurring data	with particularly specified rules and expectations which interact with personal patterns of conversational exchange	Sinclair & Coulthard
Close readers	intensive micro-analysis of a particular discourse many leveled description				Prince Gumperz Shy

As seen in the chart, Dillon et al. named the groups in a somewhat amusing way: "The Philosophers" who try to develop theories of inference in conversation through an extensive use of introspection, "The Data Gatherers" who aim at extracting patterns out of the real data, and "The Close Readers" who, even at the expense of "linguistic generalizations", probe the data through intensive micro-analysis. "The Data Gatherers" are further divided into three types, depending on the kind of situation used to gather the real data for their analysis. "Conversation Analysts" collect data from casual conversations and analyze them with no recourse to their own intuition. "Experimenters" assign a topic to their subjects and get real but controlled data from the experiment. Then, they attempt an interpretation not in interactional terms but in cognitive terms.

In the survey of current discourse analysis shown above, Dillon et al. do not intend to group the researchers into independently different types. Rather, they admit that an individual researcher may belong to one group in one respect and to others in another respect. A Japanese functional linguist, Susumu Kuno, for example, belongs to the "Philosophers" as his data are all derived from introspection, and acceptability judgments are always based on his own intuition. At the same time, his approach belongs to the "Close Readers" since he deals tightly with the micro-analysis of a particular discourse, examining factors such as viewpoint phenomena, empathy and information distribution in a set of utterances. Another discourse analyst of Japanese, John Hinds, on the other hand, bases his analysis totally on

naturally occurring conversations. Thus, he comfortably belongs to the "Conversation Analysts", and, depending upon the nature of the analysis he performs, to the "Close Readers" as well. The approach taken in my analysis, which will be shown in detail in later chapters, is like Hinds' in that a special effort is made to use data that are as natural and as varied as possible. And, at the same time, it is like Kuno's in that my native intuition is frequently used to judge the acceptability of a discourse.

2.3. Second Language Learning and Teaching¹

Douglas Brown (1980:189) explicitly states that the goal of second language learning is the acquisition not only of "forms", that is, "manifestations of language", but also of "functions", that is, "the realization of those forms." He asserts that "the pragmatic purpose of language --- the use of signs and symbols for communication --- is the final and ultimate object of the second language learner." In the past ten years or so researchers have predicted that the production and the comprehension of language at the discourse level is the focus of the issues we must deal with in second language learning and teaching. Hakuta and Cancino (1978:248) concur as follows:

Although it may take years of hard work before we develop a rigorous and sophisticated methodology for discourse analysis, the rewards will be great. For the result would create a solid link between the observed acquisition of the linguistic structures of the second language and the

1. No attempt is made here to distinguish Krashen's terms "acquisition" and "learning".

yet-to-be-determined variables involved in discourse.

A historical sketch which shows how discourse analysis was brought to the research of second languages, particularly in terms of theoretical backgrounds, is in order.

In an attempt to straighten out the confusions over the issue of second language learning and teaching in the 1950's and 1960's, Anthony (1963) offered a set of precise definitions for "approach", "methods" and "techniques":

"Approach" is the "set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language and the nature of language and learning,"

"Method" is an "overall plan for the orderly presentation of language material, no part of which contradicts, and all of which is based on the selected approach," and

"Technique" is "implementational --- that which actually takes place in a classroom."

He further clarifies: "An approach is axiomatic, a method is procedural, ... a technique is implementational. Techniques must be consistent with a method and therefore in harmony with an approach as well" (ibid.:7). "Approaches", as defined by Anthony, are thus based on the proponents' views on how a second language is learned, and they guide teachers in designing the methods and techniques they need for teaching a second language.

Historically, there was virtually no theoretical foundation for second language learning until the 1930's when behavioral psychology was established and became a powerful model for language acquisition. It therefore seems that needs, rather than theories, determined methods and

techniques for second language learning and teaching. In medieval times, for example, Latin was the language used as a means of written communication in Europe. When the necessity of oral communication arose later, a movement for using a modern vernacular, rather than the dead language Latin, for communication occurred and modern languages such as French, German and Spanish started to be taught in schools. Foreign languages were taught in the way children were thought to learn languages; that is, by the so-called "direct method" in which only the target language is used for all instruction. Along with this long tradition of learning a foreign language with the direct method, the study of grammar itself had also received attention among members of the upper class. A method called "the grammar-translation method" originated in such a background. Although, due to its ineffectiveness for developing spoken skills, this method has been subject to criticism by researchers, it is still practiced widely in many countries.

A significant impact on second language learning and teaching was made during the Second World War, when it was found that past methods had seriously failed to develop conversational fluency in a second language. Such an ability was urgently needed since it became easier (and necessary) for second language learners to travel to and live in the country where the target language is spoken. It was also at this time that behavioral psychology was developed; this field influenced views on language acquisition, and further shaped views on approaches, methods and techniques of second language teaching. "Audio-lingualism" was established from the behavioral approach, which takes language

acquisition as a set of habits in the use of language structures and patterns. The methods and the techniques are based upon operant conditioning, so that learners could develop the habits of the target language. Some of the important facets in this approach are (1) memorization of natural dialogues and natural pronunciations, (2) pattern practice --- practice of patterns until they become a habit, (3) emphasis on oral skills more than on written skills because language acquisition starts orally first, and then proceeds to written skills, (4) use of translation is normally prohibited because "contrastive analysis"² suggests that the native language "interferes" with the development of a second language.

In the case of Japanese as a second language, a very influential textbook called Beginning Japanese written by E.H.Jorden (1963), a student of the American structural linguist, Bernard Bloch, was based exactly on the behavioral view of language acquisition which was described above, and has ever since enjoyed great popularity in classrooms, especially in North America. The book is entirely written in romanization (i.e. the alphabets) not in Japanese orthography (i.e. kana/kanji) because the author intended it to be used only for speaking and listening skills. (But it is worth noting that the readers of the textbook --- that is, the learners --- actually read the alphabetized Japanese in the book for the practice of dialogues and drills and for grammar notes.) Jorden thinks language acquisition develops first

2. Particularlry a strong version such as Lado's (1957).

orally then literately. If the instruction is done in reverse order, then, she claims that the classical problem with the traditional grammar-translation method will arise. Thus, along with the advancement of technology in audio-visual equipment, the audio-lingual method successfully created learners who can produce (but not necessarily comprehend) the "patterned" expressions which became a part of their language habit.

From the early 1960's, however, the development of cognitive psychology and generative transformational grammar challenged severely behavioral psychology and American structural linguistics (see Chomsky's "Review of Verbal Behavior", 1959 for his argument against Skinner's behavioral psychology); as a result, a radical change took place in research on second language learning. Unlike the behavioral view, the cognitive view sees language acquisition as a creative mental activity through an innate human capacity called the "Language Acquisition Device" (LAD), which completely negates the view of acquisition by individual rote-memory. Teachers of foreign languages also became aware that audio-lingualism had serious shortcomings in the acquisition of "unpatterned" (or, "uncontrolled") expressions which are not part of the learner's language habits. The new approach called "Cognitive Code-Learning" was thus advocated by some researchers such as John Carroll who stressed the importance of the deductive and analytical aspects of language.

However, Chomsky (1966:37) states, with regard to the application of generative grammar to language pedagogy:

I am, frankly, rather skeptical about the significance, for the teaching of languages, of such insights and understanding as have been attained in linguistics and psychology ... It is difficult to believe that either linguistics or psychology has achieved a level of theoretical understanding that might enable it to support a 'technology' of language teaching.

"Cognitive Code-Learning" had no chance to establish its own domain in the field of second language teaching. It is actually the cognitive view of language acquisition and not the cognitive methods or techniques that made a significant contributions to second language research. For instance, "error analysis", which is based on the cognitive view, revealed that the mistakes made by second language learners are not usually a result of interference from the habits of their first, native language (as is predicted by "contrastive analysis"), but rather a result of "intralingual or developmental errors" (Richards, 1971) that have nothing to do with their first language. Thus, starting with the notion of "interlanguage" developed by Corder (1969) and Selinker (1972), researchers began to take a fresh look at the learner's language and view it not as an ill-formed or erroneous language but as a special sort of transitional and developmental dialect which is "describable in terms of a set of rules, i.e. a grammar" (Corder, 1981:14). Similarly, Krashen's "monitor model" stems from the assumption that

... adults have two distinctive ways of developing competence in second languages. The first is via language acquisition, ... the natural way to develop linguistic ability. ... The other is by language learning, ... formal knowledge of a language (Krashen and Terrell: 1983:26).

In other words, he assumes that the language acquisition device does not cease to function after puberty; it still works actively for language

acquisition.

While consideration of the "creative" aspect (as opposed to the "habit, rote-memory" aspect) of language acquisition made radical changes in second language research, the importance of communicative ability as the ultimate goal of second language learning has been maintained regardless of the approaches taken for the research. In actuality, it was around the time of the growth of generative grammar when sociolinguists started to argue that native speakers know more than grammatical competence. Dell Hymes' notion of "communicative competence" stirred the linguistic journals at that time, leaving a serious impact on the research of second languages as well. Especially, researchers in Europe, where traditionally foreign language learning has been advanced pragmatically and where the influence from the Prague Linguistic Circle prevailed, started to present significant work adopting the notion of "communicative competence" as the core of their research. Wilkins' (1976) Notional Syllabuses is a pioneer work to "find a better way of taking account of the communicative aspects of language than is possible within the framework of grammatical syllabuses" (p.11).

A growing interest in developing communicative competence in second language learning is particularly linked to the research of discourse analysis, as the former aims at explanations of linguistic phenomena in terms of the whole discourse surrounding the linguistic items in question. Hatch (1978) describes how second languages are learned "vertically" (as opposed to "horizontally"); "vertical learning" implies

that utterances are learned through the influence of the preceding and following context, that is, the construction of the discourse structure. Larsen-Freeman (1980) presents a collection of articles, which she calls "pioneer works" in this new research area of discourse analysis. Kramsch has provided a number of intriguing analyses of discourse dealing with the second language learning in the classroom, such as "turn-taking", "floor-taking" and so on (1981a, 1981b, 1983, 1985). The study of reported speech in a second language always involves examinations of both what one has heard (or will have heard) and what one has produced (or will have produced) for reporting the message. This reflects, I believe, the essential part of the processes in the "vertical learning" of a language, i.e. discourse analysis. Larsen-Freeman's (ibid.: vii) statement is quite significant in this regard and gives us a direction for the study of reported speech in Japanese as a first and a second language:

... an approach which allows the researchers to study the acquisition of the semantic, communicative, and pragmatic functions of language, the input to the learner, and the input/product interaction might yield some important insights that the researchers in the second language field have been denied by focussing solely on the forms within sentences in learner's speech. An approach which purports to do just this is discourse analysis.

CHAPTER III

REPORTED SPEECH IN JAPANESE AS A FIRST LANGUAGE¹

All languages have the means to report what has or will have been said by someone. It is normally reported either as a direct quotation (DQ, hereafter), or as an indirect quotation (Ind Q).² However, the distinction between these two forms is not always clear. This is especially true in a language such as Japanese where, whether the quotation is direct or indirect, the quotation particle to (tte, a colloquial version) appears after the quoted clause, and the subject and the indirect object are often dropped under certain identity conditions. As a result, quotations whose type cannot be identified without some recourse to prosodic features are often generated. For example:

(1) Hanako tries to turn off the TV while Taro is watching it.

Taro: Yose yo.
stop! I-tell-you "Stop it!"

Hanako: Datte, obaachan ga . . .
but granny subj. "But, Granny (told me to . . .)"

1. This is a largely revised version of my 1981 and 1983 papers. A special effort was made in this new version to present a better analysis by using new and natural data for a more thorough description of quoted clauses, which now includes a style termed Semi Direct Quotation.

2. DQ and Ind Q in this dissertation refer to the quoted clause in direct and indirect quotations.

T: Okaasan ga ii tte ittanda mon.
 mommy subj ok QT said because
 "(I'm watching it) 'Cause Mommy said (I) may do it.
 (You) may do it."

Notice that Taro's second utterance "Okaasan ga ii tte ittanda mon," may be translated into either "Mom said, 'You may do it,'" (DQ) or "Mom said that I may do it," (Ind Q). The quotative particle tte does not distinguish DQ and Ind Q. Both the indirect object of iu 'to say' and the subject of ii 'good, ok' are dropped in this discourse; hence, there is no way to identify ii as an expression quoted verbatim or indirectly, without resort to prosodic features overtone on the expression.

Such difficulty is not only found in spoken discourse but also in written discourse. Historically, it was not until the end of the 19th century that the graphological marks (" . ." in English, and 「 . . . 」 in Japanese) were first used in literary works to show a direct quotation. However, the use of quotation marks is often arbitrary and does not faithfully delineate the quoted clause from the narrative body.³ Hence, one radical proposal concerning quotations in Japanese is that there is no distinction between DQ and Ind Q. Claudia Ross (1976-7), for example, states that "Anything that can be directly reported in Japanese can be reported indirectly, with the necessary

3. See Makino (1980) for an interesting contrastive work on the use of direct quotation in Japanese newspapers and English newspapers; while the former very seldom report information by means of direct quotation, the latter frequently resort to that means.

indirect reporting adjustments taking place" (p. 246). The other common view is that the difference is "conceptually" clear. Kuno's (1978) "Direct Discourse Analysis" seems to be based on this assumption. The purpose of this chapter is, then, to elucidate syntactic and semantic differences among the types of quoted clauses as an attempt which had never received adequate attention until about a decade ago.⁴ The observation and analysis to follow will demonstrate that, contrary to Ross's claim, some things that can be directly reported in Japanese can not always be reported indirectly and that there are four distinctively different types of quoted clauses in Japanese, which I term, Direct Quotation, Semi Direct Quotation, Semi Indirect Quotation and Indirect Quotation, respectively.

While the issue of whether or not Ind Q is derived from DQ is not a question to be solved overnight, the assumption on which the following observation and analysis are based is, as proposed by Banfield (1973, 1982), that neither derives from each other but that both share the same proposition. This chapter is structured as follows. First, the traditional definition of Ind Q in Japanese is discussed, which, in turn, provides us with a description of DQ. Also included in that discussion is the discovery of other types of quotation, Semi Direct

4. In Japanese linguistics, Mikami (1953) seems to be the only exception which had a careful examination of Ind Q more than three decades ago. In English linguistics, Banfield (1973) is perhaps the first serious work on this issue.

Quotation and Semi Indirect Quotation; the former being an utterance representing only the quotee's viewpoint yet lacking the force which Direct Quotation has, and the latter an utterance representing a mixture of two different viewpoints, i.e., reporter's and quotee's.

3.1 Direct and Indirect Quotation

In English, the distinction between DQ and Ind Q seems to be easily drawn by using the complementizer 'that'. Linguists define English Ind Q in a very simple manner. For example, Quirk and Greenbaum (1971:785) state:

The difference between direct speech and indirect (or reported) speech is shown in the following:

He said: 'I am very angry.' (Direct Speech)

He said that he was very angry. (Indirect Speech)

In the case of indirect speech, the words of the speaker are subordinated in the form of a that-clause, within the reporting sentence.

On the assumption that Ind Q derives from DQ, they examine the processes which take place in "indirect statement, indirect question, indirect exclamation and indirect command," namely, "that-clause," "dependent wh-clause," and "to-infinitive clause (without subject)," respectively. Banfield (1973:3-4) makes the distinction between DQ and Ind Q basically in the same way as Quirk and Greenbaum (ibid.) do;

- (i) the subordinating conjunction that introduces indirect speech;
- (ii) the verb of indirect speech undergoes a sequence of tense rules;

- (iii) the grammatical person of pronoun with the same referent in the main and embedded clauses of indirect speech is identical, and
- (iv) the demonstrative elements which refer to the time or place of the quoted speech act differ in direct and indirect speech.

Thus, it seems that the distinction between DQ and Ind Q in English, as proposed by Quirk and Greenbaum (ibid.) and Banfield (ibid), can easily be shown without necessitating an explicit definition of Ind Q. However, in Japanese, since the quotative particle to (or tte) imposes no syntactic constraint on the quoted clause, it is impossible to examine the structure of Ind Q without an explicit definition. The next example shows an English case which is comparable to the Japanese quotation:

(2) Then Mr. Smith said to me [àî rîsîvd it]

The utterance "àî rîsîvd it" could be either of the following:

Then, (a) Mr. Smith said to me, "I received it."

Then, (b) Mrs. Smith said to me (that) I received it.

Namely, (a) is a version of DQ and (b) Ind Q. However, a close look at (b) tells us that it is normally impossible for the third person to express, on behalf of the first person, that that first person received something, as in (b). Hence, the DQ version is the only acceptable interpretation. This is what often happens with the Japanese quotations, whose structure cannot be described without looking at the semantic and pragmatic content of the quoted clause. With this much information in mind, let's first consider the traditional definition of

Ind Q in Japanese.

The first attempt to define Ind Q was made by Okutsu (1970) (who, incidentally, proposed transformational accounts of Ind Q derived from DQ);

"Ind Q is a sentence in which the content of DQ is translated to the point of the view of speaker of the sentence as a whole." (translation supplied by me)

The application of this definition makes it obligatory to change any viewpoint elements in DQ so as to meet the circumstances where the quotation takes place. Okutsu presents the following examples:

- (3) a. kinoo Taroo wa boku ni "Ashita boku wa kimi no uchi
 yesterday topic I to tomorrow I top you of house
 e iku yo," to it-ta (Okutsu's (15): DQ)
 to go I-tell-you QT say-past

'Yesterday Taro told me, "Tomorrow I will go to your house."'

QT = Quotative Particle

- b. Kinoo Taroo wa boku ni kyoo
 today

Taroo wa boku no uchi e kuru to it-ta.
 come
 (Okutsu's (15): Ind Q)

'Yesterday Taro said to me that Taro would come to my house today.'

The pair above (3a) and (3b) display the complete shift of all the viewpoint elements between DQ and Ind Q. However, Okutsu's Ind Q (3b) is not acceptable for the following reasons:

1. Identical Subject Drop: Taroo in (3a) which is repeated in Ind Q should be deleted.
2. Selection of wa 'topic marker' and ga 'subject marker' in DQ and Ind Q: the topic marker wa tends to be excluded from the subordinate clause (i.e., in Ind Q), whereas the subject marker ga is not subject to this exclusion.

These two points will refine Okutsu's example (3b) as follows:

- (4) a. Kinoo Taroo wa boku ni kyoo ~~Ø~~ boku no uchi e kuru to it-ta.

(Identical Subject Drop applied)

- b. Kinoo Taroo_i wa boku ni kyoo jibun_i
self
ga boku no uchi e kuru to it-ta.

(Reflexivization applied to Taroo,
and wa in DQ replaced by ga)

- (5) Taroo_i wa boku_j ni

- a. boku_i wa ik-anakereba-naranai
must go to it-ta
- b. boku_{j/i} ga ik-anakereba-naranai⁵

'Taro_i said to me_i

- a. I_i must go.'

5. Note that ga could indicate that boku refers to Taroo if Taro did really say so in his original speech. But, wa in (a) can only refer boku to Taroo not to the reporter.

b. I_{j/i} must go.'

Thus, the use of the topic marker wa in the quoted clause functions to signal whether the quotation is direct or indirect. Example (5a) is therefore a DQ, where wa is used in the quoted clause and boku refers only to Taroo. (5b), on the other hand, is an Ind Q, where ga triggers the subordination of the quoted clause and, as a result, boku refers to the reporter (i.e., the speaker of this sentence as a whole).

The traditional definition of Ind Q proposed by Okutsu further entails syntactic constraints on quoted clauses; particularly on modal auxiliaries, sentence final particles and transformations applied to quoted clauses. First, let us consider the following examples:

(6) Hanada-san ga watashi ni, nee,
Mrs. Hanada subj I to intj.

a. *moo o-kaeri-ni-nari-masu
soon return (↑) polite

b. *moo o-kaeri-ni-naru yo tte osshatteru no.
return (↑) I-tell-you QT saying () it's-that

c. moo o-kaeri-ni-naru
return (↑)

(↑) verb form indicating respect to the subject.

'Mrs. Hanada said to me

c. that she (a respectable person) return (↑) soon.'

(7) Hanada-san ga watashi ne, nee,

a. moo o-itoma-shi-masu
soon return (↓) polite

b. moo o-itoma-suru wa tte osshateru no.
return (↓) I-tell-you (female)

c. ??moo o-itoma-suru
return (↓)

(↓) Verb form indicating that the subject refers to himself humbly.

'Mrs. Hanada said to me

a. & b. "(I, humbly) return (↓) soon."

(6) and (7) illustrate the case where the polite marker (auxiliary) masu⁶ and the sentence final particles yo and wa strongly signal the quoted clause as DQ. With regard to "honorifics", either exalting someone or humbling oneself, Japanese has special grammatical devices called "subject honorification" (i.e., exalting someone) and "object honorification" (i.e., humbling oneself) (Harada, 1976):

(8) Subject Honorification: o-verb(stem)-ni-naru (subject = speaker)

"Someone respectable does V . . ."

e.g. (a) Hanada-san ga o-kaeri-ni-nari-masu.
subj return (↑) polite

(b) *Watashi ga o-kaeri-ni-nari-masu.

(a) 'Mrs. Hanada, a respectable person, will go home.'

(b) '*I, a respectable person, will go home.'

6. The auxiliary masu 'polite marker' is added to the verb, marking the speech containing that verb polite.

(9) Object Honorification: o-verb(stem)-suru (subject = speaker)

"I, humbly, do V for someone respectable."

e.g. (a) Watashi wa (ga) o-itoma-shi-masu
 topic (subj) return (↓) polite

(b) *Hanada-san wa (ga) o-itoma-shi-masu.

(a) 'I, humbly, go home.'

(b) '*Mrs. Hanada, humbly, go home.'

(8b) is ungrammatical because the subject is the speaker, watashi, and it makes the sentence sound absurd or ridiculous. (9b) is unacceptable for a similar reason; the subject is not the speaker but Hanada-san, supposedly a respectable guest, who deserves not "humbleness" but "respect."

To go back to (6) and (7), (6a) and (6b) are not acceptable as Ind Q for the following reasons. As observed in (8), o-kaeri-ni-naru (subject honorification) may be used only with the second or third person subject. That is, when one states his action of going home, he can not use o-kaeri-na-naru to refer to it. Only someone other than him, i.e., the reporter (or the observer, to put it another way) may use that phrase. Hence, if the observer hears Hanada-san, a respected guest, say "I'll go home," and when he reports it directly, he can apply subject honorification to says but not go home in a phrase, "Hanada-san says, 'I'll go home.'" (Iu, 'say', has a special lexicon for "someone respected say"; i.e., ossharu, as used in (6) and (7)). If the subject

honorification is applied to both words, then it turns out to mean, "hanada-san, a respected person, says (), "I, a respected person, will go home ()."; hence, an unacceptable sentence is generated. However, if the observer reports it indirectly, from his point of view, then he may apply the rule to both says and go home in "Hanada-san, a respected guest, says that she, Hanada-san, a respected guest, will go home." This explains exactly what is happening in (6a) through (6c). That is, (6a) and (6b) are both unacceptable because they mean, "Hanada-san, a respected guest says, 'I, a respected guest, will go home,'" whereas (6c) is perfectly acceptable as an Ind Q. Notice, however, that (6a) and (6b) can be acceptable as DQ, meaning "Hanada-san, a respectable guest, says, '(Someone respectable, who is not Hanada-san) will go home.'"; but, then, (6a) through (c) cannot share the same proposition in this treatment. This difference is clearly made by the polite marker masu and the sentence final particles yo and wa, whose occurrences signal DQ and whose absences Ind Q.

The examples in (7) form the reverse side of the same coin with (6). (7a) and (7b) are both perfectly grammatical because the object honorification, o-itoma-su, is applied appropriately, taking the first person as its subject. (7c), however, is not acceptable because object honorification is not applied adequately, taking the third person as its subject. Thus, (7a) and (7b) are DQ;

a. "(Watashi wa)	o-itoma-shi-masu."	(I, humbly) go home.
b. "(Watashi wa)	o-itoma-suru wa."	(I, humbly) go home.

And (7c) is

c. *(Hanada-san wa) o-itoma-suru. (Hanada, humbly) go home.

The distinction between these sentences is, again, caused by the occurrence or absence of masu and wa.

While examples (6) and (7) deal with the matter of "ellipted" subjects, the examples below demonstrate the case with anaphora in "unellipted" objects.

(10) Kinoo Taroo ga Hanako_i ni
yesterday sub to

a. "Kanojo_{≠i} to kekkonshi-masu
her with marry polite

b. "Kanojo_{≠i} to kekkonsuru yo tte it-te-ta wa
I-tell-you QT was saying

c. kanojo_{=i} to kekkonsuru

'Yesterday Taro said to Hanako_i

a. "I will get married to her_{≠i}.'

b. "I will get married to her_{≠i}.'

c. that he would get married to her_{=i}.'

Notice that the reference of kanojo, 'she/her' is clearly controlled by the occurrence or absence of masu and yo. If they appear in a quoted clause as in (a) and (b), it refers to someone other than Hanako in the main clause, separating the quoted clause from the main clause and

signalling it as DQ. If masu and yo are absent as in (c), then kanojo is bound to Hanako in the main clause, marking the quoted clause as Ind Q.

The fact that Ind Q cannot accommodate the auxiliaries masu and desu ('polite marker' added to nominal or adjectival elements') or the sentence final particles yo, ne and wa holds true not only for the declarative styles of Ind Q but also for other styles, as will be shown below.

(11) Yes/No Questions

Taroo wa sono mise de watashi ni
topic that store at I to

a. Kono mise wa ii - desu ka to
this good polite ?

b. sono mise ga { *ii-desu } ka-doo-ka kiki-mashi-ta
 { ii Ø } asked-polite

'Taro asked me at that store

a. "Is this store good?"

b. whether that store was good.

(12) Imperatives

Senzitsu Taroo no uchi e iku to, boku ni
the other day 's house to go when I (male) to

a. "itsumade-mo koko ni iro yo" to
long time here at stay! QT

it-ta-n-desu-yo.
said-it's that

b. itsumade-mo soko ni { *iro yo } yoo-ni
there { iru Ø } so that

'The other day, when I went to Taro's house, he said to me

- a. "Stay here for a long time!"
- b. to stay there for a long time.

Furthermore, in addition to auxiliaries masu and desu and sentence final particles, modals such as (S)-soo-da 'so-I-hear,' -mai '(I) guess . . . not' and daroo '(I) guess' cannot occur in Ind Q.

(13) Kinoo_i Yamada-san ga watashi_k ni, nee,
yesterday subj I to intj

- a. "Daremo ashita_j kimi_k no toko e ika-nai soo-da yo"
anybody tomorrow you 's place to go not so-I-hear
- b. ??daremo kyoo_j watashi_k no toko e ko-nai soo-da
today come not

tte osshatta wa.
QT said (↑)

'Yesterday_i Mr(s) Yamada said to me_k, . . .

- a. "No one will go to your place, so-I-hear."
- b. ??that no one would come to my_k place today_j, so-I-hear.

(Kinoo Yamada-san ga watashi_k ni, nee,)

- c. "Daremo ashita_j kimi_k no tokoro e iku-mai."
go-(I)guess not
- d. ??daremo kyoo_j watashi_k no toko e kuru-mai
come-(I)guess not

tte osshatta wa.

'Yesterday Mr(s) Yamada said to me_k . . .

- c. "I guess no one would go to your place."

d. ??that I_(yamada) guess no one would come to my_k place.

(Kinoo Yamada-san ga watashi_k ni, nee,)

e. "Daremo ashita_j kimi_k no tokoro e ik-anai daroo ne
go not I guess

go not I guess

f. ?? daremo kyoo_j watashi_k no tako e ko-nai daroo
come-not I-guess

come-not I-guess

tte osshatta wa.

'Yesterday, Mr(s) Yamada said to me_k, . . .

e. "I presume no one will go to your_k place tomorrow,"

f. ??I (=Yamada) guess no one would come to my_k place today_j.

Examples (b), (d) and (f) are not acceptable as Ind Q corresponding to (a), (c) and (e) respectively. They may be acceptable if they are mentioned as utterances separated from (a), (c) and (e). That is, (b), (d) and (f) can be acceptable (that is, as DQ) only when kyoo_i and watashi_k are interpreted as kyoo=_i (i.e., not the day when the reporting takes place) and watashi=Yamada'. In other words, in (b), (d) and (f), the reporter's viewpoint may be imposed on kyoo and watashi but not on soo-da, mai and daroo. Those modals block the reporter's viewpoint from overriding the quotee's viewpoint in the quoted clause ending with them. That is, as in the case with masu and desu, these modals signal the quoted clause only as the quotee's utterance, i.e., DQ.

That Ind Q in Japanese is a subordinated clause which is

syntactically less capable than a main clause can be further shown by application of Emmonds' (1974) proposal of "root transformations" to quoted clauses. While all the root transformations can apply to DQ, "topicalization," "right dislocation" and "left dislocation" are blocked from applying to Ind Q (see Inoue 1978 and Kamada 1981 for detail).

Lastly, the observations presented in this section have demonstrated clearly that Ind Q is not only more restricted than DQ in accomodating auxiliaries, sentence final particles and the topic marker wa but also syntactically less capable of accepting transformations than DQ. Among many proposals to generalize the phrase structures of Japanese, Akmajian and Kitagawa's (1981) "layered analysis" seems to provide a well-defined status for Ind Q. They claim that Japanese phrase structures are made up from the following rules:

$$(14) S^2 \rightarrow (\text{Adv}) S^1 \text{ Aff}^2$$

$$\text{Aff}^2 = \text{Modality} \dots \underline{\text{daroo/mai/soo-da}}$$

$$S^1 \rightarrow (\text{Adv}) S^0 \text{ Aff}^1$$

$$\text{Aff}^1 = \text{Tense} \dots \underline{\text{ru/ta}}$$

e.g. Naomi wa terebi o mi- nagara benkyoosi-ta noni
 top TV drct obj. see_{S⁰} while study past_{S¹} though
 shiken ni ukat- ta soo-da
 exam in pass past_{S¹} } S²

I heard that Naomi passed the exam although she studied while watching TV.

Given their analysis, Ind Q finds its position in S^1 which can

accommodate Aff¹ (tense) but cannot accommodate Aff² (modality).

To sum up this section;

i) Ind Q is a style of quotation in which all the viewpoint elements such as pronouns, demonstratives, time-/place-adverbs and viewpoint verbs take a form which conforms to the reporter's point of view.

ii) Ind Q is syntactically less free than DQ with regard to its capability to accommodate modal auxiliaries, sentence final particles and transformational mechanisms. It is legitimately one of the subordinate clauses in Japanese, and is radically different from DQ.

3.2 Semi Direct Quotation and Semi Indirect Quotation

This section will present two different types of quoted clause in Japanese. One of them is called Semi Direct Quotation (Semi DQ, henceforth); it projects only the quotee's viewpoint in the quoted clause but lacks the force the normal DQ carries. The other type is a style of quotation which, if the traditional definition of Ind Q is applied, becomes unacceptable, but which becomes acceptable by maintaining the quotee's viewpoint on certain elements while shifting the viewpoint on others to that of the reporter's. That is, this style represents the mixed viewpoints (i.e. quotee's and reporter's) and, yet, it is perfectly acceptable as, in my term, Semi Indirect Quotation

(Semi Ind Q). In order to facilitate the discussion, the case with Semi Ind Q is first observed and then the case with Semi DQ.

3.2.1 Semi Indirect Quotation

In "reportive sentences," in Kuroda's (1973) sense, Japanese sensation adjectives such as atsui 'hot,' kanashii 'sad,' and samui 'cold' display the following combinations with manifestive garu 'show the appearance of -' (garu itself does not express the stative state, so -te iru 'be -ing' has to follow -garu in the paradigm below).

(15) Combinations of Sensational Adjectives and Manifestive -garu subject

1st Person	Boku ga I subj	{	atsui. hot	Boku ga	{	*atsu-gat-te-iru appearing hot	
			kanashii sad			*kanashi-gat-te-iru appearing sad	
			samui cold			*samu-gat-te-iru appearing cold	
			iki-tai go want			*iki-ta-gat-te-iru go-want-appearing	
			'I am hot/sad/cold/want-go.' (adj.)				'*I am appearing hot/sad/cold/ want-to-go.'

2nd Person	Kimi ga you subj	{	*atsui.	Kimi ga	{	atsu-gat-te-iru	
			*kanashii			kanashi-gat-te-iru	
			*samui			samu-gat-te-iru	
			*iki-tai			iki-ta-gat-te-iru	
			'*You are hot/sad/cold/ want-to-go.'				'You are appearing hot/sad/cold/ want-to-go.'

3rd Person	Kare ga	{	*atsui	Kare ga	{	atsu-gat-te-iru
	he subj		*kanashii			kanashi-gat-te-iru
			*iki-tai			iki-ta-gat-te-iru
'*He is hot/sad/cold/ want-to-go.'				'He is appearing hot/sad/cold/ want-to-go./		

As can be readily observed, sensation adjectives occur only with the 1st person subjects. When they occur with 2nd or 3rd person subjects, the manifestive garu needs to follow them. In other words, in Japanese the perception of the 2nd and 3rd persons cannot be directly observed unless the narrator (or reporter) empathizes with them. That is, the perception of persons other than the speaker always needs garu (gat-teiru), i.e., "someone appears to me to feel . . ." Thus, it is reasonable to predict that when the state of one's perception is reported indirectly, it should be described from the reporter's viewpoint, i.e., as presented in the paradigm (15).

Let us consider the following case.

- (16) Obaachama ga nyuusu mi-tai tte osshateru no yo.
granny subj news see-want QT saying it's-that emph

'Granny says, "(I) want to see the news."

(16) is judged as DQ because 'mi-tai' obviously projects not the reporter's but the quotee's (i.e., obaachama 'granny') viewpoint. If (16) is reported indirectly, that is, from the reporter's viewpoint, then it should be.

(17) *Obaachama ga nyuusu mi-ta-gat-te-iru tte osshateru no yo.

Notice that sentence (17), generated by the traditional definition of Ind Q, turned out to be ungrammatical. What if someone describes the state of the 1st person's (i.e., the speaker's) perception and the reporter (i.e., 1st person) reports it indirectly (again, from the reporter's viewpoint)?

(18) Obaachama: "Taroo ga mi-ta-gat-te-iru yo."

'Taro appears to want to see it.'

Taro hears Obaachama's utterance above and reports it indirectly to others.

Obaachama ga	{	a. boku ga *mi-tai	}	tte osshateru
		b. boku ga mi-ta-gat-te-iru		

'It seems that granny says that I

{	a. *want to see it.	'
	b. appear want to see it.	

The traditional definition of Ind Q predicts that (a) is the correct indirect quotation because (18a) is described entirely from the speaker's (boku) point of view. But surprisingly, (18b), which contains the mixed viewpoints, turns out to be acceptable;

(19) Obaachama ga boku ga mi-ta-gat-te-iru tte
 sp's vp sp's vp Obaachama's vp

sp = speaker vp = viewpoint

Now, is (19) then a direct quotation because mi-ta-gat-te-iru directly reflects the quotee's (i.e., Obaachama's) direct speech, "Taroo

- (24) Kare wa { a. watashi ga nyuusu o mi-ta-gat-te-iru
 b. kimi ga nyuusu o mi-ta-gat-te-iru } to itta
 c. nyuusu o mi-tai
 he

'He said that {a. I appear to want to see the news; b. you appear to want to see the news; c. he wants to see the news.}'

(25) Shift of Viewpoints with Sensation Adjectives and Manifestive garu

Quotee	Subject of Sensational Adjectives	(+/-) <u>garu</u>
I [Viewpoint]	I	-
	you	+
	he	+
You [Viewpoint]	I	+
	you	-
	he	+
He [Viewpoint]	I	+
	you	+
	he	-

It is now very clear that the occurrence of garu in quotation is determined by the quotee's point of view. And, consequently, a mixture of viewpoints as in Watashi ga mitagatteiru results as an acceptable utterance in this type of indirect quotation, which I call Semi Indirect Quotation.

In addition to sensational adjectives, sensation verbs such as

mireru 'be visible to the speaker' and kikoeru 'be audible to the speaker' present a selectional restriction of subject similar to the one with sensational adjectives.

- (26) a. (Watashi wa) Yamada-san no kao ga yoku mieru.
 I 's face nom well be visible
- b. *Anata wa Yamada-san no kao ga yoku mieru
 you
- c. *Taroo wa Yamada-san no kao ga yoku mieru
- a. I can hear Yamada's voice well.
 b. *You can see Yamada's face well.
 c. *Taro can see Yamada's face well.
- (27) a. (Watashi wa) Yamada-san no koe ga yoku kikoeru.
 voice be audible
- b. *Anata wa Yamada-san no koe ga yoku kikoeru.
- c. *Taroo wa Yamada-san no koe ga yoku kikoeru.
- a. I can hear Yamada's voice well.
 b. *You can hear Yamada's voice well.
 c. *Taro can hear Yamada's voice well.

If reported indirectly, however, the selection shifts in the following way:

- (28) Taroo wa watashi₁ ni
 to
- a. *watashi_i ga Yamada-san no { kao ga yoku mieeru.
 koe ga yoku kikoeru.
- b. *Anata ga Yamada-san no { kao ga yoku mieru.
 koe ga yoku kikoeru.
- c. 0 watashi_i no } kao ga yoku mieru.

(33a) and (34a) indicate that seem and appear have the same selectional restriction of subject as that of -garu, -mitai-da, -yoo-da, and yorokobu. (33 b, c) and (34 b, c), however, show that when they are reported indirectly, this selectional restriction is subject to change according to the "shifted viewpoint," i.e., the viewpoint of the quotee. This is exactly what happens in Japanese Semi Ind Q.

To sum up what has been observed in this section, there is a style of quotation which, if the traditional definition of Ind Q is applied, becomes ungrammatical. Such quotations maintain their grammaticality by keeping the quotee's viewpoint in the expression of sensation adjectives and verbs, the auxiliaries mitai/yooda and the verb yorokobu, while other viewpoint elements are adjusted to the reporter's viewpoint. Because of the mixed viewpoints in the quoted clause this type of speech is called Semi Indirect Quotation. We have also seen a similar phenomenon in the English sense verbs look, appear and seem when they are used in indirect quotations.

3.2.2 Directional and Giving/Receiving Verbs in Quoted Clauses

In the last section we saw a case where the traditional definition of Ind Q creates unacceptable utterances when applied to all the viewpoint elements. Some viewpoint elements stay unconverted and maintain the quotee's viewpoint; as a result, a quotation containing

mixed viewpoints is generated, that is, a Semi Indirect Quotation. The present section demonstrates a situation similar to the preceding one except that the viewpoint elements to be treated here may or may not be converted to the reporter's point of view when being reported indirectly. We will see first the case with the directional verbs kuru 'come to the speaker's location' and iku 'go away from the speaker' and then with giving and receiving verbs such as yaru 'give something to somebody other than the speaker' and morau 'receive from somebody other than speaker.'

Unlike English, Japanese directional verbs iku and kuru are used always from the speaker's point of view.

- (35) Watashi ga sochira ni hanashi ni { a. iki-masu
I subj your place talking for { go polite yo.
b. *ki-masu emp.
come

'I will { a. go } to your place to talk.'
b. *come

- (36) Tomodachi ga kochira ni hanashi ni { a. *iki-masu } yo.
friend my place to { b. ki-masu }

My friend will { a. *go } to my place to talk.'
b. come

(35b) is ungrammatical because ki-masu 'will come', which cannot express the speaker's action of going to someone else's place is used. Similarly, (36a) is incorrect because the subject tomodachi will be with the speaker, yet iku instead of kuru is used for that action. That is,

unlike English come, kuru must be used for someone's action of approaching the speaker, and iku for someone's action of moving away from the speaker. However, if utterances like (35) and (36) are reported indirectly, the distinction between kuru and iku is neutralized.

- (38) Ano hito-tachi ga kochira ni { a. kuru } tte osshateru
 those people my place to { b. iku } QT saying
 rashii wa yo.
 look like emp (women) emp

'It looks as if those people are saying that they will

{ a. come }
 { b. go } here.

- (39) Ano hito-tachi ga

watashi-tachi ga achira ni { a. iku } beki-da tte
 we their place { b. kuru } should QT
 osshateru rashii wa yo.

'It looks as if those people are saying that we should

{ a. go }
 { b. come } to their place.'

Notice that in direct speech (38b) should be unacceptable as seen in (36a) and that (39b) should be wrong as well. But both of them are perfectly acceptable. (38a) represents only the reporter's viewpoint and, hence, is an Ind Q; (38b), on the other hand, is a Semi Ind Q since

while kochira 'my/our place' projects the speaker's viewpoint, iku shows the quotee's viewpoint. Likewise, (39a) is an Ind Q and (39b) a Semi Ind Q. Thus, in the context of (38) and (39), the quotation is acceptable either with iku or kuru. However, this alternation does not always hold true. Let us look at the following examples.

- (40) Ano hito-tachi ga kochira ni $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{kuru} \\ \text{??iku} \end{array} \right\}$ tte watashi ni chokusetsu
osshata wa yo. to directly

'Those people said directly to me that they would $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{come} \\ \text{??go} \end{array} \right\}$ here.'

- (41) Ano hito-tachi ga watashi-tachi ga achira ni $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{??kuru} \\ \text{iku} \end{array} \right\}$ beki-da tte
chokusetsu osshata wa yo. their pl.

'Those people said directly to me that we should $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{??come} \\ \text{go} \end{array} \right\}$ there.'

In (40) and (41) the version with iku in (40) and kuru in (41) receive almost unacceptable judgments. What is, then, the difference between (38), (39), (40) and (41)? As can be seen easily, it is the environment where the reporting is done. That is, in (38) and (39) the reporter presents the quotation as if he obtained it by eavesdropping; whereas, in (40) and (41), he reports it as a message which has been directly (chokusetsu) addressed to him. Namely, when the message contains iku or kuru, the more directly addressed it is to the reporter, the less acceptable it becomes to maintain the quotee's viewpoint with

iku or kuru. (Kuno (1978:267-282) presents a similar observation for his "Direct Discourse Analysis.")

- (42) Yamada-san wa boku ni wa nidoto ai ni *ik-anai
me to contrast never seeing for go not

tte boku ni ii-mashi-ta
QT me to said polite

'Yamada said to me that he would never *go to see me.'

- (43) Yamada-san wa boku no ototoo ni boku ni wa nidoto
's brother

ai ni ??ik-anai tte ii-mashi-ta.

'Yamada said to my brother that he would never ??go to see me.'

- (44) Yamada-san wa boku ni wa nidoto ai ni ik-anai tte

itteru soo-da
saying so-I-hear

'I hear that Yamada is saying he would never go to see me.'

A comparison of the case of kuru and iku and that of sensation adjectives demonstrates an interesting difference between them. When sensation adjectives appear in quoted clauses, there is no alternation as is observed when iku and kuru are quoted. That is, whether the reporter receives the message directly or indirectly, the viewpoint on those adjectives must stay as that of the quotee.

- (18) Obaachan ga boku ga mi-ta-gat-te-iru tte itteru rashii yo.
granny I appear-want-see QT saying look like

'It looks as if Granny is saying I appear to want to see it.'

- (45) Obaachan ga boku ga mi-ta-gat-te-iru tte shitsukoku boku ni
 iu-n-da yo.
 It's that she says insistently

'It's that she says insistently to me that I appear to want to see it.'

- (19) Obaachan ga boku ga ichiban yorokobu tte itteru rashii yo.
 most pleased QT saying look like

'It looks as if Granny is saying that I would be most pleased.'

- (46) Obaachan ga boku ga ichiban yorokobu tte shitsukoku boku ni
 iu-n-da yo.

'It's that Granny says I would be most pleased.'

While (45) and (46) provides an environment in which the message is given directly to the reporter, there is no difference in acceptability between them and (18) and (19), in which the message is given indirectly. It can be reasonably suspected that this difference between directional verbs and sensation words stems from the fact that the former carry a strong sense of directionality, but the latter none.

Giving/receiving verbs present a very similar phenomenon to that of directional verbs. Because the system in giving/receiving verbs is much more complicated than that of iku and kuru, we will observe, in what follows, only the case with giving verbs (readers interested in receiving verbs as well are referred to Kamada (1981), which partially presents the analysis of receiving verbs). First, the examples (47) and (48) illustrate their use in the matrix sentence.

(48) Speaker = Giver, Speaker = Recipient

G
I
V
E
R			(a) Sensee ga watashi ni hon o kudasatta.
teacher me book gave
'The teacher gave me a book.'
	kudasaru (G>R)		
		Recipient	(b) Tomodachi ga watashi ni hon o kureta
friend me book gave
'My friend gave me a book.'
	kureru (G=R)	"I"	(c) Ootoo ga watashi ni hon o kureta.
'My younger brother gave me a book.'
			(d) *Akachan ga watashi ni hon o kudasatta.
baby
'A baby gave me a book.'
	kureru (G<R)		(e) *Sensee ga Yamada-san ni hon kureta.
'The teacher gave a book to Yamada.'

Both (d) and (e) are ungrammatical because (d) needs kureta instead of kudasatta since the recipient is superior to the giver, and (e) needs watashi instead of third person Yamada-san for the recipient.

What is of interest here is to examine what happens when sentences like (47) and (48) are reported indirectly. Specifically, are these viewpoint verbs completely converted to the reporter's point of view when quoted indirectly? Or, as in the case of sensation words in Semi Ind Q, do some of the viewpoint elements remain unconverted, maintaining the quotee's viewpoint?

Let us consider the following examples.

(49) Kinoo okaasan ga itta-ja-nai=ka,
yesterday Mom said didn't-you?

boku ni hon o { a. yaru } tte.
me book { b. kureru } QT

'Didn't you, Mom, say to me that you would

{ a. give (to = 1st psn) }
 { b. give (to = 1st psn) } a book to me?'

(50) Kinoo, okaasan, otoosan ya obaachan ni itta rashii ne,
 Dad and granny said look like right?

boku ni hon o { a. yaru } tte.
 { b. ??kureru }

'It looks like you, Mom, said to Dad and Granny that

you would { a. give (to = 1st psn) }
 { b. ??kureru (to = 1st psn) } a book to me, right?'

While yarū and kureru are used basically in the same direction as iku 'go' and kuru 'come to 1st psn', respectively, the above examples show the opposite acceptability in indirect quotation. That is, both iku and kuru are acceptable when the quotation containing them is NOT directly addressed to the reporter, and only kuru is acceptable when it is addressed directly to him. The case with yarū and kureru, on the other hand, is that when the quotation containing them is NOT directly addressed to the reporter (i.e., (50)), the choice of kureru has only a marginal acceptability, but when the quotation is directly addressed to him as in (49), both of them are perfectly acceptable. What makes the situation more complicated is that the selection of yarū and kureru is not only sensitive to deictic environment as shown in the above, but also to the tense and illocutionary force (Austin (1962) & Searle (1976)) of the quoted clause. Consider the following examples.

- (51) Kinoo, okaasan, itta-ja-nai-ka, otoosan to ojiisan ni
yest. Mom didn't-you-say Dad and Grandpa

boku ni hon o { a. yatta } tte.
 b. *kureta }
 QT
 gave

'Didn't you say, Mom, to Dad and Grandpa that

you { a. gave (to = 1st psn) }
 b. *gave (to 1st psn) } a book to me.'

- (52) Kinoo, okaasan, itteta rashii ne otoosan to ojiisan ni
 were-saying look like right? and

boku ni hon o { a. yatta } tte.
 b. *kureta }

'Looks like you, Mom, were saying to Dad and Grandpa that

you { a. gave (to = 1st psn) }
 b. *gave (to 1st psn) } a book to me.

- (53) Kinoo, okaasan, itteta-ja-nai-ka oniisan ni
 weren't-you-saying? elder brother to

boku ni hon o { a. yaru }
 b. *kureru yooni } tte.
 in a way

'Weren't you, Mom, telling my big brother

to { a. give (to = 1st psn) }
 b. *give (to 1st psn) } a book to me.

(51) and (52) illustrate the case with the past tense where kureta is totally blocked in both sentences. The illocutionary force of the quoted clause of (53) is that of "request"; and, perhaps because of that kureru is blocked. This is certainly a complicated problem beyond the

realm of this dissertation.

3.2.3 Semi Direct Quotation⁷

The preceding sections presented an observation and analysis of quoted clauses on the basis of the viewpoint projected on such elements as deixis and sensation adjectives and verbs. Through this procedure it became clear to us that there are lexical items that can never be mentioned by someone on behalf of the person who uttered them originally. To put it another way, they are the elements that express one's mood toward a given proposition; that is, sentence-final particles like yo, wa and ne, auxiliaries desu, masu, soo-da, yoo-da and mai, and sensation adjectives and verbs. Some of them mark the clause containing them only as DQ and others as Semi Ind Q. Using Nitta (1979)'s typological work on sentences and Kamio's (1979) notion of "territory of information", Inoue (1981 and 1983) draws the distinction between DQ and Ind Q in a similar way to the one proposed here although no attempt was made to distinguish Semi Ind Q and Ind Q. Categorized as DQ in her analysis are those expressions that no one other than the first person, i.e., the reporter or the speaker, can use and those which express the information that belongs only to the speaker. Others are categorized as Ind Q. In her approach, therefore, sentences ending in sentence-final

7. Maynard (1984) suggested a notion of semi direct quotation. But, since she presented no description of that notion, I have no way to distinguish it from my notion of Semi Direct Quotation.

particles, modal auxiliaries and perceptual adjectives and verbs are all grouped as DQ and others as Ind Q. However, as careful readers may have already noticed, neither the analysis presented so far, nor Inoue's (ibid.) has succeeded in properly describing a situation where quoted clauses end with an element showing the original speaker's mood or sensation, but do not necessarily function as normal direct speech does. This section will present a discussion of this type of DQ, which I call Semi DQ.

First, let us observe the following examples.

- (54) Yuube totsuzen Yamada-san ga watashi ne nee,
 last night suddenly subj me to interjective

			a. soo	-desu	yo		
			So-I-hear	polite	emp		tte
			b. soo-desu				QT
daremo	kyoo	ko-nai					osshatta
anybody	today	come-not	c. soo-da		yo		said
			non-polite		emp		wa
			d. soo-da				emp

Last night Yamada said suddenly to me

- a. "I hear no one is coming today, EMPHASIS."
 b. "I hear no one is coming today."
 c. "I hear no one is coming, EMPHASIS."
 d. "I hear no one is coming."

(55) Kinoo Yamada-san ga watashi ni nee,

daremo kyoo	{	a. ko	-nai	-deshoo	ne	}	tte osshatta wa.
		come	not	(I)guess, polite	emp		
		b. ko	-nai	-deshoo			
		c. ko	-nai	-daroo	ne		
				(I)guess, nonpolite	emp		
		d. ko	-nai	-daroo			

Last night Yamada said to me

- a. "I guess nobody is coming today, EMP."
- b. "I guess nobody is coming today."
- c. "I guess nobody is coming, EMP."
- d. "I guess no one is coming."

Notice that (a) through (d) in both (54) and (55) are all DQ's because, as we saw in 3.1., the modals soo-da and daroo indicate only the original speaker's "mood" toward the proposition expressed in "daremo kyoo wa konai" ('no one comes today') and keeps the original speaker's viewpoint on deixis from converting to the reporter's viewpoint. Further, desu and yo in (54) and deshoo and ne in (55) mark the preceding clause as DQ, too. The question is, now, what the difference between them is. Particularly, what is the distinction between the examples (d) marked DQ, and the other examples, where a polite marker and/or sentence-final particle is used.

Although no statistics are available here, the use of sentence final particles like yo, ne, and wa and many others clearly characterizes conversational Japanese. In fact, it seems that without sentence final particles the conversation becomes too "stiff" and sounds

very "bookish." The following example from an actual conversation illustrates this point.

(56) A: Ushi, sukina-n-da-tte nee, biiru ne, sugoku.
cow they say (cows) like emp beer emp alot

A: You know, they say that cows drink beer, and they
really like it, you know.

B: Iyaa, . . . ikura suki-datte, nee, are jaa-nai
well no matter how like ever emp "it" isn't?

B: But, . . . you know, no matter how they like it,
but isn't that a little (too much)?

A: Un, maa, nee, sookamoshire-nai ne
mm well emp so may emp

A: Yeah, well, mmm, I haven't thought of that, (or, Maybe,
that's true, I guess.)

The reader can imagine what the version without sentence final particles sounds like by deleting them. The corresponding English translation is done as naturally as possible, so that it becomes possible to sense how the version without the underlined word sounds. It is this force that examples (a), (b) and (c) in (54) and (55), respectively, have but the (d)'s do not have. That is, given that the function of DQ is "dramatizing" one's utterance by using the quotee's speech directly in the discourse, neither (54d) nor (55d) has the full force carrying that effect. In both (54d) and (55d), while the effect of "dramatization" is caused in deixis, kyoo 'today', the quoted clause as a whole ended "half-dramatized" as "soo-da."

The modals soo-da and daroo are not the only cases which present

this kind of "half-dramatization" in quoted clauses. In the clauses discussed in the last section, i.e., Semi Ind Q, there is a strong possibility that the clause will end up not fully "dramatized" when it carries no viewpoint elements other than the clause final elements which project the quotee's viewpoint. Examples follow.

- (57) Obaachama ga 'nyuuse mitai ' tte osshateru no.
granny new want to see QT saying emp

'Granny is saying (that I = granny) want to see the news.'

- (58) Tokkuni moo o-yasumi-ni-natte-masu yo.
completely already sleeping polite emp

'kyoo wa kutakuta-da' tte osshatte.
today tired QT saying

'She has already gone to sleep, after saying (that I = she) is very tired.'

- (59) Tokyoo no Mutoo-san ga nee,
's
'Fuji-san mo yoku mieru' tte itteta yo.
Mt. Fuji also well visible to 1st psn was saying emp

'Muto of Tokyo was saying (that I = Muto) could see Mt. Fuji, too.'

- (60) Mukashi no tomodachi ga nee,
old days 's friend

'odeshi-san o shookashite -ageru' tte iu no yo.
students obj introduce for someone say emp emp

'My old friend says (that I = old friend) will introduce students for your (= the reporter's) benefit.'

Notice that all these examples must be considered a type of DQ because mi-ta 'want-to-see' in (57), kutakuta-da 'dead tired' in (58), mieru in

(59) and ageru in (60) all project the quotee's viewpoint and there is no element in the quoted clause that shows the reporter's viewpoint. Yet, they are sharply different from the version with sentence final particles or the auxiliaries desu or masu.

(57') Obaachama ga 'nyuusu mitai $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{wa} \\ \text{desu yo} \\ \text{no} \end{array} \right\}$ tte osshateru no.

(58') . . . 'kyoo wa kutakuta- $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{desu} \\ \text{desu wa} \\ \text{da wa} \end{array} \right\}$ yo tte osshatte.

(59') . . . 'Fuji-san mo yoku $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{mie-masu} \\ \text{mieru yo} \end{array} \right\}$ tte itteta no.

(60') . . . 'odeshi-san o shookaishite $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{age-masu yo} \\ \text{age-masu} \\ \text{age-ru yo} \end{array} \right\}$ tte iu no yo.

It must be very clear that while there is no question that they are a version of DQ, (57) through (60) lack the effect that (54d) and (55d) carry. (57') through (60'), on the other hand, are loaded with the full force of DQ as are (54a, b, c) and (55a, b, c). Thus, a distinction must be drawn between these two types of DQ; one is a "complete" DQ which not only projects the quotee's viewpoint but also carries the full force of the quotee's utterance, and the other is Semi DQ which projects only the quotee's viewpoint but carries partially the force of the quotee's utterance.

The dramatic effect in reporting one's utterance is not always created by a supposedly complete reproduction of the utterance in which the auxiliaries desu or masu or sentence final particles often appear. The reporter often resorts to other linguistic means for such an effect. As a matter of fact, it is too idealistic to treat DQ as an exact copy of one's utterance. One can easily imagine that it requires tremendous skill to reproduce or imitate someone's utterance completely. Think of a situation where a message is given in a foreign language and it must be reported "directly" in one's native language. More realistically, in our daily life we always experience messages expressed in someone's dialect or, more precisely, idiolect and we report it to others directly or indirectly. If it is done directly, are we to do it in the original speaker's dialect (or idiolect) or in our own dialect (or idiolect)? As mentioned earlier, Banfield (1973, 1982) presented a number of Ind Q sentences which do not have any corresponding versions of DQ and vice versa. She claimed then that neither DQ nor Ind Q derives from the other. Similarly, it is extremely difficult to prove that DQ is a complete (or even "supposedly" complete) replica of one's utterance. The following data obtained from a TV drama acutely demonstrates this fact.

(61) (male speaker)

Soonanda	yo.	Hora,	kore wakame	no	nuta
that's right		look!	this seaweed	's	fish-salada

chuun-daro?	Kore ga	kuitakute	nee.	Tsukure
called right?	this nom	want-to-eat	emp	Make!

tte-temo kono sumiso no guai ga wakan-nee* tte-iu-n da yo
 QT even this miso condition nom not-know-emp say-emp

Uchi	no	yatsu	ga.
my		wife	subj

'That's right. Look, this is called wakame no nuta (seaweed weed salad), right? 'Cause I want to eat this, but even if I say, "Make it!", my wife says "How can I know the condition of miso, idiot!."

*used only by men

(62) (male speaker)

De kimi wa kono mama ofukuro* no shitai yooni sasetoke*
 then you this state mother want do in the way let her do

tte	iu-no	kai?
QT	say	?

Then, are you saying "Let Mother do in the way that she wants to do like in this situation."?

*used only by men

Notice both the underlined quoted clauses of the DQ's in (61) and (62) carry enough dramatic effect; (61) by the colloquial, emphatic negative form wakan-nee 'don't know' and (62) by the strong imperative sasetoke 'let one do.' However, if these were a reproduction of the original speaker, i.e., the female (the reporter's wife in this case), they would have to be in women's speech style, thus:

(61') . . . kono sumiso no guai ga wakara-nai wa, tte . . .
women's style for 'I don't know.'

(62') . . . kono mama okaasan no shitai yooni sasetoki-nasai . . .
mother used by women women's style for
'let her do'

Obviously, versions (61') and (62'), reproduced supposedly completely

from the original speaker's utterance, sound odd and, at best, funny, in this discourse; hence, because of lack of coherency created in such reporting they are not acceptable as quoted clauses here. In fact, my data gathered from TV dramas have very few examples where a man reports a woman's speech directly in her style, and vice versa. Furthermore, as discussed in the next chapter, the use of a DQ with the full force of "dramatization" is more limited than that of other styles. All these facts suggest a tendency in Japanese to avoid the mixture of two different modals in a single sentence; instead, coherency is sought by eliminating linguistic obstacles which are foreign to the speaker.

Thus, rather than taking DQ as a clause whose function is to reproduce one's original utterance exactly in the original way, it is more reasonable to view it as a clause whose function is to create the effect of dramatization by a linguistic means of quotation that, the reporter thinks, appropriately corresponds to the original speaker's utterance. This explains different ways in which the reporter brings such an effect to a discourse. Consider the following examples.

(63) (In a TV Talk-show)

Nada-san, soo-iu-huu-ni "omae no tame ni, omae no tame ni"
 in that way you 's sake for

tte iwareru to kodomo wa . . .
QT be said when children

"Well, Mr. Nada, if the children were told, 'For you, for you.',
then . . .

(64) "Tateta, tateta." to erasoo-ni itta-te . . .
 made made proudly even though say

'Even though he says, "Made it! made it!," . . .'

Neither the quoted clause in (63) nor that in (64) ends in masu, desu or sentence final particles, yet it is clear that both have, by repeating the same phrase, the effect that, the reporter thinks, the original speaker would present if he or she appeared in this discourse. Again, whether the original speaker had spoken the quotation exactly as in (63) and (64) is not of importance with regard to the judgment of quoted clauses as DQ. There are other ways to create the effect of DQ; for example, by putting ample stress on a particular phrase. Although an examination of those ways goes beyond the scope of this chapter, it is certainly an interesting area to study, and would further uncover the structure of DQ.

Conclusion

The observation and analysis conducted in this section thus provide a whole view of the styles of quoted clauses in colloquial Japanese.

Direct Quotation . . . A quoted clause which has an effect that, the reporter thinks, the quotee would create with regard to the piece of information in question if he or she were present in the given discourse. Consists of some linguistic elements which make such an effect possible, such as auxiliaries desu/masu, sentence final

particles, repetition of the same phrase and so on. If the clause contains viewpoint elements, they must project only the quotee's viewpoint. However, the style, or the register, used in the clause tends to match, regardless of the quotee's style, that of the reporter.

Semi Direct Quotation . . . A quoted clause all of whose elements project only the quotee's viewpoint but partially lack the effect the quotee would create with regard to the information in question if he or she were present in the given discourse. Ends with modals sooda, mai or daroo which "command" the quotee's viewpoint on any viewpoint element in the clause, or with sensational adjectives or verbs which are not preceded by any viewpoint element projecting the reporter's viewpoint.

Semi Indirect Quotation . . . A clause which represents a mixture of two different viewpoints, the reporter's and the quotee's, but is acceptable as a quoted clause. Lacks much of the effect that the quotee would create with regard to the information in question if he or she were present in the discourse. Ends with sensation adjectives or verbs, directional verbs or giving/receiving verbs which project the quotee's viewpoint; the viewpoint elements projecting the reporter's viewpoint precede those showing the quotee's viewpoint elements.

Indirect Quotation . . . A clause, all of whose elements present the reporter's viewpoint. No effect is created which the quotee would bring with regard to information in question if he or she were present

in the given discourse.

As observed in 3.2, Akmajian & Kitagawa's (1981) "Layered Analysis" appropriately captures the syntactic status of Ind Q in terms of the phrase structure of Japanese. What about other types of reported speech? For the sake of discussion, their analysis is repeated here:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (14) \quad S^2 \text{ (Adv)} &\longrightarrow S^1 \text{ Aff}^2 \text{ Aff}^2 & \text{Modality} = \underline{\text{daroo/mai}} \underline{\text{soo-da}} \\
 S^1 \text{ (Adv)} &\longrightarrow S^0 \text{ Aff}^1 \text{ Aff}^1 & \text{Tense} = \underline{\text{ru/ta}}
 \end{aligned}$$

There seems to be no problem assigning Semi Ind Q and S^1 and Semi DQ as S^2 . However, obviously (14) cannot account for DQ, which accommodates sentence final particles as well as Aff^1 (tense) and Aff^2 (modality). Indeed, as Akmajian & Kitagawa (ibid.) hinted, this is a crucial piece of evidence that (14) needs to be expanded to incorporate Aff^3 (= sentence final particles);

(65) "Layered Analysis" extended.

$$\begin{aligned}
 S^3 \text{ (Adv)} &\longrightarrow S^2 \text{ Aff}^3 & (\text{Aff}^3 = \text{sentence final particles}) \\
 S^2 \text{ (Adv)} &\longrightarrow S^1 \text{ Aff}^2 & (\text{Aff}^2 = \text{modality}) \\
 S^1 \text{ (Adv)} &\longrightarrow S^0 \text{ Aff}^1 & (\text{Aff}^1 = \text{tense})
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, all the types of reported speech in Japanese can now be represented by (63); $DQ = S^3$, $Semi\ DQ = S^2$, $Semi\ Ind\ Q = S^1$ and $Ind\ Q = S^1$.

The following table presents an overview of the types of quoted clauses discussed in this chapter.

Table 1: Features of Reported Speech in Japanese

	DQ	Semi DQ	Semi Ind Q	Ind Q
effect of dramatization	full	less than full	some	none
desu	+	-	-	-
masu	+	-	-	-
sentence final particles	+	-	-	-
modals sooda, daroo, mai	+	+	-	-
sensational adjectives & verbs	q's vp	q's vp	q's vp	r's vp
directional verbs, giving/receiving verbs	q's vp	q's vp	q's vp r's vp	r's vp
time/place	q's vp	q's vp	r's vp	r's vp
"Layer"	s ³	s ²	s ¹	s ¹

q's vp = quotee's viewpoint
r's vp = reporter's viewpoint

CHAPTER IV

SELECTION OF THE STYLE OF REPORTED SPEECH

The last chapter demonstrated the distinction among the four different types of quoted clause in Japanese on the basis of such discourse notions as "viewpoint," "anaphora" and "dramatic effect" and other syntactic devices. This chapter attempts to unveil another very important aspect of "communicative competence" (Hymes, 1972); that is, when and how to use one particular style of reported speech in what kind of linguistic context. The question of when to choose Direct Quotation rather than any other style of speech, or Indirect Quotation instead of other styles so as to make the utterance not only "grammatical" but also "acceptable" (Hymes, *ibid.*) is certainly a very complicated issue due to the enormous number of variables surrounding the linguistic form in question. Nevertheless, it is really amazing that our linguistic competence almost automatically gives us a command to decide on one particular style in a given discourse. Gumperz's (1982) study of "conversational code switching" is in this respect similar to our concern here, since, unlike the issue of diglossia, style switching occurs "where the items in question form part of the same minimal speech act, and message elements are tied by syntactic and semantic relations . . ." and "Selection among linguistic alternants is automatic, not readily subject to conscious recall" (p. 61). Style switching in reported speech is, however, different from conversational code

switching in that the latter obviously treats the unconscious alternation between two different languages in a single discourse while the former deals with style switching in the same language. Thus, in this chapter we further deepen our investigation of reported speech in Japanese.

Recall that the most conspicuous difference between DQ and Ind Q, as observed in the last chapter, is the occurrence (or the absence) of polite markers, sentence final particles and dramatic effect created by some other linguistic devices like stress and intonation. Directly related to our interest in the use of polite markers in the present study is the functional notion of "communicative orientation," which was recently developed by Makino (1984). Makino's claim that the speaker's motivation of "inward" speech invites the deeper subordination (i.e., absence of polite markers) provides us with a significant implication for the inquiry of when to select Ind Q. Complementary to that notion are those of "important/less important information" (Makino 1982, Kuno 1983) and "given/known information" (Prince 1978). Defining important information as the information which is assumed not to be known to the hearer and is, therefore, important let him know, we find a strong correlation between important information and DQ. In what follows, first, Makino's "communicative orientation" is introduced and arguments are presented, which support our hypothesis that the higher the degree of "inward" orientation of the speaker's speech is, the more likely it is for Ind Q to be selected. Then, the information structure based on Kuno and Makino's "importance" and Price's "given/known," is discussed

and an analysis is provided to demonstrate that the more important the information in a quoted clause is, the more likely it is for DQ to be chosen in it. Finally, some of the factors that do not necessarily fit the notions of "communicative orientation" and "important/less important information" are presented and their relevance to the selection of styles of reported speech is argued.

The data to be used in our analysis were gathered from the transcriptions of three different sources; a TV drama called Tonari no Schibafu ('The Grass is Greener') which was broadcast as a serial over a period of about 30 days, another one hour TV drama called Waga Uruwashi no Tomo ('My Dearest Friend'), and a one hour TV Talkshow. While the TV dramas presented, in a sense, "planned discourse" (Ochs, 1979), no unnatural utterances were found.

4.1 Communicative Orientation and Quoted Clause

It is normally the case that a conversation develops through the interaction between the speaker and the listener. The following diagram depicts such a process nicely;

Figure 1: Message Model

However, if we closely look at our behavior in conversing with others, we notice that, depending upon the situation, we do not always address an utterance directly to the listener. At times, we create a sort of soliloquy which is verbalized and is received by the listener, but the listener knows that the speaker is talking to himself in order, for example, to recall the name of a person or a place. The example below shows such a situation in Japanese.

A: Sore kara doo shi-ta-n-desu ka?
 then how did polite? 'What did you do, then?'

B: Eetto, ano hito no namae wa nan datta-ke?
 well . . . that person 's name top what was it?

aa, Makudonarudo-san da! Makudonarudo-san tte iu hito ni
 Yes! Mr. McDonald! QT say person to

atta-n-desu yo.
 met polite

'Well, let me see . . . what was that person's name?
 . . . Oh, it is McDonald! I met a person named McDonald.'

Notice that, to the question addressed by A, B cannot answer promptly, asking himself, "What was that person's name?". In other words, in that utterance B has formed a soliloquy which is not directed to his

listener. The message model in the above diagram fails to explain this kind of "conversation." (It does not seem that the speaker imagines another listener in his mind, either.) English seems to have only a few lexical clues indicating explicitly whether the speaker is creating such a soliloquy; the pragmatic context is the only clue to tell such a speaker's motivation. Japanese, on the other hand, has some lexical elements that signal overtly the speaker's "soliloquy" in conversation. Among them are sentence-final particles S-naa (exclamation), S-kashira (I-wonder, female), S-kana (I-wonder, male) and so on.

Examples: ii naa! "How nice it is!"

ii kashira. "I wonder if it's good." (female)¹

ii kana. "I wonder if it's good." (male)

In my paper on anaphoric demonstratives in Japanese (Kamada, to appear), I have proposed that, in addition to the system based on the situation where the speaker and the listener talk face to face, there is another system where the speaker places an "exclusive focus" on the referent by creating a soliloquy such as the one described above. In this kind of conversation, the listener's presence and knowledge about the referent are "excluded" in the speaker's consideration of choice of an anaphoric demonstrative. Makino (1984a and b) examines such phenomena in conversation extensively and claims that the speaker/writer

1. Chisato Kitagawa (personal communication) pointed out kashira is used by male speakers in the Tokyo dialect but its intonation contour differs from that of its female counterpart.

always has what he terms, "communicative orientation," which consists of "speaker-orientation" (SPO) and "listener-orientation" (LSO). He then maintains that these notions adequately explain a large portion of Japanese grammar such as the differences among subordinate clauses, voices (passive and active), historical present, formality marking and so on. My notion of "exclusive focus" is a manifestation of SPO in the use of anaphoric demonstratives.

Makino (1984a) specifically deals with formality marking in the subordinate clause and has direct relevance to our present study. He defines SPO as "the speaker's communicative motivation to express some highly subjective and presuppositional information by inwardly looking at himself" (p. 139) and LSO as the opposite to it though he clarifies the difference between SPO and LSO as a matter of degree. He cites the following examples as some of the highly speaker-oriented expressions where the formality marking (+desu/+masu) is blocked from applying even in a very formal situation.

(1) (Being stung by a bee unexpectedly)	{	Itai!	"Ouch!"
		*Itai-desu.	"Ouch-formal."
(M's (18b))

(2) (a) John wa Mary ga
 top subj

{	oyoide-iru	}	no	o	mi-mashita
	swimming		nominalizer	acc	saw + formal
{	*oyoide-imasu	}			
	swimming-formal				

"John saw Mary swimming." (M's (17a))

The first example is an expression spontaneously produced out of one's control. Notice it is odd to say, "Itai-desu!" (I feel pain, formally) in such a situation. Makino explains the formal version is unacceptable because the utterance is highly oriented to the speaker. The second example concerns the degree of subordination. As is widely admitted, the subordinate clause cross-linguistically undergoes more grammatical restrictions than the independent clause. In Japanese, the occurrence of auxiliaries like desu/masu depends on the kind of subordinate clause. The nominalizer no, for example, does not allow auxiliaries to occur because, according to Makino, no leads subjective, personalized and perceptive (like miru 'see', above) arguments, which are oriented to the speaker. In contrast, another nominalizer, koto, takes objective arguments, which are oriented to the listener and, therefore, accepts the formality marking. In short, Makino's claim is that the higher the degree of SPO is, the deeper the subordination is and, as the result, it becomes harder for formality marking to occur.

If Makino's claim is correct, then Ind Q which lacks formality marking must appear comfortably in the environment with SPO. DQ, on the other hand, must have some difficulty taking place when the speaker

holds SPO in his speech. The following table shows the number of samples from the data and their distribution in the environment of communicative orientation. While it is not always clear which orientation the speaker takes in a given dialogue, this was judged on the basis of both verbal and non-verbal expressions I could observe on TV.

Table 2: Communicative Orientation and Quoted Clause

	DQ	SDQ	S. Ind Q	Ind Q
LSO	49 (100%)	8	2	36 (63%)
SPO	0	0	0	21 (37%)

- (1) Numbers indicate the number of samples.
- (2) % is the ratio of LSO and SPO in the same style of quoted clause.
- (3) Out of 49 DQ's, 18 are imperatives which do not end in sentence-final particles.

Examples:

DQ/LSO

- (3) Dakara kaasan itta-hazu yo. DQ [Chaanto keisan-ni-
 so mother (me) said certainly properly figuring in
 irete-tate-nasai yo] tte.
 build/! QT

'So, I must have told you, "Build it after properly thinking about it."'

- (4) Atashi mo desu. Kuwataroo-kun ni tsutaete-kudasai-masu ka?
 I (female) too be Kuwataro to convey-would you please?
 DQ [Kondo no nichiyooobi ni kanarazuai-mashoo] tte.
 next 's Sunday on for sure let's meet-formal QT

'Me, too. Would you please tell Kuwataro,
"Let's meet next Sunday."?'

- (5) K: Jaa, nani ka?
then you mean?

DQ [To . . toshiyori wa wa . . wakaionna-no-ko o
old person top young girls obj
suki-ni natchaa ikenee] tte no-ka? e, oi oi
like become shouldn't (male) QT you mean? hey you!
Jaa, nani ka, DQ [TE . . te . . tegami mo
letter too
kaichaa-ikenee] tte
write shouldn't (male) QT
no ka? Sonna koto dare ga kimetanda yo. . . .
you mean? that kind thing who sub decided
Oi, dare ga kimetanda sonna koto?
hey, who sub decided that kind thing

'Then, are you saying, "O . . Old people shouldn't love young
girls."? Are you saying, "They shouldn't write letters,
shouldn't talk to them."? Who decided that kind of thing?
Hey, you, who decided that kind of thing?

G: DQ [Toshiyori-rashiku shiro] tte ittenda yo.
like old people do! saying

'I'm saying, "Do (behave) like old people (should do)!"'

SDQ/LSO

- (6) K: A, sono yookan na, ohukuro no daikoobutsu nanda.
Oh that cake intj mother 's favorite is

Yonde kuwashite-yatte kure.
call let eat for me

'That cake is my mother's favorite thing. Call her and let
her eat it.'

T: Tokkuni moo oyasumini-natte-masu yo.
completely already sleeping (↑) polite

SD[Kyoo wa kutakuta-da] tte osshatte.
 today dead-tired saying

'She has already gone to bed, saying that SDQ[I'm deadtired today.]'

SIQ/LSO

- (7) Nee, nee, Tomoko-san, soodanshi-tara sanseeshite-kurete ne
 listen! when consulted agreed-for me intj

SIQ[Kono atari ni mo kao-ga-hiroi kara odeshisan o
 this area in too familiar because students obj
 shookai-shite-ageru] tte iu-no yo. Ima sono denwa datta no.
 introduce for you say now that telephone was

Moo ne, odeshisan IndQ[roku-ninmototte-kureta]
 already students 6 people many found-for me

n-desu-tte
 I heard

'Listen, tomoko. When I consulted with my friend, she said that
 SIQ[because (of the) familiarity with this area, I (=friend) will
 introduce students for you (=the reporter).] It was that tele-
 phone-call (from her). I was a little surprised to hear her say
 IndQ[she already found as many as 6 students for me.]

Ind Q/SPO

- (8) Aa, moo takusan-da yo. . . . kawaiisooni, IndQ[dokonimo iku
 Oh, already enough pitiful anywhere go

tokoro ga nakute kiteru] tte iu noni . . .
 place subj not exist is come say though

'Oh, I'm fed up with (that kind of story), . . . despite the fact
 that she says that she came (here) because there's no place to go.'

- (9) Sooka, nannimo iwanai nante ohukuro-rashii na. Ano hito
 is-that-right anything not say like mother that person

puraido no takai hito da-kara na. IndQ [Oretachi to umaku
 pride 's high person because we/us with well
 ikanakatta] nante kuchi-ga-sake-temo ii-taku-nai-n daroo.
 go not past even forced to say say want not I-guess

'Is that right? It's just like Mother that she said nothing. That person (i.e., Mother) has so much pride, so I guess she doesn't want to say that she didn't get along with us, even if she is forced to say so.

- (10) Atashi kono-aida Shopenhaueru no jisatsu-ron yonda no.
 I the other day Schopenhauer 's suicide-essay read

IndQ [ningen shinkara iki-yoo-to-suru-to sore ga shi ni
 man earnestly if-trying-to-live that death to

tsunagatte iku] tte iu no ne, jisatsu wa. Jisatsu wa jikanteki
 connecting go say suicide top suicide timewise

kuukanteki sonzai no hitei deattemo, ishi no hitei de-wanaku
 space-wise existence 's refusal even if will 's refusal not

kootei desae aru no yo.
 affirmation even is

'I (a high school girl) read Schopenhauer's Suicide the other day. He says that if man tries to live earnestly, it will lead to death. Even if suicide is refusal of existence in time and space, it is not a refusal of will and it is even an affirmation of will.'

The result is quite straightforward in that DQ occurs only when an utterance carries LSO; that is, when the speaker intends to get a message directly across to the listener, DQ is preferred over Ind Q. Example (5) particularly makes this point acutely, where K and G are directly arguing face to face. In the case of Ind Q, while LSO still outnumbers SPO, it is yet significant that Ind Q occurred with SPO at a rate of 37% in normal dialogues (no data were obtained from monologues). In all examples (8), (9) and (10) it is clear that the

speaker talks "inwardly," creating a sort of soliloquy. In (8) noni 'although' as opposed to keredo 'though,' indicates that the argument preceding it is of "internal psychology" (Makino, 1984b:130). In fact, if a DQ occurs in a noni clause, the sentence turns out to be unacceptable, whereas keredo, which takes objective, external factual arguments, can felicitously lead a DQ.

(8') . . . donkonimo iku-tokoro nakute
anywhere go place not there

			*tte (iu) noni.
kiteru	<u>no yo</u>		say
is come		DQ	tte iu keredo.

' . . . though she says she's come here because there's no place to go.'

Similarly, in (8) the phrase iitaku-nai-n-daroo 'I conjecture that she doesn't want to say' apparently shows that SPO is taken by the speaker; hence, a DQ version cannot occur in the quoted clause.

(9') DQ??[Uchi-no-ko to wa umakuiki-masen-deshita] nante
my kids with well-didn't go- polite QT

kuchi ga sake-temo	iitakunain	daroo
even forced to say	not want to say	I-guess

The speaker of (10) starts to talk directly to the listener, but immediately after that she reports what she has read in Schopenhauer's Suicide almost as if she were obsessed by its content --- that is, almost like a soliloquy. Here again, Ind Q is the only possible style that matches the communicative orientation taken in the discourse. In actuality, all of the examples of quoted clauses in SPO are Ind Q and

none of the DQ examples occur, at least in my data, with SPO.

Thus, a strong correlation is clearly found between the direction of communicative orientation and the selection of styles of reported speech. The higher degree of SPO requires Ind Q, more often than other styles, to take place in quoted clauses. The higher degree of LSO, on the other hand, is more likely to require DQ than other styles in quoted clauses.

(11) Correlation of Communicative Orientation and Reported Speech

When the reporter holds the communicative orientation of SPO, the quoted clause used in his reported speech can most comfortably be Ind Q. DQ, on the other hand, can most comfortably occur when the reporter holds a higher degree of LSO; and it is much less likely to take place when he holds SPO.

Hypothesis (11) implies, implicitly, that other styles, SDQ and SIndQ, are chosen when the degree of communicative orientation (either toward LSO or SPO) does not reach the level where DQ or Ind Q is uniquely selected. Indeed, a closer look at examples (6) and (7) shows that neither of them is surrounded by the higher degree of communicative orientation. In (6) the phrase "Kyoo wa kutakuta-da osshatte" ('saying that she was dead tired today') is a supplementary remark added after the preceding phrase which is addressed directly to the listener; hence, the degree of LSO has apparently decreased. It is very intriguing, too, to note that the communicative orientation in (7) has started with LSO and ends with SPO. Notice that the second quoted clause, "roku-nin-mo-totte-kureta" ('she found as many as six students for me') is clearly an Ind Q with a higher degree of SPO, as the phrase "desutte"

('I am a little surprised to hear . . .') acutely marks an "inward" (surprising) orientation in it. (Notice that while desu-tte (polite-QT) contains formality marker desu, the phrase preceding it is judged as Ind Q. Detailed discussions of this structure are presented in 4.3.) Thus, while this is a sketchy description of communicative orientation surrounding SDQ and SIndQ, it reasonably justifies hypothesis (11).

However, hypothesis (11) has no explicit prediction about a case where Ind Q is chosen even where a relatively higher degree of LSO is maintained. As a matter of fact, as Table X shows, Ind Q did occur in my data in the environment of LSO at the rate of 63%. The following example illustrates the choice of Ind Q in a discourse where the communicative orientation is a relatively higher degree of LSO.

- (12) K: IndQ^[i-nai] tte ii-nasai.
 be not say imperative
 'Tell her (the guest) that (I) am not (home).'
- M: IndQ^[iru] tte itte-shimatta no yo.
 be said end-up
 'I said accidentally that (you) are (home).'

Both K's and M's speech are, without doubt, Ind Q, having no formality marker, no sentence final particle and no force of dramatic effect; yet, the communicative orientation in the dialogue is not SPO but LSO. Particularly, K's speech is directed straight toward the listener. M's speech which ends with "shimatta" ('ended up . . . ing'), on the other hand, takes a highly presuppositional and subjective argument

(Makino, 1984b: 68), and therefore it is possible to consider the Ind Q in this instance as the result of SPO. However, along with the following example of Ind Q with LSO, K's Ind Q in (12) still remains unexplained.

(13) Taro talks back to her mother.

IndQ [Onna no okyakusan ga kae-ttara sugu
 women 's guests sub go home when soon
 koshiraete-kureru]
 make-for me
 tte itta-ja-nai ka.
 said-didn't you?

"Didn't you say that once the women-guests leave for home, (you'd) make (dinner) for me?"

Hence the question that now needs to be made clear directly concerns the limitation of the notion of communicative orientation. And the question seems to be two-fold, one being what kind of information is reported directly or indirectly in the environment of LSO, and the other being the relationship among the speaker, the listener and the third person who is referred to in the quoted clause, about which the notion of communicative orientation has very little to say. In the following sections these questions will be discussed in detail.

4.2 Information Structure

Repetition is, by definition, production of old information. As Makino (1980 and 1982) correctly points out, if Grice's (1975:45) "Cooperative Principle: . . . 2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required." is seriously observed, our conversation would not be able to have any repetition (because the repetition would create more information than is required). Contrary to Grice's principle, Makino claims that repetition is hardly a product of redundant information but is an important function of language which cannot be dispensed with in human communication. Reporting is no exception to repetition since it is a repetition of what one has said or will have said. If Grice's principle is correct, DQ particularly must be banned from occurring in our speech. Nevertheless, the truth is that our communication cannot do without reporting--both directly and indirectly. Recent studies in functional linguistics strongly suggest that the notion of "old" and "new" information be replaced by the notion of "important" and "less important" information. Makino's justification for repetition of old information is specifically directed to support the notion of "important/less-important" information since repetition is done for "old" but "important" information. Reporting is also performed for "old" but "important information." But, how is it that the choice of styles of reported speech is determined for repetition of old but important information? In what follows, first Makino (1982) and Kuno (1983)'s notion of "important" information is introduced and then it is

further elaborated on the basis of Prince's (1978) notions of "given" and "known" information. Finally, the analysis of my data is presented employing those notions.

4.2.1 Notion of Important Information

On various occasions, Kuno (for example, 1978 and 1979) claimed that deletion takes place in the order from older information to new information. However, presenting the following example, Kuno (1983:34) proposes that the notion of "important" information replace that of "old/new" information.

(14) A (1): You must have spent a fortune on hotels during your trip. Couldn't you stay with your friends, or your friends' friends?

B (1): In some cities, I did, but in many cities, I did have to stay in hotels.

A (2): You started out in Paris, right? Did you stay in a hotel there?

B (2): No, I didn't stay in a hotel $\emptyset$ --- I stayed with an old friend of mine who is studying music there.

A (3): Did you stay in a hotel in London? I hear hotels are getting awfully expensive there.

B (3): a. Yes, I stayed in a hotel $\emptyset$ because I didn't have any friends there.

b. Yes, I'm sorry to say, in a hotel.

c. #Yes, in London.

(Kuno's (20), # marks unacceptable)

Notice that B(3) is an answer to the question given in A(3), "Did you stay in a hotel in London?", whose information structure, based on the

"old/new" information, is as follows:

A(3): Did you stay in a hotel in London?

older information new information

The phrase "in a hotel" is older information in the sense that it is recoverable from the preceding discourse even when it is "garbled with noise," whereas "in London" is newer information because it is not recoverable if such noise is covered on it. Yet, in the three versions of answer to this question, i.e., B(3) a, b and c, only a. and b. are acceptable, where newer information, "in London," is deleted and older information, "in a hotel," is left repeated. Interestingly, B(3) c., where new information is not deleted and old information is deleted, is unacceptable. In order to account for this counter example to his past analysis, Kuno re-describes the information structure of A(3) as follows, defining "important information" as "the focus of the implicit question" (p. 33).

A(3): Did you stay in a hotel in London?

(older) (newer)

more important less important

Then he proposes the revised version of "Pecking Order of Deletion Principle: Delete less important information first, and more important information last" (p. 31), which satisfactorily accounts for the three versions of B(3) where deletion of important information is blocked and that of less important information is accepted.

For the phenomenon of repetition, instead of deletion, in Japanese, Makino (1982) demonstrates that repetition, which is by definition repetition of old information, is not governed by the notion of "old/new" information but by the notion of "communicative importance." His example follows:

(15) A: Anata wa 1965-nen ni wa moo nihon e kite-i-mashita ka?
 you top year in already Japan to come polite

'Were you already in Japan in the year of 1965?'

B: (a) Hai, 1965-nen ni wa moo nihon e kite-i-mashita.

'Yes, I was already in Japan in the year of 1965.'

(b) Hai, nihon e kite-i-mashita.

'Yes, I was in Japan.'

(c) Hai, kite-i-mashita.

'Yes, I was.'

(d) ??Hai, 1965-nen ni wa kite-i-mashita.

'Yes, I was (there) in the year of 1965.'

Notice that B(d) is not acceptable because "it repeats the relatively unimportant element and deletes the important element" (pp. 163-64). Thus, his "Pecking Order of Repetitions" says, "Repeat the more important information first, and the less important information last."

The notion of important information does explain, as observed above, what is repeated (and what is reported), but it does not account for how it is reported directly or indirectly, which is of most concern here. In other words, Makino and Kuno's notion of important information

can explain the following data, where only the important information is repeated (or the less important information is deleted) in the second speaker's speech.

- (16) T: Ano, doko desu ka? 'Well, where will it be?'
 well where be
- M: Doko de tte, koko yo. '(You asked) where it will be?'
 where be QT here It'll be here.'

However, their notion cannot explain the choice of DQ as in the example below:

- (17) K: Oi, ohukuro moo ne-ta ka?
 hey mother already slept
- T: Ima ohuro desu yo.
 now bath be
- (a) _{DQ}[Hayaku haitte-kudasai!] tte mooshiagetemo,
 soon take please even said
- (b) _{IndQ}[shimaiyu ga ii] tte osshatte.
 last bath good said
- 'She is taking a bath now. Even if I said, "Please take a bath," she said that the last bath was good and . . .

In T's speech both (a) and (b) are reported because they are important in this discourse. But why is it that (a) is reported directly and (b) indirectly? What is the principle governing this alternation in reporting old but important information? That is, what kind of important information is reported directly and what kind of information is reported indirectly?

4.2.2 Prince's Notions of "Given" and "Known"

In an attempt to clarify the difference between *wh*-clefts and *it*-clefts, which are often considered to be interchangeable, Prince (1978) demonstrates that so-called "presupposed" (or "old") information has two types, one being the information known both to the speaker and the hearer and the other being the information known only to the speaker but not to the hearer. She terms the former "given" and the latter "known" information. The distinction drawn between "given" and "known" information has a direct bearing on our discussion of what kind of important information can be reported directly or indirectly.

As widely admitted, the elements in *wh*-clauses and *that*-clauses (of *wh*-cleft and *it*-clefts, respectively) are "presupposed".

(18) a. What John lost was his keys. (P's (1b))

b. It was his keys that John lost. (P's (1c))

In both (18a) and (18b), the fact that John lost something is presupposed. However, in a discourse initial position, *wh*-clefts can be used only when there is some--linguistic or non-linguistic--understanding between the speaker and the hearer. Consider the example below.

(19) (When a lecture starts,)

a. What we're going to look at today (this term) is . . .

(P's (18a))

b. #What one of my colleagues said this morning was . . .

(P's (18b))

(# marks unacceptable.)

(19a) is acceptable because both the speaker and the hearer have a linguistic or non-linguistic "bridge" (or inference) about what a teacher is expected to say at the beginning of a lecture; whereas, (19b) is not acceptable because such a "bridge" is interrupted by an unexpected message given by the teacher. On the other hand, it-clefts carry a different kind of information.

(20) a. E.P.: Mmm . . . (Eating pieces of fudge)

b. K.M.: Aren't those good? It was only sheer will power that kept me from eating twelve every night.

(P's (33c))

Prince (ibid. 894) states that (20b) presents "an excellent illustration of the difference between GIVEN, i.e., (assumed to be in the hearer's consciousness) and KNOWN" (i.e., known to the speaker but not assumed to be in the hearer's consciousness). Contrary to the information in the wh-clause, as in (19a), the information in the that-clause of an it-cleft as in (20b) is known only to the speaker and not assumed to be known to the hearer. She thus claims that wh-clauses represent GIVEN information and that-clauses KNOWN information.

Further, as an example of "informative-presupposition it-clefts," Prince presents the following example from a discourse initial position.

(21) (a newspaper article)

It was just about 50 years ago that Henry Ford gave us the weekend.

(P's (41a))

As this example illustrates, the function of it-clefts is, she claims, "to mark a piece of information as fact, known to some people although not yet known to intended hearer." (pp. 899-900; underlined by OK) Notice the difference between (21) and its non-clefted version: "Fifty years ago, Henry Ford gave us the weekend.", which, according to Prince, means "the newspaper had just discovered the information in the that-clause." (p. 898)

What is striking about Prince's observation on wh-clefts and it-clefts is that DQ has a number of features in common with it-clefts; it-clefts "lessen the speaker's responsibility for the statement made," "reduce the speaker's assertiveness" and "claim to originality--and, therefore role." (p. 903) It is, further, possible to apply the notions of Prince's "given" and "known" information to our study in the following way:

1. "Important information" -- a piece of information which is "known" to the speaker but not to the hearer and is communicatively "important" in letting it be known to the hearer.
2. "Less important information" -- a piece of information which is known both to the speaker and the hearer (i.e., "given") and is communicatively less important because both of them already know it.

Based on this definition, I examined the distribution of DQ, SDQ, SInd Q and Ind Q in my data. The result was as follows.

Table 3: Important Information and Quoted Clause

	DQ	SDQ	SIndQ	Ind Q
Important Information	45	6	1	22
Less Important Information	4	1	0	27
Undetermined	0	1	1	8

It is markedly evident that when the information in the quoted clause is not known to the hearer and is, therefore, important to be transmitted to the hearer, DQ is by far favored over other styles. On the other hand, Ind Q is preferred when it is known both to the speaker and the hearer and is, therefore, less important for communication. Examples follow.

(22) DQ/Important

T: Atashi wa annani onegaishita-hazu yo.
 I that much asked-should have

DQ [Shibaraku wa okyakusama dake wa kanbenshite-
 for a while guest only refuse
 kudasai] tte.
 please!

'I must have told you (i.e., Did you forget what I said?)
 "Please refuse things like (inviting) guests for a while."

(23) SDQ/Important

T: Dakara atashi ga ii-tai no wa ne,
so I sub say-want nominalizer

SDQ[ima wa semete kore-ijo okyakusama da-nanda tte
now at least more this guest thing like

wazurawashii koto wa yamete-hoshii] tte itteru no.
troublesome thing want you to stop saying

'So, what I want to say is, I'm saying SDQ[I want you to stop
things like (inviting) guest or the like.]

(24) SIndQ/Important

SIndQ[Kono atari ni mo kao-ga-hiroi kara odeshisana
this area in also familiar because students

o shookaishite-ageru] tte iu no yo
obj introduce- for you say

'She says SIndQ[because she is familiar with this area, I (=she)
will introduce students for you (=reporter)].

(25) Ind Q/Less Important

H: Taroo ne, gohan ira-nai tte.
intj meal need-not QT

'I heard Taro doesn't need meal.'

T: Soo, jaa IndQ[tabe-taku-nai] tte
is-that-so? well eat-want-not

iu hito ni tabete-morau koto-nai wa yo ne
say person to eat-have-one-do unnecessary

'Is that so? Well, then, it's not necessary to have a person
who says that he doesn't want to eat, eat it, is it?'

(26) Ind Q/Less Important

T: (Told a long story that implied that their mother would go to
K's house because she didn't like T's house.)

K: Shikashi, soo kantan-ni IndQ[uchi ni kuru]
 but so house to come
 tte iware-temo . . .
 be said-even

'But, even if I am told that that she would easily come to my house, . . .'

In (22) the speaker is reminding the hearer of what she said before, but the hearer has forgotten, using DQ. The quoted clause of (24) has started with the pronoun "kono atari" ('this area') which reflects the reporter's viewpoint, but ends with the quotee's viewpoint element "ageru" (someone gives something to someone other than the speaker), resulting in Semi Ind Q. It seems possible to take 'ageru' to be the most important in the quoted clause and, as a result, to have appeared as a DQ element rather than an IndQ element "kureru." (25) is quite interesting because, although it is not certain whether Toro actually said that he didn't want to eat, the speaker T assumed that it was the case from the implication expressed in H's utterance and quoted Taro's speech, which is now assumed to be known to H, indirectly. It is thus evident that in (25) and (26) Ind Q was chosen because the information reported is known both to the speaker and the hearer and has less importance in letting it be known to the hearer. In (22), on the other hand, DQ is called for because the information in the quoted clause is assumed not to be known to the hearer at the time of this discourse and it is considered to be important to let it be known to him.

The observations made in this section thus suggest the following principle controlling the style of quoted clause.

(26) Correlation of Information Structure and Reported Speech

The more important the information to be reported is, the more likely it is for DQ, rather than other styles, to be chosen for the quoted clause. Likewise, the less important the information to be reported is, the more likely it is for Ind Q, rather than other styles, to be chosen for the quoted clause.

Hypothesis (27) further implies that SDQ and SIndQ are selected when the degree of importance does not reach the point where DQ or Ind Q is strongly called for.

4.3 Other Factors

Unlike analysis at the single sentence level, any study related to discourse inevitably becomes complicated because of the great number of variables surrounding the linguistic items in question. The notions employed in the preceding sections are, without doubt, of great importance in determining the style of quoted clauses. But it is also true that they do not represent an exhaustive listing of relevant factors. In what remains in this chapter I will illustrate some other factors that do not necessarily fit the notions used thus far.

4.3.1 Inversion, Dramatization and DQ

A number of DQ examples in my data from TV dramas are located in an environment where the reportive verb is inverted from the normal post-quoted-clause position. On the other hand, most of the Ind Q examples are followed by the reportive verb and are maintained in the canonical word order of Japanese. Let us observe the following examples.

(3) (repeated)

Dakara kaasan itta-hazu yo. DQ[Chaanto keisan-ni-irete
 so mother (me) said-certainly properly figure in
 tate-nasai yo] tte.
 build!

'So, "Build it after thinking about it properly!", I must have told you.'

(28) Watashi nanka yoku iwareta mon yo.
 I often was told

DQ[Yokeena koto shi-nai-de kudasai] tte
 superfluous thing do not do please

'I was often told: "Don't do superfluous things, please."'

Evidently this inversion of reportive verbs is a result of "right-dislocation" of the quoted clause.

S NP[DQ] to V	→	S V, NP[DQ]to
Normal Order	right-dislocation of quoted clause	Inverted Order

Functionally, this process reflects the general principle of locating more important information (or "newer" information) later in the sentence. To put it another way, it is reasonable to assume that DQ can most comfortably occur in an environment which is created for more important information. Inversion of the reportive verb and the quoted clause is certainly one of the processes that creates such an environment for DQ.

Related to this kind of process for an environment of DQ's, my data

for the TV Talkshow contain a number of DQ used after a dramatic setting is established. Observe the example below.

(29) The speaker, a writer, talks about "father's authority."

. . . de boku nanka uchi ni iru desho. Gorogoro iru-to ne
then I home in stay right? if lying under foot

DQ [Chichioya ga asemizu- tarashite-hataraitte ..]
father work by the sweat of his brow

nante hahaoya ga ittemo ne
mother even say

DQ [asemizu-tarashite-hataraiteru mon kaa] tee,
working by the sweat of his brow nonsense

DQ [guutara gorogoro shiteru ja-nai ka] tte (iu-n-desu yo)
good-for-nothing lying under foot doesn't he? say

' . . . then, I, since I am a writer, I am often home, right?
If I am lying under foot, even if my wife says, "Your father is
working by the sweat of his brow . . .," they (our children) say,
"No way! He is not working by the sweat of his brow. He is
lying under foot, good-for-nothing, isn't he?"'

The topic of the TV show is "Father's role," on which six people debate for about an hour. In such a situation participants often make their arguments stronger (or elaborate upon them) by creating a new "scenario" (Sanford and Garrod, 1981). As (29) shows, the phrases like "tatoeba" ('suppose, for example, that . . .') and ". . .tara" ('if . . .') commonly precede the establishment of new scenarios and the use of DQ's greatly helps maintain the new scenario in a given discourse.

4.3.2 Speaker, Hearer and Referent-Person in Quoted Clause

Out of 49 DQ examples in my data, 18 are direct imperatives (i.e., V-te kudasai 'Please do V,' V-ro/re 'Do V' etc.). On the other hand, only one example of the indirect imperative (i.e., V-yooni iu 'tell one to V') is found out of 57 Ind Q samples. Though my data certainly do not represent all the possible forms of quoted clauses, this unbalanced distribution of imperatives does imply something about favoritism of DQ imperatives.

Recall that communicative orientation is a notion which is continuous in nature; either inclined toward the speaker or to the hearer. It has nothing to do with the relation between the speaker, the hearer and the person referred to in the quoted clause. It seems that such a relation becomes most vivid when the quoted clause contains honorification and imperatives since both forms are determined by careful consideration of "who speaks to whom about whom" and "who orders whom," respectively. As pointed out in many studies (Hinds, 1976, for example), whether the referent person is present or not at the time of conversation greatly influences the kind of style -- honorific, humble, very polite, neutrally polite, etc. --- to be chosen. For example, if 'Professor Tanaka' is present in the conversation, his students would normally use an honorific style to refer to him.

(30) Yamada (student) talks to his friends,

Kinoo, Tanaka-sensee ni
yesterday Prof. Tanaka to

{ a. irasshaimasen ka }
 would you come?
{ b. oide kudasai }

tte

{ please come } QT

c. oide-ni-natte kudasai masen ka?
would you mind coming?

```

onegaishita    node ....
requested      because

```

'Because I asked Prof. Tanaka (who is right here) { a. ..
b. .. ,
c. ..

However, if Prof. Tanaka is not present in the conversation, then Yamada would very likely say the following.

(31) Kinoo, Tanaka- $\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{sensee} \\ \text{prof.} \\ \text{san} \end{array} \right\}$ ni [kite] tte onegaishita node
Mr. to come (informal)

'Because I asked Prof./Mr. Tanaka, "Come!," . . .'

Notice that, in the presence of Prof. Tanaka, his student Yamada shows some respect to him by choosing an appropriate honorific form out of many varieties like a., b. and c. in (30). On the other hand, if Prof. Tanaka is absent in the conversation, Yamada would even refer to him by Tanaka-san instead of Tanaka-sensee and simply report what he said, simplifying what he would have actually said in front of Prof. Tanaka by saying something like "Kite!" ('Come!').

The example below is more revealing in that a very polite form of imperative "Nannimo nasara-naide kudasai." ('Would you please do not do anything' = Please relax!) is chosen even when the referent person is not present at the time of conversation.

(32) T. talks to her husband about his mother.

T: . . . [Nannimo nasaranaide kudasai] tte iu-to
 anything please do not do when say

jamamono-atsukai shiteru yoo-ni
 treat as a nuisance manner

'When I say to her, "Please relax (very politely)," she takes
 it as treating her a nuisance . . .'

T (wife) used a very polite imperative form to show "respect" to her husband's mother in his presence. It seems quite likely that if T. talks to someone who is not related to her mother-in-law, she would simply say, "Nannimo shinaide ne!" (Don't do anything! - informal imperative -) to report what she has said to her.

The following examples present another very intriguing case which cannot be accounted for without considering the relationship between the speaker, the hearer and the referent person.

(33) H: Doo shita no yo. 'What's the matter with you?'
 how did ?

T: Aa, Okaasan ga Ind Q[ashita omie-ni-naru] n-desu tte.
 well mother tomorrow come (↑) formal

'(I'm a little surprised to hear that) mother-in-law says that
 she would come tomorrow.'

(34) H: Takahira no okaasama wa ogenki?
 's mother fine?

S: Oneechan ne, taihen. Takahira no okaasan, IndQ[zutto
 sister trouble all time

Tookyoo ni iru rashii] n-da tte.
 in be look like informal

means that, in this context, (33') cannot be interpreted as "Mother-in-law_i said, 'I_i, a respectable person, will come ().'"

Besides, the nominalizer, n, a highly empathetic element (as opposed to another nominalizer, koto), can only show the speaker's mood and cannot be quoted indirectly. Furthermore, the fact that no (reportive) verb can follow n-desu/da tte adds evidence that n-desu/da tte is a sort of modal, functioning exactly like sentence final particles such as yo, ne and wa, and means "I am a little surprised to hear that someone said that"

The nominalizer n shows the speaker's empathy with the referent person, "mother-in-law," and it is reasonable to judge that desu, instead of da, is chosen due to the speaker's respect (or politeness) to that referent in front of her son (i.e., the speaker's husband). It is surely odd to imagine "tripartite," rather than dichotomous, communicative orientations in normal life. Perhaps the orientation toward the referent person may be part of LSO, but there is no question that the relationship between the speaker, the hearer and the referent person contributes some small but significant influence on the communicative orientation held in the conversation.

Summary

In this chapter I made an attempt to elucidate some of the principles governing the selection of styles of reported speech. Functional notions of "communicative orientation" (Makino, 1984),

"important/less important information" (Kuno 1983, Makino 1982) and "given/known information" provided us with significant guidance in probing into this complicated inquiry in discourse analysis. Elaborating upon those notions in our examination, we came up with the following hypotheses:

A. Correlation of Communicative Orientation and Reported Speech

When the reporter holds the communicative orientation of SPO, the quoted clause used in his reported speech can most comfortably be Ind Q. DQ, on the other hand, can most comfortably occur when the reporter holds a higher degree of LSO; and it is much less likely to take place when he holds SPO.

B. Correlation of Information Structure and Reported Speech

The more important the information to be reported is, the more likely it is for DQ, rather than other styles, to be chosen for the quoted clause. Likewise, the less important the information to be reported is, the more likely it is for Ind Q, rather than other styles, to be chosen for the quoted clause.

Besides these two hypotheses, I have also shown that DQ is quite likely to be chosen when the quoted clause is right-dislocated and when the speaker establishes a new scenario in the given discourse. A suggestion was further made that, when treating the presence or absence of formality markers, the notion of "communicative orientation" needs to be revised so that the role of the referent-person referred to in the quoted clause is taken into account.

CHAPTER V

REPORTED SPEECH IN JAPANESE AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

5.1. Introduction: Interlanguage Hypothesis

It was not all by accident that creation of a new view in second language learning coincided with the growth of transformational generative grammar in the late 1960's. Pit Corder's "Significance of Learner's Errors" in 1967 and Larry Selinker's "Interlanguage" in 1972, particularly, brought radical changes in the conventional treatment of second language learning at that time, which was based on the view of "habit-formation" in language acquisition. Researchers started to take a fresh look at the processes of second language learning, taking the cognitive psychological view which considers language acquisition as the development of language by testing hypotheses through the so-called "Language Acquisition Device",. Selinker (1972: 214) characterized the learning of a second language as a "separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a TL (i.e. target language) norm" and called it "interlanguage".

Corder (1981: 72) described the historical background as follows.

The term interlanguage was introduced because learners' language studied to that time had regularly displayed formal features both of the target language and of some other language, notably, though not exclusively, of the mother tongue. The presence in learners' language of characteristics of the mother tongue has ... been

accounted for by the psychological process of 'transfer'. More wide-spread studies of interlanguage development in recent years ... have now shown cases where virtually no syntactic interference has been detected from the mother tongue ... interlanguage may quite regularly exhibit systematic properties which show no obvious resemblance to the mother tongue or any other language known to the learner.

Obviously the former half of this statement refers to the failure of so-called contrastive analysis, and the latter half to independent studies conducted on second language acquisition within the framework of cognitive psychology. Dulay and Burt (1972) is the first attempt to demonstrate the similarity between the processes of children's first and second language acquisition, which suggests that learning a second language is more of a creative than a restructuring process. Bailey, Madden and Krashen (1974) examine the morpheme acquisition order in adults' second language acquisition and support the notion of interlanguage.

Thus, interlanguage is now widely acknowledged as a language which is "rule-governed and describable in linguistic terms" (Corder, 1981: 56) rather than as a deviant or deformed language used by non-native speakers. Corder (1967) claims that the structure of such a language can be presented through the analysis of errors that second language learners make. In the past decade or so, the field of English as a Second Language (ESL) has particularly benefitted from error analysis and many attempts have been made to propose the structure of interlanguage. Concepts such as "fossilization", "overgeneralization", "prefabricated patterns" and "transfer" seem to be well accepted as constituents of interlanguage (Hakuta and Cancino 1978, Selinker and

Gass 1984).

However, it also seems to be the case that the study of interlanguage through target languages other than English is quite behind. In the case of Japanese, except for Hakuta's study of a Japanese child's acquisition of English, no serious attention has been paid to the issues of the interlanguage that non-native speakers of Japanese construct when they learn it as a second language¹. Indeed, very few studies have been conducted on Japanese as a second language from the point of view of the interlanguage hypothesis. The reason for this delay in the field of Japanese pedagogy seems to be twofold. One is that it is not until recently that Japanese has been learned and researched as a second language. Japanese has long been treated only as a foreign language which has been learned by formal instruction. Interlanguage is hypothesized as a language which the learner develops in informal settings, as is the case with the immigrants in America, as well as in formal settings. Thus, the rarity of opportunities to examine Japanese as a second language has led to the researcher's

1. The term "second language" refers to a language which the learner uses because it is the major means of communication in the country (or area) where he is located. "Foreign language" refers to a language which the learner uses although it is not the major means of communication where he is. Thus, "Japanese as a second language" refers to the Japanese which learners of Japanese use mostly in Japan; whereas, "Japanese as a foreign language" is the Japanese used by learners in, say, the U.S. (See Richards, 1978, and Holms 1978 for further discussion.) In this chapter, however, such a distinction is not made unless the terms, "second" and "foreign" are clearly contrasted as in this place; otherwise, "second language" is employed regardless of the situation where the learner uses it instead of his first language.

inability to discuss general problems of interlanguage through Japanese. Actually, to the best of my knowledge, no study has yet been conducted to find how non-native speakers of Japanese "acquire," as opposed to "learn" (Krashen, 1981 and 1982), Japanese as a second language in Japan².

The second reason is that, as Miyaji (1985) warns, despite the advancement of theoretical work in Japanese linguistics, most teachers of Japanese as a second/foreign language, who include many linguists and applied linguists with a background in generative grammar, have no resort other than to the traditional behavioral model of language learning. Consequently, it must be admitted that the present state of Japanese language pedagogy is left quite behind in understanding the general issues of second language acquisition³. In the mid 1970's "error analysis" did intrigue the teachers and the researchers of Japanese greatly. In 1978 a major journal for Japanese language pedagogy called Nihongo Kyooiku ('Japanese Language Teaching'), published in Japan, presented a special issue on error analysis of Japanese a second language. Unfortunately, however, it is hardly possible to find in the analyses demonstrated in it any implications that relate to the notion of interlanguage, for whose description error

2. This is certainly a new research area in urgent need. John Hind (personal communication) has reported that he has initiated such a project.

3. Tohsaku (1985) makes the similar criticism against the current state of Japanese language pedagogy.

analysis is proposed to be employed. As a result, the studies introduced in the journal end up mostly being simply a collection of errors or, at best, a presentation of suggestions to avoid those errors in the process of learning and teaching Japanese. Even in the recent issue of Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese published in the U.S., Muraki and Soga's (1983) "Patterns of Errors among Intermediate and Advanced Students" shows virtually no attempt to relate their analysis to the more general inquiry of interlanguage.

As Corder (1981: 35) puts it, the main object of the error analysis is to find "something about the psycholinguistic processes of (second) language learning", which will eventually contribute to our understanding of interlanguage. Needless to say, what is of great benefit to language teachers, in dealing with error analysis is to draw pedagogical implications from the learners' errors in order to improve their teaching methods and techniques⁴. However, without serious consideration of the main goal of error analysis, any pedagogical implications from it may turn out to be only a temporary solution. Furthermore, the learner's language comprises not only erroneous utterances on which error analysis has mostly concentrated, but, more importantly, utterances which the learner has correctly generated. Unlike the errors which are easier to describe to illustrate the distinction between the learner's second language and his target

4. In this sense there is no doubt that the studies presented in Nihongo Kyooiku (1978) and in Muraki and Soga (1983) are of great value.

language, the correct utterances are difficult to treat with regard to the description of the structure of interlanguage. Yet, it is certainly true that an accurate picture of interlanguage cannot be presented without considering the utterances that learners produce correctly either through their possession of right hypotheses concerning their second language, through avoidance of other expressions which they find difficult to use (for the issue of avoidance, see Schachter 1974), or through an accidentally well-operated mechanism. The goal in this chapter is, thus, to present a global view of reported speech in Japanese as a second language within the framework of the interlanguage hypothesis.

The structure of this chapter is as follows. The next section presents the description of the data collected at the Japanese Summer School, Middlebury College, Vermont in summer 1985 and at Amherst College, Massachusetts in February 1986. Then, an analysis of the data is given first for cases where the learners generated unacceptable utterances and then for cases where they generated acceptable utterances in the context. Finally an attempt will be made to show a picture of reported speech in Japanese as a second language, which reflects some developmental stages that learners of Japanese as a second language would likely go through.

5.2. The Data

The data for this study were collected in two places; one at the Japanese Summer School in Middlebury College, Vermont during its 9-week

program in 1985 and the other at Amherst College, Massachusetts in February 1986. The former body of data represents the major source for this study, while the latter is intended to supplement the former. The nature of the data gathered at the Japanese Summer School is as follows. Four students from two different levels, 3rd and 4th year classes, were chosen; one male and one female from each level. They all are native speakers of English and had learned the grammatical patterns of direct and indirect reported speech in Japanese described in the major textbooks of Japanese such as Jorden (1963) and Mizutani (1977)⁵.

Four 30 minute sessions were held for each level of learners separately from other students, every other week. Before each session a topic for the discussion was announced and the students were requested to gather information on the topic and to report on it in the session. All the sessions (a total of four sessions in each level, i.e. eight sessions in all) were tape-recorded and later transcribed. The sessions were conducted informally, starting with casual greetings and allowing digressions from the assigned topic until the end, which could keep the learner's anxiety ("affective filters" in Krashen's term) lower. The topics assigned before the sessions were designed to greatly encourage various forms of verbal interaction between the learner and native speakers. Some of them are such as: "Interview Professor M., director

5. Needless to say, none of the textbooks of Japanese presents the issue of reported speech in Japanese in theoretical linguistic terms, as has been demonstrated in the preceding chapters. Particularly, none of them deals with the selection of reported speech styles.

of the school (male), and get information as to how long he has been in the program, when the best or the toughest time was while he has been here and why so," "Interview the K family, a Japanese family with a 10-year daughter and a 14-year son from Ohio, and ask them what they think about living in Middlebury," "Interview Professor C., a middle-aged female, and ask her if she thinks that her personality changes depending upon the language (particularly English or Japanese) she uses for communication" and so on.

The summer language program at Middlebury College is characterized by its strict enforcement of use of the target language. Students are requested, upon entrance to the program, to sign the pledge forbidding use of English throughout the program. The learners for our data, thus, used only Japanese for eliciting the information I requested that they collect and reported it only in Japanese in the sessions. What is worth noting about such an environment is that, in addition to the formal learning in class every morning, the learners obtain ample opportunities to learn the language informally. The students and the instructors live in the same building and use Japanese as the means of communication for all activities ranging from dining to participating in sports and other entertainment. In other words, while not being exactly the same as in Japan, the learners are provided with an environment sufficient for what Krashen (1981, 1982) calls "acquisition" (unconscious learning through the focus on meaning) to be developed. Though the enforcement of the use of the target language might cause some listening comprehension trouble, for example, particularly to beginning students of the language

(Postovsky, 1974), upper level students such as the learners who presented data for our study should benefit greatly from it. Thus, the data here should reflect the processes of both formal and informal learning, which is essential for the study of interlanguage.

Additional data were collected from two advanced learners of Japanese, who had lived in Japan (one for two years and the other for one year), at Amherst College in February 1986, in order to look into utterances of reported speech which are produced without an obligation that some message be reported in the conversation with native speakers if it is not necessary. Unlike the method taken for the interviews with the learners at Middlebury College, no topic was assigned in advance for the interview with the learners at Amherst College, which increased the spontaneity of conversations. In fact, the method of assigning topics in advance did facilitate the interviews. But a shortcoming of this method is that spontaneity of reported speech is not guaranteed because the reporting is done in the interview as a sort of assignment needed to be accomplished rather than as an outcome which is called for from the communicative necessity in the interview. Reported speech, particularly the selection of styles, is sensitive to communicative factors. Although, as stated above, a great effort was made to make maximally informal the interviews with the learners at the Japanese Summer School and how spontaneous the conversation can be is a matter of degree, additional data were collected from two male learners of Japanese whose native language is English and both of whom had lived in Japan but stopped formal learning in the classroom at the time of the interview.

The interviews with them were conducted twice, both for about thirty minutes each; no topics were assigned in advance and an effort was made to ensure that they produce reported speech out of their spontaneous desire.

The following table presents the background of the learners in this study.

Table : Background of Learners

Learners	Sex	Level (class)	Experience Living in Japan	Undergraduate/ Graduate
(Middlebury)				
E	m	3	No	Grad.
H	f	3	No	Grad.
G	m	4	Yes	Grad.
L	f	4	Yes	Undr.
(Amherst)				
R	m	*	Yes	Under.
C	m	*	Yes	Under.

5.3. Analysis

Corder (1981: 29-31) categorizes the utterances of interlanguage as "superficially deviant", "superficially well-formed but inappropriate in the context" and "superficially well-formed and appropriate in the context". Our reported speech data in Japanese as a second language serve to illustrate his classification. A quoted clause produced by the learner for reporting some message can be judged as "deviant" before being embedded in the clause which contains a reportive verb. Or, it

can be "superficially well-formed" before being placed in that kind of context, but turn out to be "inappropriate" once it is used in that context. Or, it can be "acceptable" irrespective of the situation where it is used; i.e. it can be acceptable, whether it occurs just as it is or in a larger discourse.

Further, as we have observed in Chapter II, the notion of "grammaticality" of sentences has been replaced by that of "acceptability" in discourse analysis. While "grammaticality" concerns the judgment of utterances normally in the single-sentence perspective, "acceptability" always operates in the discourse perspective. And it is the notion of "acceptability" that has direct bearing on our discourse analysis of data in reported speech in Japanese as a second language. In fact, by using this notion we can simply judge the interlanguage utterance either as "acceptable" or unacceptable". Corder's tripartite classification then serves to detail the types of acceptable or unacceptable utterances. Thus, the utterances to be discussed in our analysis can be diagrammed as follows;

Figure 2

The discourse notion of "acceptability" has further significance for our study of interlanguage. As Corder (1981) proposes, interlanguage is a developmental, transitional dialect of a second language learner. In that sense, so-called "errors" in his interlanguage, unless fossilized, cannot be considered as "errors" because they always have the potential to develop into better forms. Indeed, this seems to me to be the point that Corder (1981) has made in stating that the term "error analysis" is misleading for the study of interlanguage. That is to say, when dealing with the learner's utterances I am less concerned to know how they produce errors than to understand how they develop their second language by testing the hypotheses that would generate acceptable utterances. In this respect, the analysis presented in what follows is not an "error" analysis but an "acceptability" analysis of reported speech in Japanese as a second language.

Notations employed in the transcription of data are as follows; H(3-f) indicates that the speaker H is a female learner placed in the third year class. QC[xxx] marks a quoted clause which is completed with a certain reportive verb. { xxx } marks a clause which, in the target language norm, needs to be concluded by a certain reportive verb but is left without it in the learner's speech.

5.3.1. Unacceptable Utterances.

5.3.1.1. Transfer.

In contrastive analysis, particularly in its stronger versions, any utterances which can be traced back to the learner's mother tongue are considered to originate in "transfer" from his mother tongue to his target language. If the utterances are incorrect in terms of the target language grammar, they are attributed to "negative transfer", i.e. interference, from the mother tongue. If, on the other hand, the utterance is correct, "positive transfer" is thought to have happened from the mother tongue. In recent research, however, transfer is often regarded as a result of the learner's reliance on his mother tongue. For instance, Krashen and Terrell (1983: 41) treat transfer in the following way;

... errors that show the influence of the first language are simply the result of "falling back" on the first language when we lack a rule in our second language.

The data below demonstrate an extremely interesting case of transfer, in which the generated reported speech is "superficially well-formed" but "inappropriate in the context". In this case what makes the reported

speech unacceptable is not the incorrect selection of reported speech styles but the fact that information which must be reported with a reportive verb in Japanese grammar is transmitted without a reportive verb in the learner's interlanguage. And this fact seems apparently to be attributable to the difference between English, the learners' native language, and Japanese, their target language, in their way of reporting information. When observing the data below, attention must be paid to the quoted clauses marked { xxx }, which is left without a reportive verb.

(1) H (3-f):... QC(a)[Dakara eigo de hanasu no wa yasashii]
to iimashita.

E (3-m): C-sensee, hajime to owari no iken wa chotto
chigaimasu. QC(b){Hajime, C-sensee wa jibun, eigo de
nihongo de hanasu toki ni onaji hito desu. Paasonality
ga kawarimasen.}

I(nterviewer): to osshaimashita.

E: ee, shikashi, atode, as .. rei ga hanashimashita. Tatoeba,
QC(c){Nihongo de aa, mm, tomodachi, anata no hon karimashita.
Mada motte kimasen.} Mottekuru to iu nihonjin wa QC(d)[Doo
itashimashite, mondai ja nai] to iimasu. C-sensee wa
QC(e){Hitoni yotte chigaimasu. aa, zenzen chigaimasu.
aruhito wa onaji desu.}

H: .. She said that QC(a)[speaking in English is easy.]

E: Professor C. (Her) first opinion and later opinion are
different. QC(b){At first, Prof. C., herself, in English, in
Japanese, when speaking in (those languages), (she) is the

same person. Her personality doesn't change.}

I(interviewer): she said.

E: Yes, but, later, er ... examples spoke (=she showed examples). For example, QC(c){In Japanese, er, mm, friends borrowed your book. Later (they) won't bring it back.} The Japanese who would say he would bring back would say QC(d){You're welcome. No problem.} QC(e){It is different from person to person. er .. very different. (?) some person is the same.}

- (2) L (4-f): iie, anoo QC(a)[mae ni ryokoo shita koto ga aru] to
osshattemashita. Anoo, komakai koto de iu to, K-sensee wa
QC(b){mae ni kita koto ga arimasu kedo, oshigoto de kita
koto ga arimasu kedo, sono toki wa itsukakan gurai kaigi ni
kuru tame ni irasshata.}

"No, well, he said that QC(a)[he had traveled here.] Let's see ... if I say some more detail, QC(b){Prof. K has come here, but, he has come here on business, but, he came here to attend a conference for about five days.}"

- (3) G (4-m): Hajime ni anoo, L-san ga K-sensee ni, anoo,
QC(a)[Naze nihongo o oshiete rasshai masu ka] to kiitara,
K-sensee ga QC(b)[Saisho wa nihongo no sensee ni naru mokuteki
ga nakatta] to osshatte mashita. QC(c){Saisho wa daigaku wa
kokugogaku no senmon toshite, joshi, nihongo no joshi ga dandan
nakunatte kita to iu keekoo ni tsuite ronbun o kakimashita.}

"At first, you know, Ms. L asked Prof. K, err ..., QC(a)[Why are you teaching Japanese?] Then, er, after she finished asking that, Prof. K said QC(b)[he did not have the purpose to become a Japanese teacher.] QC(c){At first, as a Japanese major at college, he wrote a thesis on the tendency that particles, Japanese particles became fewer in number.}"

It is clear that the learners, regardless of their proficiency levels, made the same error in reporting; some information the learners

had obtained before the session was reported with a reportive verb such as " ...to iimashita" ('said that ...'), but some was expressed without such a reportive verb. In Japanese, however, the information marked by { xxx } also must be accompanied by some reportive verb in the same way as the other information which was correctly reported with a reportive verb. In the above examples, the messages that need to be followed by a reportive verb with some adjustment for direct or indirect speech styles are;

- Example (1) --- QC(b), QC(c), QC(d) and QC(e)
 (2) --- QC(b)
 (3) --- QC(c)

It is not improbable that, as some of the learners (G and H) pointed out to me, they just "forgot" to complete the sentence by a reportive verb and the produced sentence turned out to be "incomplete" and unacceptable. Unlike the English verb, the Japanese verb always comes at the end and, therefore, such an error of performance sometimes cannot be avoided.

However, a closer examination of our data and a recent study of "territory of information and sentence forms" proposed by Kamio (1979 and 1985) clearly demonstrate that errors of this sort are not accidental but are the result of influence from the learner's mother tongue, English, in this study. First, notice that in Example (1) I(nterviewer), tried to "repair" E's speech by supplying "to osshaimashita" ('she said') after E's QC(b), realizing that E does not complete the information by any reportive verb. E, however, without

without a phrase like "he said" in English. But, in Japanese, unless the information originates in the speaker, it may not be conveyed without a reportive verb.

In this regard Kamio's (1979 and 1985) study of "territory of information and sentence forms" is very revealing. His classification is presented below;

(6) (Kamio's (1985) (35) and (39) are combined here.)

		Speaker's Territory		
		IN	OUT	
Hearer's Territory	OUT	A:	J - Direct Form	J - Indirect Form
		E - Direct Form	E - Indirect Form	
		J - Direct Form + <u>ne</u>	J - Indirect Form + <u>ne</u>	
	IN	B:	E - Direct Form	E - Indirect Form
		C:		

(J/E =Japanese/English, ne = 'confirmation marker')

"Direct form" refers to the form that is expressed without phrases like "...soo-desu" ('so-I-hear'), "...rashii" ('it looks as if') and "S ne" ('right?', tag-question or confirmation marker). "Indirect form" is the form which must be expressed with those elements, indicating that the information conveyed is not the speaker's own but is the hearer's or someone else's.

Two interesting points in regard to (6) deserve attention here.

noticing I's attempt, still continues to report other information, ignoring any reportive verbs to be furnished for it. (Thus, QC(d) and QC(e) still lack a reportive verb.) The following example from E's speech further illustrates this point.

- (4) E: Baagaa-san no hanashi ni yoruto, hiburaigo ga ichiban
's story according to Hebrew sub best

yasashii kara, hiburaigo ga eigo yori hanashi-yasui desu.
easy therefore English than easy-to-speak cop

"According to Burgerson's story, because Hebrew is the easiest, Hebrew is easier for her to speak than English."

The English (literal) translation of (4) is perfectly acceptable, but the Japanese version is not. In Japanese, the phrase "...ni yoruto" ('according to ...') must be completed by such reportive verbs as "...to iimashita" ('X said ...') and "...soo-desu" ('so-I-hear') . Thus, example (4) should be something like the following.

- (5) Baagaa-san no hanashi ni yoruto ... hanashi-yasui soo-desu.

"According to Ms. Burger's story, I heard that ..."

What is striking in the unacceptability observed in (1) through (4) is that English and Japanese have different rules as to what kind of information is reported with or without reportive verbs and that difference has caused the unacceptability presented here. In other words, the information marked by { ... } may be reported without a reportive verb in English because the learners gathered the information by themselves and it is not "second-hand" but their own information at the time of speech. For example, QC(c) in (3) is perfectly acceptable

One is that information which belongs to the speaker as well as the hearer (i.e. Category B; for example, the weather that the speaker and the hearer are experiencing at the same place and time, say, on the street) can be expressed simply in the direct form in English (something like "It's a beautiful day!") but in Japanese it must be expressed in the direct form plus ne (something like "Ii tenki desu ne!" ('It's a beautiful day, isn't it?'). The other point is what kind of information falls into the category A (i.e. the speaker's, but not the hearer's) depends upon the language. As observed in (4) and (5), in Japanese even if the speaker obtains information directly from some source, it may not be directly possessed by the speaker and expressed in the direct form. In English, however, such information easily falls into the category A and is expressed in the direct form. Kamio's (1985) example below (slightly modified for the sake of presentation here) is also very convincing.

- (7) You have just had a phone call from your brother, John, saying that he will come see you tomorrow. You report it to your mother.

Mother: Nan datta no? "What was that?"

You: (a) Ashita John ga kuru tte/ sooda yo/ rashii yo.
tomorrow sub come said/ I-heard/ it-looks-as-if

'John said/ I heard/ It looks as if he (John) is coming see us tomorrow.'

(b) ??John ga ashita kuru yo.

'John is coming to see us tomorrow.'

Notice that in Japanese direct form (b) is marginally acceptable, but in English it is quite common that whatever information one obtains

directly from others is expressed in direct form as in the English version of (7b). And, more interestingly, (7a) in English cannot avoid some awkwardness.

Thus, to return to our original inquiry about unacceptability in some of the reported speech exemplified in (1) through (4), it seems quite reasonable to assume that those unacceptable utterances were generated due to the fact that the learners transferred the English system of "territory of information and sentence forms" into their target language. This does not, however, mean that the transfer was triggered by "interference" from English, but rather it seems to be the case that without the proper rule in Japanese available at the time of speech the learners simply "fell back on" their mother tongue's system. If the learners had known the rule of their target language, Japanese, then it would be possible to argue that interference from their mother tongue, English, had overridden the Japanese system when they produced utterances like (1) through (4). However, the difference between English and Japanese in terms of the territory of information and sentence forms has been discovered only recently and none of the conventional textbooks and reference grammar books such as Martin (1976) describe it. Thus, for the learners in our study, who evidently had no knowledge about the difference between English and Japanese on this particular point, there was no way other than "falling back on" the English system when passing on information which they obtained directly from its source.

As a matter of fact, as Krashen (1981 and 1982) argues, no grammar

in any language is complete and the learner is often left to find out (or "pick up" in Krashen's term) the rules of the target language by himself, which are yet to be known. Learners sometimes discover the unknown rule subconsciously and sometimes consciously. A student of my first year Japanese class recognized the difference between English and Japanese systems of territory of information and sentence forms without receiving prior instruction on formal explanations. After listening to some announcements orally provided for listening comprehension practice, which contained sentences like "X-sensee ga kyoo piano recital o nasaimasu. Mozart o ohikini naru-soo-desu." (Lit., 'Professor X will give a piano recital. I heard he will play Mozart.'), he raised a question to me, saying "Why do you say "...soo-desu" so often in Japanese even though what you are saying is your own information?" Transfer due to the learner's reliance on his mother tongue when he lacks the proper rule seems to be a natural developmental process of second language learning. How negative transfer should be "repaired" can be answered in many ways, but what seems to be indispensable in second language teaching is to provide the learners with ample opportunities where they can "try out" whatever they have learned so that they can test their hypotheses and develop their interlanguage optimally. The next chapter is devoted to the presentation of a methodological framework which makes this kind of learning possible.

5.3.1.2. Intralingual problems

Richards (1972) classifies the errors in second languages into three categories:

- (1) Interlingual errors
- (2) Intralingual errors
- (3) Developmental errors

"Interlingual errors" are errors attributable to the structural differences between the learner's mother tongue and the target language. On the other hand, if the errors are caused by structural difficulty in the target language, they are classified as "intralingual errors". For example, errors caused by overgeneralization about the target language belong to this type. Second language learners' errors which can also be found in the process of child first language acquisition are "developmental errors". The unacceptable utterances which will be discussed in this section are "intralingual errors" in the sense that the learners produced them without resort to the structure of their mother tongue. In addition, they can be called "developmental errors", not because Japanese children show similar errors but because those errors are a product of the learner's attempt to develop his or her interlanguage by examining the knowledge (consciously or subconsciously) they have about the target language. Thus, although the unacceptable utterances discussed in the last section may well be called "errors", those presented here are in no sense "errors". They are unacceptable only due to the awkwardness projected in their expressions. In what follows we will first observe inappropriateness in the selection of styles of reported speech, and then that in the form of expressions produced in the appropriately selected speech style. Unacceptable quoted clauses are marked by ??.

First recall that the study discussed in Chapter IV suggested two hypotheses with regard to the selection of styles in reported speech. They can be summarized as follows: DQ is more likely to take place when the communicative orientation of the conversation is toward the hearer and when the information contained in the quoted clause is more important in that it needs to be known to the hearer. Ind Q, on the other hand, is more likely to occur when the communicative orientation is toward the speaker and when the information in the quoted clause is less important in that the speaker assumes that the hearer does not need to be informed of it. Dramatization is another factor triggering DQ, which, however, seems to be accounted for by the notion of "communicative orientation"; i.e., dramatization is a manifestation of a higher degree of "listener orientation" in the given discourse. With these criteria in mind, let us consider the following examples.

(8) L: Anoo, roshiago gakkoo wa Language Pledge ga kibishii toka

Anoo, QC(a)[ninen, ichinen kan, natsugakkoo ja nakute
futsuu no gakunen ni ichinen kan roshiago o benkyoo shite,
sorekara, ninensee no natsu ni roshiago gakkoo ni haitte sugoku
muzukashikatta] to oassha .. itteimashita. QC(b)[language
Ind Q

Pledge wa taihen kibishii kara kyuushuu kan zutto, anoon,
kantan na koto wa jibun no kangae o anoo, shinakereba
narimasendeshita kara, sugoku komarimashita] to itte mashita.
? DQ

"Well, I heard the Russian School is very strict about the Language Pledge. Err, she said QC(a)[that she studied Russian for two, one year in the regular program, not the summer program, and then entered the Russian School in summer in her

sophomore year, and it was very hard for her.] She said, QC(b) ["Their Language Pledge is very strict and so we had to do, er, our thinking, simple things, throughout the nine weeks, and I was really in trouble."] QC(b): DO ??

- (9) G: ... Hutaritomo QC(a)[America no koto o amari shiranai] to
Ind Q
osshatte mashita. Middlebury dake de shigoto o shite sorekara
himaga areba shuu ni ikkai machi ni aruite soredake deshoo.
Dakara, Koide sensee ga osshata no wa QC(b)[Kono gakkoo ga New
York no hoo ni attara, motto omoshiroi deshoo] to
?? DQ
osshaimashita.

"Both of them said that QC(a)[they don't know very well about America.] They work only in Middlebury, and if there is free time, they walk in town once a week, and that's all, right? So, what Professor Koide said was QC(b) ["If this school were in the area of New York, it would be more fun!"] QC(b): DQ ??

- (10) G: Hajime ni Loos-san ga Koide sensee ni QC(a)[naze nihongo
o oshiete rasshaimasuka] to kiite, kiitara, Koide sensee ga
DQ
QC(b)[saisho wa nihongo no sensee ni naru mokuteki ga
nakatta] to osshatte mashita.
?? Ind Q

"First, Loos-san asked Prof. Koide, QC(a) ["Why are you teaching Japanese?"], and then he said that QC(b)[he didn't have a purpose (i.e. intention) to become a Japanese teacher.]
QC(b): Ind Q ??

- (11) H: Anoo, sono mensetsu no mae ni Akiyama-san wa QC(a)[hokano
hito wa HONTON NI (stressed) paasonaruna shitsumon o shite
chotto komarimashita, komatta] to iimashita.
DO ?? Ind Q

"Er, before the interview, Ms. Akiyama said QC(a)[other people asked her VERRY personal questions and I was embarrassed ... she was embarrassed]"
DO ----- shifting ----- Ind Q

In (8) L. recalled the information she had gathered and, first, successfully reported a message indirectly in this situation where no higher degree of listener-orientation or importance of reporting it "dramatically" is detected. A minute later, however, she added more information by reporting it directly this time, which resulted in inappropriateness. Thus, if QC(b) is replaced by its indirect counterpart (i.e. the formality marker "komarimashita" is replaced by "komatta"), it makes the quoted clause more appropriate in the context. (9) shows a case where while the nominalizer no in "Koide sensee ga osshaimashita no wa" ('what Prof. Koide said was ...') mostly requires a form with deeper subordination (i.e. indirect quotation), the DQ form "...deshoo" is inappropriately chosen instead of its indirect counterpart "...daroo"⁶.

Examples (10) and (11) are the case where while the environment is appropriate for the selection of DQ, Ind Q is chosen inappropriately for some reason. In (10) QC(a) is appropriately reported in the direct style, but QC(b), which is supplied as a response to QC(a), is reported indirectly inappropriately. (11) is more interesting in that it shows an instance where the learner mis-corrected her original choice of DQ into Ind Q. In order to emphasize the information needed to be transmitted to the hearer, H successfully attempted to stress the word "hontooni" ('truly') and to conclude the quoted clause by a DQ element

6. Remember also that the nominalizer no often occurs in "the speaker oriented" environment.

"mashita", but immediately after that, she realized, consciously or subconsciously, a need to correct it and changed the style into that of Ind Q inappropriately. It is noteworthy that while the shift from DQ which ends in the so-called "masu-form" to Ind Q in the middle of speech is quite common, especially among beginning learners, the opposite shifting (i.e. Ind Q to DQ) is neither found in our data nor in any of my contact with other learners on many occasions. With regard to the question of what causes this shifting, (11) reveals an interesting psycholinguistic process that second language learners undergo. The next section will provide a detailed account of this phenomenon.

Unlike the examples discussed above, the following demonstrate a case where while the selection of styles of reported speech is done appropriately, the utterance produced has turned out to be unacceptable in the context. This is particularly true when DQ is appropriately chosen but its form does not fit in the context.

(12) L: ... tatoeba, anoo, nihon ni iru toki ni america no hoo no

haha ni denwa suru toki ni, itsumo, iwareta koto ga hitotsu

arimasu kedo, sore wa watashi no okaasan, haha ga anoo,

QC(a)??[anata no eigo wa dooshite sonna ni yukkurito
DQ

doshite hakkirito hanashite iru no desu ka] to, ano,
DQ

kiitara, ano, watashijishin wa sore ni ki ga tsukanakatta kedo ...

"... er, for example, let's see, when I was in Japan and when I called my mother in America, there's a thing I was always told. That is, my mother, er, she asked QC(a)??["Why is it that you speak English so slowly, and so clearly?", but I didn't notice it."

(13) G (male): Watashi wa anmari kikoena⁷katta. Nihongo no, anoo,
 kitanai kotoba, tatoeba, america e kaette kite kara, watashi
 no tomodachi wa, anoo, QC(a) ["Kitanai kotoba o oshiete kudasai"]
 to itte ...

"For me, not many were heard. Japanese, er, dirty words, for
 example, after I came back (from Japan) to America, my friends,
 er, QC(a)?? ["Would you please let me know Japanese dirty words,"]
 they said and ..."

In both (12) and (13), while the direct speech used in the quoted
 clause is acceptable in the context, the expression produced is not
 appropriate in it. In (12) the formal form "...no desuka" ('Is it that
 ...?') does not match the normal expectation of the form used between
 mothers and their daughters. Unless the mother intends to create a
 superficial formality in her speech to her daughter, "... no desuka?"
 should be replaced by its informal version "...no?" Likewise, in (13)
 the formal expression "...te kudasai" ('Would you please ...?') is
 least likely to be heard among close male friends⁷. Indeed, speaker G
 intended to emphasize the fact that his close freinds wanted to know the
 information by reporting it in direct reported speech. However, it
 seems that, without having available Japanese expressions that are
 strong enough to show this emphasis, he ended up by using a
 counterproductive form.

As discussed in Chapter III, direct reported speech is not an exact
 copy of someone's original utterance. If one attempts to copy another's

7. Expressions used among close female friends for this kind of occasion
 are expected to be informal, too.

statement verbatim in his reported speech, it will create some incoherency, or at best an amusing effect. In Japanese when male speakers report female speakers' messages directly, the feminine lexicons are normally replaced by some other (either male or neutral) ones. In English when children report adults' messages directly, their direct reported speech does not normally retain the adults' lexicon (no "big words", for example) which they may have heard in the conversations among the adults; if they do, they may be either laughed at for using those adult words or they may be even thought not to have understood the adults' speech. It seems that native speakers of any language are capable of handling a variety of speech styles, and when reporting directly they can mix the different styles to the extent that such mixture does not result in unacceptability (or incoherency) in the context. For second language learners, it does certainly take a great deal of time to develop such an ability in their target language. And fluency resulting from this ability in the second language seems to grow only by the learner's frequent attempts to experiment with the available styles and see if the hypotheses they have would work or need to be revised.

Unlike indirect reported speech, direct reported speech represents a variety of forms. Thus, the production of DQ whose form is acceptable in the context is normally more difficult and requires taking more risks than that of an Ind Q. In this sense the unacceptability observed in this section, particularly in examples (11), (12) and (13) are in no sense "errors"; it is a manifestation of development in one's second

language. The learners' fluency in the language certainly grows more by taking the risk of generating a variety of speech styles than by avoiding this risk.

5.3. Acceptable Utterances⁸

5.3.1. Avoidance

Unacceptable utterances in one's second language always reflect some problem in his learning of the language and have, hence, received a great deal of attention in error analysis. However, as pointed out in relevant literature (for example Corder 1981 and Schachter 1977), utterances that learners have correctly generated also reveal, though not always explicitly, some psycholinguistic processes they undergo in developing their interlanguage. Schachter (1974) has presented evidence indicating that the low percentage of errors in relative clauses in English produced by Chinese and Japanese speakers (in contrast to Persian and Arabic speakers) is not due to the fact that they possess the competence to use them easily but because they have avoided using them. The Chinese and Japanese speakers in Schachter's study, finding relative clauses in English difficult to produce, resorted to other ways of expressing the intended meaning and, as a result, the percentage of errors in their relative clause turned out to be considerably lower than that of other speakers. Corder (1981) calls this "risk-avoidance strategy".

8. The importance of the examination of acceptable utterances in this study was pointed out by Judy Solsken.

In this regard our data are quite striking. The following table shows the distribution of DQ's and Ind Q's in the entire corpus of reported speech in this study. Since neither Semi DQ nor Semi Ind Q was produced in it, there are no statistics concerning them in the table. (See Appendix A for the distribution of unacceptable utterances.) The number of acceptable utterances is indicated in parentheses. % indicates the ratio of DQ/Ind Q occurrence out of the whole set of utterances of reported speech. The utterances produced by learners R and C are not presented here because they were few.

Table 4: Distribution of Acceptable Utterances

	DQ	Ind Q	% of Acceptable Utterances
E (m-3)	4 (3); 23%	17 (14); 77%	81%
H (f-3)	3 (2); 7%	39 (31); 93%	76%
G (m-4)	31 (20); 44%	40 (32); 56%	73%
L (f-4)	11 (6); 31%	24 (21); 69%	77%

All the learners have produced acceptable utterances at the rate of 70% or more. However, what is more significant here is the factors which caused those acceptable utterances. The difference between H and G is quite striking, suggesting that H had obviously relied on a certain strategy. That is, H apparently took a strategy that avoids using DQ in her reported speech, whereas G seems least likely to resort to any strategy leaning either toward DQ or Ind Q. A similar contrast can be observed between E and L, though the difference is not as great as that between G and H. Given the statistics shown above, it can be reasonably

suspected that the lower the proficiency level of the learner, the more likely it is for him/her to resort to the strategy of avoiding using DQ. Another factor which seems to be relevant in this respect is whether the learner has experienced living in Japan or not. In other words, the question is how long the learner has experienced learning in informal environments where the target language is used as the major means of communication and all sorts of speech styles are used among speakers. The table clearly shows that there is a strong correlation between the low percentage of DQ and those learners who have not lived in Japan (i.e. E and H) and between the high percentage of DQ and those who have lived (for two years) in Japan (i.e. G and L). But why is it that these factors influence the production of reported speech in one's second language? What does the risk avoidance strategy have to do with it? What does the living experience in Japan have to do with it?

First, recall that unlike indirect reported speech, direct reported speech represents a variety of speech styles and it takes learners a great deal of time to develop the competence to generate proper direct reported speech. Hence it is reasonable to assume that the learners at the lower proficiency level tend to choose simpler forms which do not involve different speech styles. This apparently leads to the strategy of avoiding the use of DQ. Moreover, a closer look at our data and at the processes which most of the learners, including those in this study, go through when learning Japanese in formal learning environments, i.e. classrooms in colleges and universities, in the U.S. will reveal another factor causing this kind of tendency among learners of Japanese as a

second language. That is to say, in most of the textbooks used in the Japanese programs, such as Jorden (1963) and Mizutani (1977), Japanese expressions are first introduced in the so-called "masu-form" (formal form which is commonly used among adults in the formal situation and is neutral in terms of the different registers; for example, men's and women's speech). After a certain period of time when the learners get familiarized with the "masu-form", expressions are introduced in the so-called "dictionary form" (or "informal" form, i.e. without masu, which is neutral in terms of registers), so that subordinate clauses can be learned, in which that form is used. As a matter of fact, Ind Q, a subordinate clause, is often presented as a grammatical pattern for which learners must use and practice expressions in the "dictionary form"⁹. Further, it is often the case that the more formal (or, the more "grammar-oriented") the instruction is, the more stressed the "internalization" of grammatical patterns is. Putting it differently, the more formal the learning environment is, the more strongly the learner is required to use the "dictionary form" (i.e. Ind Q). That is, for learners H and E, who have very little experience in learning Japanese in informal environments, the choice of Ind Q whose clause ends in the "dictionary form" is a natural and risk-free strategy.

On the other hand, the learners G and L readily experiment with various forms of DQ in order to develop their fluency in the target

9. For example, Jorden (ibid.) introduces Ind Q specifically for this purpose.

language. Such development seems to grow out of experiences in informal learning environments. Interestingly enough, learner R, who had interrupted studying Japanese in the formal environment after living in Japan for two years, showed the use of DQ at the rate of 80%, which is an opposite case to that of learner H. This suggests to us that while it may be risky for learners to produce harder forms, without such an attempt it would be difficult to develop fluency in a second language. Pedagogically, what is important in making it possible for such a development to happen in second language learning is to provide links between formal learning and informal learning. This point will be elaborated in Chapter VI. The observation made here also suggests another interesting aspect of formal learning. That is, if language learning is restricted only to formal learning, learners get "over-compensated"¹⁰ and, as a result, they resort excessively to the risk-avoidance strategy. Putting it differently, unless formal learning and informal learning are nicely coordinated, learners must suffer from some "side-effect" of biased learning. This seems exactly to be the case with learner H.

5.3.2.2. Self-correction

Acceptable utterances comprise not only the utterances which the learners generated as a substitute for harder expressions but also the utterances they produced from the right hypothesis about the target

10. Chisato Kitagawa's (personal communication) terminology

language. As "errors" show psycholinguistic processes more clearly than correct utterances, the latter process in acceptable utterances can be more easily observed when learners show some effort to produce better utterances than when the acceptable utterances are made without such an effort. In our data this process can be seen more vividly when the learners demonstrate "self-correction" in the middle of their speech. Let us consider some examples.

(14) H: QC[eigo de iroirona joodan ga dekite, onaji no yoona,

joodan ga nihongo de dekimasen, dekinai] to
DQ --- correct --- Ind Q
osshaimashita.

"She said QC[I, she can make jokes in
DQ -- correct -- Ind Q
Japanese but cannot in English.]

(15) E: Akiyama-san wa QC[nihongo de hanasu to eigo de hanasu to

onaji kimochi ga arimau, aru] to iimashita.
DQ -- correct -- Ind Q

"Akiyama-san said QC[I she has the same feeling
DQ -- correct -- Ind Q
when speaking in Japanese and when speaking in English]."

(16) G: anoo, QC[Bunsetsu to iu oshiekata o hakkenshita toki niwa

totemo ureshiku narimashita, ureshikunatta] to
DQ --- correct --- Ind Q
ossahimashita.

"QC[When having discovered the teaching method of "clausing",
I was pleased, he was pleased] said he."
DQ ---- correct ---- Ind Q

(17) L: aa, sore wa mae ni kiita koto ga arimasu ga, kego,

QC[kodomo no toki kara zuutto roshia ni kyoomi ga
arimasu, atta] to itte imashita.

DQ --- correct --- Ind Q

"Ah, I've heard of that before, but, she said
 QC[I have, she had had an interest
 DQ --- correct --- Ind Q
 in Russia ever since (her) childhood.]

All these examples show the learners' (conscious or subconscious) correction of their speech. Unlike the previously observed case where learner H's attempt to shift DQ into Ind Q turned out to be an adverse effect (i.e. example (11)), the shifts presented here have all resulted in acceptability. This reflects a very similar process to what Krashen calls "the monitor" (1981 and 1982).

Krashen claims that adults have two distinct ways of developing competence in a second language: The first is a subconscious process of "acquisition" of the language and the second is a conscious process of "learning" of the language. He further maintains that the conscious process, i.e. "learning" of formal knowledge about the language, functions only as "the monitor". The figure below is a model of adult second language performance proposed by him.

The monitor is then thought to work more effectively when the performer has enough time, is conscious about correctness and knows the rules. Krashen claims that the monitor (conscious learning) has only the function of self-correction and "it is not used to initiate production

in a second language" (1983:32)¹¹. He maintains that production is initiated only by acquired competence, i.e. acquisition, and learned competence has nothing to do with acquisition.

However, the self-correction observed in our data, such as that in examples (14) through (17), is, in its theoretical implications, distinctively different from what the Monitor Hypothesis predicts. First of all, the Monitor Hypothesis presupposes that learners are equipped with "the rules learned" through formal instruction or learning of grammar at the time of performing the self-correction. The learners in this study, on the other hand, attempted self-correction not on the ground of "learned rules" but on the grounds of the hypothesis (or the strategy) they had at the time of speech¹². It seems to me that while the Monitor Hypothesis does make sense as a criticism against second language teaching/learning based on the grammar translation method, it does not capture the reality found among second language learners such as those in this study. As Krashen emphasizes, no grammar in any language is complete in its description. Hence, if the rules that the learners need are not complete in any sense, learners are not able to operate the monitor efficiently. (For example, the use of the articles "a" and "the" and the non-article in English, and the topic marker "wa"

11. The notion of "self-correction" has long been acknowledged by many teachers and learners of second language prior to Krashen's claim of the "the monitor". But it is not until Krashen made his claim of "The Monitor Hypothesis" that the role of self-correction received adequate attention in second language learning.

12. I owe this observation to Chisato Kitagawa.

and the subject marker "ga" in Japanese.) If "the monitor" is supposed to function only when the rule is completely known, then its function becomes very limited. What seems to be more realistic is that learners, regardless of their proficiency, constantly test hypotheses and, by so doing, develop their interlanguage. This is exactly what is demonstrated in examples (14) through (17). Their hypotheses may generate acceptable utterances as in (14) through (17), or unacceptable utterances as in (11), which is repeated here for the convenience of the discussion.

- (11) H: Anoo, sono mensetsu no mae ni Akiyama-san wa QC(a)[hoka
no hito wa HONTOO NI (stressed) paasonaruna shitsumon o
shite chotto komarimashita, komatta] to
DQ: formal --shifting-- ??Ind Q: informal
iimashita.

"Well, before that interview, Ms. Akiyama said QC(a)[other
people asked VERY (stressed) personal questions and
I was embarrassed ... she was embarrassed."
DQ ----- shifting ----- Ind Q

Although it is not clear whether the learner constructed a correct hypothesis after this attempt, it seems that, by repeating this kind of trial in the course of their learning, learners develop the competence necessary to generate acceptable utterances.

Secondly, any speakers, native or non-native, self-correct their speech either consciously or subconsciously. As Rivers (1980) argues, it is a moot point what is subconsciously "acquired" or what is consciously "learned" in one's second language learning. While there is no question that adults do have an ability to "pick up" (or "acquire" in Krashen's sense) a language, it is quite suspicious that competence obtained

subconsciously (or "acquired competence" in Krashen's term) is the only source initiating output. As examined above, self-correction, a conscious or subconscious process of testing hypotheses, does motivate the production of output. If our observation is correct, then a modification becomes necessary in the model of adult second language performance proposed by Krashen in the following way:

Figure 3: Role of Self-Correction

This is certainly more than a modification of Krashen's model. "Learning" and "acquiring" roughly correspond to Krashen's "conscious learning" and "subconscious learning", respectively. However, unlike Krashen's "monitor", "self-correction" is performed either consciously or subconsciously. Learners' learning and acquiring merge¹³ before initiating output and this results in output as an outcome of hypothesis-testing either through conscious or subconscious self-correction. Self-correction is realized in many ways; it may involve changing one form to another, as seen in this study; a longer pause before a proper expression is found; or an instant selection of one form over another. This model seems to capture how learners generate output in their developmental and transitional interlanguage

13. This assumption will be elaborated in the next chapter.

more accurately than Krashen's model.

Conclusion

As Corder claims, interlanguage is a transitional and developmental language which contains both acceptable and unacceptable utterances in the target language norm. The observations described in the preceding sections have shown a picture of reported speech in Japanese as a second language within the framework of the interlanguage hypothesis. Further, the picture, based not only on unacceptable utterances on which "error analysis" is conventionally focused, but also acceptable utterances, is intended to illustrate a certain aspect of interlanguage from a discourse analysis perspective, which can be diagrammed as follows.

Figure 4: Interlanguage

The learners in this study produced unacceptable utterances in reported speech in Japanese because of transfer from English; their lack

of knowledge about the territory of information and sentence forms in Japanese led them to resort to those of English, which caused some of their reported speech to occur without a reportive verb. In addition, their unacceptable utterances were attributed to intralingual difficulty in selecting proper styles and forms of reported speech. Particularly, when DQ was chosen, the complexity of the registers available for the quoted clauses was found to increase such difficulty. The transition between unacceptable utterances and acceptable utterances could be observed vividly in the process of risk-avoidance strategy. Learner H frequently produced Ind Q in an attempt to avoid the risk of making mistakes in producing DQ. Learner G, on the other hand, showed the least tendency to resort to such a strategy, producing a variety of forms of DQ. While H's avoidance strategy brought about a higher percentage of acceptable utterances than G, G's effort to test the hypothesis about DQ was found to be more risky but promising in his development of reported speech than H. We saw a strong correlation between the frequent use of DQ and longer experience of learning in the informal environment and between higher reliance on the risk-avoidance strategy and shorter learning experience in informal environments. Finally, the process of self-correction in reported speech was examined. It was then suggested that, unlike the role of self-correction claimed in Krashen's "The Monitor Hypothesis", self-correction is a manifestation of hypothesis-testing in interlanguage and does involve initiation of output.

Lastly, the pedagogical significance of the study presented in this

chapter seems to be that the optimal development of interlanguage can be made possible when ample opportunities are provided to learners where they can test their hypotheses both in formal and informal environments. The creation of a strong link between formal and informal learning seems to enable "learning" and "acquiring" to function together to initiate proper output. Reported speech involves, as observed earlier, not only highly sophisticated grammatical knowledge for whose learning formal instruction might better serve, but also a tremendous amount of exposure to various types of register. For the latter facet, informal learning environments are essential. Further, neither of the facets should be treated separately from the beginning of the learning stage. The next chapter focuses on pedagogical implications, particularly on a methodological framework in which reported speech --- an outcome of one's comprehension of a message and its production --- can be developed optimally by ensuring such a link between formal and informal learning.

CHAPTER VI

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS:

A METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Reported speech always involves comprehension of someone's message and its reproduction for conveying the message to another, which reflects the major purpose of second language learning. And, regardless of the proficiency level of one's second language, he or she needs to be able to perform reporting in some way or another¹. In this sense, reported speech ought to be taught and learned in all of the stages of second language learning. In this chapter on pedagogical implications, I will propose a methodological framework which aims to facilitate the development of comprehension and production of a message in a second language, so that learners can perform one of the basic functions of language, reporting, more efficiently.

Unlike some of the approaches recently proposed, such as the Natural Approach, which has a heavy reliance on the development of comprehension, or "comprehensible input" (Krashen 1981), the framework presented here is designed to develop both comprehension and production, that is, input and output from the outset of learning and teaching a second language. Further, the framework is intended to fully realize

1. Even if someone has no proficiency or limited proficiency, some "communicative strategies" could help him or her do the task.

the ideas presented in the preceding chapters. In particular, the need for a strong link between formal and informal learning environments receives focal attention, which will greatly help, for example, to keep "over-compensation" of formal learning from taking place and release learners from the over-use of the risk-avoidance strategy.

The outline of this chapter is as follows. First, an observation will be made on a problem of many of the communicative approaches; namely, that on one hand, they admit the idea of early development of input (and delaying oral practice), and on the other hand learners are compelled, with no solid justification, to produce output from the beginning of learning the second language. A solution to this contradiction is sought in the recent studies conducted by Swain (1985) and Gibbson (1985), which have provided evidence supporting the importance of output. On the basis of that justification for output a new framework will be constructed to enhance the development of both input and output in second language teaching and learning. Finally some ways of putting the framework into practice will be demonstrated.

6.1. Contradition in current communicative approaches

In his book Notional Syllabus, Wilkins (1976: 1-20) vindicated his approach to second language teaching by comparing the conventional grammar-based approach and a new semantics (or "notion") based approach. In the former approach, which he calls "the synthetic approach", "the different parts of language are taught separately and step-by-step so that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of

the parts until the whole structure of the language has been built up" (ibid.: 2). In contrast, "the analytic approach", on which his "Notional/Functional Syllabus" is based, takes structural considerations to be secondary to "the purpose for which people are learning language and the kinds of language performance that are necessary to meet these purposes" (ibid.: 13). While the synthetic approaches rely heavily on the learner's capacity to synthesize grammatical elements, the analytic approach is based on his analytic capacity to "recognize the linguistic components of the language behaviour he is acquiring" (ibid.: 14).

The assumptions behind Wilkins' analytic approach are, though not stated explicitly, that language is learned rather than taught, that learners create and modify their own systems with experience and use of the language, and that we must therefore present them with holistic chunks of language within contexts, as well as extensive and diverse language experiences. As discussed in Chapter I, other current approaches in second language learning, such as Corder (1969, 1981), Selinker (1972), Krashen (1981 and 1982) and Krashen and Terrell (1983) share exactly the same view as Wilkins. Krashen's "Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis", for example, is based on the assumption that adults have, as children do, an ability to "acquire" a language subconsciously when exposed to a natural, holistic body of language. Selinker's "Interlanguage Hypothesis" stems from the same theoretical ground as well. However, there is a fundamental difference between Wilkins' analytic approach and the current "creative construction model" (a term borrowed from Littlewood (1984)). Whereas both approaches pursue the

development of communicative competence², the former focuses its attention on the production (output) of messages, but the latter on the comprehension (input) of messages. Wilkins' Notional/Functional Syllabus is clearly a production-based approach, in which learners are expected to speak the target language from the outset. This is mostly the case with other communicative approaches such as Krashen (1981a, 1981b, 1983 and 1985). However, in the creative construction model, which is perhaps the most influential of the approaches presently available, the ability to speak is thought to "emerge by itself after a sufficient amount of competence has been acquired through input" (Krashen and Terrell, 1983: 20). Further, as to its pedagogical implications, Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982: 25) emphasize that "communication situations in which students are permitted to remain silent or respond in their first language may be the most effective approach for the early phases of language instruction".

To my knowledge, this difference has never been treated adequately in the research on second language learning. Most of the communicative approaches practiced commonly now are production-based. Teachers are required to use them without sufficient justification for the development of output. The awareness of the importance of comprehension and the influence of the comprehension-based approach seems to make them even feel "guilty" for using their production-based communicative

2. However, Krashen's theories are exceptionally weak in development of communicative competence such as discourse competence or communicative strategies. Spolsky (1986) makes the same criticism

approach. However, does the development of speaking from the outset really hamper the learning of a second language? Does a delay in the development of speaking really motivate the second language learning? My framework, which promotes the development of both input and output from the outset so that learners of any proficiency level can comprehend a message and report it to another cannot be proposed without adequately dealing with this issue.

6.2. Justification for output.

My intuitive conjecture about second language learning has always cast clouds over the views that accept, without due consideration, the silent period hypothesis, Postovsky's (1974) "delayed oral practice" or the common assumption that comprehension always precedes production. Instead, I have strongly felt that the silent period in second language learning is too vague to define and, hence, it is not feasible to make any claim similar to that for first language learning. This conjecture has further led me to reject the view that comprehension always occurs before production. Especially in adults' second language learning, both comprehension and production seem to me to develop first roughly and later with greater precision, and "which precedes which" has seemed to me to be a false issue. Without evidence, the idea presented here has long been mere speculation, but very recent studies in second language learning have begun to suggest that it is justified. In what follows, I will review those studies, which support the development of output as described in the present framework.

First, Gibbson (1985) deals directly with the issue of the silent period. As discussed earlier, many of the recent studies proposing the significance of input (for example, Krashen's "Input Hypothesis") have a theoretical basis in the silent period hypothesis. However, contrary to many of the studies on the silent period in which only a few subjects are used, Gibbson conducted a large-scale survey using 47 children (of multi-ethnic background) as to how long they remain "silent" in the early stages of their acquisition of English as a second language. His findings are summarized as follows:

1. The length of the silent period is considerably shorter than was found in other studies.

mean length	15.2 days
standard deviation	12.2 days ³

2. Individual differences in the length of the silent period ranged from 0 to 56 days.

3. The phrase period ranged from 0 to 18 weeks

mean length	5.5 weeks
standard deviation	4.5 weeks

Based on these findings, Gibbson makes several arguments refuting what has been proposed in the conventional silent period hypothesis:

1. An initial silent period of two weeks may well be a period of not comprehension but incomprehension, when learners need to "sort and make sense of a flood of input." Hence, a period of silent comprehension need neither be postulated in order to explain the silent period in second language learning, nor can be evidence supporting the "Input Hypothesis" claimed by Krashen.

3. Gibbson compares this finding with "at least several months" of Krashen and Terrell (1983).

2. The early use of routines and patterns can be seen, from a communicative and interactive view of second language development, as evidence of the first developmental stage of an ability to interact in the second language.

3. An extreme interpretation of the silent period findings can lead to silence being imposed on the learner, possibly equally against the learner's will. Hence, a "strong emphasis on input has inherent danger of making the teaching insufficiently supportive of the learner's first attempts to speak the second language (ibid.: 264-5).

Gibbson proposes, then, that "the first part of a language curriculum should consist of a reduced output stage." His term "reduced output stage" means, in essence, the stage where, while reducing the pressure to speak that is placed upon learners, speaking at the outset of learning is not discouraged.

While Gibbson has re-examined the issue of the silent period hypothesis, Swain (1985) has demonstrated the importance of what she calls "comprehensible output" in second language learning. In her study she compared the communicative competence in grammatical/ discourse/ sociolinguistic traits spoken by English speaking students in a French immersion program in Ontario, where they can make infrequent use of the target language (i.e. French), and that of French native speakers in Montreal of the same age-range. Swain found out that some "aspects of the immersion students' second language proficiency cannot be totally accounted for on the basis of the input received" (ibid.; 236). Her study revealed that while the input that the students in the French immersion program received in 7 years was as comprehensible as for their native counterparts, their grammatical competence (performance) was not equivalent to that of native speakers. She considers this to be a

crucial counter-example to Krashen's "Input Hypothesis" which says that spoken fluency emerges after comprehensible input is acquired. She argues that "immersion students do not demonstrate native-speaker productive competence, not because their comprehensible input is limited but because their comprehensible output is limited" (ibid.: 249). Whereas "comprehensible input" focuses on the meaning as opposed to the form of a message, her notion of "comprehensible output" pertains to the form, i.e. syntax. She claims that learners of a second language need to be "pushed in output" in order to gain higher proficiency in syntax. As "comprehensible input" (Krashen, 1981) consists of " $i + 1$ ", in which " i " stands for the present level of the learners' proficiency and " 1 " for a level a little higher than that, Swain maintains that "comprehensible output" must be composed of " $i + 1$ ", by which learners can "test their hypotheses --- to try out means of expressions and see if they work" (ibid.: 249).

Notice that neither Gibbson nor Swain ignores the importance of input. They have rather brought up the significance of output which has been neglected (or could not be legitimized) because of the influence of the input issue. Gibbson's proposal of "a reduced output stage" in the earlier phase of second language learning and Swain's proposal of " $i + 1$ comprehensible output" can be construed as strong evidence supporting our approach, the intent of which is to promote both input and output from the beginning. The notion of "a reduced output stage" certainly reflects my introspection that both comprehension and production develop first roughly and then with greater precision. The notion of " $i + 1$

comprehensible output" may be taken even as a suggestion of drills in second language teaching because although, in a strict sense, comprehensible output ought to be initiated of the learner's own will⁴, how it is "pushed" may be by some outer force such as drills⁵. Actually, before presenting my methodological framework which is based on the evidence provided by Gibbson and Swain, it seems worthwhile to consider Littlewood's (1984) argument for supporting drill work in second language teaching.

Based on the study by Willem Levelt (1978), Littlewood (ibid.:74-6) argues that unlike the cognitive aspect of language learning, which involves the internalization of plans for creating appropriate behavior, "the behavioral aspect involves the automation of these plans so that they can be converted into fluent performance in real time." This conversion into fluent performance occurs, he argues, "mainly through practice in converting plans into performance, i.e. through productive language activity, with receptive activity playing a less clearly defined role." Then he concludes that though native speakers subconsciously perform the lower levels of language behavior (e.g. selecting and producing grammatical structures and words to perform

4. No drills are suggested in the Natural Approach, although it seems to me that "acquisition" through "total physical response", which is the major technique implemented in the Natural Approach, is, in a sense, a kind of "substitution drill".

5. Another way to "push" output, rather than resorting to conventional drill, is to provide natural conversational opportunities to use "i+1" by, for example, providing tutoring or coaching by native speakers. I owe this idea to Catherine Walsh.

communicative interaction), "a person who is still acquiring language skills does not possess such a wide repertoire of ready-made, automated plans," (ibid.: 75) and, therefore, needs to practice them in drills. While there is, as will be discussed later, a substantial difference between Littlewood's treatment of drills and mine, some sort of operation of drills in second language teaching cannot and should not be neglected.

6.3. A methodological framework.

The methodological framework which I propose for promoting the learner's communicative competence, particularly in the form of "i + 1 comprehensible input/output" can be represented diagrammatically as follows.

Figure 5: A Methodological Framework

This framework presupposes that a second language is learned or taught so that learners can acquire communicative competence in Savignon's (1983) sense ("grammatical competence", "sociolinguistic competence", "discourse competence" and "strategic competence" (See also Canale and Swain (1980))). Unlike commonly exercised frameworks, this framework takes the incorporation of informal learning environments as an essential component in its construction. Without this component it is hardly possible to provide learners with an opportunity to fully test their hypotheses concerning communicative competence. In addition, without the link between the formal and informal environments it becomes extremely difficult to prevent "over-compensation" of formal learning from happening, which leads to the over-use of the risk-avoidance strategy. Classroom settings mostly represent the formal environments, where the target language is taught to learners at the same level of

proficiency, and the out-of-classroom setting represents the informal counterpart, where learners associate with native speakers or advanced learners and are exposed to a totally or partially controlled corpus of the target language⁶. However, it must be noted that the classroom setting can be the informal environment and the out-of-classroom setting the formal environment, as well. Thus, to draw the distinction in this way is not as important as to ensure that the learning environment is provided, where learners can test their hypotheses and expand their present ability in such a way that the extra "1 (or more)" to "i" in comprehensible input and output is generated. Where it is made possible is not a crucial matter for this framework, but how it is made possible represents the central concern. In the next section procedures for linking the formal environments and the informal environments will be discussed.

A functional view of language requires no element of language as existing without its function in communication; language is meaningful when it performs its function in communication. In this respect, it goes without saying that the effectiveness of learning and teaching of a second language increases as the material is provided in a meaningful context. In the informal environment where a second language is used for communicative purposes such meaningfulness is automatically obtained. In the formal environment, however, it is quite common that a

6. "Partially controlled input" is commonly called "foreigner talk" in recent research and receives serious attention for the understanding of second language "acquisition" (Larsen-Freeman, 1980)

second language is presented without a meaningful context. Thus, in order to ensure the meaningfulness in language learning and teaching, what ought to be done more than anything else is to introduce any material in a coherent context which has a discourse as a minimum unit. Here, such a discourse is meant to consist of, at least, a coherent pair of a question and an answer, or of a coherent series of sentences.

In the formal environment three types of activities of learning and teaching can be suggested: structural, functional and social activities. The differences among them depend on the focus of the activity. As in Littlewood's framework, which will be discussed soon, if the focus is on the form of language, the activities are grouped as "structural activities". If, on the other hand, the focus is on the meaning of language, it falls within "functional" or "social" activities, the former of which intends to develop the learner's ability to function, i.e. to get the message across or make sense of the message, in his or her best possible way. The social activities aim to develop the learner's ability to understand or produce socially appropriate expressions in the target language. Thus, functional activities are intended to help learners develop their "strategic competence", and social activities "sociolinguistic competence" in Savignon's (1983) sense⁷. Note, however, that the distinction between

7. Savignon's definitions are as follows; "strategic competence" is an understanding of strategies that "one uses to compensate for imperfect knowledge of rules --- or limiting factors in their application such as fatigue, distraction and inattention", and "sociolinguistic competence" is "an understanding of the social context in which language is used:

these categories is not intended to be discrete, but rather to be a continuum. Actually, communicative meaningfulness is the key notion supporting the whole framework, and a minimization of the distinction among the different categories is more to be desired than a widening of it.

In informal environments, learners are expected to test their hypotheses and see how they work. The input to which learners are exposed in this environment is neither finely adjusted at their present proficiency level, nor does it need to be so. As recent studies show, input in informal environments (often called "caretaker speech" or "foreigner talk") is roughly adjusted at somewhere in the learner's proficiency level. This state of input becomes an ideal situation where learners can develop their strategic and sociolinguistic competence, while focusing on the communicative meaning through functional and social activities. Needless to say, learners' hypotheses based on communicative notions such as "communicative orientation" and "given/known information" can be tested more realistically in activities in informal environments than in formal environments.

My framework is radically different from other conventional communicative approaches such as Paulston and Bruder's (1976), which had long been employed in many ESL programs in the U.S., or even Littlewood's (1981 and 1984) communicative approach. Paulston and Bruder's approach represents most of the communicative approaches

the roles of the participants, the information they share, and the function of the interaction." (p.37)

conceived after the notion of communicative competence appeared in the early 1970's and began to influence audiolingualism. Their approach is made up of three components: (1) "Mechanical drills", (2) "Meaningful drills" and (3) "Communicative drills"⁸.

While this model was innovative in that it had a communicative component in addition to other grammatical components, the theoretical foundation of this approach is basically an extension of audiolingual methodology. Indeed, even "communicative drills" are different from others only in their sophisticated conditioning. That is to say, this is, in Wilkins' term, a typical example of "the synthetic approach", in which all skills, including communicative skills, are built up step by step. In my framework, on the other hand, while acknowledging the necessity for step-by-step practice in structural activities which focus on the form of language, functional and social activities are based on the analytic or creative construction model, which lends itself to the learners' innate ability (in a Chomskyian sense) to acquire communicative competence. Activities in informal environments add another opportunity that encourages the learner to test his/her hypotheses about second language learning⁹. Furthermore, the basic

8. Their definitions are as follows: Through these drills, (1) learners internalize structural patterns without paying attention to the meaning of the language used, (2) learners internalize structural patterns by responding to the cue appropriately in the given context, which necessitates the understanding of the meaning, and (3) learners attempt free transfer of learned language patterns to appropriate situations.

9. However, special care must be taken so that learners do not get "drowned" in the flood of incomprehensible discourse.

requirement of a discourse as a minimum unit in structural activities excludes any meaningless or mechanical activities from second language learning and teaching. This represents the substantial distinction between Paulston and Bruder's approach and mine.

Littlewoods' (1981 and 1984) framework shows some similarity to ours.

Figure : Littlewood's methodological framework

However, first of all, his "structural activities" are basically the same as Paulston and Bruder's (ibid.) "mechanical drills"¹⁰. As mentioned earlier, the basic requirement of "discourse as a minimum unit" in my framework is intended to exclude any meaningless activities. Thus, structural activities as well as other activities in the framework allow no mechanical practice to be exercised. Secondly, Littlewood's "quasi-communicative activities" are conceived as "a way of reconciling" the creative learning model and the skill learning model;

10. Littlewood states, "whether learners are aware of meaning in structural activities is in no way essential to performing the operation"(1981: 9).

that is, the bridge between structural activities (skill learning) and functional/social activities (creative learning). In my framework, not only is such a bridge included in the structural activities, but the bridge is more extended over formal and informal learning. Although, as in my framework, the sequencing of each activity is not fixed in Littlewood's framework, more effective sequencing can be attempted in my framework; depending on the material, the sequencing of activities can be freely done within the formal learning component or between the formal and informal learning. In fact, at any level of language learning presentation of appropriate context is always a must and sequencing from functional/social learning to structural learning often creates more effective results than sequencing in the other way. We may even start with learning in informal environments.

6.4. Implementation

a. "Try Japanese"

My framework aims to ensure that an extra "1" (or more) is provided to "i" in comprehensible input and output. While in the formal environments the emphasis in the activities is to help learners obtain firm acquisition of "i + 1", the informal environments provide learners with less structurally controlled but more communicatively rich opportunities where they can test their hypotheses and expand their proficiency more than in the formal environments. It is in the informal learning environment that unknown rules such as "territory of information and sentence forms" are discovered by learners, that

learners can attempt different types of reported speech, that they can make an effort to resort to strategies other than risk-avoidance and that their self-correction becomes more subconscious. However, it should also be noted that if the input in the informal environments is too incomprehensible, learners get easily "drowned" in the flood of such incomprehensible input. Hence, the link between the formal environments and the informal environments must be made with care. A way to make such a link possible is to create an activity which I call "Try Japanese"¹¹.

In "Try Japanese" learners are expected to perform an activity (or activities) specified in advance such as "requesting" and "reporting", and see how it works in such respects as: "Could the learners get the message across?", "Could they understand their listeners?", "Did they have any unexpected success or unexpected failure?", "Did they find any cultural or extra-linguistic elements such as body-language in the conversation they had with native speakers?" and so on. The objectives of "Try Japanese" must be stated in such a way that learners are encouraged to "try out" more input and output. The learners are then to report their results in writing and get the instructor's remarks. Thus, this activity becomes not only a great opportunity for learners to test their hypotheses but also a place where learners and the instructor exchange their views on language learning. As the learners' proficiency

11. It is perfectly possible to "Try English", "Try French", "Try Spanish" and so on.

increases, they start to respond in Japanese: writing in Japanese — a very meaningful writing opportunity! Their responses can also be discussed with their peers. A successful learner's experience can be shared by others and become a strong motivation for further study.

There are basically two types of "Try Japanese"; one for those learners who have just stated to learn Japanese and the other for those who are at the "intermediate" or upper level of Japanese. "Try Japanese" for beginners is designed to let learners try more or less discrete grammatical items within the scope of functional and social activities, such as "progressive" and "passive". "Try Japanese" for non-beginners, on the other hand, guides learners to concentrate more on wider notions in communication such as "request" and "refusal" than discrete grammar items. However, the distinction between these two types is a matter of degree. It is ideal to assign a "Try Japanese" once a week or once every two weeks and to discuss the learners' responses either orally or in a written statement.

Appendix B is an example of Try Japanese assigned for the work of the first week in the Fall semester. Learners had studied the introductory material. This student's report vividly shows her joy in speaking and hearing Japanese with native speakers for the first time. In Appendix C the learner reported his experience in Try Japanese at a Japanese bookstore in New York City. Appendix D shows how the learner did with reported speech. Some learners are very conscious about grammar, and some are not. Some learners are eager to write their report in Japanese, some are more reserved about it. Their reports can

be done orally as well. The learners' experiences provide the instructor with valuable suggestions for better communicative language teaching.

Depending on where the Japanese program is located, it is sometimes difficult to provide a good informal environment where learners can "try Japanese" with native speakers. However, my experience tells me that most universities or colleges in the U.S. have a considerable number of foreign students from Japan and they organize events such as Japanese language tables. If the institution is located in a big city, Japanese restaurants, bookstores or grocery stores turn out to be a wonderful informal environment for "Try Japanese". Using a telephone for this activity is less problematic in maintaining informal environments and more effective in "listening comprehension" per se¹². The examples shown in the Appendices are only a few among many successful, unsuccessful, amusing or frustrating experiences with Japanese as a second language. Some of my students tried Japanese with a Japanese waitress, some with a bookstore clerk, and one even with a Japanese passenger who happened to ride the same bus as the learner. No matter how it worked out, the learners developed a functional and communicative experience in Japanese! Needless to say, "Try Japanese" can be performed with no trouble in Japan and "Try second language X" can be

12. It is certainly true that a telephone conversation is difficult since the learner cannot use non-verbal clues to help comprehend the message. But if the learners' anxiety is reduced, most of the learners find their performance better than they anticipated.

easily done as suggested here.

b. Structural, functional and social activities.

Unlike other frameworks such as Littlewood's (ibid), any activities in my framework are made meaningful by presenting the material in an appropriate context. This requirement is particularly important in structural activities because while other activities cannot be performed without providing such a context, structural activities tend to be conducted, if careful attention is not paid, in isolation from a proper linguistic context. A way to make this possible is to always construct teaching materials with a discourse which consists of a coherent pair of a question and an answer as a minimum unit. In this way all of the activities in my framework contribute to the development of communicative competence. First, some examples for structural activities are presented to illustrate this point.

Teaching point: particles dake 'only' and mo 'also'.

- (1) {
 Q: Sumisu-san, { ashita nani o shimasu ka
 Mr/s Smith { tomorrow what obj do ?
 { kinoo nani o shimashi-ta ka.
 { yesterday past
 'Mr/s Smith, { what will you do tomorrow?'
 { what did you do yesterday?'
 A: Ashita tennis o shimasu. 'I will play tennis tomorrow.'
 tennis
 { Kinoo tennis o shimashita. 'I played tennis yesterday.'
- (2) {
 Q: Tennis dake desu ka. 'Only tennis?'
 only be
 A: Iie, huttobooru mo shimasu/ shimashita.
 no football
 'No, I play/played football, too.'
- (3) {
 Q: Tennis to huttobooru dake desu ka?
 and
 'Only tennis and football?'
 A: Iie, resuringu mo shimasu/ shimashita.
 wrestling
 'No. I do/did some wrestling, too.'

Notice that by providing a context such as the one above it becomes easily possible to ensure an extra 1 (or more) to the learner's present proficiency level "i" above comprehensible input and output. If the development of input is the objective of the activities, the instructor first shows appropriate visual aids to the learners and then asks them just to nod their heads for hai 'yes' or shake them for iie 'no'. For the development of output either the instructor or the learners initiate the question and the answer is orally provided by the other. The

instructor may as well present a whole context such as a series of slides or a short film before starting the structural activities and then "drills" like the above may be conducted. (Remember that in my framework no sequencing of activities is set.)

The next example concerns the practice of reported speech.

- Q: Yamada-san wa hontooni kuru n desu ka?
 top really come is it that?
 'Is Yamada really coming?'
- a. Ee, kuru tte itte-mashita kedo.
 yes QT say-ing past though
 'Yes, he said that he would come, but...'
- (4) A: b. Ee, iku yo tte itte-mashita yo.
 go I-tee-you
 'Yes, he did say, "I'll go."'
- c. Watashi mo yoku shirimasen kara
 I also well don't know therefore
 kuru ka-doo-ka kiite-kudasai.
 whether ask-please
 'I don't know (about it) very well, either, so, please
 ask him whether or not he will come.'

(A.a) illustrates the situation where the information in the quoted clause (i.e. that Yamada will come.) is known both to the speaker and the hearer and is less important for communicative purposes in this context; thus, the indirect version is selected. (A.b.), on the other hand, shows that only the speaker knows the information but not the hearer, and hence the direct version is used, for the information is so important as to need to be transmitted to the hearer. (A.c.) is a case where the speaker is not sure of the information, and therefore he asks

the hearer for that information. As in the example of the particles dake and mo, the presentation of appropriate context is mandatory for this practice, too. Again, the instructor may as well provide a larger context where background information for reporting is included. Perhaps a role-play involving various types of decision-making can be performed before this structural activity is done. Then learners practice three types of reported speech according to the facts alluded to in the role-play they have performed. It may certainly take a longer time to proceed from holistic learning to local learning than the other way round, but it goes without saying that this becomes more effective learning in the long run.

The difference between functional activities and social activities is that the intent of the former is to help learners develop the ability to comprehend a received message and to get it across to others as best they can at their proficiency level, whereas the latter focuses on the development of the ability to understand and express a message with a greater precision which accords with the social norm of the target language. However, despite such a difference, they are both activities based on "meaning" (as opposed to "structure") and, therefore, the success of the activities is judged not by the structure of the language used by the learners but by the meaning understood or expressed by them. Further, as I emphasized earlier, it is not intended at all to draw a discrete distinction between different types of activities in our framework; the types form a continuum linked by the notion of communicatively meaningful teaching and learning of a second language.

Both functional and social activities lend themselves easily to role-plays in the classroom setting (in informal environments, role-play is replaced by natural conversations among learners with or without native speakers of the target language.) Role-play is not a new invention in second language teaching at all. There is a great deal of literature discussing and demonstrating many effective types of role-play or group-work in the classroom (Long, 1975, 1977, 1981 and 1983). A series of studies conducted by Clair Kramsch (1981a, 1981b, 1983 and 1985) concerns the teaching of functional skills in conversations such as "turn-taking", "taking/giving floor", "paraphrasing" and so on. Littlewood (1981) offers interesting ideas for activities involving "two-way" information exchange. (See also Long, 1983). All of these suggestions are without question valuable for my framework. Nevertheless, what seems not to have received enough attention in the literature is what I call "Interactive Role-plays". Unlike conventional role-plays where interactions between learners are normally limited only within the same role-play group, in the Interactive Roleplays learners in one role-play group are strongly encouraged to exchange information with learners in other groups. The interaction of (4) Q and Ac in the example used for the practice of reported speech serves nicely to illustrate this point.

Q: Yamada-san wa hontooni kuru n desu ka?
 'Is Yamada really coming?'

Ac.: Watashi mo yoku shirimasen kara

- { 1. kuru ka-dooka
 - { 2. irassharu ka-dooka
- kiite-kudasai.

'I don't know (about it) very well, either, so please ask him if
 { 1. he (equal status as the speaker's) will come.'
 { 2. he (higher status than the speaker's) will come.'

Notice that, depending upon the status of the referent in relation to that of the speaker and the hearer participating in the conversation, the hearer must choose either 1 or 2 in his response to the question addressed to him. This is merely one of the many situations where learners need to be exposed to dynamic situations. And it is the interaction between different groups that maximizes the effects of functional and social activities. Interactions between formal environments and informal environments further increase the effect of those activities. Further, communicative notions such as "communicative orientation", "important/unimportant information" and "given/known information" cannot be realized without authentic interactions among speakers; in second language learning Interactive Role-plays and links between formal and informal environments seem to be the keys for making this possible. The optimum learning and teaching of "i + 1 comprehensible input and output" will also be fully realized through those activities.

Conclusion

In this chapter on pedagogical implications I have proposed a methodological framework for developing "i + 1 comprehensible input and output", which is the main motivation for the learning and teaching of reported speech in second language learning. My framework is distinctively different from other frameworks in that any activity for learning and teaching the target language is designed to be communicatively meaningful and that the learners' innate abilities to learn a language are greatly encouraged to develop through the presentation of links between structural, functional and social activities and links between formal and informal learning environments. There are many ways to implement this framework effectively. The ideas suggested here, "Try Japanese" and "Interactive Role-Plays", are only the tip of the huge iceberg of creative realizations of this framework, which ought to be demonstrated in effective second language classrooms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, A.R. and P. Kiparsky. (eds.). A festschrift for Morris Halle. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York.
- Akmajian, Adrian and Chisato Kitagawa. 1981. Aux in Japanese. In Steel et al.
- Austin, J.L. 1962. How to do with words. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Mass.
- Bailey, N., Madden, C and Krashen, S. 1974. Is there a natural sequence in adult second language learning? Language learning. 21: 235-243.
- Banfield, Ann. 1973. Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. Foundation of language. 10: 1-39.
- Banfield, Ann. 1982. Unspeakable sentences. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Boston.
- Bates, Elizabeth and MacWhinney, Brian. 1981. Second language acquisition from a functional perspective: pragmatic, semantic and perceptual strategies. In Winitz (eds.). 190-214.
- Bedell, G., E. Kobayashi, and M. Muraki. (eds.). 1979. Explorations in linguistics. Kenkyusha, Tokyo.
- Burt, Marina. and Heidi Dulay. (eds.). On TESOL '75. TESOL. Washington, D.C.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1980. Principles of language learning and teaching. Prentice Hall. New York.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1959. Review of Skinner's Verbal behavior. Language. 35: 26-58.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the theory of syntax. MIT Press. Cambridge.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. Essays on form and interpretation. North-Holland. New York
- Cole, P. and J. Morgan. (eds.). Syntax and semantics III: Speech acts. Academic Press. New York.
- Corder, Pit. 1969. The significance of learner's errors. International review of applied linguistics. V. 4.

- Corder, Pit. 1981. Error analysis and interlanguage. Oxford Press. London.
- Dik, Simon C. 1978. Functional grammar. North-Holland. New York.
- Dillon, G.L., L. Coleman, J. Shanestock and M. Agar. 1985. Review article; Brown & Yule: Discourse analysis; Leach: Principles of pragmatics. Language. 61.
- Dulay, H. and M. Burt. 1974. Natural sequence in child second language acquisition. Language learning. 24: 37-53.
- Dulay, H., M. Burt, and S. Krashen. 1982. Language two. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Emonds, J.E. 1976. A transformational approach to English syntax: root, structure-preserving, and local transformation. Academic Press. New York.
- Forley, Willima A. and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. Functional syntax and universal grammar. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Gaies, Stephen J. 1983. The investigation of language classroom process. TESOL Quartely. 17.2: 205-217.
- Gass, Susan S. and Carolyn Madden. (eds.) 1985. Input in second language acquisition. Newbury House. Rowley, Mass.
- Gibbson, John. 1985. The silent period: an examination. Language learning. 35.2: 255-267.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Cole and Morgan. (eds.).
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. Discourse startegies. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Hakuta, Kenji and Herlinda Cancino. 1978. Trends in second-language acquisition reserach. Harvard educational review. 47. 3.
- Harada, Shinichi. 1976. Honorifics. In Shibatani. (ed.).
- Hinds, John. 1976. Aspects of Japanese discourse structure. Kaitakusha. Tokyo.
- Holmes, J. 1978. Sociolinguistic competence in the class room. In Richards. et al.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972. On communicative competence. In Pride. (ed).
- Inoue, Kazuko. 1978. Nihongo no bunpo-kisoku (grammatical rules in Japanese). Taishukan, Tokyo.

- Inoue, Kazuko. 1981. A type of intermediate speech in Japanese and its function in a discourse. In Makino. (ed.).
- Inoue, Kazuko. 1983. Nihongo no denbun-hyoogen to sono danwa-kinoo. Gengo (language). 12. 11. Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Jorden, Eleanor H. 1963. Beginning Japanese. Yale University Press. New Haven.
- Kamada, Osamu. 1981. Indirect quotation in Japanese. In Makino. (ed.).
- Kamada, Osamu. 1983. Nihongo no kansetsu-wahoo. Gengo (Language). 12. 9. Taishukan. Tokyo.
- Kamio, Akio. 1979. On the notion speaker's territory of information: a functional analysis of certain sentence-final forms in Japanese. In Bedell, Kobayashi, and Muraki. (eds.).
- Kamio, Akio. 1985. Territory of information and sentence forms. Presented at Japanese Linguistics Conference. UCLA.
- Kramsch, Claire J. 1981a. Discourse analysis and second language teaching. Center for Applied Linguistics. Washington, D.C.
- Kramsch, Claire J. 1981b. Teaching discourse skills: a pragmatic approach. Foreign language annals. 14: 93-104.
- Kramsch, Claire J. 1983. Interaction in the classroom: learning to negotiate roles and meanings. Die unterrichtspraxis. 16.2: 175-190.
- Kramsch, Claire J. 1985. Classroom interaction and discourse options. Studies in second language acquisition. 7: 169-183.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1976. Formal and informal linguistic environments in language acquisition and language learning. TESOL Quarterly. 10.2: 157-168.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1981. Second language acquisition and second language learning. Pergamon Press. Oxford.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press. New York.
- Krashen, Stephen D. and Tracy D. Terrell. 1983. The natural approach. Pergamon/Alemany. New York.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1978. Danwa no bunpo (Discourse grammar). Taishukan Pub. Tokyo.

- Kuno, Susumu. 1979. Newness of information and order of deletion. Cahiers Charles 1: 211-221. L'Institut d'Anglais Charles V. Paris.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1983. Principles of discourse deletion. Proceedings of XIIIth international congress of linguistics. Tokyo.
- Kuroda, S-Y. 1973. Where epistemology, style, and grammar meet: a case study from Japanese. In Anderson and Kiparsky
- Levelt, Willem. 1978. Skill theory and language teaching. Studies in second language acquisition. Vol. 1. No. 1. 53-70.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1980. Discourse analysis in second language research. Newbury House. Rowley, Mass.
- Littelewood, William. 1981. Communicative language teaching. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Littlewood, Willima. 1984. Foreign and second language learning. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Long, Michael H. 1975. Group work and communicative competence in the ESOL classroom. In Burt and Dulay. (eds.). 211-233.
- Long, Michael H. 1977. Groupwork in the teaching and learning of English as foreign language problems and potential. English language teaching journal. 31.4. 285-292.
- Long, Michael H. 1981. Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In Winitz. 250-278.
- Long, Michael H. 1983. Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. On TESOL '83. 207-225. TESOL. Washington, D.C.
- Long, Michael H., and Charlene Sato. 1983. Classroom foreign talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions. In Seliger and Long. (eds.).
- Makino, Seiichi. (ed.).1981. Papers from Middlebury symposium on Japanese discourse analysis. University of Illinois.
- Makino, Seiichi. 1982. Japanese grammar and functional grammar. Lingua 57:125-173. North-Holland. New York.
- Makino, Seiichi. 1984a. Speaker/listener-orientation and formality marking in Japanese. Gengo kenkyuu (Linguistic research). 84:124-145. Taishukan Pub. Tokyo.
- Makino, Seiichi. ed. 1984b. Middlebury elementary Japanese. University of Illinois. Urbana, Illinois.

- Maynard, Senko K. 1984. Functions of to and koto-o in speech and thought representation in Japanese written discourse. Lingua 64: 1-24. North-Holland.
- Mikami, Akira. 1953. Gendai gohoo josetsu (Modern Syntax) reprinted in 1972 by Kuroshio Shuppan. Tokyo.
- Nitta, Yoshio. 1979. Nihongo-bun no hyoogen ruikai --- shukaku no ninshoo seigen gobun koozoo no arikata no kannen ni tsuite. In Festschrift for Hayashi Eiichi Eigo to nihongo to. 287-306
- Okutsu, Keiichiro. 1970. Quotative structure and indirectification. Gengo kenkyu. 56. Nihon Gengo Gakkai. Tokyo.
- Paulston, Christina Bratt, and Mary Newton Bruder. 1976. Teaching English as a second language: techniques and procedures. Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Postovsky, V. 1974. Effects of delay in oral practice at the beginning of second language learning. Modern language journal. 58: 229-239.
- Pride, J.B. (ed.). 1972. Sociolinguistics. Penguin Books.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1978. A comparison of wh-clefts and it-clefts in discourse. Language 54. 4: 883-906
- Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum. 1973. A concise grammar of contemporary English. Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich. New York.
- Richards, Jack C. 1971. A noncontrastive approach to error analysis. English language teaching journal. 25: 201-219.
- Richards, Jack C. et al. 1978. Understanding second and foreign language learning. Newbury House. Rowley, Mass.
- Rivers, Wilga. 1980. Foreign language acquisition: where the real problems lie. Applied linguistics. 1. 1: 48-59.
- Ross, Claudia. 1976-77. Reporting style as discourse strategies -- a study in Japanese and English. Papers in Japanese Linguistics. 5.
- Sanford, A.J. and S.C. Garrod. 1981. Understanding written language. Chichester. Wiley.
- Savignon, Sandra. 1983. Communicative competence: theory and classroom practice. Addison-Wesley. Reading, Mass.
- Schachter, J. 1974. An error in error analysis. Language learning. 24. 2: 205-214.

- Searle, J.R. 1976. A classification of illocutionary acts. Language in society. 1976. 5. 1. 1-23.
- Seliger, Herbert W., and Michael Long. (eds.). 1983. Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition. Newbury House. Rowley, Mass.
- Selinker, Larry. 1972. Interlanguage. International review of applied linguistics. X. 3.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. (eds.). 1976. Syntax and semantics: Japanese generative grammar. 5. Academic Press. New York.
- Soga, M. and M. Muraki. 1983. Patterns of errors among intermediate and advanced students. Journal of the association of teachers of Japanese. 18. 1.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 1986. Formulating a theory of second language learning. Studies in second language acquisition. 7: 269-288.
- Steel, Susan. et al. 1981. An encyclopedia of Aux. MIT Press. Cambridge.
- Swain, Merrill. 1985. Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass and Madden. (eds.).
- Tohsaku, Yasu-Hiko. 1985. Towards a classroom model facilitating the development of communicative competence --- theory and classroom practice. Nihongo Kyoiku (Journal of Japanese Language Teaching). 56: 97-109.
- Vachek, Josef. 1966. The linguistic school of Prague. Indiana University Press. Bloomington, Indiana.
- Wilkins, D.A. 1976. Notional syllabuses. Oxford University Press. London.
- Winitz, H. (eds.). 1981. Native and foreign language acquisition. Academy of Sciences. New York.

Appendix A: Distribution of Unacceptable Utterances

Without Reportive Verb		Incorrect Selection	
		DQ	Ind Q
E	7	1	3
H	5	1	8
G	6	11	8
L	6	5	3
Total:		19 (28%)	24 (36%)

Appendix B: Try Japanese Sample 1

にほんごで はなしてみよう!

TRY JAPANESE !! No. 1

Name: ほ"すじえいん

What to try?: New Expressions in Lesson 1.
(with emphasis on Major Points)

Who did you try to? ... みせんこせんせい,
はやしさん & others

How did it work? ...

The phrase I used most often was:
"わかいません".

but occasionally I could answer:
"わかいます".

Another helpful phrase was:
"もう いちど" いってくださ"さい".

I learned the word for flower ... はな? はな!
and even started to use a few words
from lesson 2 ... これは, それは, いい, etc.
when I could figure out what to say,
I was usually understood. When I had
trouble thinking and speaking, I received
much needed help. I really enjoy
Language Table even though it is a
bit intimidating! Very good!

Reference: Language Table on Tue. 9/25 12:30 - 1
F. Saito x2913
A. Chiba x3066
H. Kawai x2952 5
H. Hayashi x2969
Keep trying!

TRY JAPANESE no. 8

ゴードン イッヅ

Who did you try with?

Woman in store

How did it work? Any trouble? Any success?

Over the vacation, I visited the Zen Oriental Store on 57th Street in New York City. I was looking for a book of haiku by Issa. I couldn't find it on the shelves, so I asked the clerk to help me find it. She only spoke Japanese, and she used many of the phrases from lesson six, such as migi and hidari. Surprisingly, I was able to find the book using her directions! Also, I asked her several questions about Sake cups because I wanted to buy a set.

If you are ever in New York City, you should visit this store, which is located on West 57th Street between 5 and 6 Avenues.

日本語で話してみよう

TRY JAPANESE: Lesson 4 --- Direct and Indirect Report ---

Directions:

Make up 5 questions among your friends concerning either a teacher(s) or a student(s) of an upper level class. Ask those questions directly to the person "targetted" and exchange the answers with your friends.

Example: About Makino sensei. (1) Where is he from? (2) What kind of sports does he like? (3) When does he go to bed? (4) What kind of Japanese food does he like? (5) A more touchy (and "hot") subject like?

Then, report how it worked. Pay attention to direct and indirect quotes.

できるだけ日本語で書いて下さい。(Write in Japanese as much as possible!)

1. To whom did you ask?

2 よねんせい (I told them I wouldn't use their names)
Sensei? (Confidential?)

2. What kind of questions did you ask?

- (1) いつもいってもしないですか。✓
- (2) かんい か いくつぐらいわかりますか。✓
- (3) にほんのたべものが好きですか。✓
- (4) どんな たべものが好きですか。✓ (にほんのたべもの)
- (5) どのせんせいが一番いいですか。... ーは"んねん"ですか。
(かん ぶん)

3. Response. (How did this Try Japanese work?)

It worked well for the most part. I had to ask the よねんせい to repeat some of their answers but I understood most of what they said the first time. Relating their answers back to my friends wasn't difficult. I feel comfortable with both direct and indirect quotes. Indirect quotes are, of course, easier to use since you are able to simplify what was said. ~~Maybe~~.

In case you're wondering, both people questioned said they could recognize a thousand kanji, but were able to write less. Both liked Japanese food. One's Favorite was tempura and the other's Favorite was Sukiyaki. How about the best & the funniest teacher?