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ABSTRACT

Japanese hierarchical relations called *senpai-koohai* ‘senior-junior’, which in school are based on different class standings, have been observed to be salient and stable across different situations beyond school, once such relations are built between a pair of people (Dunn, 1996; Nakane, 1967/1972). However, presuming that such relations are static in nature is problematic in light of social constructionist views, especially because there are no studies that examine college students’ dyadic or multiparty interactions in terms of their hierarchical relationship building. This dissertation examines how college students of different class levels interact in practice by analyzing multiparty interactions during an extracurricular activity at a Japanese college. Drawing on indexicality approaches (Ochs, 1992, 1993; Silverstein, 1983), I focus on three linguistic forms: speech styles, address and reference terms, and knowledge-related stance markers. The results of the analyses suggest that the construction of *senpai-koohai* relationships is influenced by two types of context of talk, on-stage and off-stage. During on-stage talk, the participants’ club roles are foregrounded, which puts less focus on their *senpai-koohai* identities. During off-stage talk, their identities are less influenced by their club roles, and this situation allows more freedom for other identities, which include *senpai-koohai*, to be constructed. A speaker’s use of linguistic forms can be indexical to the context, while the meaning of a linguistic form is under the influence of the context. Moreover, the construction of *senpai-koohai* relations is also influenced by the content of the conversation. Overall, this dissertation demonstrates that, in the data analyzed, *senpai-koohai* relations among college students are much more fluid in nature than has been shown in previous studies.
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Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the problem

College students in Japan take part in a seniority-based system of senpai-koohai,\(^1\) or ‘senior-junior’, relations. According to Nakane (1967/1972), this seniority-based system is dominant and omnipresent across Japanese society, and it contributes to building a web of hierarchical relationships within the society. Relations among college students are no exception. For example, Nakane (1967/1972) claims that, without knowing others’ class standings at school, students cannot communicate with each other, or even decide where to sit at meetings. Moreover, the relations of senpai-koohai reportedly last even after their graduation from school (Dunn, 1996). Overall, most studies that deal with this topic have observed that senpai-koohai relations at school are based on different class standings, and once such relations are built between a pair of people, the relations are considered to remain salient and stable across different situations beyond school. However, there are no studies that examine college students’ dyadic or multiparty interactions in terms of their hierarchical relationship building, and so there is a lack of information about the saliency and stability of senpai-koohai relations among college students in practice.

This dissertation investigates senpai ‘senior’ and koohai ‘junior’ relationships in interactions that occur during meetings among college students. The data derive from multiparty interactions during an extracurricular activity—that is, bukatsudoo ‘club activities’—at a Japanese college. Bukatsudoo are perceived as the major site of practicing hierarchical relations based on class standings, because, unlike classroom

\(^1\) Due to the various systems of romanization used to transcribe Japanese in alphabets, senpai can be spelled sempai, and koohai can be kohai or kōhai.
activities, the club activities bring together students of different class standings, and class standings are the criteria to decide who is treated as senpai or koohai in relation to the other (Dunn, 1996).

In analyzing identities based on actual interaction, this dissertation takes a social constructionist approach rather than following essentialist ideas that assume that a person will always act in accordance with his or her social standing. The social constructionist approach is based on the assumption that, in reality, our identities shift moment by moment. For example, a university counselor does not always act solely as a representative of his profession, and he could take a friendly stance toward a counselee even during an academic counseling session (He, 1995). In order to analyze the dynamic nature of identities, social constructionist approaches have long been considered the basic—though often unspecified—premise in diverse fields, including discourse analysis (Phillips & Jørgensen, 2002). Social constructionist approaches problematize treating identities as fixed relations, instead perceiving social relations as identities constructed during interaction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Gergen, 1985). Instead of considering identities as static and a priori given, social constructionist approaches enable us to view identities as constantly shifting moment by moment. While identities are constructed at multiple levels, careful examination of interaction makes it possible to discern how one identity is foregrounded while others are backgrounded in a particular situation. This dissertation is the first work that takes the social constructionist view in investigating the status of senpai-koohai relations among college students in dyadic and multiparty interactions. It aims to investigate when senpai-koohai relationships are foregrounded and when they are backgrounded during the students’ interactions at club meetings.
The statement that identities are constructed in interaction does not necessarily
embrace the idea that identities are built contingently to the degree that there are no
constraints or regularities (Phillips & Jørgensen, 2002). There is a series of works on
indexicality (Ochs, 1992, 1993; Silverstein, 1985) that support the notion that certain
linguistic forms are known to indicate particular identities in society through ideological
links between the linguistic forms and social identities (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). In this
analysis of senpai-koohai relations, I focus on three linguistic forms: speech styles,
address and reference terms, and knowledge-related stance markers. These three forms
are all considered salient features to index senpai-koohai relations. On the other hand,
the indexicality framework also warns that the relationship between linguistic forms and
identities is not automatic (Ochs, 1992). The findings of some recent studies of Japanese
speech styles are a case in point.

College students’ choices of speech styles have been treated as a prototypical
linguistic feature to judge their hierarchical relationships (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987;
Nakane, 1967/1972; Niyekawa, 1991; Shin 2004). These speech styles involve two
distinctive clause-final forms marked by the presence or absence of so-called addressee
honorifics, which I refer to as the masu form and the plain form,² respectively, in this
dissertation. Aside from choosing an incomplete form,³ the masu and plain forms are the
only options to end a clause with predicates. For example, suppose that two students are
looking at the last piece of pizza on the table. When one student asks the other if she will

² Other terms for the masu form include the “desu-masu form” and the “polite form.” The plain form is
also called the “casual form” and the “da form.”
³ An example of an incomplete form would be the gerund with -te, a preverbal form, illustrated in TABLE
3.1 in Chapter 3, where speech style issues are elaborated in detail.
eat the piece by uttering (1), the other student has two basic options to reply positively, shown in (2a) and (2b).

(1) taberu? ‘Are [you] going to eat [it]? <PLAIN form>’
(2a) taberu. ‘[I] will eat [it]. <PLAIN form>’
(2b) tabemasu. ‘[I] will eat [it]. <MASU form>’

While (1) and (2a) use the plain form of taberu ‘eat’, (2b) uses the masu form of taberu, that is, take-masu ‘eat’. The presence of the morpheme masu is considered a type of addressee honorific. In contrast, the plain form is the non-honorific counterpart. As suggested by the identical translation of (2a) and (2b), the choice of the plain or the masu form makes no difference in the referential meaning. The difference is considered to be social. The common interpretation is that the masu and the plain forms represent speakers’ polite and casual attitudes, respectively, toward the addressee (e.g., Niyekawa, 1991). Therefore, the form in (2b) is considered the speaker’s expression of respect toward the addressee, who is the speaker of (1). Since the utterance in (1) lacks an addressee honorific, the utterance in (2b) creates a gap in terms of respect toward addressees. It is believed that this gap further indicates status differences, i.e., the speaker of (1) is higher in status than the speaker of (2b) (Ide, 1989; Niyekawa, 1991; Shibatani, 1990). In other words, it is commonly interpreted that, when the speaker’s status is lower than the addressee’s, the speaker is paying socially required respect toward the other speaker by using the masu form, while the other, higher-status speaker is not required to pay an equal degree of respect toward the lower-status addressee. Following Okamoto (1997), in this dissertation I call this pattern of speech style use by two interactants the non-reciprocal use of speech styles. In contrast, the reply in (2a) does not
constitute such a gap, meaning that there is no status difference between the speakers of (1) and of (2a). The pattern of contrastive use of reciprocal and non-reciprocal speech styles has given rise to the assumption of a connection between Japanese speech style use and interactants’ hierarchical relationships, which is made not only in prescriptive grammars and linguistics literature (e.g., Martin, 1964, 2004), but also in Japanese language planners’ guidelines (Bunka Shingikai Kokugo Bunkakai “Subdivision on National Language of the Council for Cultural Affairs,” 2007) and Japanese language textbooks (e.g., Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987).

Is this prescriptive use of speech styles consistently observed in practice? Dunn (1996) provides a counter example with an episode of interaction by two native speakers from a Japanese college. A sophomore student contended that she had used the masu form toward a junior student consistently, but both the junior student and the researcher who observed their interactions reported that this was not the case. This is a phenomenon that Silverstein (1981) calls the “limits of awareness,” which means that what a native speaker is aware of in his or her language use is not necessarily an accurate description of that language use. The episode described by Dunn (1996) exemplifies the point raised by some researchers (Cook, 2006; Dunn, 1996; Okamoto, 1997) that speakers’ self-report of their speech style use is not valid data for research on actual language use. Therefore, recent developments in studies on Japanese speech style use are built on analyses of naturally occurring data (e.g., Cook, 2006; Dunn, 1996, 1999; Ikuta, 2008; Maynard, 2008; Okamoto, 1998). These studies’ results indicate that lower status speakers sometimes use the plain form when talking to a higher status interlocutor and yet maintain and support their hierarchical relations (Cook, 2006, 2008a; Ikuta, 2008;
Okamoto, 1998). Therefore, the assumed connection between non-reciprocal speech style use and two interactants’ hierarchical relationships does not hold. We have to look into the contexts in which a speech style is used, because different situations may lead to different meanings of the speech style.

Much like speech styles, Japanese address and reference terms have been treated as salient features of hierarchical identities (Nakane, 1967/1972; Niyekawa, 1991). Nakane claims that, among adult male speakers, the categorization within a hierarchical system can be “demonstrated in the three methods of addressing a second or third person” (pp. 26–27), in such a way that a suffix –san is used for senior members, –kun for junior members, and the name without a suffix is reserved for those with the same rank.

However, these uses of address and reference terms have not been investigated using naturally occurring data. By investigating the contexts in which address and reference terms are used in terms of senpai-koohai relations, this dissertation broadens the inquiry into how linguistic forms point to, or do not point to, hierarchical relations among speakers.

Finally, senpai-koohai relationships are often discussed as involving the transfer of knowledge from the senior to the junior; hence, the senior senpai is supposedly the person who is more knowledgeable than his/her junior (Nakane, 1967/1972). Although some Japanese expressions, such as evidentials, are associated with knowledge-based stances (Aoki, 1986; Iwasaki, 1985), and studies of various languages support the view that knowledge-based stances can contribute to identities (Ochs, 1996), the use of Japanese evidentials in connection with identity construction has not been fully
investigated. No studies have provided empirical evidence for how knowledge-related stances may contribute to *senpai-koohai* relations within interaction.

In sum, previous studies on speech styles support the social constructionist view that the use of certain linguistic forms does not directly point to the speakers’ identities, which are instead constructed within interaction. However, the other features that I look at in my analyses, address and reference terms and knowledge-oriented expressions, lack examinations of their use in practice, although their connection to *senpai-koohai* relationships has been presumed. In its investigation of *senpai-koohai* relationships, this dissertation takes the stance that connections between linguistic forms and identities are not automatic and that identities are indexed with the aid of other features during interaction. To explain the mechanism of indexed identities, I use an indexicality framework, which will be introduced in Chapter 2. Before that, I provide background information on *senpai-koohai* relationships in Section 1.2, followed by a discussion in Section 1.3 of the goals of this research and the specific research questions that the dissertation addresses.

### 1.2 Senpai and Koohai in Japanese colleges

While both *senpai* ‘senior’ and *koohai* ‘junior’ can be used as reference terms, only *senpai* can be used as an address term, such as *Tanaka-senpai* ‘senpai Tanaka’ (Suzuki, 1978). Although the terms *senpai* and *koohai* are not used in the same way, their meanings are considered to be parallel notions. The meanings of the words *senpai* and *koohai* are commonly explained through the way they are written in the Chinese characters used in a Japanese orthographic system, as shown in Figure 1.1 below, as if
their meanings are transparent to literate Japanese language users (e.g., Niyekawa, 1991; Rohlen, 1991).

As seen in the figure, the word *senpai* is written with two Chinese characters: the first, *sen*, means ‘ahead’ or ‘before’ and the second, *pai*, means ‘companion’, which makes *senpai* a compound that means “a person who proceeds or leads, with the implication that those that follow are his or her companions in the same pursuit, career, or institution” (Rohlen, 1991, p. 21). *Koohai* is a compound of *koo* ‘behind’ and *hai* ‘companion’, thus “companion that is behind,” and it is “the other half of the senior-junior relationship” (Rohlen, 1991, p. 21). These two words’ written forms and definitions suggest three points: the interdependence of *senpai* and *koohai* in definition, their relativeness in feature, and the two parties’ membership in a community. First, as *koohai* is described as “the other half” (Rohlen, 1991, p. 21), the relationship is interdependent in the sense that the two parts of it cannot exist independently. The usage of *senpai* and *koohai* clearly indicates this interdependent relation. For example, Sentence (4) is identical to Sentence (3) in structure, with only a change of names and of the word *senpai* to *koohai*. The result is two sentences that can be considered synonymous. That is, the statement that

---

*Hai in koohai and pai in senpai are phonological variants and written with the same character, as shown in Figure 1.1.*
Ms./Mr. Tanaka is Ms./Mr. Yamada’s *senpai* ‘senior’ automatically assumes that Ms./Mr. Yamada is the *koohai* ‘junior’ to Ms./Mr. Tanaka. Therefore, *senpai* and *koohai* are two sides of the same coin.

(3) Tanaka-san wa Yamada-san no senpai da.
[Family name]-Mr./Ms. TOP [Family name]-Mr./Ms. LK senior COP
‘Ms./Mr. Tanaka is a *senpai* to Ms./Mr. Yamada.’

(4) Yamada-san wa Tanaka-san no koohai da.
[Family name]-Mr./Ms. TOP [Family name]-Mr./Ms. LK junior COP
‘Ms./Mr. Tanaka is a *koohai* to Ms./Mr. Yamada.’

The second point, their relativeness, means that both ‘ahead’ and ‘behind’ in the words’ definitions require a reference point. This is clear when the sentence from (3) lacks the part *Yamada-san no* ‘of Yamada’, as shown in (5).

(5) Tanaka-san wa senpai da.
[Family name]-Ms./Mr. TOP senior COP
‘Ms./Mr. Tanaka is a *senpai* [to me/us/a person already referred to].’

Sentence (5) assumes that Tanaka is a *senpai* to the speaker, or the group involving the speaker, or somebody already referred to. We need at least two people to consider *senpai* or *koohai* relationships, because their definitions are based on the comparison of at least two individuals. In concert with the first point, the reference point of the claim in (3) is Yamada-san, who takes the *koohai* role in relation to Tanaka-san, as expressed in (4). A speaker can also add more information about the degree of difference in age,

---

5 As the translation indicates, *senpai* and *koohai* are gender-neutral terms.
6 The list of abbreviations used in the examples is presented before the Table of Contents.
7 The reference point can be either singular or plural.
experience, or class standing at school, for instance by adding *ni-nen* ‘by two years’ prior to *senpai*, as in Sentence (6). The same sentence with *koohai* in place of *senpai* is also grammatical.

(6) *Tanaka-san wa Yamada-san no ni-nen senpai da.*  
‘Ms./Mr. Tanaka is a *senpai* to Ms./Mr. Yamada by two years.’

Although *senpai* and *koohai* can be considered as being in an interdependent relationship, the two terms are not necessarily used in the same way. In order to express that someone is a *senpai* by a considerable degree of difference in age or experience, you can call that person *dai-senpai* ‘big *senpai*’, making a compound of *dai* ‘big’ and *senpai*. However, making a similar type of compound with *koohai* is not possible.

The last point the definitions of *senpai* and *koohai* suggest is the parties’ membership in a community, indicated by the second Chinese character, the one shared by *senpai* and *koohai* (FIGURE 1.1), which is *hai* and its phonological variant, *pai*. This entails that a person’s *senpai* may not be his or her *senpai* in another situation. Therefore, it is possible to say, for example, that Ms. Tanaka is my *senpai* at college, but she is my *koohai* at work. In short, *senpai-koohai* is a situation-oriented relationship. This is in line with Wetzel’s (1993) observation that vertical relationships, including *senpai-koohai*, are *uchi* ‘inside’ relations. By calling someone *senpai*, the speaker simultaneously indicates that both the speaker and the person referred to belong to the same social group.

With the prescriptive meanings described above, how are *senpai-koohai* identities conceived of in particular situations? The most investigated site of *senpai-koohai* relationships is corporate culture. Based on her ethnographic study of a Japanese bank,
Nakane (1967/1972) interprets senpai-koohai relations as a hierarchy based on a gap in relevant experience and knowledge, manifested by the individuals’ difference in rank within the community. Nakane explains that, among colleagues, many factors, such as differences in age and year of entry or of graduation from school or college, contribute to a sense of senpai and koohai even among people with the same rank within an institution. The senpai is older, has worked longer, and has a higher rank than the koohai at the bank, and the senpai’s established position provides power to help his/her koohai. That is, based on the senpai’s greater experience and knowledge, a senpai is expected to contribute to the development of his or her koohai, while the koohai is expected to obey the senpai’s teaching. Similarly, Rohlen (1991), who reexamined Nakane’s (1967/1972) study, argues that knowledge exchange is part of an implicit agreement between the senpai and koohai. According to Davies and Ikeno (2002), their relationship continues for their lifetime. Ideally, the koohai’s feeling of gratitude to his/her senpai for help would motivate the koohai to return the favor by becoming a good senpai for someone younger, which constitutes the chain of senpai-koohai relationships among community members diachronically (Rohlen, 1991). At the same time, such senpai-koohai ties among members connect each member synchronically in a web to all other members.

Various studies have found that one recurring feature of Japanese hierarchical relationships is paternalism (e.g., Bennett & Ishio, 1963; Wagatsuma & DeVos, 1984; Wetzel, 1993), due to these relationships’ interdependency and continuity (Rohlen, 1991). For example, Bennett and Ishio (1963) characterize the oyabun-kobun “parent-child” relationship among members connect each member synchronically in a web to all other members.

---

8 This oyabun-kobun relationship does not refer to biological ties, but a tie at work that resembles the parent-child relationship.
the superior’s position and status in the community, inheritance of his prerogatives, his personal-social influence, and his power to distribute rewards to subordinates” (pp. 40–41). This paternalistic nature is characterized by two elements: A superior is justified in taking the role of control because of his superiority, and the superior is viewed as somehow responsible for his workers, and in some cases, even their families. This role overlaps with the role of a father, who traditionally is most likely to be the most educated among the family members, and who is also responsible for the other family members. These scholars’ work is based on their data from the mid 1940s, but even more recent work, such as that of Kondo (1990), also illustrates the paternalistic features of Japanese companies, as well as the company-as-family ideology. With her ethnographic study at a mid-size Japanese firm, Kondo (1990) shows how paternalistic managerial ideologies of Japanese corporate culture are introduced and reinforced to young employees through their participation in training offered at an outside training institution. One of the symbolic exercises of the training requires participants to walk in bare feet and sit with folded legs on gravel. The trainer, a paternal figure, explains that their pain is nothing in comparison to their mothers’ pain at their birth. The point of this training is to make the trainees realize the care their parents have provided, which is then connected to selfless devotion to the participants’ companies through the company-as-family ideology. This type of overlapping between family roles and institutional roles is said to derive from Confucian teachings of filial piety and respect for one’s elders, reinforced by the traditional paternal family system and formal civil law that made the father the chief of the household, with his authority inherited by the eldest son (Davies & Ikeno, 2002). The consciousness of hierarchical ranks is also manifested “in the patterns and practices of
daily conversation, in which a senior or an elderly man monopolizes the talk while those junior to them have the role of listener” (Nakane, 1972, p. 34).

The harmoniousness of relations within Japanese hierarchies is often highlighted as a difference between Western and Japanese hierarchical relationships. Wetzel’s (1993) term “vertical relationships,” avoiding the word “hierarchy,” is rationalized by an explanation that the kind of power relation in the West implied in the word “hierarchy” is not applicable to Japanese vertical relationships, which do not refer to the autonomous force of, for example, political power. In contrast, she maintains, Japanese vertical relationships can be considered as “fundamentally close and harmonious” (p. 396). Drawing from Wetzel (1993), Dunn (1996) also describes the Japanese ideal hierarchical relationship as one where “a superior benevolently takes care of subordinates who respond with loyalty, service, and respect” (p. 227). How, then, are harmonious yet hierarchical identities conceptually achieved and maintained in institutionalized settings? The very existence of the corporate training described by Kondo (1990) suggests the need for junior members to learn to accept certain teachings for the purpose of successful management of a company. When the senior members take a paternalistic role, the junior members’ role should be as one of the children in a family. Although a junior member may consider it beneficial to receive valuable information as knowledge, and conforming to a community’s expectations may guarantee solid standing as a good novice member,

---

9 In this dissertation, I choose to use “hierarchical relationship,” rather than “vertical relationship,” based on my observation that, at least to some extent, there are autonomous power relations between certain senpai and koohai in my data, characterized by such actions on the part of the senpai as intruding on a koohai’s turn and suspending a koohai’s authoritative power as a discussion leader. An examination of the nature of power, however, is beyond the scope of this dissertation.
what would be a psychological compensation to junior members for accepting the inferior roles in the community?

Nakane (1967/1972) points out that junior members exhibit a type of dependency called *amae* (Doi, 1971/1980,10 1986), or an infantile desire to be loved that is present “in all formal relationships” (1986, p. 126). Based on his observations as a psychiatrist, Doi (1971/1980, 1986) describes how human relations in Japan are motivated by needs for unconditional care. Similarly, Rohlen (1991) explains that the younger members accept and assume their own dependency, and this is what constitutes the foundation of the seniority-based relationship. As such, “affection and hierarchy, rather than contradictory, are understood as mutually reinforcing” (Rohlen, 1991, p. 23). *Amae* is not only the characteristic of a subordinate, but of a superior as well, who needs to demonstrate it by “unlimited endearment, protection, and support” (Kyogoku, 1987, p. 106). Therefore, good superiors would demonstrate that they are dependent on their subordinates, while ideal subordinates would reply with gestures of dependency on their superiors.

In a nutshell, *senpai-koohai* is considered a hierarchical relationship among members of a community based on the gap between members in the knowledge that is essential for the community (Nakane, 1967/1972; Rohlen, 1991). The relevant knowledge is an invaluable asset of seniors, and it must be transmitted to the next generation. A *senpai* provides knowledge and nurtures his or her *koohai* in order to contribute to the *koohai*’s development, while the *koohai* accepts the *senpai*’s teaching and respects the *senpai*, at least in an ideal picture. Their relationship is characterized as interdependency, in that they both rely on each other, harmoniously and with mutual

---

affection. The role of senpai overlaps with the role of father, while the role of koohai is viewed as similar to the child’s role.

Although knowledge of senpai-koohai relationships is considered essential for Japanese adults to have in order to communicate within a community, there are not many opportunities for younger generations to be exposed to these relationships, because the school system does not usually mix different grades in classes (Niyekawa, 1991). An exception to this is in high school and college clubs, official organizations for extracurricular activities such as sports and cultural practices, which are considered to be a suitable site for learning senpai-koohai relationships during the school years and prior to work (Davies & Ikeno, 2002; Dunn, 1996). Davies and Ikeno (2002) state that high schools, especially sports clubs, practice senpai-koohai relationships more strictly than colleges. The degree of exposure to hierarchical relationships varies among clubs, as well as among individuals. At sports clubs, it is usually the job of the koohais to clean club rooms and manage equipment for the senpais (Davies & Ikeno, 2002). In general, a large college, such as Dunn’s (1996, 1999) study site, tends to have more than one hundred official clubs. Although clubs are extracurricular activities and student participation in them is voluntary, most students belong to at least one (Dunn, 1996).

Dunn’s (1996, 1999) study is the first work to examine naturally occurring data of participants’ interaction in order to investigate college students’ senpai-koohai relationships. As part of a large comparison study between female college students and middle-aged women, her data include recordings from an English speech and debate club at a college. Dunn’s (1996) analyses of college students’ data aim to illustrate how

---

11 In 1994, there were close to six thousand students at the college (Dunn, 1996).
12 However, in high schools, there are clubs with mandatory participation.
students build solidarity and hierarchy by utilizing two speech styles in two situations, i.e., English speech at debate club meetings and their conversations at a casual pizza party. With the same data, Dunn (1999) analyzes how speakers express their intense emotions with the plain form. Her meeting data mainly consist of one person’s narratives, rather than multiparty interactions. Although I value her pioneering work, I believe in the importance of analyses of identity construction based on non-narrative interactions. This is because I conceive of identities as social meanings that are emergent from interactions, in which speakers not only claim their identities but also must negotiate their claimed identities with others throughout interactions. Especially because hierarchical identities are interrelational in nature, meaning that one person’s identity is constructed in relation to another’s, dyadic or multiparty interactions are indispensable for analyses. The difference in methods between Dunn’s (1996, 1999) and my research derives from methodological orientation. Dunn focuses on speakers’ agency and strategies based on her critique of traditional variationists’ views of styles as directly indicative of speakers’ social categories. As I use social constructionist approaches that conceive of identities as emergent from interaction, this dissertation requires multiparty interactions as data.

1.3 Goals of the study

As described at the beginning of this chapter, this dissertation aims to illustrate college students’ relations in light of senpai-koohai identities based on actual interaction. It fills a gap in studies investigating senpai-koohai relationships in practice; the gap is associated with the influence of an ideological notion that presumes hierarchical relations among speakers of different social statuses. To expand Dunn’s (1996, 1999) observation
that college students realize hierarchical relationships in monologic speech, this
dissertation uses data in which college students interact in the context of club activities.
By examining participants’ use of three linguistic forms considered salient features to
lead to senpai-koohai relations, the analyses show how senpai-koohai relations are
foregrounded and backgrounded in different situations. In conceptualizing different
situations, I utilize context as frame of talk (Goffman, 1974) that influences the meaning
of language forms. For the analysis of speech styles and address and reference terms, I
discuss how frames of talk influence the meaning of speech styles, and thus the
constructed identities. Goodwin and Duranti (1992) consider context in line with
Goffman’s (1974) frame of talk, in which participants treat certain behaviors as focal and
others as background. Focal events naturally include the content of interaction, which
becomes relevant in my third analysis, which looks into knowledge-based stances.

As the ethnographic information provided in Chapter 4 illustrates, the meeting
data of this dissertation come from a club in which corporate culture is reinforced
verbally and structurally, initiated by a founder whose goal for the club activities is to
prepare the members for their future workplaces. The members have opportunities to
interact with Japanese companies when fundraising for an event, as well as with general
audience members from outside of the school, who purchase tickets to attend the event,
as “customers.” Therefore, the participants are exposed to situations where they need to
conform to the hierarchical system of the corporate world outside of college. In the
meantime, the setting can be characterized as less formal in nature, compared to Dunn’s
(1996, 1999) data. The students’ choices of speech styles are a mixture of the masu and
the plain forms with frequent shifts, and there are many cases where participants use the
plain form toward their seniors. While the term *senpai* can be used as an address or reference term toward participants (Dunn, 1996; Rohlen, 1991), the participants in this research never address or refer to each other as *senpai* and *koohai* in my data; their *senpai-koohai* identities, when they are constructed, are implicit. In fact, the only time the participants ever mention *senpai* or *koohai* in the entire body of data is when the graduate student Okada-san mentions once that an outside supporter from a private company is *senpai* to the participants, meaning that the supporter is a college alumnus. However, the data suggest that the participants are constructed as *senpai* and *koohai* with respect to class levels, i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior.

These implicit identities require special treatment in investigation, because the use of linguistic forms such as address terms does not directly relate to *senpai-koohai* relations. Throughout the data, *senpai-koohai* relations are inferred indirectly by the use of linguistic and non-linguistic features together with other co-occurring features. This function of pointing to certain meanings with the mediation of context is called indexicality, which I use for the analyses. Studies on indexicality cover a broad area, and I introduce relevant information on indexicality in the next chapter.

In order to further describe my goals, it is helpful to mention what I do not aim to achieve with this study. First, I do not aim to conduct quantitative analysis on how often one participant uses the plain form to another of higher or lower class standing. Frequency matters when one form is used exclusively or significantly more to one social group. My data simply do not suggest that this is the case in this context. On the other hand, address and reference terms are used more categorically than speech styles. Therefore, I have supplemented my qualitative analysis with some quantitative analyses
in the section on address and reference terms. Even in these analyses, I do not assume that, say, a senior student always acts as a *senpai* to a freshman student. Although the class levels of all members are known to all participants and serve as constituents of *senpai-koohai* identities, two participants can have relationships that are both *senpai-koohai* and non-*senpai-koohai*, regardless of their class standing, and their identities can shift moment by moment. Second, in a related point, I do not investigate how social identities such as gender relate to *senpai-koohai* identities or the participants’ speech styles. Studies on interactions of *senpai-koohai* and other social identities are suited for quantitative analysis with large-scale data. My data would not serve well for this type of analysis. The strength of qualitative analysis for this study is that it enables the untangling of complex processes of identity construction as the consequence of participants’ claims and negotiations within interaction, through the close examination of moment-by-moment shifts of identities. Next, this study is not designed to make claims about the status of college students’ *senpai-koohai* identities in general. Each situation provides a different context to specify the meaning of *senpai-koohai*, and each community holds different norms about these identities. Finally, and for similar reasons, it is not my goal to provide all possible meanings of Japanese speech styles or address and reference terms with this data. This study serves as a case study to understand linguistic identity construction of *senpai-koohai* and Japanese linguistic practice in a specific situation, so that it contributes to our understandings of *senpai-koohai* relationships.

13 Hypothetically, it is possible that, for example, one freshman student’s knowledge of music may become relevant, and so may give that student the status of *senpai* in relation to a junior student.
The structure of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter 2 introduces the theoretical framework of the dissertation, an indexicality framework, along with relevant issues about indexicality based on social constructionist approaches. Chapter 3 summarizes previous issues around Japanese styles, as exemplary of how linguistic forms relate to, or do not relate to, identity construction. After describing the ethnographic information of the situation in which the data were collected and the methods of analysis in Chapter 4, I present my analyses in Chapters 5 to 7. Chapter 5 focuses on speech styles, while Chapter 6 focuses on address and reference terms. In Chapter 7, my focus shifts to stances, specifically, an epistemic stance of being a knowledgeable party. The overall results and their implications are discussed in the final, concluding chapter.

This dissertation addresses three main research questions:

1. In what contexts are senpai-koohai identities foregrounded, or not foregrounded, in students’ club meetings?

2. How do linguistic and non-linguistic features contribute to the construction of senpai-koohai identities?
   
   a. Does identity construction of senpai-koohai rely on speakers’ non-reciprocal use of the plain and masu forms?

   b. How do address and reference terms help constitute senpai-koohai relationships?

3. Is a senpai a knowledgeable party?
Chapter 2. INDEXICALITY

When we investigate the relationship between linguistic forms and senpai-koohai identities, we deal with the issue of how a linguistic form, which does not have any direct relationship with the identities, helps to point to (i.e., index) them. This is the very issue of indexicality. This chapter illustrates how the indexicality framework helps us to link language use to identity construction. I will first summarize issues around indexicality that are relevant to my study, and then I will briefly discuss how other studies view identity in relation to indexicality.

2.1 Premises of indexicality

Among studies that concern indexicality, frequently quoted is the definition by Lyons (1977, p. 106), which reads “some known or assumed connexion between a sign A and its significatum C such that the occurrence of A can be held to imply the presence or existence of C.” Borrowing Peirce’s (1955) analogy, indexicality is analogous to the phenomenon of “smoke meaning fire,” where smoke (a sign A) is associated with fire (its significatum C) even though there is no visible fire in its vicinity. As Duranti (1997, p. 17) interprets the analogy, “the actual smoke is connected, spatio-temporally and physically, to another, related, phenomenon and acquires ‘meaning’ from that spatio-temporal, physical connection.” The sign A in Lyon’s definition is called an “index,” and I call the significatum C “indexed meaning” in this study.

What connects an index to its indexed meaning? As early as Peirce (1955), it has been pointed out that it is context that connects an index and its indexed meaning. In his
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14 Ochs (1996, p. 432) also points out some concepts similar to indexicality, such as Goffman’s (1974) keys and frames and Gumperz’s (e.g., 1982) contextualization cues.
proposal of the trichotomy of signs (icons, symbols,\textsuperscript{15} and indexes), only indexes consistently need context in order to be understood. Prototypical examples of an index are deictics, which in general means a type of word that needs contextual information for hearers to comprehend what is being referred to, such as words that relate to persons (pronouns such as “I” and “you”), time (adverbs such as “now” and “then”), place (demonstratives such as “here” and “there”), and tense. The meaning of “I” can shift depending on who the speaker is. The moment of “now” is constantly shifting. Therefore, these deictic words are sometimes called “shifters” (e.g., Silverstein, 1976). As Hanks (1992) points out, the meanings of deictic words are speaker-centered, or egocentric. The word “here,” for example, denotes the area that is close to the speaker, but we do not know the location indicated by “here” unless we know where the speaker stands. Therefore, the meaning of a deictic word is intrinsically context-dependent.

The category of deixis can be broader. Levinson (1983, p. 54) includes “grammatical features tied directly to the circumstances of utterance.” Therefore, honorifics that indicate social relations fit his category of deixis, termed social deixis. However, his concept of deixis focuses on grammaticized expressions, but not the actual language use, which he considers to belong to the field of sociolinguistics. On the other hand, to Fillmore (1971/1975, p. 76), social deixis should “reflect or establish or [be] determined by certain realities of the social situation in which the speech act occurs”; thus it includes greetings and expressions of gratitude. In my interpretation, this means

\textsuperscript{15} An “icon” is a sign that resembles the signified entity, such as onomatopoetic words. A “symbol” is a word that is used for the propositional content, such as “dog.” The word “dog” does not relate to the way dogs are, but is used based on arbitrary assignment that is agreed upon by users of the English language. And, unlike indexes, its meaning does not change in context (unless it is used as a metaphor, which is an example of secondary iconicity, or secondary meaning).
that while the expression “you’re welcome” in English is generally considered the
response token to the gratitude expression “thank you,” its utterance with an ironic tone
along with the absence of a preceding “thank you” may mean a request for the expression
of gratitude.

Indeed, in language practice, indexes are not limited to deixis. Hanks (2001)
views indexicality as “the pervasive context-dependency of natural language utterances”
(p. 119), such that the interpretation of a word requires contextual information. This is in
line with Wittgenstein’s (1921/1972, p. 51) philosophy of language that holds the context
principle, i.e., that “only in the context of a proposition has a name meaning.” The view
that the meaning of a linguistic form is not fixed but open-ended and determined in
context is further elaborated by Garfinkel’s work on ethnomethodology (1972, p. 306), in
which “ways of speaking are essentially indexical (like pronouns), in the sense that part
of their meaning and intelligibility always will lie in the situation.” Similarly, Ochs
(1990, 1993, 1996) proposes that the socializing function of a language is achieved by
both the propositional content of a linguistic form that can be found in a dictionary and its
indexed meaning(s) that implies norms of the community about how the form should be
interpreted. But how does context influence the process of meaning creation?

Silverstein (1976) contributes to conceptualizing indexicality as a dynamic system
of meaning creation, providing a model of how context is involved in the process of
creating meaning. In his indexicality framework, context is no longer an outside
influence on the semantic properties of a word. The meaning of a word is specified with
the help of relevant contextual features. Here, context is not limited to the verbal
environment of an utterance. As Goodwin and Duranti (1992, p. 3) describe it, context
means “a frame (Goffman, 1974) that surrounds the event being examined and provides resources for its appropriate interpretation.” For Goffman, a frame is the “organization of experience” (1974, p. 11), by which participants’ understanding of what is going on is influenced during any moment or period of an event. When we view context in this sense, it includes the physical situation of the event, shared knowledge among the participants, previous related events, and co-occurring features (linguistic or non-linguistic), among other elements. These features of the context that together contribute to the indexed meaning can be called collocational forms (Ochs, 1990) or the constellation of features in indexicality (Auer, 2007; Gumperz, 1982). In Ochs (1990), for example, copula deletion in English (“That Ø bad”) may mean the addressee could be a child, foreigner, patient, or elderly person. When an English speaker uses a high pitch level along with copula deletion, it may index that the addressee is a child. In accordance with Goodwin and Duranti’s inclusion of previous related events in context, Ochs (1990) points out that indexicality can also recontextualize the past to the present, and precontextualize the future. What links a linguistic form and the indexed meaning is discourse, “a set of norms, preferences, and expectations relating language to context, which speaker-hearers draw on and modify in producing and making sense out of language in context” (Ochs, 1990, p. 289). This is similar to the function of grammar that regulates how to form sentences. For example, a linguistic form may evoke situational dimensions of social rank, as if they are connected with “chemical valence” (Ochs, 1996).
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16 Goffman (1974) suggests two ways to connect participants’ experience and its meaning: keys and fabricates. While keying is an established interpretation of the meaning, fabricating is manipulation of the meaning, such as when a magician makes the audience believe his magic. And, as Ochs (1996) explains, keying is a type of indexing.
p. 417); a link is created and enforced through a history of usage of the form and cultural expectations of the community through discourse (Ochs, 1996).

The context-dependency of indexicality entails that the meaning of a linguistic form is unspecified prior to the indexicality process (Ochs, 1990). Unspecified meanings of a linguistic form may result in phenomena where a form can index different meanings by drawing on different contextual features, which is well attested with cases of unsuccessful communication, such as those that constitute Gumperz’s (1982) crosstalk and Blommaert’s (2007) polycentricity. Blommaert considers unsuccessful communication from the perspective that speakers are influenced by different evaluative authorities. On the other hand, Ochs (1996) suggests that Searle’s (1969) and Gumperz’s crosstalk describes cases of indexical breakdown, i.e., the mismatch between an illocutionary act (the performer’s intended act) and a perlocutionary act (others’ interpretation of the act). Although phenomena of miscommunication are treated differently by Blommaert and Gumperz, who view them through distinct frameworks, they are essentially the same type of phenomena.

Silverstein (1976) proposes two types of indexicality functions, illustrated in Figure 2.1. One is referential vs. nonreferential functions, and the other is presupposing vs. creative or performative functions. An axis of referential vs. nonreferential functions indicates “a measure of the independence of indexes from the semantic-referential mode of communication” (p. 35). Referential function can pinpoint an anaphoric category of an index, such as the word “I,” which usually refers to the speaker in oral communication. Non-referential indexes do not have such concrete meanings that are inherent to the word. An axis of presupposing vs. creative or performative functions refers to “a measure of the
independence of indexes from every other signaling medium and mode in speech events” (p. 36). The more contextual features involved in an indexicality process, the more we need to draw on the creative nature of indexes. For example, in Figure 2.1, the label “Dyirbal ‘mo-in-law’ lexicon,” under the presupposing index category, refers to the existence in Dyirbal, a language in Northern Queensland, Australia, of two sets of vocabulary, an “everyday” set and a “mother-in-law” set. The latter set is used only when the speaker’s mother-in-law or an equivalent is present. It is relatively presuppositional because it needs a contextual factor, the presence or absence of the mother-in-law in the audience, for the meaning to be understood.

![Figure 2.1: Silverstein’s functional characteristics of indexes (1976, p. 36)](image)

The mapping of the examples and the categories in Figure 2.1 is not meant to be fixed. Any indexes have two functional modes, referential vs. non-referential and presupposing.
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17 Silverstein (1976) draws this phenomenon from Dixon (e.g., 1972).
vs. creative. However, in general, the “deference indexes of speaker-hearer relations,”
which are most closely related to this study of senpai-koohai and Japanese speech styles,
can be categorized as creative, non-referential indexes. The meaning of deference
indexes is established not only by the interaction taking place, but also by “the social
relations of the individuals in the roles of speaker and hearer, speaker and audience, or
speaker and referent” (Silverstein, 1976, p. 36). In addition, a piece of linguistic form
may be the only overt sign of the contextual parameter that implies deference (Silverstein,
1976, p. 34). The analysis of deference indexes, therefore, needs careful examination of
both the index and its context.

Silverstein (1976) also emphasizes the need for analyses based on naturally
occurring data. There is a limit to native speakers’ awareness (Silverstein, 1981),
mentioned in Chapter 1, especially of “nonsegmental, non-referential, relatively creative
formal features, which have no metapragmatic reality” for native speakers (Silverstein,
1976, p. 49). This means that the analysis of such features needs sensitive observation
and comparative illumination of referential and nonreferential functions of indexicality
based on naturally occurring data (Silverstein, 1976), such as the data of this research.

2.2 Indexing identities

As early as Abercrombie (1967), identities have been considered as indexed
meanings. In his work on phonetics, Abercrombie observes that voice quality and
paralinguistic features indicate membership in a group, characterize the individual, and
reveal changing states of the speaker. Drawing on this, Lyons (1977) develops two
subclasses of an index that relates to identities: individual-identifying and group-
identifying indices. In a different tradition, Labov’s (1972) ground-breaking sociolinguistic, variationist study on postvocalic /r/ in New York demonstrated that its presence and absence indicated the speakers’ evaluation of their own and their audience’s social positions.

In the approaches to indexicality that consider meaning creation as a dynamic process, the mechanical association between a linguistic feature and identities as its indexed meaning has been problematized. Ochs (1993), for example, criticizes correlational studies in sociolinguistics that assume social identities as *a priori* givens. Similar critiques can be found in other frameworks, such as Cameron’s (1990) critical perspective that disapproves of traditional variationist views that consider society as a homogeneous, monolithic, and transparent entity, and language users as pre-programmed autonoma. For example, although postvocalic /r/ could be considered prestigious in New York City (Labov, 1972), instances of an individual’s use of the feature do not necessarily reflect his or her social status. In fact, Labov (1972) utilizes Mills’s (1951/2002) observation: “salesgirls in large department stores tend to borrow prestige from their customers, or at least make an effort in that direction” (Labov, 1972, p. 45). This suggests that the salesgirls control at least two modes of language use, one of their own and the other borrowed and prestigious, which is assumed to be connected with the presence of /r/. This assumption derives from the salesgirls’ treatment of the prestige community that stereotypically uses /r/ as a monolithic entity. Ironically, however, their own language practice, according to Mills (1951/2002), is non-monolithic. One contribution of correlational studies is that they provide evidence for our understanding of the ideological link between speakers and their social categories. Critiques of
correlational studies are directed toward the confusion between this ideological treatment of a community as monolithic and the reality of the community as diverse (e.g., Cameron, 1990). In the same vein, Kroskrity (2001, p. 107) states that, in practice, “most of these different types of identity are neither exclusive nor singular.”

As contemporary variationists (e.g., the Third Wave) consider identities as multiple and situationally emergent (e.g., Eckert, 2001), recent qualitative studies have established the view that speakers’ identities are not a priori given, but fluid and emergent from interaction. For example, Kroskrity (2001) defines identity as “the linguistic construction of membership in one or more social groups or categories” (p. 106). In this definition, identity is not conceptualized as a social category that one belongs to, but as a category that emerges from interaction where one is constructed as a member of the category at that moment. This treatment of identity is built upon social constructionist theories that view our reality as socially constructed (Burr, 1995). Building upon Gergen (1985), Burr (1995, pp. 3–5) characterizes social constructionist approaches as involving four premises: (1) a critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge; (2) historical and cultural specificity; (3) a link between knowledge and social processes; and (4) a link between knowledge and social action. The connection between identities and their expected linguistic and non-linguistic behavior is a type of “knowledge,” in Burr’s sense. In other words, it is culturally specific “knowledge” that labels an identity onto an individual based on his or her social action taking place at a certain moment. Therefore, one’s identity is a social construct based upon people’s belief that defines how a certain social action relates to the identity. Ochs (1990, 1993, 1996) takes this social constructionist view and emphasizes the importance in analysis of
ethnographic “knowledge” among community members, because it forms “the interlocutors’ understandings of conventions for doing particular social acts and stances and the interlocutors’ understandings of how acts and stances are resources for structuring particular social identities” (Ochs, 1993, p. 289). Ochs (1993) proposes a list of three minimal conditions for social identities to take hold in interaction:

(a) whether the speaker and other interlocutors share cultural and linguistic conventions for constructing particular acts and stances;
(b) whether the speaker and other interlocutors share economic, political, or other social histories and conventions that associate those acts and stances with the particular social identity a speaker is trying to project; and
(c) whether other interlocutors are able and willing or are otherwise constrained to ratify the speaker’s claim to that identity. (p. 290)

Drawing on Ochs (1993) and Silverstein (1985), Bucholtz and Hall (2005) view identities as something that emerges through four related indexical processes: “(a) overt mention of identity categories and labels; (b) implicatures and presuppositions regarding one’s own or other’s identity position; (c) displayed evaluative and epistemic orientations to ongoing talk, as well as interactional footings and participant roles; and (d) the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups” (p. 594). Identities may constantly be shifting “both as interaction unfolds and across discourse contexts” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 606).

18 What Bucholtz and Hall call “evaluative and epistemic orientation” seems to represent Ochs’s (1993, p. 288) “stance,” which is “a display of a socially recognized point of view or attitude,” which Ochs (1996) further categorizes into affective and epistemic stances.
Therefore, investigations of identities through indexicality frameworks need to give due attention to interaction.

Because the definition of identities varies in different studies, it is important to specify what types of identities I investigate in this research. Zimmerman (1998) proposes three types of identities: discourse identities (relating to conversational machinery, e.g., “current speaker”), transferrable identities that can be easily drawn on in different situations (e.g., age, gender, race), and situated identities. Situated identities link local activities to “standing social arrangements and institutions through the socially distributed knowledge participants have about them” (Zimmerman, 1998, p. 95). Thus, situated identities rely on extra-situational knowledge, or “distal context” in Zimmerman’s term, that prescribes how the identity is supposed to act in a particular situation. Drawing on Zimmerman’s categorization, I treat *senpai-koohai* as situational identities in my dissertation, based on my observation of the data in which relationships among participants constantly shift with situations.
Chapter 3. JAPANESE SPEECH STYLES

The purpose of this chapter is to briefly summarize relevant studies of Japanese speech styles and to critically review issues around the connection between speakers’ use of speech styles and hierarchical identities, which include senpai-koohai relations. First, I delineate what the plain and the masu forms are in terms of their morphological characteristics and the received accounts of their meaning differences in relation to hierarchical identities. Then, I introduce recent developments in studies based on the analysis of naturally occurring data that oppose the received accounts.

3.1 Traditional accounts of Japanese speech styles

The masu and the plain forms, the target speech styles of this dissertation, consist of various clause-ending forms. As shown in Table 3.1, modified from Cook (2008a, p. 36), the general characteristic of the masu form is the presence of a morpheme mas or a copula des (both of which are underlined in Table 3.1), while the plain form is characterized by their absence. Variations of mas and des are mashi and deshi, respectively.

\[\text{[Table 3.1]}\]

19 A speaker can choose to avoid the choice of speech styles by using a gerund of the plain form, because an incomplete form does not have to define the relationship (Cook, 2006). The plain form gerund is the unmarked speech style. Because the gerunds of the masu form, mashite and deshite, are very formal, their occurrence is rare in non-professional oral conversation. In my casual observation, the adjectival gerund -i deshite rarely occurs in daily conversation.
TABLE 3.1: Three clause types and gerunds in the *masu* and plain forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>Masu form</th>
<th>Plain form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb [V]</td>
<td>stem + mas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past</td>
<td>V stem -mas-u</td>
<td>V stem -(r) u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past, NEG</td>
<td>V stem -mas-en</td>
<td>V stem -nai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>V stem -mashi-ta</td>
<td>V stem -ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past, NEG</td>
<td>V stem -mas-en-deshi-ta</td>
<td>V stem -nakat-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>V stem -mashi-te</td>
<td>V stem -(t) e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective [A]</td>
<td>stem + copula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past</td>
<td>A stem -i-des-u</td>
<td>A stem -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past, NEG</td>
<td>A stem -ku-ari-mas-en/</td>
<td>A stem -ku-nai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A stem -ku-nai-des-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>A stem -kat-ta-des-u</td>
<td>A stem -kat-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past, NEG</td>
<td>A stem -ku-ari-mas-en</td>
<td>A stem -ku-nakat-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-deshi-ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>A stem -i-deshi-te</td>
<td>A stem -kute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal [N]</td>
<td>[N] + copula</td>
<td>[N] (+ copula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past</td>
<td>des-u</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past, NEG</td>
<td>ja-ari-mas-en/</td>
<td>ja-nai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ja-nai-des-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>deshi-ta</td>
<td>dat-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past, NEG</td>
<td>ja-ari-mas-en-deshi-ta</td>
<td>ja-nakat-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ja-nakat-ta-des-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>deshi-te</td>
<td>de/na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- NEG means a negative form.
- A copula *da* in the plain form of a nominal is optional.

---

20 A gerund form is a pre-verbal, tentative form (Jorden, 1963).
While the referential meanings are identical for both forms, the local understanding of their differences lies in their social meanings. One way of learning the local understandings of Japanese language users is to look at the language planner’s account of the language, since it influences descriptions of the language in textbooks for Japanese schools (Wetzel, 2004). The *Bunka Shingikai Kokugo Bunkakai* “Subdivision on National Language of the Council for Cultural Affairs,” a committee specializing in national language matters that is part of the *Bunka Choo* “Agency for Cultural Affairs,” consolidated their account of honorifics in *Keego no Shishin* “Guidelines for Honorific Expressions” in 2007, in response to consultation with the *Monbu Kagaku Shoo* “Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology.” Their term for the *masu* form is *teeneego* ‘polite language’ (Wetzel, 2004), which is defined as “something for careful” speech toward the listener and the reader.” *Teeneego* is a constituent of the *keego* ‘honorifics’ system. The guidelines also make a contrast between the *masu* and the plain forms with the terms *kee-tai* ‘honorific style’ and *joo-tai* ‘common style.’ As these terms suggest, the sense of *teenee* is intertwined with the *masu* form, and the *masu* form is differentiated from the plain form as an honorific style. These terms derive from

---

21 This committee consists of not only Japanese language researchers from colleges, but also people with other professions such as high school principal, kabuki actor, novel writer, and dialect advisor for TV dramas. It also has a subcommittee specifically for *keego* ‘honorifics’, in which Japanese language researchers meet and discuss solely *keego* issues.

22 The original definition in Japanese is *hanashi ya bunshoo no aite ni taishite teenee ni noberu mono*. Because of my view that *teenee* here means careful observation of norms, rather than politeness, I translate it as ‘careful’.

23 Due to differences in romanization systems, it is more often spelled *keigo*.

24 Tsujimura (1992) points out that the origins of *teeneego* were various forms of referent honorifics. In addition, according to Tsujimura, an influential *kokugagaku* scholar, Motoki Tokieda, considers *teeneego* as the real *keego* that directly expresses the speakers’ *keei* ‘respect’, while other referent honorifics do not. Instead, referent honorifics indicate the speakers’ recognition of social relationships with the interactants (Tsujimura, 1992, p. 598).

25 Tsujimura (1992) explains that *kee-tai* ends with *desu, masu*, and *de arimasu*, while *joo-tai* ends with *da* and *de aru*. 

---
the *kokugogaku* ‘[Japanese] national language studies’ tradition. Although the analysis of *keego* varies across different *kokugogaku* traditions, the categorization of the *masu* form as a part of *teeneego* is salient among *kokugogaku* scholars who have influenced Japanese language planners, notably, Hashimoto (1935, quoted in Wetzel, 2004) who contributed to textbook accounts of *keego* for Japanese pupils (Wetzel, 2004), and Oishi (1975) whose account “represents the academic institutionalization of the received analysis” of *keego* (Wetzel, 2004, p. 31).

Linguists outside Japan have taken a similar view as the traditional Japanese view that conceives of the *masu* form as polite language when they consider the *masu* form as part of honorific language. Japanese honorifics are generally divided into two categories, i.e., referent honorifics and addressee honorifics. The *masu* form is the latter.26 Due to its inclusion in *keego*, the *masu* form is commonly deemed a type of speech27 associated with politeness (Comrie, 1976; Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Niyekawa, 1991), formality (Jorden, 1963; Martin, 1964), or being distanced (Jorden & Noda, 1987).

Direct association between the *masu* form and politeness is also prevalent in recent studies. Most notably, Brown and Levinson (1978/1987), whose work on politeness in pragmatics has been influential, treat the Japanese honorific system as one of the addressee honorific systems, i.e., “direct encodings of speaker-addressee relationship, independent of the referential content of the utterance” (p. 276). Their view of politeness as a universal phenomenon has been influential in studies concerning politeness, but it also has encountered opposition. Ide (1989; Ide & Yoshida, 1999)

---

26 This categorization matches that of Tokieda’s 1941 work, discussed by Wetzel (2004), in the *kokugogaku* ‘national language studies’ tradition.
27 Depending on the researcher, the polite form may be considered style (Martin, 2004), language (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987), or register (Agha, 1998, 2002).
opposes Brown and Levinson’s view of politeness as a speaker’s strategy that is universal across cultures, and claims that, in Japanese, politeness is achieved through *wakimae* ‘discernment’, not based solely on strategic volition as Brown and Levinson propose. According to Ide’s notion of discernment, Japanese society holds normative expectations regarding the choice between the plain style and the honorific style (which includes the *masu* form) so that the choice of a speech style suits the situational and/or social context. To Ide, the use of honorifics in certain situations is “socio-pragmatically obligatory” (1989, p. 227). In Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki and Ogino (1986), Japanese and American students responded to a task that asks them how they would request a pen from different interactants. Japanese participants choose the *masu* form over the plain form for interactants such as professors, and the plain form for their mothers and close friends. In contrast, the authors observed no clear distinctions in the forms used by American students. Matsumoto (1988, 1989) also criticizes Brown and Levinson’s claim that politeness is universal, arguing that Japanese speakers are forced to choose an honorific form when they refer to the action of their teacher, for example. Therefore, their obligatory choice is not in accordance with the face work that Brown and Levinson presume. Essentially, however, the association of the *masu* form and politeness has never been questioned in any of the frameworks of Ide and her colleagues or of Matsumoto.

In response to these scholars’ proposals of obligatory honorific use, words of caution are raised in various studies. Watts (1992, 2003) and Pizziconi (2003) point out that Ide’s notion of discernment is not unique to the Japanese language. Watts (2003) claims that *wakimae* ‘discernment’ is a socioculturally determined behavior to establish or maintain harmonious human relationships during the course of interaction, which he
terms “politic behaviour.” He maintains that politic behavior is universal, and can be observed in the West. Only the understanding of what constitutes politic behavior is culturally specific, and that is prescribed at a metapragmatic level. Ide’s notion of the cultural specificity of wakimae ‘discernment’ lies in, Watts contends, the folk notion of politeness. In the same vein, Agha (2002, p. 21) investigates honorifics of different languages and defines an honorific system as a system of registers in which linguistic tokens are “linked by their uses to stereotypes of honor or respect.” In my interpretation, Agha’s “stereotypes” and Watts’s “folk notions” are equivalent to what Silverstein (1979, p. 193) calls linguistic ideologies, i.e., “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use.” Their proposals entail that, despite speakers’ stereotypical views on honorifics, the meaning of honorifics is not fixed; the meanings they are believed to have may be deviated from in practice. In line with Silverstein’s (1979) observation that linguistic investigation tends to rely too much on native ideologies of language use, Okamoto (1997) critically examines Japanese women’s use of interactional particles and honorifics; these linguistic forms are loaded with hegemonic linguistic and gender ideology. She finds that, for example, beliefs that women tend to use honorifics are not always borne out in practice. As Cook (2006) rightly points out, inquiry-based studies, such as that of Hill et al. (1986), which asks participants to report on how they would request a pen from a professor or a close friend, indeed are asking participants about their linguistic ideology. The confusion between speakers’ judgment “about what constitutes an appropriate social behavior in a particular situation” (Okamoto, 1997, p. 811) and their actual language use can lead to a methodological flaw (Wetzel, 2004). Researchers
should be cautious about this issue, because one attested function of linguistic ideologies is that speakers deem their notions about language as not only central but commonsensical, although they frequently distort the reality to the extent that they hinder other notions (Woolard, 1998).

The association of the polite and casual dichotomy with the two speech styles that is shared by some Japanese linguists and *kokugogaku* ‘[Japanese] national language studies’ is inseparable from the issue of linguistic ideologies of *keego*, Japanese honorifics. Currently, *keego* is loaded with linguistic ideologies due to its historical development (Wetzel, 2004). The status of *masu* in relation to *keego* was first established by Yamada’s (1924/1931) grammar of *keego* (Miller, 1994; Wetzel, 2004). Yamada’s and other scholars’ treatment of *keego* as a “refined custom of deference for us Japanese” (Oishi et al., 1983, quoted by Wetzel, 2004, p. 21) reinforces the tie between honorifics and politeness (Wetzel, 2004). Miller (1994) also observes that *keego* was used as a political tool to represent the cultural superiority of Japan in relation to colonized cultures during Japan’s expansionist period, a political movement that affected language researchers in Japan. In this historical context, being *teenee* has been used as a positive evaluation of both the Japanese and their language. As early as Yamada (1924/1931), the word *teenee* has been part of the denoted meaning of *keego*. The ideology of *teenee* has been reinforced whenever speakers use the term *teenee-go*, as *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1991/1982).28 Other meanings of the *masu* form are hindered by the dominant meaning

---

28 Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus* (1991/1982) means a set of dispositions that is “acquired through a gradual process of inculcation,” and it generates “practices, perceptions and attitudes which are ‘regular’ without being consciously co-ordinated or governed by any ‘rule’” (p. 12). The act of calling the *masu* form *teenee-tai* generates, justifies, and reinforces the ideological link between the form and *teenee*. 
of politeness,\textsuperscript{29} which becomes the common-sense meaning through speakers’ practices around the use of the term.

Recognizing that degrees of politeness are assigned to the two linguistic forms as a type of linguistic ideology (Silverstein, 1979), rather than being their overarching meanings, I call the two forms the \textit{masu} form and the plain form\textsuperscript{30} in this dissertation.

The gap between the stereotypical meanings and actual practices for the two forms may be adequately captured in studies of identities, which are introduced in the next section.

3.2 Japanese speech styles and identities

\textit{Keego no Shishin} “Guidelines of Honorific Expressions” (\textit{Bunka Shingikai Kokugo Bunkakai}, 2007) by Japanese language planners treats \textit{keego} as a language practice that is in accordance with Japanese hierarchical relationships that are omnipresent in the society, and as the manifestation of peoples’ respect toward each other. The consequence of considering \textit{teenee} or politeness as the meaning of the \textit{masu} form is that it is treated as the form to be used for a higher status person than the speaker, as a gesture made to show the speaker’s politeness. In line with this prescriptive use, Ide’s discernment framework assumes that identities of the speakers are fixed and \textit{a priori}

\begin{itemize}
\item In my view, the Japanese word \textit{teenee} is not equivalent to the English meaning of politeness, although \textit{teenee} is treated as an equivalent of being polite (Hill et al. 1986). While politeness is considered a characteristic of interpersonal behavior (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1987), \textit{teenee} does not necessarily require interpersonal behavior, and it may describe carefulness in people’s work. Just as we can say \textit{teenee ni hanasu} ‘speak politely’, we can also say \textit{teenee ni kuruma o naosu} ‘fix a car carefully’ or \textit{teenee ni gurasu o tsutsumu} ‘wrap a glass carefully’. It concerns the actor’s careful observation of appropriate procedure, rather than showing politeness to others. The absence of being \textit{teenee} is associated with inappropriateness of the act, but not casualness. The opposing term would be \textit{zatsu} ‘rough’, such as \textit{zatsu ni naosu} ‘fix roughly’, and implies negative evaluation toward the behavior.
\item I choose not to call the plain form the \textit{da} form due to the absence of the copula \textit{da} in verbal and adjectival clauses, as well as the frequent omission of the copula in nominal clauses.
\end{itemize}
given in Japanese society, and that the speaker essentially does not have choice in selecting speech styles in a situation. This treatment of identities as fixed is not unique to the discernment framework, but is present in various studies (e.g., Comrie, 1976; Kuno, 1973).

Politeness as the dominant meaning of the *masu* form also relates to the image of high status and being refined, another recurring characterization of the *masu* form. Originally, *desu*, the *masu* form copula, was a marker of the urban speech style of former samurai and wealthy merchants in the late 19th century (Wetzel, 2004). The social constructionist approach conceives of identity as a historical construct (Burr, 1995), and indeed the images of prestige and urban culture adhere to *desu*, reinforcing hegemonic ideology that contrasts the *masu* form with the plain form.

### 3.3 Meanings of the *masu* and the plain form found in naturally occurring data

Analyzing naturally occurring data has been shown to be an alternative method of investigation that effectively captures the meanings of the speech styles in practice. In opposition to prescriptive views, research indicates that non-reciprocal speech styles are not necessarily used consistently between people with different social statuses and roles, such as a college instructor and a student during academic consultation sessions (Cook, 2006), a former professor and a student (Okamoto, 1999), an interviewer and an interviewee during a TV program (Ikuta, 2008), a customer and a sales clerk (Okamoto, 1998), a host mother and an exchange student during home-stay (Cook, 2008a), a caretaker and a child (Cook, 1997), and senior and junior faculty members at school meetings (Geyer, 2008a, 2008b). Two types of observations are involved here. One is
where interactants’ identities are sustained in one situation even though their uses of styles are not consistently non-reciprocal, and the other is where interactants’ identities shift within a situation, and this shift in part is indicated by different speech style use. In the case of the customer–sales clerk interaction described by Okamoto (1998), for example, their statuses are maintained during the interaction even though the sales clerk uses the plain form to the customer. In this case, different degrees of closeness are negotiated between the two interactants of different statuses. In an example of shifting identities within a situation, Cook (2008a) demonstrates that, during a plain-form based interaction, some host parents use the masu form when they teach Japanese culture to an exchange student. How can we account for the phenomenon of interactants’ identities shifting even within one situation?

In terms of statuses of identities, Cook (2006) analyzes speech style use based on social constructionist views (e.g., Bucholtz & Hall, 2005), which assume that social identities are created and negotiated in social interaction. In these views, speakers are not passively observant of social expectations, but have the agency to take an active role in making choices of linguistic forms. Their identities are constructed through interaction with other participants; therefore, their identities are fluid and may differ moment-by-moment, even among the same interactants or within the same situation. In Cook’s study (2008) of host mother–exchange student interactions, some host mothers sometimes use the voice (Bakhtin, 1981) of teacher, which is indexed by the use of the masu form. The question is what social meanings of the masu form can point to the teaching role.

To answer the question, Cook (1997, 2008a) utilizes Ochs’s indexicality framework (1990, 1993, 1996) in which social meanings, including identities, are
indexed with the mediation of context. A linguistic form directly indexes stances and acts, and the stances and acts further point to identities. Cook (1997, 2008a) proposes that the central meaning of the *masu* form is self-presentational stance, that is, an affective stance that indicates “the self which presents an on-stage display of a positive social role to the addressee” (Cook, 2008a, p. 46). The self-presentational stance is what Japanese would call *shisee o tadasu* ‘to hold oneself up’; this is literally the posture elementary school pupils are disciplined to take before class starts. The speaker’s self-presentational stance may mean that the speaker is in charge of the situation, such as being a parent at home, a knowledgeable party as a teacher, and a presenter on a TV show, depending on the context. A self-presentational stance may also mean the speaker is lower status and is showing a good self image to the other interactant in a non-reciprocal exchange of *masu* and plain forms. All of these social identities are constructed in part via self-presentational stance because display of self-presentational stance is “indicative of a responsible or good social persona in Japanese society” (Cook, 2008a, p. 47). For example, pupils at an elementary school use the *masu* form when they present their opinions during a *happyoo* ‘presentation’ activity (Cook, 1996b), but when they are “out-of-role,” they use the plain form. When a speaker uses a self-presentational stance (Cook 2008a, 2008b), it can index that the speaker’s role is spot-lighted in a sociocultural context of “on-stage.” This analysis is in line with others’ findings about the meanings of the *masu* form, such as that it is indicative of *omote* style, which is a “disciplined, socially aware style” (Dunn, 1999); of psychological distance (Ikuta, 2008); or of a speaker’s awareness of being heard (Maynard, 1991). When a pupil presents in class, his role as a presenter is indexed by the self-presentational stance as the spot-
lighted role in class, which is conceptually distanced from other students’ roles (Cook, 1996). It can also be considered as an act deviating from the usual in-group activities, but still treated as an official activity in class. Simultaneously, his stance also indexes his polite act, his “good social persona,” because his act is in accordance with the politeness code presumed in the community.

Geyer (2008a) investigates the function of the masu form as used in a faculty meeting, and finds that it often draws the boundary of topics, such as when the leader of the discussion uses the masu form to introduce a new topic. In my interpretation, this is compatible with Cook’s (2008a) proposal, in that the discussion leader is “in-role” to set the boundary of topics.

One puzzling issue is how to treat diverse uses of the plain form, which appears in contexts that range from written articles in the newspaper to oral disputes between two interactants. Maynard (1991) points out that the plain form functions differently with and without interactional particles, and observes that interactional particles add meaning to the plain form. She claims that the plain form with interactional particles is used when the speaker’s stance is deliberately addressed to the listener in conversation. For example, in her data, the speaker’s shift from a plain form that is not accompanied with interactional particles to a plain form with an interactional particle yo is observed when she shifts from self-directed speech to talk delivered to her friend. Based on Maynard’s observation, Cook (1998, 2006, 2008b) utilizes Ochs’s indexicality framework to consider interactional particles as affect keys to index various affective stances, which relate the speaker’s mood and emotion. Together with affect keys, the plain form “foregrounds the speaker’s affecting stance toward the addressee or the content of talk.”
(Cook, 1998, p. 104). Besides interactional particles, affect keys include prosodic features (e.g., pitch use and vowel lengthening), and form variations such as coalescence (shortened form of speech; Cook, 2006) and postposing\(^31\) (Dunn, 1999). Based on the observation that the presence of these affect keys changes the social meaning of the plain form, Cook (2006) calls the plain form accompanied by these affect keys the “non-naked plain form,” and the plain form that lacks such keys the “naked plain form.”

Because the non-use of affect keys with the plain form is devoid of affective stance, the naked plain form directs and foregrounds the referential content of an utterance, and it can be a highly detached speech style. In consequence, the naked plain form is used for content- or information-based utterances, such as in the enumeration of items on a list, or in newspaper articles. The naked plain form is also observed to be used to present information subordinate to a larger information structure. Makino (2002) points out, with his analysis of written texts, that the main body of the information is presented officially in the *masu* form, so it resembles talk toward an outsider. On the other hand, when items that are subordinate to the main body of information are presented in the naked plain form, the utterance indexes low awareness of the addressee, and thus resembles unofficial talk that is directed toward the speaker himself or herself. His observation is in line with the work of Maynard (1991), who finds that, in oral conversation, the naked plain form is used for self-directed speech. Other content-based types of speech are when a TV interviewer uses the naked plain form for summarizing the content of the interviewee’s utterances (Ikuta, 2008), or a student uses it for summarizing his teacher’s utterance during an academic consultation (Cook, 2006). The

\(^{31}\) This is the postposing of grammatical elements. For example, if an OVS sentence is used in an SOV language it shows the post-positioning of the subject.
naked plain form in effect is treated as the unmarked use (Myers-Scotton, 1993) of the
plain form because of its function of content presentation, which contributes to
accomplishing conversational goals for both interactants.

In sum, the analyses that claim that the *masu* form indexes politeness cannot
adequately account for the meanings of the speech styles present in naturally occurring
data. Although native speakers are often not conscious of different uses of the plain and
the *masu* forms due to the effect of dominant linguistic ideologies, various meanings of
the speech styles are used to accomplish conversational goals.
Chapter 4. DATA AND METHOD OF ANALYSIS

4.1 The movie club at a Japanese university

4.1.1 Demographic information for the movie club

The movie club in this study is a student club at a large Japanese university in an urban area of Hokkaidoo, Japan. According to the club website, the club was established several years before the period of fieldwork, when a graduate student, Okada-san, gathered some students to initiate a student-led movement for establishing a movie theater on campus. Since the ultimate goal of the club is to launch an on-campus movie theater, advertising the club to the public has become a key activity that provides experience for the members, as well as gaining the public support necessary for the club to achieve its goal. Among various club activities, such as taking field trips to movie events and showing movies on campus, the most significant is their own annual movie event (hereafter the “movie event”), which is like a small film festival during which several movies are shown over a period of four days, along with entertainment and talks by invited speakers. The dates of the event coincide with Culture Day on November 3rd, i.e., Japan’s national holiday for celebrating culture, when various cultural events happen. In preparation, the club members hold meetings in order to plan how to collect funds from local companies, invite speakers, sell tickets, and screen and select the movies, among other things.

The club’s mission and activities are intertwined with Japanese corporate culture, which influences the participants’ acts and roles. The structure of the club roles

---

32 All names used in the dissertation are pseudonyms, which have been chosen to reflect participants’ ways of addressing or referring to each other. For example, the graduate student is consistently called by his family name plus a suffix –san. Therefore, for him I use a pseudonymous Japanese family name, Okada, with the suffix –san.
resembles that of companies. The president (whom participants call “Cap,” the abbreviated form of “captain” and possibly a jargon term from the movie industry) leads the whole club, while occasionally consulting with a “retired” graduate student. The majority of the section names and participants’ titles take after terms that are used in Japanese firms, such as *eegyoo-bu* (the “sales section,” a compound of *eegyoo* “sales” and *bu* “section”) and *eegyoo-bu-choo* (the “sales section representative,” with an affix *choo* “representative”).

Within a section, there are subsections that are responsible for specific tasks, and each section and subsection serves as a task force that has a specific agenda for their role in the event. For example, the selection section is responsible for selecting all the movies to be shown during the movie event, and it has a subsection called the short movie subsection, which is responsible for selecting short movies for a specific part of the event’s program. In order to prepare for the event, each section, as well as the whole club, holds meetings beginning several months prior to the event date. All members belong to at least one section, with the exception of the club representatives (the graduate student and Cap) who supervise all sections. The club members from different sections sometimes meet for informal gatherings, such as a dinner party, for solidarity building and socializing. Their roles in the club are decided through discussion and election before April. That is, when freshmen start their first academic year at college in April, the members are ready to recruit new students to become members of the club and to join their sections.

---

33 Other sections include *soomu-bu* ‘general affairs section’ and *koohoo-bu* ‘advertisement section’, both of which are common section names for Japanese companies.
34 The Japanese academic calendar starts in April and ends in March.
4.1.2 Recording the club meetings

The researcher, myself, was present to record interactions and to take field notes during all recordings. Takatoshi, my first informant, introduced me to the participants as a researcher from the University of Hawai‘i who was conducting research on young people’s talk. Being present at the recording sites provided me rich insight into the relationships among participants that was indispensable for the analysis, and it also gave me an opportunity to ask questions of some participants to learn ethnographic information about the participants. Especially during the meeting sessions, the influence of my presence on the participants—the observer’s paradox (Labov, 1972)—was not strong enough to disturb the flow of discussion, because of the large number of participants and the length of meetings. For instance, during a three-hour meeting, my informant, Takatoshi, forgot about my presence and used a vulgar term *jijii* ‘elderly man’, during his opinion presentation. He then covered his head with his arms, a gesture of embarrassment, while others teased him for his bad language use.

The data of this study consist of approximately nine hours of audio recordings of three consecutive meetings at the college movie club, recorded with digital and cassette recording devices. The recordings include interactions from the in-session discussion and short breaks, as well as one-to-one interactions between the researcher and participants in the form of casual conversations, from which I gathered information such as participants’

---

35 I met Takatoshi through his instructor at the college. The instructor is a personal acquaintance of mine, who introduced several students to me. I recorded their interactions in different sites, such as informal conversation in the cafeteria and at school clubs. This data derives from one of these recordings.

36 Labov (1972, p. 209) defines the observer’s paradox as follows: “The aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain these data by systematic observation.” Although for him, the problem arose in sociolinguistic interviews where the researcher and an interviewee interact dyadically, multiparty interactions are also certainly affected by the observer’s presence.
major fields of study and reported summaries of previous email communication among members. The recording of the data took place in July and August 2008, just before the first semester was over. Despite the pressure of final examinations and papers, the meetings gathered more members than discussion leaders expected, which caused a change to a larger room for the third meeting. All meetings started at 6 p.m., and lasted for approximately three hours with a five to ten minute break with light snacks.

Of the three meeting sessions that I attended and recorded, the second session was the general meeting, which all club members could join, while the first and the last sessions were meetings for the sales section, which I refer to as Sales Meeting 1 and Sales Meeting 2 in the analyses. TABLE 4.1 presents some details of each meeting.
TABLE 4.1: Description of three meeting sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting types</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Discussion leader</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Section Meeting 1</td>
<td>July 16</td>
<td>Conference room at a civic center</td>
<td>Hiroshi</td>
<td>16 8 8 4 3 4 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Meeting</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>Lecture room on campus</td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>23 14 9 4 4 10 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Section Meeting 2</td>
<td>Aug. 4</td>
<td>Conference room at a civic center</td>
<td>Hiroshi</td>
<td>12 7 5 3 1 5 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Fr = freshman; Sp = sophomore; Jr = junior; Sr = senior; Grad = graduate student; ? = unknown class level

There were sixteen members at the first session, twenty-three at the second session, and twelve at the last session. The members of the movie club that I observed were diverse in terms of their academic backgrounds, their favorite genres of movies, and even the colleges they belonged to. TABLE 4.2 is a list of participants who are the speakers in the excerpts that I analyze. The members who attended all three sessions are highlighted.

37 Their academic disciplines include education, engineering, literature, and design.
### TABLE 4.2: Names and background of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names used in this dissertation</th>
<th>Name/title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Title/role in the club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okada-san</td>
<td>Last name with −san</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>Founder of the club; an OB (old boy; retired member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>The representative of the club, the “captain”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoo</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Short movie section representative; sub-captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshi</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Sales section representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasu</td>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoohee</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishi</td>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Selection section representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takatoshi</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Sophomore from another college</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asami</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in TABLE 4.1, the general meeting took place in a large lecture room on campus, and the two section meetings took place in a small meeting room in a civic center. FIGURE 4.1 illustrates the site of the general meeting, and FIGURE 4.2 shows the first sales section meeting site. The positions of the participants listed in TABLE 4.2 are indicated in the figures. For other participants, F in the figure stands for a female seated participant, and M stands for a male seated participant.
FIGURE 4.1: The site of the general meeting

FIGURE 4.2: The site of Sales Meeting 1
Despite the difference in the number of attendants, the three meetings shared certain characteristics. The discussion leader of the meeting stood in front of a board, writing the agenda on the board prior to the meeting, while other participants rarely moved from their seats during sessions, unless they were assigned to write on the board or lead the meeting as a subsection leader. Aside from the discussion leader, one participant distinctive in his physical posture was the graduate student Okada-san. He was standing during the section meetings, and he could walk around relatively freely. Although Cap stood in the same position during the section meetings, in the general meeting, Cap served as the discussion leader. In the general meeting, the graduate student sat on a desk after the mid-point of the meeting. Because the large lecture room was built theater-style, which put Cap’s position on the lowest floor, Okada-san’s position was exceptionally high once he sat down. Among seated participants, junior and senior students generally sat closer to the board, while freshmen and sophomore students sat further from the board, as the dotted lines in Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2 demarcate. This observation of mine fits with a participant’s retrospective comments that there was a clear division between younger (i.e., freshman and sophomore) and older (i.e., junior and senior) participants in terms of their knowledge about event planning, and that the club was divided almost equally between these two groups. Therefore, the participants’ locations and postures are indicative of their status in the club (e.g., standing Cap and the graduate student; freshman and sophomore students sitting in the back during the general meeting) and their roles in the discussion (e.g., standing discussion leaders who face the participants).
From their locations, postures, and interactions, their class standings were transparent enough for me to guess them on the first day of observation.38

4.2 Method of analysis

Prior to the description of the method of analysis for this study, I need to clarify what I mean by certain key terms that have to do with methodology and that appear in the analyses.

4.2.1 Context, frame, and identities in this study

In a general sense, context can be interpreted in two ways. It may mean linguistic features surrounding a linguistic form in a text, or, more broadly, it can mean sociocultural dimensions where the form resides. Context in this study is the latter, that is, social and psychological dimensions, which are evoked by certain linguistic forms or content through indexicality (Ochs, 1990). In this sense, context includes affect, knowledge, beliefs, social acts, activities, and identities (Ochs, 1990).

As my data consist of multiparty interactions that are strongly influenced by meeting procedure, which affects the context, I modeled my analysis after Geyer’s (2008a) work on group interactions at faculty meetings in Japanese secondary schools. Her analyses reveal how the type of interaction is crucial for the meaning of styles. According to Geyer, “official and planned talk is transactional in nature (i.e., expressing ‘content’), and its content is likely to appear in the agenda or minutes of the meeting.

38 After my observation of meetings, I made inferences about participants’ classification (e.g., freshman or senior), and requested a participant to check my accuracy. With some possible exceptions of quiet participants whose classification is unknown, most of my inferences about participants’ classifications were confirmed.
Unofficial and spontaneous talk is interactional in nature (i.e., expressing social relations and personal attitudes), and its content is peripheral” (p. 46). She argues that it is not the speech styles themselves that determine official or unofficial talk but the constellation of relevant features, which includes speech styles along with other elements such as the content of the utterance and the tone of the voice. Geyer’s (2008a) official and unofficial talk are parallel to Cook’s on-stage and off-stage talk. Cook (1996b, 2008a) utilizes these frames of talk (Goffman, 1974) that serve as context to influence the meaning of linguistic forms within Ochs’s indexicality framework (1990, 1993, 1996). Because Goffman’s (1974) frame is also conceptualized as context (Goodwin & Duranti, 1992), on- and off-stage talk are cogent in the indexicality framework. I will look into whether hierarchical relations are constructed in one frame of talk or both, and consider what the results suggest about the nature of hierarchical relationships among students. For example, if senpai-koohai identities are constructed in one frame but not another, it would show that the hierarchical identities are not transferrable (Zimmerman, 1998) in at least one frame.

One strength of frame as an analytical tool lies in its analytical efficacy for data of multiparty interactions, like that on which this study is based. In contrast, Dunn (1996) analyzes monologic speech data with Japanese cultural terms, such as uchi-soto ‘inside-outside’, omote-ura ‘formal-informal’, and tatemae-honne ‘principle-true feeling’, notions commonly used to describe Japanese communication patterns (e.g., Doi, 1986). For example, in Dunn’s analysis, which incorporates the speakers’ own retrospective explanations, the plain form is used when the speaker expresses her true feeling (honne) toward an insider (uchi people), which indicates the speaker’s ura ‘informal’ persona.
Using the participants’ explanations about their own interactions, Dunn (1996) succeeds in describing how members of the community in question perceive their relationships at the level of discourse (Ochs, 1990).

In the current study, however, Dunn’s approach would not be effective. In addition to the nature of the data, which show multiparty interactions, it is not the case that Japanese cultural principles can determine who should be senpai and koohai in every club in all situations. As some clubs do not practice strict senpai-koohai relations, and the same pair of speakers may or may not be constructed as senpai and koohai, local principles (Ochs, 1996) governing hierarchical relations play a crucial role in indexing senpai-koohai relations. The context of a particular situation would influence what features become relevant in indexing social relations. In order to identify what becomes relevant in a certain context, frames of talk serve as the context of interaction that mediates the connection between participants and their social identities.

In this dissertation, I draw on both general expectations of senpai-koohai in a Japanese community and expectations specific to this club. In particular, senpai-koohai relations constructed in my data are often indexed with the influence of the corporate culture, in terms of the organizational structure and the club’s style of pursuing the movie event by selling tickets to the public, as well as actual communication with companies as financial contributors throughout the preparation process for the movie event. For example, as the analysis in Chapter 7 demonstrates, the graduate student is indexed as senpai in relation to other participants not only because he is the founder of the club, but also because he is the only person with first-hand knowledge of corporate culture. This is in line with the social constructionist idea that considers identity as emerging within
interaction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). Therefore, investigating implicit *senpai-koohai* relations in this dissertation starts with identifying frame as context that is relevant to *senpai-koohai* relations.

4.2.2 Description of analysis methods

All recorded data were transcribed in the Hepburn system of romanization with minor modifications. The modifications are: (1) double vowels are shown as two consecutive vowels, e.g., *sensee* (not *sensei*) for ‘teacher’\(^{39}\) and (2) the phoneme /N/, a nasal stop with different places of articulation, is indicated as \(n\); thus, the /N/ before /b, m, p/ is shown as \(n\), not \(m\). I follow Cook’s (2008a) transcription conventions\(^{40}\) and abbreviations for word-to-word translation with some modifications. Word segmentation is based on the CHAT system for CHILDES (MacWhinney & Oshima-Takane, 1998).

As described in the introduction, I chose three linguistic features that are salient in constructing *senpai-koohai* relations: speech styles, address and reference terms, and knowledge-related stance markers. This dissertation aims to investigate when and how the hierarchical relationships of *senpai* and *koohai* are constructed with these features. I first illustrate which context is relevant to *senpai-koohai* identity construction, and how the linguistic forms of Japanese speech styles relate to the construction of identities in the context. After identifying contexts relevant to *senpai-koohai* relations, I will focus on the contexts where *senpai-koohai* relations are constructed, and then move on to examining address and reference terms and knowledge-related expressions, to examine how these features relate to the construction of *senpai-koohai* relations.

---

\(^{39}\) I treat personal names as exceptions to this rule, when the spelling is for an author, for example.

\(^{40}\) Cook’s transcription conventions derive from those of Sacks et al. (1974).
Chapter 5. On- and Off-Stage Talk in the Meetings

The main claim of this chapter is that the *masu* form is used differently in two frames of talk. During on-stage talk, the *masu* form indexes the speaker’s official stance of acting in accordance with a meeting role during on-stage talk, which does not concern *senpai-koohai* relationships. During off-stage talk, on the other hand, interactants’ non-reciprocal exchanges of the non-naked plain and the *masu* forms contribute to the construction of *senpai-koohai* relationships, as previous studies suggest (Ide, 1989; Niyekawa, 1991, Shibatani, 1990). First, I explain the participation structure of the meeting site, which defines on- and off-stage talk in my data. Then, I will discuss how participants interact in each frame, and how the meanings of speech styles are influenced by the frame of talk.

5.1 The participation structure of the meetings

In sales section meetings, there are two supervisors, who stand outside of the discussion frame, as shown in the schematic illustration of participation structure in Figure 5.1. The two supervisors are Okada-san, a male graduate student and the founder of the club, who stands on the right side of the on-stage activity of the sales section discussion in Figure 5.1, and Cap, a female senior student and the representative of the club, who stands on the left side.
While the discussion is happening in the center of the figure, i.e., “the on-stage activity of sales section discussion,” highlighted in gray, Okada-san and Cap do not join the discussion as other participants do, but supervise the discussion from outside in the capacity of senpai to the whole group. Their special status as senpai of the group is evidenced by their distinctive posture and their participation styles. Both Okada-san and Cap are standing (indicated with diamonds in the figure) on the sides of the meeting room, facing toward the discussion leader, while other participants are sitting (indicated with circles in the figure). Their participation style is not influenced by the discussion, because they communicate with the discussion leader, irrespective of the meeting procedures, in the plain form.

In contrast, within the frame of discussion (“the on-stage activity of the sales section discussion”), other participants join the discussion through the discussion leader’s
nomination using the masu form. I hereafter call these participants’ role “Participant,” to distinguish it from the cover term for all participants in the data, which includes supervisors and discussion leaders. There are two groups of Participants: freshman and sophomore Participants who sit in the back of the meeting room and junior and senior Participants who sit closer to the discussion leader in the front of the room. While freshman and sophomore Participants barely speak during the meeting, the rest of the Participants actively participate in the discussion.

Finally, a male junior student, the discussion leader (hereafter DL) Hiroshi, is the representative of the sales section. He is standing and facing toward the Participants, in front of the whiteboard at the front of the room. He sometimes nominates a non-freshman Participant as a sub-leader to lead a topic-based discussion, in which case the nominated Participant acts as another DL. In order to distinguish the two types of DL, I will call Hiroshi “the main DL,” and other, nominated discussion leaders “nominated DLs” for the sales section meetings.41

Two types of interaction, the interaction between the DL and Participants versus the interaction between the DL and the two supervisors, are distinctive in my data, due to the distinctive frames of talk. In order to describe these two types of interaction, I utilize Goffman’s (1974) notion of frame, and consider the first type to occur in the frame of on-stage talk and the second type to occur in the frame of off-stage talk (Cook, 1996b). Cook uses the on- and off-stage distinction in the analysis of elementary school classroom happyo activity (1996b). For example, in her analysis of happyo activity,

41 As mentioned in the previous chapter, there is another type of meeting, i.e., the general meeting, which all club members can attend, and in which the overall participation structure is the same. At the general meeting, Cap acts as the main DL due to her status as representative of the entire club, and Hiroshi becomes an active Participant. Okada-san, the graduate student, remains in the supervisor position.
students use the *masu* form when they are in the role of a participant of the *happyo* activity, while they use the plain form when they are out of the role. In my dissertation, activities that take place based on meeting procedure belong to on-stage talk, and are those that occur in the “on-stage activity” area, as shown in Figure 5.1.

5.2 On-stage talk as *masu* form-based interactions

In this section, I illustrate how on-stage talk between the DLs and other Participants during meetings is *masu* form-based interaction in my data. On-stage talk is characterized as types of talk where participants are acting based on the discussion roles. The connection through indexicality between the on-stage talk and the *masu* form use is evidenced by co-occurrence of the two. In other words, the *masu* form use indexes that the speaker is “in role” of the discussion, which makes the *masu* form the characteristic talk of on-stage talk. This is in accordance with Cook’s (1996b) findings, for example, on *happyo* activities of elementary school classroom interaction, where the *masu* form indexes the self-presentational stance, or the mode of self for public presentation of the speakers’ social roles. It is also in accordance with other previous studies, which look at the interactions of various speakers, such as participants in a faculty meeting (Geyer, 2008a, 2008b), interviewers on TV programs (Ikuta, 2008), and instructors at a college advisory meeting (Cook, 2006). Speakers’ use of the *masu* form indexes that they talk from the standpoint of their institutional roles. That is, when a senior student talks as the main DL, she uses the *masu* form. This is the function of the *masu* form that indexes presentational stance of self (Cook, 1996b, 1997). The discussion roles in the current study are assigned based on the participants’ roles in the club, which do not always
follow the order of seniority. There are cases where some Participants have higher class
standing than the discussion leader. The participants’ reciprocal use of the masu form
during on-stage talk indexes their roles in the activity regardless of their differences in
class standing.

The agenda of a meeting is set prior to the meeting, and the results of discussion
based on discussion procedure are listed as minutes. In what follows, I will discuss the
structure of the meeting as a base for participants’ “in-role” activities.

The main DL (DL in Figure 5.2) controls the discussion procedure during on-
stage talk, as shown in Figure 5.2. This indicates that on-stage talk is DL-led discussion
in which all participants know what to do in order to fit into their discussion roles. The
main DL opens the discussion, and introduces the agenda that the main DL has set prior
to the meeting (Step 1). When the discussion starts, the main DL nominates a reporter
who is in charge of the first topic in order to explain the current situation. The main DL
then summarizes it (Step 2). In opinion presentation (Step 3), the main DL nominates
Participants (P in Figure 5.2). After all participants express their opinions, the main DL
puts the item to a vote (Step 4), and proceeds to the next item on the agenda (Step 2).
Occasionally, the main DL invites a person who has been nominated as a sub-discussion
leader, the nominated DL, to physically stand in the position in which the main DL
usually stands. In this case, the nominated DL plays the role of the DL until the point of
the vote (Step 4) is reached. Finally, the main DL closes the meeting (Step 5).
FIGURE 5.2: The structure of on-stage talk in club meeting discussions

In the following excerpt from my data, two junior students use the *masu* form, when they are acting in accordance with their discussion roles, as the DL\(^{42}\) and a Participant. Their indexed identities are not *senpai-koohai*. In the transcription, the *masu* form is underlined with double lines, and the plain form is underlined with a single line. No underlining indicates utterances with an incomplete ending.

Excerpt 1 (Sales Meeting 1, 411\(^{43}\)):
Hiroshi (male, junior, main DL) and Yoohee (male, junior, Participant)

[Hiroshi, the main DL, is leading a brainstorming activity to elicit the weaknesses and strengths of the club as preparation for the annual movie event planning. Hiroshi nominates a participant, Yoohee.]

\(^{42}\) Hereafter, DL stands for the main DL, rather than the nominated DL, for the sake of simplicity. A nominated DL will be indicated as “nominated DL.”

\(^{43}\) This number indicates the line number in my data.
Yoohee presents his opinion in the *masu* form (Line 1), to which Hiroshi gives positive evaluation in the *masu* form (Line 2). *Kure* (Line 2) derives from a donatory verb *kureru* that adds the meaning of speaker’s appreciation directed to the interactant (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989). Therefore, Hiroshi’s positive comment on Yoohee’s opinion is presented in the capacity of Hiroshi’s DL role, expressing the DL’s appreciation for Yoohee’s contribution to the discussion.

More evidence of the *masu* form indexing “in role” is that DLs and Participants generally use the *masu* form for greetings. Opening and closing greetings are typical examples of Geyer’s (2008a) official talk, and Cook (2006b) observes that set formulas often include the *masu* form in informal conversation among family members. In my data, the presence of the *masu* form in greetings evokes a sociocultural dimension of on-stage talk, a formal context of the situation. In the next example, the DL Hiroshi officially opens the sales section meeting in the *masu* form and Participants reply to Hiroshi in the *masu* form.

**Excerpt 2 (Sales Meeting 1, 1):**

Hiroshi (male, junior, main DL) and other Participants

[The DL Hiroshi is writing the meeting agenda on the whiteboard, and other participants chat in low voices.]

---

44 According to Makino and Tsutsui (1989), *kureru* indicates that “someone does the first person...a favor by doing something” (p. 217).
Immediately after his writing, the DL Hiroshi starts the opening greeting with *zentai kaigi o* ‘general meeting’ (Line 1), which is a speech error for the sales section meeting. He laughs (Line 1), and then other participants laugh (Line 2). Hiroshi restarts the opening greeting in Line 3. Although Takatoshi, a male sophomore student, follows up the joking atmosphere by providing a teasing comment *yatchatta* ‘[he] made [an error] unfortunately’ (Line 4), Hiroshi completes the opening greeting in Line 5, by adding a verb *hajimema: su* ‘[we] will start’ to complete the sentence from Line 3, followed by the opening greeting *onegai shima: su* ‘greetings’. In response, Participants greet him back (Line 6), which is the common exchange for opening an event. There is no *senpai-koochai* relationship linguistically constructed in this excerpt. Hiroshi acts as the main DL, and the participants in Line 5 act together as Participants in accordance with the DL’s

---

45 The greeting *onegai shimasu* is most commonly used by interactants to greet each other at the beginning of an event.
initiation of greetings. The joking atmosphere with laughter and Takatoshi’s comment are redirected to the formal setting with the formal initiation of the meeting with interactants in their roles of DL and Participants speaking in the masu form.

Another piece of evidence of the masu form’s function of indexing participants being “in role” is that DLs frequently use the masu form for topic changes during the meetings. In this case, the masu form utterances set the frame boundary (Geyer, 2008a), and other utterances in the incomplete form are embedded into the frame of talk (Makino, 2002). In the middle of the general meeting, Cap (the DL of the general meeting) sets the boundary of the second item on the agenda, “scheduling,” and proceeds to the next item, “events,” with the masu form.

Excerpt 3 (General Meeting, 664):
Cap (female, senior, main DL) and other Participants

1 Cap (. ) sate. ja: ichioo sukejuuru kakunin shita to yuu koto de. well well then for now schedule confirmation do-PAST QT say thing COP
‘Well. Well then, for now, [we] did [the second item of the agenda, that is,] confirming the schedule [of event preparation].

2 → e; komakai tokoro wa kakubu mitingu de yarimasu. er detail place TOP each section meeting P do ‘Er, [we] will do details at each section meeting.

3 → de, sanban no, ibento na n desu kedo. then number three LK event COP NOM COP PR ‘Then, about “Event” in number three [of the agenda].

4 ite, etto, hachigatsu juuninichi ni, umi ni, ikoo ka to. ouch er August 12th P ocean to go-VOL Q QT ‘ouch,46 er, [we are planning] to go to the beach on August 12th.

5 (. ) iyaa, atashi moo, ↑kore dake ga tanoshimi de sa:. gee [[FEM; COLLOQ] more this only S pleasure COP P[COLLOQ] ‘Gee, I, this is the only entertainment [for me].’

---

46 Apparently, Cap hurts herself with the edge of the paper she is holding.
Some participants @

Takatoshi SUGOI (looking at brochures Cap brought))
awesome ‘AWESOME’

Cap kore motte kiteru da yo, hora, umi biraki, endoo mappu.
this bring ~PROG NOM COP P here ocean opening roadside map
‘This, [I] brought [it]. Here, a roadside map for open beaches.’

hai. (passing the map she is holding to the participants sitting in front))
here ‘Here.’

Cap confirms that she is finished with the second item of the agenda, i.e., scheduling, in the incomplete form de, which is the incomplete form of a copula da (Line 1). She adds, in the masu form (Line 2), that details will be discussed in section meetings, which concludes the scheduling item of the discussion. After the conjunction de ‘then’ (Line 3), she proceeds to the next item on the agenda, ibento ‘events’, in the masu form^47 (Line 3), and proposes the date and the destination of the event, an excursion to the beach, with the incomplete form (Line 4). She shifts to off-stage talk with the incomplete (Line 4 lacks a verb, and Line 5 de is the incomplete form of a copula da) and the plain form with an affect key, a particle yo (Line 8). The masu form utterances in Lines 2 and 3 set the boundary between two topics, the schedule check and the excursion event. Consequently, all other utterances are embedded in the two topics that have been delimited by this boundary. Line 1 ends in the incomplete form with falling intonation, indicating the end of the utterance. However, with the masu ending of Line 2 following Line 1, the content of Line 1 sounds as if it is the preface to Line 2, still under the second agenda item

^47 This masu form follows kedo ‘but’, but this phrase lacks a main clause. Therefore, I consider kedo a pragmatic marker that constitutes a main clause.
“scheduling,” because the two lines can syntactically form one sentence. After the third agenda topic, the event, is presented in Line 3 with the masu form, the following utterances, including off-stage talk after Line 5, appear subordinate to Line 3 in terms of the content, that is, they fall under the topic of “event.”

In the next excerpt, the use of the naked plain form (the plain form without affect keys such as particles) is structurally embedded, which is in line with Makino’s (2002) observation of structures in written prose, as well as Cook’s (2008b) listing function of the naked plain form. The naked plain form use appears in the next excerpt in a DL’s semi-monologue, that is, the DL’s explanation with minimum involvement by other participants. At the general meeting, the nominated DL, Shoo, updates short movie selection issues in his capacity of the short movie selection section representative. The content and the speech styles of his semi-monologue are summarized in Table 5.1 before the excerpt. The main issue to discuss is highlighted in the masu form, while two plans (Plan A and B) for the second slot are in the naked plain form, as in the list before the transcript. Speech styles before quotatives (e.g., tte in Line 9), subordinate clauses (e.g., kimashita in Line 15 that modifies the next phrase), and others’ utterances (Lines 3 and 13) are excluded from this analysis so that I can focus on the DL’s choices of utterance finals.

---

48 The copula de is the continuation form, which may be followed by another phrase.
49 Speech styles in the subordinate clauses are known to have different meanings. Makino (2002), for example, states that the masu form in a subordinate clause sounds hyperpolite. In the case of Line 15, I consider that Shoo presents the ‘Yuubari best selection’ (Line 16) as if it is a written advertisement, which includes yuubari kara matte kimashita ‘[we] brought from Yuubari [competition]’ (Line 15).
### Table 5.1: Summary of Shoo’s monologue in Excerpt 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slot 1: Same as last year <em>(masu)</em> [Lines 1 and 2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slot 2: Plan A: Same as last year (incomplete) [Line 4]; (naked plain) [Line 5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan B: Yuubari (plain + coalescence) [Line 6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>← from Yuubari Off Theater (naked plain) [Line 8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explanation of Yuubari Off Theater <em>(masu)</em> [Line 7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currently [the section] checking previously awarded movies <em>(masu)</em> [Lines 9 to 12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ideally, [we] can set Yuubari Best Selection <em>(masu)</em> [Lines 14 to 16]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 4 (General Meeting, 1419):

Shoo (male, junior, short movie section representative and nominated DL) and other Participants

[Shoo explains that there are two 90-minute slots for short movies, and that there are two plans for the second slot.]

1 Shoo e;; futatsu no uchi hitotsu wa;; ((writing on the blackboard with chalk))

*Er, out of two [slots to decide], [the first] one is*

2 hobo kyonen to onaji to omotte sashitsukae nai desu.

*Almost last year with same QT think receive problem not exist COP*

*‘[there’s] no problem to consider [that the first slot is] almost the same as last year.’*

3 Male participant moo hitotsu no mondai wa?

*More one QT problem TOP*

*‘[What is] the problem for the other [slot]?’*

4 Shoo moo hitotsu wa;; kyonen to onaji yoo ni moo ikko kumu ka.50

*More one TOP last year with same manner more one thing set Q*

*‘[The issue for] the other one is whether [or not we] set another [slot similar to the first slot], like last year.*

---

50 This sentence ends with the incomplete form, which abbreviates *dooka* ‘or what’, and a copula, either *desu* or *da.*
dakara, kyonen to onaji yoo na mono ga dekiagaru.
so last year with same manner thing S complete
‘So, [the program] becomes one similar to last year’s.

de, moo ikko no an ga, kore o yuubari ni shichau.51
and more one thing LK plan S this O [CITY NAME] P do-complete
‘And, the other plan [for the second slot] is making this [=the second slot] Yuubari.

yuubari no ofu shiataa konpe tte no ga aru n desu kedo,
[CITY NAME] LK off theater competition QT NOM S exist NOM COP PR
‘there is what [is called] Off Theater Competition of Yuubari,

((sound of writing on the board)) kok↑kara:, sakuhin o itadaite kuru.
here from piece O receive[HON] come
‘From here [=the Yuubari competition], [we] receive pieces.

e: ma: kok kara kumu to doo yuu koto ni naru kana tte yuu to;
er um here from set if/when how say thing P become wonder QT say if
‘Er, um, when [we] set [our event program] from here [=Yuubari pieces], if [I]
say how things will become,

kotoshi no guranpuri toka:, maa shoo o totta sakuhin ni naru tte yuu koto
this year LK 1st award and other um award O take-PAST piece P become QT PR thing

ni nari:, maa kanoosee to shite, zero roku zero go zero yon gurai made ima
P become um possibility as 0 6 0 5 0 4 about until now

atatteru n desu kedo:, ano:, ((sound of writing on the board))
check-PROG NOM COP PR um
‘[The movie that won the] 1st award of this year, etc., um, [the contents of our program]
becomes pieces that won awards [at Yuubari], um, as possible [choices], [we] are checking [awarded movies from] 2006, 2005, and 2004, but, um’

Male participant @sugoi yo kore@
awesome P this
‘This is awesome’

Shoo dakara, sugoi risoo o ieba:, zero hachi zero go zero yon no guranpuri to:, ato
so extreme ideal O say-if 0 8 0 5 0 4 LK 1st award and rest

zero hachi ni sakuhin gurai de:, kyuujuppun yuubari kara motte kimashita
0 8 two piece about with 90 minutes [CITY NAME] from bring come-PAST

51 Shichau is the coalescence of shite shimau ‘completed’.
yuubari  besuto serekushon mitai  ni kumeru n  desu yo.
[CITY NAME] best selection like P set-can NOM COP P
‘So, if [I] say an extreme ideal [case], with 1st awards from [Yuubari
[we] brought from Yuubari [competition].’

17 Male participant o:
  oh
  ‘Oh.’

In summary, in on-stage talk, both DLs’ and Participants’ use of the *masu* form
indexes their discussion roles, and the naked plain form is embedded in the *masu* form
sentences in terms of both content and structure. The *masu* and plain forms do not serve
as a strategy for creating senpai-koohai relationships during on-stage talk.

5.3 Off-stage talk as non-naked plain form-based interactions

Off-stage talk is the deviation from on-stage talk in terms of procedure (FIGURE
5.2); the content of these interactions typically does not appear in the agenda or the
minutes. During off-stage talk, participants are out of discussion roles, which is indexed
by their use of the plain form with affect keys (Cook, 2002), i.e., the non-naked plain
form. Non-hierarchical\(^{52}\) identities are constructed in terms of speech style during on-
stage talk. In contrast, both senpai-koohai and equal relationships are indexed by speech
style during off-stage talk. First, I discuss non-hierarchical relations, followed by cases
of senpai-koohai relations.

\(^{52}\) By hierarchical, I mean senpai-koohai identities. Although it is possible to consider other identities and
relationships, such as those of discussion leader and participant, as hierarchical because of the discussion
leader’s control over the participants, it is not the focus of this analysis.
5.3.1 Off-stage talk with non-hierarchical relationships

The non-naked plain form is the characteristic speech style for off-stage, indicating that speakers are out of their discussion roles. When they exchange the non-naked plain form, participants achieve equal statuses as friends, even among those of otherwise different statuses, by engaging in activities of solidarity building (Geyer, 2008a), such as joking and back seat chatting. This type of interaction typically constitutes a side sequence of the discussion procedure shown in Figure 5.2. The following example illustrates a typical example of back seat chat by two Participants, Shoo (male junior student and a section representative) and Takatoshi (male sophomore student with no titles), during the meeting. Although they are of different class levels and have different statuses in the club, their constructed relations are non-hierarchical, which is indexed by their unvarying use of the non-naked plain form and their acts. Prior to the excerpt, Shoo stood up and walked to Takatoshi’s seat, saying *taikutsu da:* ‘I’m bo:red’ in the non-naked plain form with prolongation of the final vowel *a*, and placed his head on top of Takatoshi’s desk. The following excerpt happens when Cap, the main DL, initiates questions to the whole group about the date of a club excursion.

Excerpt 5 (General Meeting, 2463):
Shoo (male, junior, section representative) and Takatoshi (male, sophomore, no title)

[Takatoshi is raising his hand to indicate that he is available, while facing Shoo.]

1 Takatoshi → kanzzenni muri da kedo ne? tesuto mae da kedo ne?
   completely impossible COP but P exams before COP but P
   ‘[I am raising my hand,] but it is absolutely impossible [for me to attend].
   [Because it’s] before exams.’

2 Cap (counting people’s raised hands)) ichi, ni, san. shi, go, roku, shichi, hachi, kyuu.
3 juu. mok kai juuninichi ikeru hito:. ichi, ni, san, shi, go,
10 more once time 12th day go-can person 1 2 3 4 5
‘1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. 10 [people]. Once more, people who can come on the
12th, [raise your hands]. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 [people],’

4 Takatoshi → ((Finds Shoo not raising his hand)) chanto, chanto. ( ) dada konenai
properly properly act unreasonably -NEG
‘[Be] proper, proper. ([unclear utterance])
don’t be unreasonable [like a child].’

5 Cap juuroku, juuroku doyoobi ikenai HITO
16 16 Saturday go-can-NEG person
‘16th, Saturday 16th, people who cannot come, [HANDS UP]!’

6 Shoo → roojin da kara, ore. ((still laying his head on Takatoshi’s desk))
elderly man COP because I[MAS/ VULGAR]
‘Because I am an old man.’

7 Cap IKERU HITO
go-can person
‘PEOPLE WHO CAN COME, [hands up]!’

8 Shoo sugu deteta janai,53( )
soon go out-PROG-PAST NEG
((unclear utterance))

9 Takatoshi wakai desho,54 mada
young COP still
‘[You] are still young, aren’t you?’

10 Cap hachi. ue.; sukunee. juu-, juunana wa?
8 gee small number [VULGAR] -teen 17 TOP
‘Eight [people]. Gee, so few. [How about] 17th?’

11 Takatoshi → juunana, kotchi?
17 this side
‘17th, [are you going to raise] this [hand]?’

12 Cap a, IKERU HITO
ah go-can person
‘Ah, PEOPLE WHO CAN GO, [hands up]!’

13 Takatoshi ((Picks up Shoo’s hand and raises it))

53 I exclude this utterance from the analysis because it is unclear.
54 Although desho (the coalescence of desho) is etymologically the masu form, it is reported to be used
commonly in informal conversation, such as host family conversation (Cook, 2011). Therefore, I do not
include it as a masu form in my analysis.
14 Shoo → ore, ikeru no? ((Looking at Takatoshi))
I [MAS/VULGAR] go-can NOM
‘Can I go?’

15 Takatoshi n? wakannai
hmm know-NEG
‘Hmm? [I] don’t know.’

16 Cap ichi, ni, san, shi, go, roku, nana. ↓ juuhachi wa?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 18 TOP
‘1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 [people]. [How about] 18th?’

17 Shoo → iya chotto muri da. juuku mo muri da. nijuu mo.
no a little impossible COP 19 also impossible COP 20 also
‘No, [it’s] a bit impossible. 19th is impossible, too. As is the 20th.’

18 Cap JUUHACHI IKERU HITO: ↓ ichi, ni, san, shi, go. ↑ juukyuu. (. ) nijuu.
18 go-can person 1 2 3 4 5 19 20
‘PEOPLE WHO CAN GO 18th, [hands up]. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 [people]. 19th. 20th.’

During their informal interaction, the non-hierarchical identities of Shoo and Takatoshi are indexed by the exchange of the plain form (Lines 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 15, and 17), Shoo’s use of the vulgar first singular pronoun ore ‘I’ (Sturtz Sreetharan, 2006) in Lines 6 and 14, Shoo’s laid-back posture, and Takatoshi’s act of playing with Shoo jokingly. For example, both Takatoshi and Shoo are appearing to join the discussion, sitting and facing toward the DL Cap, and responding to Cap by raising hands. However, in Line 1, Takatoshi explains that he won’t be able to attend, using the non-naked plain form, even though he expresses his intention to join by raising his hand. In Line 4, Takatoshi, who is a sophomore, teases a junior student, Shoo, treating him like a small child. The expression dada (o) konenai is typically used when a caregiver scolds a misbehaving child. Lastly, when Cap asks other participants if they can join on the 17th (Lines 10 and 12), Takatoshi picks up Shoo’s hand and raises it (Line 13). Although it appears that Takatoshi is assisting Shoo to join the meeting, Takatoshi does not know Shoo’s availability on the date Cap asked about, as evidenced by his reply to Shoo, wakannai ‘[I]
don’t know’ in Line 15. Therefore, this is Takatoshi’s act of playing with Shoo, who is reluctant to join the meeting. Overall, their participation in the discussion is not sincere, and the interaction between Shoo and Takatoshi creates a side-sequence that is outside of the Cap-led discussion.

This type of interaction rarely happens with freshman Participants throughout the data. Its rareness indicates that it is unusual for freshman Participants to participate in side sequences that construct equal relationships with other Participants. It is the privilege of non-freshman participants to join the non-hierarchical, friendly conversation. This situation of being non-active participants, especially in comparison to others, underlines freshman participants’ lower status (koohai) in the club, which is also indicated by their position in the meeting room (Figure 5.1). Their position—seated in the back of the room behind participants of higher class standing—means that freshman and sophomore students’ koohai identities are constantly recalled regardless of changes in the frames of talk. However, among the multiple identities that are indexed by various means during the meetings, their koohai identities are backgrounded during on-stage talk, while their discussion roles are foregrounded.

In the next excerpt, a sophomore student directs his comment, using the plain form, in response to a junior student, the nominated DL, while the nominated DL proceeds with the meeting with the masu form. The comment is clearly audible to the nominated DL, but he does not respond to the comment. The non-naked plain form of a participant’s comment does not evoke hierarchical relations among interactants, but evokes another sociocultural dimension of off-stage talk. The nominated DL, Shoo (male junior student), explains the cost of the two plans described in Excerpt 4, and Takatoshi
(male sophomore student) makes a comment in the non-naked plain form that leads to a side sequence joke. Takatoshi’s seat is the closest to the blackboard, being in front of Shoo’s standing point, which makes Takatoshi’s utterances clearly audible to Shoo (Figure 4.1). Although Takatoshi (sophomore student) responds to Shoo’s (junior student) masu form in the non-naked plain form, this does not contribute to Takatoshi’s higher status in relation to Shoo. The student’s comment with the non-naked plain form is used as a solidarity marker to tie him to other participants as friends (Geyer, 2008a), which is off-stage talk. Therefore, the differences in their speech styles are due to the shift between on-stage and off-stage talk.

Excerpt 6 (General Meeting, 1455):
Shoo (male, junior, nominated DL), Takatoshi (male, sophomore), and other participants

1 Shoo kosuto men wa, hobō zero. dotchi demo.
   cost side TOP almost zero which even
   ‘The cost will be almost zero. Regardless of which [plan we choose].

2 aa, un? ↑niman, sanman mitokeba mondai nai.
   ah oh 20,000 30,000 see-if problem not exist
   ‘Ah, oh? If [we] expect 20,000 or 30,000 yen [for the short movie program],
   [there] won’t be any problems.

3 eeto, tanpen yosan ichioo gomanen itadaiteru n desu yo.
   er short movies budget for now 50,000yen receive-HON-PROG NOM COP P
   ‘Er, [our] short movie program [section] received 50,000 yen as budget for now.

4 a puroguramu de?
   ah program P
   ‘Ah, as the program [fee].’

5 Takatoshi → yasu cheap [COLLOQ]
   ‘[That’s] cheap.’

6 Some male participants @ ((giggle))
7 Male participant

\[\text{ii na:} \quad \text{good P}\]

‘[That’s a] good [one].’

8 Shoo

\[((\text{writing on the blackboard})) \text{ de, (}) (\text{points at the board})) \text{ kotchi ni kanshite wa;}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{this side P relate} \quad \text{TOP}\]

9 hobo zero, ima.

\[\text{almost zero now}\]

‘and, about this side, [it costs] almost zero for now.’

When Shoo explains the budget available to the short movie section in the \textit{masu} form in his DL role (Line 4), Takatoshi adds a comment in the non-naked plain form, \textit{yasu} ‘cheap’ (Line 5). \textit{Yasu} is a coalescence (Cook, 2002) of \textit{yasui} ‘cheap’, which adds an informal, joking atmosphere, and it contrasts with Shoo’s expression of appreciation for having 50,000 yen as budget, indexed by \textit{itadaiteru}, an honorific donatory verb of ‘humbly receive’. Some male participants giggle (Line 6), and another male participant adds another comment in reaction to Takatoshi’s comment, that is, \textit{ii na:} ‘[That’s a] good [one]’ (Line 7). The plain form \textit{ii} ‘good’ accompanies a particle \textit{na:} making it an exclamatory sentence (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989), which works as an affect key. Lines 5 to 7 are a side sequence to the discussion, the joke lines. Therefore, the DL Shoo does not react to these comments and proceeds to the next step of the meeting (Lines 8 and 9).

However, Takatoshi’s comment does not treat Shoo as an outsider of the utterance. Even though Shoo does not respond to Takatoshi’s comment, Takatoshi’s comment involves Shoo directly, because his comment about the low budget can be interpreted as teasing, or even a challenge, to Shoo, who is responsible for collecting money for the budget. In other words, it may be heard as meaning that Shoo is not capable enough to collect ample funds. Importantly, however, Shoo does not pick up Takatoshi’s initiated off-stage sequence, and stays in the on-stage frame.
Finally, I introduce a case where two interactants use non-reciprocal speech styles, but their identities are non-hierarchical. Recall that, stereotypically, the plain form indexes the higher status of the speaker and the masu form indexes the lower status of the speaker. The following cases provide counter-evidence to the stereotype, and my claim is that the meanings of speech styles reflect the dynamics of on-stage and off-stage talk. A nominated DL answers a participant’s non-naked plain form question with the masu form. In this case, the DL shifts back to on-stage talk while others stay in off-stage talk. That is, the nominated DL uses the masu form to index that she is in the role of DL, even in the middle of spontaneous off-stage talk. Ishi, a female sophomore student, is a nominated DL, and she is explaining the selection section’s situation as the section representative. In response to Takatoshi’s (a male sophomore student) question in the non-naked plain form, Ishi replies with the masu form. Prior to this excerpt, Ishi, as the selection section representative, leads the discussion on the classic movies as if it has been decided to show classic movies for the annual movie event among the selection section members. But she later confesses that there had not been consensus among the selection section about the issue. Hearing the participants’ expression of surprise for the chaotic situation of the selection section, Cap, the main DL, takes over the DL role, and initiates a question to the selection section members, including Ishi, in order to investigate the source of the problem in the section from Line 1. The main concern of this data excerpt is the interaction between Takatoshi and Ishi.

Excerpt 7 (General Meeting, 382):
Ishi (female, sophomore, the selection section representative, nominated DL) and Takatoshi (male, sophomore, Participant, no title)
Cap  (.) te yuu ka, meega no koto hanashi atta toki toka; (.) doo datta?

‘Um, when [the section] discusses the issue of classic movies, etc., how was [it]?'

2 nagashitai, mitaina kanji ga a, (looking at no response)) are? @

‘[Was there] the sense like [the members] want to show [them], ah, oh?’

3 Male participant from the selection section sore nakatta kedo;

‘That, [there was] none’

4 Some participants @

5 Cap ↑maji?

‘Really?’

6 Ishi nakatta not exist-PAST

‘[There was] none.’

7 Cap nakatta no?

‘[Was there] none?’

8 The male participant tabun.

‘Perhaps.’

9 Ishi te ka, yuukuri hanashi atte nai n desu yo.

‘Rather, [we] did not spend much time for discussing [this issue].’

10 Another male participant outside of the section e?:

‘What?’

11 Takatoshi →sonna ni koo, maki de hanashi atta no?

‘Did [the section members] discuss in haste like that?’

12 Ishi → maki deshita ne.

‘[It] was in haste.'
After Cap’s non-naked plain form question *doo datta?* ‘how was [it]?’ with a rising intonation pattern (Line 1), the interaction is led to be off-stage, spontaneous interaction without the DL’s nomination of speakers. The content of this string of interaction—why the section’s discussion was problematic—also indicates characteristic off-stage talk, because this content is not part of the minutes or agenda items. Ishi, who once responds in the naked plain form *nakatta* ‘[there was] none’ in Line 6, explains the situation, that they did not spend enough time on the discussion, in the masu form (Line 9). She is in the role of the person who is responsible for the issue, as the leader who must explain why there was no consensus about the issue. In Line 11, Takatoshi raises a follow-up question, without Cap’s nomination, *hanashi atta no?* ‘did you discuss?’ in the non-naked plain form, which indexes the off-stage talk. *Maki* ‘rolling’ (Lines 11, 12) is a jargon term of the movie industry that means completing a job in haste. In reply, Ishi uses the masu form, *maki deshita ne* ‘[It] was in haste’ (Line 12). Again, Ishi is speaking in the role of the section leader who is responsible for what has happened in the section.
As shown in this section, the non-naked plain form is the characteristic style for off-stage talk. The masu form in the above examples does not contribute to the construction of senpai-koohai relationships, because it is used to indicate the speaker’s “in role” stance.

5.3.2 Indexing of senpai-koohai relationships by speech style in off-stage talk

In the examples in this section, the masu form contributes to the construction of senpai-koohai relationships. The examples in this section conform to the general belief that non-reciprocal use of speech styles relates to hierarchical relations.

While the characteristic speech style for off-stage talk is the non-naked plain form, as illustrated in the last section, a participant may use the masu form to another participant with a higher classification, which results in constructing their hierarchical relationships. The first example derives from a chat during the break, that is, off-stage talk, when participants are waiting for the meeting to begin. Two members, Okada-san (the graduate student) and Takatoshi (a sophomore student) talk about a past event, an informal gathering. Okada-san’s use of affect keys that accompany the plain form adds the sense of informality. In contrast, Takatoshi’s choice of the masu form indexes a formal stance in this meeting.

Excerpt 8 (Sales Meeting 1, 119):
Okada (male, graduate student) and Takatoshi (male, sophomore)

1 Okada nee nee, (hey hey) kon aida the other day itsu when kaetta? return-PAST

---

55 This does not imply that participants do not use naked plain forms during off-stage talk. As shown in Chapter 7, the meaning of naked plain forms in off-stage talk is similar to their meaning during on-stage talk, which indicates that it is not the characteristic use of the plain form during off-stage talk.
‘Hey, hey, ((unclear utterance)) when did [you] leave the other day?’

2 Takatoshi → boku desu ka?
I[MAS] COP Q
‘Me?’

3 Okada un, itsu no ma ni ka inakatta no, tonari ni.
yeah when LK duration P Q exist-NEG-PAST NOM next P
‘Yeah, [you] disappeared [from the seat] next [to me], without knowing when.’

4 Takatoshi → hachiji: sugi gurai desu yo
8 o’clock past about COP P
‘[It was] a little past 8 o’clock.’

5 Okada nan-, nande inaku natta no
why why exist-NEG become-PAST NOM
‘Wh-, why did [you] disappear?’

6 Takatoshi yotee ga, denwa haitta nde.
plan S telephone enter-PAST because
‘[I had] a plan, because [I] received a call.’

7 Okada fu:n
I see
‘I see’

In Okada’s utterances, there are affect keys in addition to the plain form endings. He uses casual forms in Line 1 nee nee ‘hey, hey’ to address Takatoshi and kon aida, a coalescence of kono aida ‘the other day’. Altogether, his utterances index informality.

In contrast, Takatoshi’s utterances end in the masu form (desu ka? in Line 2, desu yo in Line 4), and that, along with his choice of the less vulgar male first person pronoun boku, indexes his formal attitude. Their contrastive use of sentence-ending forms and other features contributes to the construction of their senpai-koohai relationships.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the participant framework of the two supervisors who stand outside of the on-stage talk of the sales section meetings (Figure 4.1), the graduate student Okada-san and the club representative Cap, is distinctive due to
their special status as senpai to the rest of the participants. Their exceptional positions allow them to override the main DL’s authority to lead the discussion, which results in constructing their senpai identities in relation to the DL. There are no similar cases in my data of one of the other participants taking over the DL’s role. In such instances, the supervisor’s use of the non-naked plain form and the DL’s use of the masu form enhance their hierarchical relationships. In what follows, I will introduce two types of these instances: the supervisor’s intrusion into an interaction and the supervisor’s incompliance with a main DL, both leading to off-stage talk in the middle of on-stage talk.

First, Excerpt 9 shows the case of the supervisor’s intrusion. The graduate student Okada-san often self-selects his turn in the middle of on-stage talk and initiates a side sequence. His utterance characteristically has a non-naked plain form ending, which contrasts with Hiroshi’s response with a masu ending directed to Okada-san.

Excerpt 9 (Sales Meeting, 16):
Okada (male, graduate student, the founder of the club) and Hiroshi (male, junior, main DL)

1 Hiroshi zenkai wa mazu, kyoosan-, ma eegyoobu no shigoto wa kyoosankin atsume last time TOP first sponsor um sales section LK job TOP sponsor fund collection

2 to, koookokatsudoo to, ato kikaku zukuri to yuu mittsu na n desu ga, and advertisement activity and rest plan making QT PR three COP NOM COP but ‘In the last [meeting], first, sponsor-, um sales section’s jobs are collecting sponsor funds, advertisement, and making plans, these three, but,

3 k- kyoosankin no chiimu, no genjoo o, ma hookoku shite, sponsor fund LK team LK current situation O um report do ‘c-, current situation of the sponsor fund team, um, [can you] report,

4 donna kanji desu tte yuu, kakunin o chotto ima, suimasen ga, how feeling COP QT PR identification O a little now sorry but ‘[so that we can] identify how things are, now, [I] am sorry, but,’

5 Okada → hiroshi sa, dakara sore wa dame da tte. [FIRST NAME] P[COLLOQ] so that TOP no good COP QT ‘Hiroshi, so, that’s no good [as I told you].’
6 ((brief silence. The sound of watch signaling time))

7 Some participants @

8 Okada dakara kyoo yaruko to yatchai na? kakunin ja nakute so today do thing do-finish P identification NEG
‘So, finish things to do today, OK? Not identification [of current situation].’

9 Hiroshi hai, wakarimashita. (. ) jaa yes understand-PAST well then
‘Yes, understood. Well then’

10 Okada oi zenzen meeru imi nai desho? at all Email meaning not exist COP
‘[Because exchanging] Emails [before the meeting becomes] totally meaningless.’

11 Hiroshi ichiban wa okadasan no chikara ni yori, owari to yuu koto de number 1 TOP [LAST NAME]-san LPK power according to finish QT PR thing COP
‘[The item] number one [=identification of status quo] is decided to be done, due to the power of Okada-san’

12 Okada ↑ato da tte ato later COP QT later
‘Later, [I] said later [we deal with identification]’

Hiroshi conducts a formal initiation of the discussion as a DL with the masu form (Lines 1 and 4) in the subordinate clauses, in which the formality of on-stage talk is highlighted by following a request with sumimasen ga ‘[I] am sorry, but’ (Line 4). Okada-san’s intrusion into Hiroshi’s move is initiated from Line 5. Okada-san’s lines are characteristic off-stage talk with a forceful stance, starting with his bare first name calling of Hiroshi, along with a casual particle sa (Line 5), and the non-naked plain form, that is, dame da ‘no good’ with a quotative marker tte.56 The negative tone of the evaluation dame is reinforced with the plain form copula da. With dakara ‘so’, the quotative tte indexes Okada-san’s previous instruction to Hiroshi about the same content, i.e., do not

56 Technically, there is an omission of a sentence ending (such as itteru n da ‘[I] am telling you’) following the quotative tte (Lines 5 and 12). But I consider these as the plain form with an affect key tte because the function of tte is a grammaticized command.
start the meeting with identification of the current situation. Okada-san’s sudden intrusion causes an awkward pause on the floor (Line 6), which is saved by the watch signal (Line 6) and participants’ laughter (Line 7). Okada-san gives a further command in Line 8 in the non-naked plain form, that is, the coalescence form yatçhai, originally yatte shimai ‘finish doing’, along with na, the abbreviated form of the command ending nasai (Martin, 2004), and post-posing of kakunin ja nakute ‘not identification’. Hiroshi, in return, accepts Okada-san’s command with the masu form wakarimashita ‘understood’ (Line 9). Hiroshi’s use of the masu form here is not as the DL, but as a koohai responding to Okada-san, because he is directly communicating with Okada-san. Although Hiroshi shifts back to his DL role with ja ‘well then’ (Line 9) and the official closure to the topic in Line 11, Okada-san continues his turn in Lines 10 and 12. The off-stage talk between Okada-san and Hiroshi has not concluded until Okada-san finishes his lines, which indicates that the person in control during this off-stage talk is not Hiroshi, but Okada-san. In Line 12, Okada-san’s follow-up is accompanied by a quotative tte as in Line 5, and post-posed ato ‘later’ that is an emphasis by repetition.

In Excerpt 9, the participation of the supervisor Okada-san leads to a dyadic interaction of off-stage talk despite the on-going activity of on-stage talk. Okada-san’s senpai status is exercised as acts of intrusion and incompliance in relation to Hiroshi. Okada-san overrides Hiroshi’s authority as the DL, and takes the entire floor outside of the on-stage discussion frame. The DL’s use of the masu form responding to Okada-san is not indexing his “in role” stance, but formality directed toward Okada-san. Therefore, Hiroshi’s use of the masu form contributes to their senpai-koohai relationship.
In contrast, the DL’s plain form use can indicate the DL’s stance of approaching a nominated Participant. It is a similar case as when a school teacher who uses the masu form to the entire class shifts to the plain form to direct a question to one student in the class (Cook, 1996). In the next example, the main DL of the general meeting, Cap, asks a question in the non-naked plain form, and the question is directed to freshman or sophomore Participants. Because Cap is the DL, she is not acting as a supervisor standing outside (FIGURE 4.2). The nominated Participants typically answer in the masu form. While the DL’s act of eliciting opinions is in line with her DL role, her use of the non-naked plain form indicates that she is stepping away from the DL role and approaching the Participant, which indicates a deviation from the pattern of on-stage talk. Because of the general tendency of freshman Participants toward inactive participation, the DL moves away from the formality of her role as the DL, wearing a more approachable, informal persona in order to encourage the freshman Participant to speak up. In such a case, senpai-koohai identities are constructed between the DL and the Participant.

Excerpt 10 (General Meeting, 505):
Cap (female, senior, main DL) and Asami (female, freshman, Participant)

[In the general meeting, the DL, Cap, learned that the selection section had discussed classic movie selection without reaching consensus among section members. Cap redirects the question, whether or not to include classic movies in the program, to each member of the selection section.]

1 Cap (. ) aa jaa, eto, maa, yaru ka yaranai ka wakannai mama hanashi atteta
2 rashii n desu kedo; (. ) jibun wa yaritai tte omotteita no ka doo ka,

ah well then er um do Q do-NEG Q know-NEG while talk each other-PAST

seem NOM COP but self TOP do-want QT think -PROG-PAST NOM Q how Q
‘Ah, well then, er, um, [the selection section members] seem to have discussed without knowing whether or not they will show or not show [classic movies], but, [I want to ask] whether or not [each] member [of the section] was thinking that [they] wanted [to show classic movies].

3 → saa, saa, asamichan @
    well well [FIRST NAME]:DIMIN
    ‘Well, well, Asami-chan’

4 Asami meega, desu yo ne?
   classic movie COP P P
   ‘Classic movies, right?’

5 Cap un
   yeah
   ‘Yeah’

6 Asami (.)

7 Cap un, nanka sono giron no naka de meritto demeritto iroiro dete kita to
   yeah um that discussion LK inside P merit demerit various raise come-PAST QT

8 → omou n da kedo; (.) doo, doo omou? ((talking to Asami))
    think NOM COP but how how think
    ‘Yeah, um during the discussion, various [opinions about] the merit and demerit [of showing classic movies], I think, but, (.) what, what do you think?’

9 Asami atashi wa:
    I [FEM, COLLOQ] TOP
    ‘I:’

10 Cap un
    yeah
    ‘Yeah’

11 Asami bunka no hi toka mo aru to omou n desu kedo; (.) un; nanka, sekkaku
    culture LK day etc. also exist QT think NOM COP but um um chance

12 dattara meega ja nai yatsu o; yaritai na to omou n desu@
    COP-NEG classic movies stuff O do-want P QT think NOM COP
    ‘[There] also exist [opinions that want to set the event program in observance]
    of] the Culture Day, etc., [I] think, but, (.) um, um, if [we use it as] a good
    chance, [I] want [to show] non-classic stuff, I think.’

13 Cap → o? o?: atarashii ne? (. ) sore wa naze?
    oh oh new P that TOP why

---

57 It is the tradition of the Culture Day, November 3rd, to appreciate the classic arts.

First, Cap nominates Asami with diminutive –chan and casual tokens of encouragement saa saa (Line 3), and asks Asami in the plain form with a rising intonation pattern (Line 8), indicating informal inquiry. While Asami’s answers are in the masu form (Lines 4, 11, 12), including an extra formal use of the masu form in a subordinate clause (Line 11), Cap’s evaluative comment and a follow-up question are in the plain form with an interactional particle ne? (Line 13) and another rising intonation pattern (Line 13). By approaching Asami for solidarity-building, Cap takes an informal, curious stance, even though Cap is still conducting the DL’s job of eliciting opinion from a Participant. The situation is similar to the moment described in Cook’s (1996) study when a teacher approaches a student in an elementary school classroom. On the other hand, Asami stays in the on-stage frame of talk by using the masu form. Their speech styles enhance their hierarchical relationship in a way that is typical of senpai-koohai interaction.

5.4 Chapter conclusion

This chapter illustrates that, in college students’ club meetings, senpai-koohai relationships can be foregrounded during the context of off-stage talk, while they are backgrounded during the on-stage talk. The speech style of on-stage talk is mutual masu form use for the most part, with occasional naked plain forms. In these meetings, a hierarchical relationship is not indexed through speech style. The only exception to this is when Cap takes an approachable stance to freshman participants by eliciting their participation with the use of the non-naked plain form. Therefore, the speakers’ non-reciprocal use of the plain and masu forms does not necessarily lead to their senpai-
koohai identity construction. Off-stage talk, on the other hand, is the deviation from on-stage talk, such as chat during the break, back seat chat during the meeting, and side sequences happening during the meeting. The non-naked plain form that accompanies affect keys is the characteristic talk of off-stage talk. In that case, the participants’ use of non-reciprocal speech styles may lead to construction of senpai-koohai identities. The differences between the two types of frame and the meanings of the speech styles are summarized in Table 5.2.

**Table 5.2: Summary of on- and off-stage talk and speech styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-stage talk</th>
<th>Off-stage talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Masu</em></td>
<td>“In-role” &lt;Both DL and P&gt;</td>
<td>The speaker’s koohai identity in non-reciprocal speech styles use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PLAIN</em></td>
<td>Content presentation (no affect keys) &lt;DL&gt;</td>
<td>“Out-of-role” (with affect keys)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6: ADDRESS AND REFERENCE TERMS AS RESOURCES FOR SENPAI-KOOHAI RELATIONSHIPS

6.1 Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to illustrate how address and reference terms, the use of which is one of the most obvious ways to index social relationships, contribute to the construction of senpai and koohai identities. Brown and Ford (1961) demonstrate that, among American and British English speakers, two interactants do not exchange the same address terms when they differ in age and occupational status. Their unequal relationships are indexed by non-reciprocal use of address terms in dyadic interactions, such as a senior person’s use of a junior’s first name and the junior’s use of the senior’s last name. This observation is in line with Leech’s (1999) claim that address terms, or vocatives in his terminology, function to construct and reinforce interactants’ social relationships.

Address terms in Japanese language involve variation in the suffixation that follows names. The most frequently used terms in oral conversation include –san or –chan suffixed to a name, and the name used in this structure can be first name alone, last name alone, full name, or a nickname. The absence of such suffixation also occurs in practice. Several scholars have reported that, as a language that frequently elides pronouns and with its avoidance of the second person pronoun anata, Japanese relies more heavily on address terms than pronouns to index social roles of interactants (e.g., Martin, 2004; Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Morita, 2003b; Niyekawa, 1991). Due to the general tendency to replace pronouns with names with or without suffixation, names plus suffixation function for both addressing and referring to people in practice (Morita, 2003b).
The choice of address and reference terms is considered “the most important aspect of speaking politely in Japanese, aside from the desu-masu sentence ending” (Niyekawa, 1991, p. 74). Prescriptive studies assume that the social meaning of address and reference terms adheres to interactants’ identities. For example, Niyekawa (1991) explains that students of equal statuses mutually use the first name plus an address term – san, while the person of higher rank in general should be called by a title. It is considered “presumptuous” (p. 77) if a junior person calls a senior person by the last name plus – san, although it is a type of “honorific suffixation” (Niyekawa, 1991) and the most neutral way of addressing people. However, this observation does not necessarily reflect actual linguistic practice in all social situations. For example, the word senpai ‘senior’ can be used as a title (Rohlen, 1991), but my data do not contain any instances of senpai ‘senior’ as an address title. This gap derives from a difference in perspectives. The static treatment of identities in prescriptive studies such as Niyekawa’s (1991) enables them to provide clear instructions on how to address a higher-ranking person. From the social constructionist perspective, however, identities are mutually negotiated and they may be constantly changing during the course of interaction. The absence of studies on hierarchy among students based on naturally occurring data results in a lack of explanation of how senpai-koohai relationships are constructed through the use of address terms in practice.

In this chapter, I will discuss address and reference terms as they are used in this movie club. It is observed that higher class-level participants often call or refer to a lower class-level participant with one of two address and reference terms: a name with a

---

58 Although address and reference terms are merged in practice and the border between them is not always clear (Morita, 2003b), I differentiate them in this study by using “address terms” to refer to “vocatives used to address or summon someone” and “reference terms” to indicate “vocatives that are used to denote a particular person and are syntactically required” (Morita, 2003b).
suffix \textit{–chan} for female participants and no suffixation, or what I call “bare name calling,” for male participants. This is non-reciprocal term use because a lower class-level participant never calls a higher class-level participant by these address terms throughout my data. The central claim of this chapter is that address and reference terms are indexical and thus foreground different social relationships in a given situation. As with the use of speech styles (i.e., \textit{desu/masu} vs. plain form), the social meanings of the address and reference terms here are mediated by context. For example, hierarchical relationships are not constructed when two interactants call each other by the same address terms, such as the cases of \textit{–san} and bare name calling. And the social meaning of an address term may differ when it is used in another frame of talk.

6.2 Japanese address and reference terms

As a “pro-drop” language, Japanese allows pronouns to be omitted when they are understood from the context. It is more common to use personal names, kinship terms (e.g., \textit{neesan} ‘big sister’), and titles (e.g., \textit{sensee} for an instructor) (Martin, 2004; Niyekawa, 1991). In Niyekawa’s (1991) example of “Professor Smith, may I speak to you for a moment?”, both the address term “Professor Smith” and the reference terms “I” and “you” are optional as long as it is known to the professor that the speaker is talking to him/her. Even were the professor to be addressed directly, he or she would be called by name and/or title, and not \textit{anata} ‘you’.\footnote{The pronoun \textit{anata} ‘you’ is especially avoided in conversation (Morita, 2003a; Niyekawa, 1991; Suzuki, 1978). Therefore, the sentence will be something like: \textit{[Sensee], chotto yoroshii desu ka.} ‘[Professor,] is
The suffixes that are used normatively are –sama, –san, –chan, and –kun, all of which are considered a type of honorification (Niyekawa, 1991) or reduced title (Martin, 2004).

**Table 6.1** summarizes these suffixes based on the previous studies. A category marked with an X means that previous studies consider it possible to use. For example, the suffix –sama can be used when a lower status speaker refers to a person whose status is higher than the speaker’s, but not vice versa, according to the previous studies. FN in the chart stands for first names, while LN means last names. This table indicates that all suffixes can be used for both hierarchical and non-hierarchical relationships. It further indicates that these suffixes and bare forms can be exchanged reciprocally or non-reciprocally.

**Table 6.1: Summary of normative use of three suffixes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LN; FN</th>
<th>Hierarchical</th>
<th>Non-hierarchical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High status → Low status</td>
<td>Low status → High status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–sama</td>
<td>LN; LN + FN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–san</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–kun</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–chan</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No suffixes</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The information in this table mainly comes from the studies by Niyekawa (1991), Makino and Tsutsui (1989), Martin (2004), and Mizutani and Mizutani (1987).

The combination of a name and a suffix –sama is said to be “the most respectful of the group of honorific suffixes” (Niyekawa, 1991, p. 81), and to be used only in two
situations, which are addressing letters (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989; Niyekawa, 1991) and “highly polite speech used to clientele by clerks/attendants of hotels, restaurants, travel agencies, department stores, etc.” (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989, p. 385). Therefore, the only common situation where –*sama* is normally observed is in the service industries. In writing, it is uncommon to find a letter without this suffix or the addressee’s title, and in this situation, –*sama* can be used for anybody, of both higher and lower ranks than the writer.

The combination of LN and the suffix –*san* is the most common way to address an adult (Martin, 2004; Niyekawa, 1991), and it is used “regardless of sex, age, marital status, or social status” of the addressee or referent (Niyekawa, 1991, p. 79). Derived from the highly respectful suffix –*sama*, the suffix –*san* is said to indicate the speaker’s respect toward the addressee or referent (Niyekawa, 1991). Nevertheless, adults habitually use it for children along with the FN in non-polite speech (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989; Niyekawa, 1991), which indicates that –*san* can be used to address younger speakers. Similarly, Martin (2004) reports that a teacher uses LN-*san* to address his/her students. Moreover, –*san* is mutually used among close individuals, such as well-acquainted students, with the LN (Martin, 2004) or the FN (Niyekawa, 1991), and among familiar persons, within companies, or by professionals in business talk (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989; Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Niyekawa, 1991).

---

60 According to Makino and Tsutsui (1989), the polite meaning of the suffix derives from the meaning of *sama* ‘appearance’. Referring to Mr. Yamada as *Yamada-sama* ‘the appearance of Yamada (a family name of the addressee)’ is a less direct way to address Mr. Yamada than *Yamada*, without any suffixation, and such indirectness shows the speaker’s polite attitude toward his or her superior.
The suffix –chant is a phonetic variant of –san, and is “the affectionate diminutive honorific” (Niyekawa, 1991, p. 82). As its change in sound (/s/ to /ch/) suggests, it is considered “child-like language” (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989, p. 386) that is used to address or refer to children within the family (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Niyekawa, 1991), which seems to be the reason that –chant is never attached to the LN (Niyekawa, 1991), although it is possible to use it with nicknames. Because adults frequently call children by their FN with –chant, children are said to use –chant to each other, and childhood friends tend to call each other by this form even when they reach adulthood (Niyekawa, 1991). Niyekawa (1991) also explains that young female friends sometimes address each other with FN-chan.

Finally, the suffix –kun is frequently associated with masculinity (Jorden, 1963; Makino & Tsutsui, 1989; Niyekawa, 1991). While Jorden (1963) claims that it is the way a man addresses a male friend, Niyekawa (1991) explains that recently women have begun to use FN-kun to male friends as well. The term –kun relates to hierarchical relationships in such ways as teachers addressing students with LN-kun (Martin, 2004), female students addressing same or lower-ranking male students at school with LN-kun (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989), higher status men calling lower status women and men by LN-kun at work (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989), and adults calling a friend’s child by FN-kun in non-polite speech (Niyekawa, 1991). However, a reciprocal use of the term –kun is also associated with equal relationships. The term –kun is reported to be used among children with LN (Martin, 2004) or FN (Niyekawa, 1991), and later among childhood friends.

---

62 Tsurutani (2007) reports that, during mother-child interaction, both Japanese mothers and 1-year-old children use /ch/ more frequently than /s/ for words such as –san, which is in line with previous findings that Japanese children acquire /ch/ before /s/.
friends or close male friends in non-polite speech (Niyekawa, 1991) or at school or work (Makino & Tsutsui, 1989). The term is often associated with institutional talk, such as interactions at school or work.

The absence of a suffix, or what I call bare name calling, is used for both hierarchical and non-hierarchical relationships. Mizutani and Mizutani (1987) explain that bare LN calling is used toward younger persons at work and toward younger family members. On the other hand, the bare FN is also considered to be used among young friends (Martin, 2004; Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Niyekawa, 1991). As data from Sturtz Sreetharan (2004) exemplify, the use of bare name calling is typically viewed as rough, masculine talk, possibly accompanying strong affect.

Brown and Ford (1961) point out that the choice of FN or LN also influences the meaning of address terms. However, abbreviated names (e.g., Bob for Robert) and diminutives (e.g., Bobbie) are all included in the category of first names in their analysis. In Japanese, similarly, investigations of address and reference terms do not focus on the definition or meaning of nicknames. Niyekawa’s (1991) study discusses nicknames in the context of calling children by the diminutive –chan. In Sturtz Sreetharan’s (2006) study, the abbreviated last name Okumoto and –chan, Oku-chan, is used to index the speaker’s familiarity with the addressed as well as the speaker’s superiority toward the addressed.

In the next section, I will examine how participants in my data use, or do not use, these suffixes during on- and off-stage talk.
6.3 Uses of address and reference terms among the movie club members

To examine how participants use address and reference terms, I selected excerpts that involve six participants, one speaker for each classification plus one more freshman student. These participants’ ways of addressing or referring to each other are summarized in Table 6.2, below. In order to see how the other five participants call or refer to the male graduate student Okada, for example, we can find “Okada” in the top row, and look down the column with that name at its head, which is the first column. “No data” in the table means there are no instances of address and reference terms directed to the participant at the head of that column by the participant in that row. The table shows that, among the five, only Hiroshi calls or refers to Okada in the data, and he consistently calls Okada by LN-san “Okada-san.” The numbers after the address/reference terms indicate the number of tokens; for example, Hiroshi calls or refers to Okada thirteen times. The ways to refer to oneself, such as “I,” are not included in the analysis; these are gray cells in the table. Since the participants are arranged in the order of their class level, the gray cells form a diagonal that separates participants whose classification is lower than or equal to the speaker’s from those whose classification is higher. For example, starting at Hiroshi in the addresser’s column and moving to the right to see how he addresses the other participants, we see that Okada’s and Cap’s names are below and to the left of the gray-cell diagonal, which indicates that they are higher in classification than Hiroshi; the three other participants, Takatoshi, Asami, and Mika, are above and to the right of the gray-cell diagonal, and their classifications are lower than Hiroshi’s.
**TABLE 6.2: Summary of participants’ use of address and reference terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Okada (M, graduate)</th>
<th>Cap (F, senior)</th>
<th>Hiroshi (M, junior)</th>
<th>Takatoshi (M, sophomore)</th>
<th>Asami (F, freshman)</th>
<th>Mika (F, freshman)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addresser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okada</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>FN (6), LN (1),</td>
<td>FN (1)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M, graduate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FN-kun (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>LN-san (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F, senior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshi</td>
<td>LN-san (13)</td>
<td>LN-san (1)</td>
<td>FN-san (1)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M, junior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takatoshi</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Linchoo (1)</td>
<td>FN-san (1)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M, sophomore)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asami</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>LN-san (1)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F, freshman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F, freshman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussion leaders often nominate participants during the meetings, two discussion leaders, Cap and Hiroshi, produce many tokens of address and reference terms in the data. The male graduate student Okada, the observer of the meetings, addresses other participants, especially the discussion leader Hiroshi, whom he addresses nine times throughout the data. As for the non-leaders, Takatoshi, the male sophomore student, addresses or refers to Cap and Hiroshi, using the title *linchoo* ‘committee chair’ for Cap and using *FN-san* for Hiroshi. The two other participants in the table, Asami and Mika, use address and reference terms quite rarely, Mika not at all and Asami only once, using *LN-san* to Hiroshi. In general, students of higher classification tend to use address and reference terms more often than lower classification students.

As for suffixation, a speaker often chooses to use different suffixation for the same participant. For example, Hiroshi uses *-chan, -san*, and bare name calling for
Asami. The choice of suffixation varies across participants. While Okada never uses suffixation for anybody, Cap addresses others both with and without suffixes. In general, no participants use –sama, and many participants use –san, –chan, and bare name calling.

The suffix –san is widely used with LN, FN, and NN (nickname). LN-san is used for higher classification students, such as when Hiroshi (junior) uses it for Okada (graduate) and for Cap (senior). On the other hand, FN-san is also used for lower classification students, as when Hiroshi uses it for Asami (freshman) and Mika (freshman). Cap once uses NN-san: Taka-san for Takatoshi. In this study, a nickname is defined as an abbreviated FN or LN, as in this case, where the first name Takatoshi is abbreviated as Taka.

The use of the suffix –chan shows a clear pattern in that it is used for lower classification participants. Both Cap and Hiroshi use FN-chan for freshman students Asami and Mika. Cap uses NN-chan and Taka-chan for the sophomore Takatoshi.

Okada consistently calls two male participants (Hiroshi and Takatoshi) by their bare FNs. Bare FN or LN calling is consistently used for participants whose classification is lower than the speakers’. For example, Hiroshi (male, junior) calls Takatoshi (male, sophomore) and Asami (female, freshman) by bare FN or LN, and Cap (female, senior) calls Hiroshi (male, junior), Takatoshi (male, sophomore), and Asami (female, freshman) by bare FN or LN.

To give an overview of suffixation in the data, bare name calling is the most common, with twenty-four tokens, followed by –san with eighteen tokens and –chan with thirteen tokens. There is one token for each of the following categories: title use when Takatoshi calls Cap iinchoo ‘committee chair’, and –kun, which Cap uses with Hiroshi.
In the next section, I look into examples of the most common suffixations, –san, –chan, and bare name calling, and study how each comes to index different social meanings.

6.4 FN-san and FN-chan: The difference between on- and off-stage talk

First, I will illustrate the contrastive use of address terms in relation to on- and off-stage talk by the same pair of speakers. While higher class-level participants use –san to nominate a female freshman participant officially, they use –chan to treat the addressee as a lower class-level assistant to the speaker, leading to a senpai-koohai relationship.

In the following excerpt, the suffix –san is used when the discussion leader’s nomination is done officially. There is no senpai-koohai relationship constructed between the discussion leader and the addressed person here. Prior to this excerpt, Hiroshi, the male junior student and discussion leader, starts off the meeting. The agenda on the board indicates that the item they will discuss now is suotto bunseki, the “SWOT Analysis,” which is a discussion method that is commonly practiced in business. Because this discussion method is not well known among students, Hiroshi first checks if the Participants who were absent from the last meeting know the method by asking for its definition from Asami, a female freshman Participant.

Excerpt 11 (Sales Meeting 1, 40):
Hiroshi (male, junior, discussion leader) and Asami (female, freshman, participant)

1 Hiroshi jaa, suotto bunseki tte yuu hanashi o shita to omou n desu ga, well then SWOT analysis QT say talk O do-PAST QT think NOM COP but ‘Well then, [I] think that [I] talked about SWOT Analysis (in the last meeting), but
zenkai yasunde ita hito no tame ni, ((mumbles something in low voice))

‘for those who were absent last time

hai, jaa, suotto bunseki to wa nani ka. (. ) asamisan.

‘OK, well then, what is SWOT Analysis? Asami-san

Er, [I am asking you] because [you] won’t look at me.’

Some participants @

Asami hai. etto; suotto bunseki wa, esu ga sutorongu de, daburyuu ga uikunesu de,

‘Yes. Er, SWOT Analysis is, [the letter] S means strong, W means weakness,

oo ga opochunitii de, tii ga suretto? (. )

‘O’ means opportunity, and T means threat.’

Hiroshi hai. OK

‘OK.’

In Line 3, Hiroshi first asks a question to the floor. After a brief pause, he nominates Asami with –san (Line 3). This turn construction is in line with the discussion order in which the discussion leader presents a question to the entire group of Participants, followed by nomination of a selected Participant. Hiroshi’s act of searching for a nominee is indicated by two things, the brief pause after his question and the content of his utterance in Line 4, which states that Asami is the one who did not make eye contact with him, implying that other Participants did. Although the utterance in Line 4 has a casual tone that causes some to laugh in Line 5, the official tone of conversation is kept with Asami’s token of reply, hai ‘yes’ (Line 6). After Asami’s explanation (Lines 6 and 7), Hiroshi responds with another official token of reply hai ‘OK’, which is an indication that he is moving to the next topic as the discussion leader. Overall, the foregrounded
identities of Hiroshi and Asami in this interaction are their discussion roles of the
discussion leader and a nominee, in spite of the casualness of Hiroshi’s method of
choosing a nominee (Line 4). This entails that the frame of talk in this excerpt is on-stage.

On the other hand, Hiroshi’s nomination and Asami’s reply are much more
spontaneous in the following excerpt. Although it contains on-stage talk, there is an
observed shift to off-stage talk, and their constructed identities often deviate from their
discussion roles. This excerpt begins a few minutes after the previous excerpt, when the
discussion leader Hiroshi moves to a brainstorming activity. “Brainstorming activity” is
referred to in Japanese by an abbreviated form, buresuto, and Hiroshi asks Asami to
define this term. This time, his nomination is accompanied with the diminutive –chan
and it is not preceded by a question to the floor.

Excerpt 12 (Sales Meeting 1, 66):
Hiroshi (male, junior, discussion leader) and Asami (female, freshman, participant)

1 Hiroshi mazu buresuto shite hoshii na tte yuu (. ) fuu ni shukudai o
first of all brainstorming do want wonder QT PR way P homework O

2 dashite ita n de, sok kara hajime tai to omoi masu.
give-PROG-PAST because start want QT think COP
‘First of all, [I] gave [all participants] homework, in the way, like, “[I] want
you to do buresuto,” so, [I] think that [I] want to start from there.

3 → asamichan, buresuto no imi wa?
[FN]-chan buresuto LK meaning TOP
‘Asami-chan, [what is] the meaning of buresuto?’

4 Asami etto, ( . ) tadashii ka tadashiku nai ka ni kakawarazu, sono teema ni,
er correct Q correct-NEG Q P concern-NEG that theme P

5 sotta yoo na koto o, (. ) minna de dashi au
go along-PAST way COP thing O everyone with present each other
‘Er, irrespective of being correct or incorrect, presenting things that go along
with the theme with everyone’
Immediately after Hiroshi’s official explanation on the discussion procedure of *buresuto* (Lines 1 and 2), he nominates Asami with –*chan* and asks the meaning of *buresuto* ‘brainstorming’ (Line 3). The order of these sentences, nomination followed by inquiry, is the opposite from that in the previous excerpt, which indicates that the question is not directed to the entire set of Participants but targeted to Asami from the beginning. Because Hiroshi initiates one-to-one interaction with Asami here, it is not typical of the on-stage but of the off-stage type of nomination. The informal nature of the question is highlighted by the absence of the predicate *nan desu ka* ‘what is it?’, which could have followed after Hiroshi’s utterance in Line 3. Asami replies with no pause and starts with *etto* ‘er’, rather than the official reactive token *hai* ‘yes’ as in the previous excerpt. These features indicate the informal and spontaneous nature of their utterances, characteristic of off-stage talk. A shift to on-stage talk happens right after this. After Asami provides her definition (Lines 4 and 5), Hiroshi inquires what the original form of *buresuto* is (Line 6), to which Asami responds with the unabbreviated Japanese form of ‘brainstorming’ (Line 7). Here, Hiroshi uses the formal way of asking with *deshoo ka* in a question (Line 6), which matches his formal concluding remark *hai arigatoo gozaimasu* ‘OK, thank you’ in
Line 8. Hiroshi’s token of appreciation indicates that he is talking as the discussion leader who appreciates Asami’s contribution to the discussion. Hiroshi’s role as the discussion leader is foregrounded. Asami’s naked plain forms in Lines 5 and 7 index her detached stance toward the content of her talk (Cook, 1996, 2008a). However, with Hiroshi’s appreciation token, Asami’s answer in Line 7 is treated as what is needed for the discussion, and her previous answer in Lines 4 to 5 is relegated to being background information to the discussion, that is, content that is less relevant to the discussion, thus a side sequence to the discussion order.

Their hierarchical identities in this excerpt are further emphasized by the content of Hiroshi’s question. Note that buresuto is a part of Hiroshi’s assignment that was to prepare all participants for the meeting (Line 1). This means that the meaning of the word buresuto was supposedly shared among all at the point when Hiroshi gave the assignment. Hiroshi’s clarification question functions as a basic knowledge check on the entire group of participants. For this purpose, the question can be directed either to a knowledgeable Participant so that less knowledgeable members can learn from the nominee, or a less knowledgeable one so that Hiroshi can check whether the least knowledgeable nominee knows the answer. With the diminutive –chan that is commonly used for children (Niyekawa, 1991), the targeted nominee is, therefore, implied as being at the bottom among the participants in terms of knowledge. If Asami can answer the question, all participants should know the answer.

The contrastive identities in these two excerpts relate to the meanings of the two suffixes, –san and –chan; that is, –san contributes to the construction of on-stage roles
while –chan does not. In the next section, I discuss further how –chan contributes to the construction of senpai-koohai identities.

6.5 FN-chan as a resource for senpai-koohai relationships

As seen in Section 6.3, the diminutive suffix –chan is exclusively used with first name or nickname in this study’s data. The suffix –chan is typically used when the class level of an addressed or referenced participant is lower than the speaker’s. In such cases, senpai-koohai relationships are frequently constructed between the addressee and the addressee. Typically, the interaction is initiated by a non-freshman speaker to address or refer to a female freshman participant. Two types of acts are involved: (1) a non-freshman discussion leader treats a freshman as an incapable member of the group and (2) a non-freshman speaker protects a powerless freshman from the discussion leader.

The previous excerpt is an example of the first type of senpai act; that is, a non-freshman speaker treats a freshman speaker as a less capable member of the group. The following example again clearly illustrates this type of act, where the discussion leader Hiroshi (junior student) treats the female freshman Asami as a novice member of the group. Hiroshi initiates his characteristic act of senpai with his use of the term ‘Asami-chan’. The participants are discussing the topic of advertising the movie event, and one group of advertising sites is high schools. Asami is in charge of listing candidate high schools.

Excerpt 13 (Sales Meeting 1, 2680):
Hiroshi (male, junior, discussion leader) and Asami (female, freshman, participant)

1 Hiroshi shōchūgakkō mo kyōnen itta to koro no risuto ga aru node;
   elementary/junior high school also last year go-PAST place LK list S exist so
‘[We] also have a list of elementary and junior high schools that we visited last year, so,

2 demo kore mo, kore mo, ((looking at the list)) (.)

but this also this also

‘but this and this also,

3 → kore wa e:to asamichan ga, risuto motteru kara ((eye contact with Asami))

this TOP er [FN]-chan S list have-PROG because

‘this [issue] is, er, since Asami-chan has the list’

4 Asami

n

yeah

‘Yeah’

5 Hiroshi

→ doo shitara ii kana. sekininsha o asamichan ni shite; (.)

how do-if good wonder person in charge O [FN]-chan P do

‘[I] wonder what [is] a better [way] to do it. [I] assign Asami-chan to be the person in charge, and,

6 hitori de yareru? muri. rokkoo nanakoo nara yoyuu?

one person P do-can impossible six schools seven schools if easy

‘Can [you=Asami] do [the job] alone? [You seem to be saying] impossible. [Can you contact the schools] easily if [there are only] six or seven schools?’

7 Asami

e, renraku o suru tte koto desu ka?

er contact O do QT thing COP Q

‘Er, [you] mean, contacting [these schools]?’

8 Hiroshi

un, sasete moraitai n desu kedo, shimekiri toka ((unclear utterance))

yeah do-CAUS receive-want NOM COP but deadline etc.

‘Yeah, [you can ask them like,] “[we] would like [to advertise the event], but the deadline etc. ((unclear utterance))’

9 Asami

hai.

OK

‘OK.’

10 Hiroshi

oh

‘Oh.’

11 Some participants

After Hiroshi refers to Asami with –chan (Line 3), he makes eye contact with Asami.

Hiroshi assigns Asami the job of being the person in charge in Line 5, referring to her by
her first name with –chan. Hiroshi then initiates one-to-one interaction with Asami from Line 6. He asks Asami whether or not she can handle the job alone in Line 6, hitori de. He further asks her whether she can handle the job if it involves only six or seven high schools. While all Hiroshi’s utterances in Line 6 are in the plain form, Asami uses the masu form in Line 7, in which she asks for a clarification. Hiroshi demonstrates for Asami how to talk to high school officials (Line 8). He provides a model for communicating with school officials with forms appropriate for the situation, such as the combination of a causative form and receiving verb sasete moraitai.

For Hiroshi to ask Asami if she can handle the job alone is not necessarily a typical senpai act, because the assignment might be burdensome for any member, especially because it must be done during the examination season. However, by providing a model example of how to communicate with high school officials, Hiroshi constructs Asami as a novice member. Overall, Hiroshi’s treatment of Asami as a less capable participant matches his use of the diminutive –chan. And Asami’s quiet acceptance of the assignment presents another characteristic act of a koohai, who is supposed to obey the senpai’s order unconditionally.

The second type of characteristic act that relates to senpai-koohai identities occurs when a non-freshman speaker protects a powerless freshman from the discussion leader. In the following excerpt, Cap, the representative of the club who stands outside of the on-stage discussion frame, protects a female freshman participant from the authority of the discussion leader, Hiroshi, who assigns a job to the freshman Participant without asking her preferences. Prior to this excerpt, Hiroshi assigns a job to Takatoshi, a male sophomore student, and now he is looking for a job partner for Takatoshi.
Excerpt 14 (Sales Meeting 1, 2036):
Hiroshi (male, junior, discussion leader), Cap (female, senior, Captain), and Mika (female, freshman, participant)

1 Hiroshi dare ga hoshii moo hitori. (facing toward Takatoshi)
   ‘Whom do [you] want [as] another [person as a partner]?’

2 Takatoshi n; tesuto aru kara, ato hanhan gurai ni shitai.
   ‘Hmm, since [I] have exams, [I want to] split the work about half and half.’

3 Hiroshi → ja ano, me atta kara mikasan. (Looking at Mika)
   ‘Well then, um, since [I just] had eye contact [with her], [I nominate] Mika-san.’

4 Cap → @ mikachan, hanran shite ii kara
   ‘Mika-chan, [it’s] OK [for you] to revolt, so’

5 Mika e? @
   ‘Huh?’

6 Cap ya dattara ya tte
   ‘If [you] don’t like [Hiroshi’s nomination], [you can say] that [you] don’t like [it]’

7 Some participants @

8 Mika ya
   ‘no’

9 Hiroshi iya da.
   ‘[You] don’t like [it]’

10 Mika iya do yatte shitara ii no ka ((mumble; inaudible utterance))
   ‘No, [I don’t know] how to do [the work]’ (inaudible)

11 Hiroshi tada ano;
   ‘[It’s] only, um’
Because Takatoshi does not answer Hiroshi’s question in Line 1 directly (Line 2), Hiroshi nominates the freshman participant Mika for the assignment by addressing her with FN and –san, only because he happened to exchange eye contact with Mika (Line 3). His nomination is informal, due to the reason he gives for the nomination and the lack of a request to the floor, asking for volunteers, although his use of –san adds some degree of formality. His unusual way of nominating Mika leads Cap to laugh (Line 4). Cap initiates one-to-one interaction with Mika by calling her by her first name and –chan (Line 4), and gives her permission to revolt against the authority of the discussion leader (Line 4). Her word choice, hanran ‘revolt’, along with her laugh, suggests that this is a joking utterance, which indicates characteristic off-stage talk. By these acts, Cap takes Mika out of the discussion frame, indicating Cap’s higher authority in relation to Hiroshi’s. In other words, Cap’s permission overrides the discussion leader’s nomination. When Mika responds to Cap with e? (Line 5), i.e., a sign of incomprehension, Cap gives a further instruction on how to revolt against Hiroshi (Line 6). Later, in Line 10, the conversation is developed in such a way that Mika is not opposing Hiroshi’s nomination, but is simply unsure of how to carry out the assignment, which enhances her position as a novice member. Mika’s utterance is not a clear question pattern directed to Hiroshi, but ends with mumbling, indicating her passive participation in the discussion. Mika’s utterance in Line 10 may be indirect resistance to Hiroshi’s assignment, but the
significance of her excuse in Line 10 is minimized with Hiroshi’s utterance *tada* ‘[it’s] only’ (Line 11) and Takatoshi’s offer to reduce Mika’s burden (Line 12). Finally, Mika accepts the job with the minimum but formal agreement token *hai* ‘OK’ (Line 13).

Cap’s act of protecting Mika initiates off-stage talk, evidenced by a simultaneous turn-taking pattern involving another participant, Takatoshi, as well as the content that is not directly related to the main point of the discussion. During this off-stage talk frame, multiple relationships of *senpai-koohai* can be observed. Cap’s utterance in Line 4 positions Mika as a Participant who needs Cap’s support to survive, and Cap’s use of the diminutive –*chan* reinforces Mika’s weak position. The absence of verbal resistance from Mika to Hiroshi exhibits a characteristic act of *koohai* to *senpai*, as a *koohai* is supposed to obey the *senpai*’s job assignment, even after assistance such as Cap’s.

Similarly, Cap helps freshmen participants during a break. When the female freshman Asami asks for advice from Takatoshi (male junior student), Cap joins the conversation to add concrete advice for Asami. Cap’s advice starts with her addressing Asami with –*chan*.

Excerpt 15 (Sales Meeting 1, 2810):
Takatoshi (male, sophomore), Cap (female, senior, Captain), and Asami (female, freshman, participant)

1 Asami  doko made setsumee shite:,  
*where until explanation do*

‘To which point [I should] explain [to media], and’

2 Takatoshi e? e: to doko made tto  
huh er  
*where until QT*

‘Huh? Er, until where’

3 Asami  nani-, nani yattara ii no ka,  
*what what do-if good NOM Q*

‘what-, what [I] should do,’
4 Takatoshi kantannichi, ichioo, gaiyoo to; koo-, koo yuu koto yatteru node:, zehi:
simply anyway outline and this way this way thing do-PROG because please

5 kochira de:, watashitachi no katsudoo o toriagete kudasai masen ka tte yuu here P we LK activity O take please COP-NEG Q QT

6 no ga NOM S ‘Anyway, [you will] simply explain [to the media about] the outline [of our event] and, [ask] that, “since we are doing these kinds of things, could [you] please mention our activities in your [media]?”

7 Asami @

8 Cap → asamichan? ikkai [FN]-chan once ‘Asami-chan, once’

9 Asami hai @
yes ‘Yes’

10 Cap shita(gaki) nanka jibun de:
draft um oneself P ‘draft, um, by yourself’

11 Takatoshi un, tabun denwa yori wa;, bunshoo no hoo: yeah perhaps telephone than TOP sentence LK side ‘Yeah, perhaps, writing [is better] than telephone’

12 Cap → de takasan ka;, hiroshi ni:, chekku shite morai na? and [NN]-san or [FN] P check do receive P ‘And [ask] Taka-san or Hiroshi to check [your writing], OK?’

13 Takatoshi un, soo, ikkai meeru yeah right once Email ‘Yeah, right, once Email’

14 Cap okuru mae ni.
send before P ‘Before [you] send [Email messages to media].’

15 Takatoshi ore toka, ni, okutte, chekku shite,
I [VULGAR/INFORMAL] etc. to send check do ‘send [your Email message] to me or somebody, and [let us] check [your message]’
First, in Lines 2, 4, 5, and 6, Takatoshi responds to Asami’s question (Lines 1 and 3). Asami produces an ambiguous laugh, indicating that her problem is not solved yet. Cap is standing near them and joins the conversation from Line 8. First, Cap gets Asami’s attention by calling her *Asami-chan* (Line 8). After Cap’s next word, Asami utters a formal reaction token *hai* ‘yes’ (Line 9). From Line 10, Cap gives advice to Asami about what to do, and Takatoshi adds words after Cap’s utterances (Lines 11, 13, 15). Asami does not give any reaction tokens, but listens to them quietly. With her participation without words, Asami is constructed as somebody who listens to two people’s advice.

The use of *morai* ‘receive’ in the predicate of Cap’s advice in Line 12 is a donatory verb that means that, from the standpoint of Asami, it is a favor by Takatoshi or Hiroshi to check Asami’s draft. Asami’s appreciation of others’ help is assumed with Cap’s use of the donatory verb. *Na?* at the end of Line 12 is a form that is the abbreviated command form *nasai* ‘do’ that is often used among equals or younger speakers, and combined with a verb, it indexes the addressee’s lower status in relation to the speaker. The final particle in Line 16, *ne?*, further encourages Asami to comply with Cap’s suggestion. In this case again, Cap’s role is constructed as the person who offers assistance to the freshman Asami so that Asami can complete her assignment. Therefore, their *senpai-koohai* identities are constructed.

Another notable feature presented in this excerpt is the way Cap refers to Takatoshi and Hiroshi in Line 12. Cap refers to Takatoshi with *Taka-san*, his nickname and –*san*, while she uses bare first name calling for Hiroshi, which is less formal than
Taka-san. Since Takatoshi is a sophomore and Hiroshi is a junior, Cap’s way of addressing them does not reflect the two students’ class-level differences. While this conversation is taking place, Hiroshi is on the other side of the meeting room and cannot hear the conversation. Cap adds –san to the usual nickname Taka for the sophomore student as a participant of the conversation, and she refers to Hiroshi with bare first name, her usual way of calling Hiroshi (TABLE 6.2). Takatoshi is providing assistance to Asami during this excerpt, and Cap’s use of –san to Takatoshi indicates her recognition of his role as advisor to Asami in front of Takatoshi. For Hiroshi, Cap does not treat him the same way, perhaps because Hiroshi is not present at the scene. This presents a case where speakers’ choice of reference terms may differ depending on the presence or absence of the person referred to.

In the situation of a meeting discussion, the discussion leader may step away from the discussion leader role, and approach freshman or sophomore participants in order to elicit their opinion, as seen in Excerpt 10. This is a senpai’s characteristic act of assisting inactive koohai, because quiet freshman or sophomore participants would not be able to join the discussion otherwise. In such cases, the discussion leader tends to use the suffix –chan for nomination. Excerpt 10’s discussion is presented again in Excerpt 16.

Excerpt 16 (General Meeting, 505):
Cap (female, senior, discussion leader) and Asami (female, freshman, participant)

[In the general meeting, the main discussion leader Cap learned that the selection section had discussed classic movie selection without reaching consensus among section members. Cap redirects the question, whether or not to include classic movies in the program, to each member of the selection section.]
In Line 3, Cap calls Asami by FN plus –chan, along with casual tokens of encouragement saa saa (Line 3).

Each excerpt in this section exemplifies that –chan can be used as a resource in the construction of koohai. In the data, freshman and sophomore students never use –chan toward junior or senior students. It is consistent with my observations that, in my data, a higher class-level student is never constructed as koohai in relation to students of lower class levels. As –chan helps to build an identity of an addressee as a novice, participants who do not have access to –chan do not have an opportunity to build an equal status with the interactant when they are addressed with –chan. That is, even when a junior or senior student calls a freshman with –chan, a freshman does not use the same address term to construct equal status. Therefore, this unequal access to this suffix contributes to the construction of senpai-koohai relations.
6.6 Bare FN and LN as resources for a *senpai* and a male *koohai* relationship

In contrast with the diminutive –*chan*, bare first name and last name calling are considered as rough, masculine, and informal ways to address people, especially men, of equal or lower statuses (Martin, 2004; Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Niyekawa, 1991). In my data, there is no instance of lower class-level participants using bare name calling toward higher class-level participants. It is common to use these terms toward lower class-level male participants, but no female participants of any class level are addressed or referred to in this way. Therefore, bare name calling indirectly indexes male gender of the addressee.

The male graduate student, Okada, a supervisor standing outside of the on-stage discussion, consistently calls the male junior student Hiroshi by his bare first name. This often accompanies Okada’s act of disciplining Hiroshi when Hiroshi is in the role of a discussion leader. Since Okada is not following the discussion order, the interaction between Okada and Hiroshi constitutes off-stage talk in the manner in which Okada drags Hiroshi away from the discussion order. Let us revisit Excerpt 9, where Okada interrupts the discussion leader Hiroshi’s turn by addressing Hiroshi by bare first name calling.

**Excerpt 17 (Same as Excerpt 9):**
Okada (male, graduate student, the founder of the club) and Hiroshi (male, junior, discussion leader)

1 Hiroshi zenkai wa mazu, kyoosan-, ma eegyoobu no shigoto wa kyoosankin atsume last time TOP first sponsor um sales section LK job TOP sponsor fund collection

2 to, koohookatsudoo to, ato kikaku zukuri to yuu mittsu na n desu ga, and advertisement activity and rest plan making QT PR three COP NOM COP but ‘In the last [meeting], first, sponsor-, um sales section’s jobs are collecting sponsor funds, advertisement, and making plans, these three, but,
Okada’s intrusion on Hiroshi’s move is initiated with his bare first name calling of Hiroshi (Line 5). After Okada’s objection to the first item on the agenda, Hiroshi utters an agreement token hai, wakarimashita ‘Yes, understood’. Hiroshi’s quick agreement without much resistance indicates his lower status in relation to Okada. After a brief pause, Hiroshi returns to his discussion leader role with the token of topic change jaa
‘well then’ (Line 9). However, Okada remains in off-stage talk in Lines 10 and 12. In Line 11, Hiroshi proclaims a move to end the current agenda because of Okada-san no chikara ‘the power of Okada-san’. With this line, Hiroshi publicly presents Okada’s power as something that can change the discussion leader’s action. Hiroshi’s use of the reference term Okada-san is presented within the frame of on-stage talk, reframing the event with his interpretation of Okada’s interruption to other participants as the discussion leader. He treats Okada’s interruption as an event that happened outside of the discussion frame. In accordance with this treatment, Hiroshi uses the last name with –san for Okada, the form that is commonly used for senior participants. As seen previously, on-stage participants are addressed with their first names or nicknames with –san. As all participants consistently call Okada with his last name plus –san, this use of the last name along with –san indicates their treatment of Okada as a person who stands outside of the discussion frame (on-stage talk), simultaneously recognizing him as someone who is in a higher class level compared to them.

Hiroshi’s use of the last name and –san is contrastive with Okada’s addressing of Hiroshi with bare first name calling, which indexes an unequal relationship. It is significant that bare first name calling by Okada accompanies his interrupting act toward Hiroshi, while Hiroshi’s mentioning of Okada with –san occurs when he recognizes Okada’s authoritative power that affects on-stage participants from outside the discussion frame. Here again, the address terms of Hiroshi and Okada and their acts together index their senpai-koohai relationship.

Cap, the other observer of the meeting, also interrupts Hiroshi while he is acting as the discussion leader, as introduced in Excerpt 14. In the following case, Cap scolds
the discussion leader Hiroshi by calling him with his bare first and last name. During the discussion of advertisements, Hiroshi asks the freshman participants if they knew about the movie event when they were in high school. Asami, a female freshman participant, mentions that she knew, and Hiroshi starts teasing her that she is showing off.

Excerpt 18 (Sales Meeting, 1611):
Cap (female, senior, Captain), Hiroshi (male, junior, discussion leader), and Asami (female, freshman, participant)

1 Hiroshi ima ichinensee no hito de shitteta hito, now freshman LK person P know-PROG-PAST person
   ‘Any current freshman people [who] knew [about this event], [raise your hand].’

2 Asami ichioo nanka namee wa oboete nakatta n desu kedo,
   PR um name TOP remember NEG-PAST NOM COP but
   ‘Um, I didn’t remember the name [of the event], but, [I] read the newspaper ((mumble))’

3 Cap and other participants he:
   wow
   ‘Wow:’

5 Male participant aa nanka eega joohoo da mitaina
   ah something movie information COP like
   ‘[You were] like, “ah, [here is] some information about movies”’

6 Hiroshi suggee
   awesome [COLLOQ/ MAS]
   ‘Awesome’

7 Male participant ((unclear utterance))
   ((unclear utterance))

8 Hiroshi nanige- nanige ni shinbun yondemasu mitaina
   implying newspaper read-PROG like
   ‘[You are] implying like, “[I] am reading the newspaper [, so I am a good student]”’

9 Asami ya ((light laugh as if she is embarrassed))
   no
10 Cap → HIROSHI
[FN]
‘HIROSHI!’

11 Some participants @

12 Cap → (.) kyoo mendokusai ne, hirata. (to others)
   today complicated P [Hiroshi’s LN]
   ‘[He] is troublesome today, right? [I mean] Hirata is.’

13 Some participants @

Hiroshi’s utterance in Line 8 implies that Asami’s utterance in Lines 2 and 3 contributes to building Asami’s good image of being a diligent student who carefully reads the newspaper, thus being attentive to social issues. Asami responds to Hiroshi with a short ya ‘no’, along with a light laugh of embarrassment (Line 9). This is when Cap self-selects her turn in Line 10, addressing Hiroshi by his bare first name. Cap’s loud voice indexes the emotional intensity of her utterance, giving an effect of scolding. While some participants treat this interaction as laughable (Line 11), Cap adds a negative comment about Hiroshi, kyoo mendokusai ne ‘[He] is troublesome today, right?’ (Line 12). The interactional particle ne here presumes agreement from other participants. When the authoritative outsider encourages other participants’ agreement here, it is equivalent to propagating a negative image of Hiroshi to the others. Cap further specifies who is being ‘troublesome’ by using Hiroshi’s last name without suffixation. This is the only instance where anybody among the participants, including Cap, addresses or refers to Hiroshi with the bare last name. This means that Cap’s use of the bare last name deviates from casual conversation. Since it is optional for Japanese speakers to mention names at the end of the utterance when the referee is clear from the context, Cap is not
obligated to mention Hiroshi’s name at the end of the utterance in Line 12. Therefore, this additional name mention further emphasizes that Cap’s critique is directly targeted at Hiroshi. Cap’s critique comes after other Participants’ laughter (Line 11) and also causes some more laughter (Line 13), which indicates that Cap’s open critique of Hiroshi is treated as something laughable to others. However, Cap is not smiling then. Both the intensity of Cap’s bare name calling while scolding in Line 10 and her use of the bare last name to make fun of Hiroshi in Line 12 complement Cap’s superior stance in relation to Hiroshi. Hiroshi’s lack of response to Cap makes it appear as if Cap’s scolding act silences Hiroshi, which then highlights an unequal status between the two interactants. Overall, the hierarchical relationship between Cap and Hiroshi is foregrounded after Cap’s intrusion into the discussion with the help of Cap’s two ways of using Hiroshi’s bare name.63

The excerpts in this section illustrate how two observers’ acts targeting the discussion leader Hiroshi are initiated and further developed by bare name calling of Hiroshi, both by his first name and his last name. *Senpai-koohai* relationships between the interactants are constructed during the off-stage talk, and the absence of address and reference terms contributes to the identity construction in accordance with their characteristic acts of *senpai* and *koohai*.

As is the case with the suffix –*chan*, there are no instances in the data where lower class-level students use bare name calling toward their seniors. This suggests that when a higher class-level student addresses a lower class-level student with either –*chan*

63 Furthermore, their hierarchical relationship contains another set of relationships that include Asami, constructed as the *koohai* of both Hiroshi and Cap. Because Cap’s act of scolding Hiroshi is caused by Hiroshi’s teasing act toward the freshman Asami, Cap’s scolding act targeted at Hiroshi implies Cap’s act of protecting Asami, although Cap does not mention Asami’s name.
or bare name calling, the lower class-level student has no way to reply with the same address term, which would contribute to constructing an equal relationship. If the lower class-level students cannot use these forms reciprocally in an interaction, they have no other choice than to be constructed as *koohai* in relation to the higher level student who can use the forms. The unequal access to the term may contribute to unequal relationships between the two interactants. Therefore, these two types of suffixation, –*chan* and no suffix, relate to hierarchical relationships due to the participants’ unequal access to them.

### 6.7 Chapter conclusion

This chapter deals with the issue of address and reference terms that contribute to the identity construction of *senpai-koohai*. It presents two types of suffixation, the affectionate diminutive –*chan* and no suffix, that can contribute to *senpai-koohai* identities, and another, –*san*, that indexes on-stage talk. Although –*chan* and bare name calling are contrastive in terms of the addressees’ gender, both of them accompany the non-freshman speakers’ characteristic acts of *senpai* targeted toward freshman speakers. The suffix –*chan* is used when a non-freshman speaker treats a female freshman participant as a less capable member of the group, and when a non-freshman speaker protects a powerless female freshman. The lack of active participation on the side of the freshman participants creates contrast between the addressee and the addresseee. Together with such acts, the diminutive helps to construct the female freshman student as a *koohai* to the addressee, the *senpai*. Bare name calling is used to address and refer to a male junior student, the discussion leader. The addressees are outsiders to the discussion frame,
and they override the discussion leader’s authority. With these outsiders’ acts of interruption and the discussion leader’s obedience to them, senpai-koohai identities emerge.

There are no instances of reciprocal use of either –chan or bare name calling in the entire data set. Furthermore, no participants use –chan or bare names toward their seniors in the data. The participants’ unequal use of these terms highlights the hierarchical relationships between students of higher and lower class levels.
CHAPTER 7. SENPAI AS A KNOWLEDGEABLE PARTY

7.1 Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to illustrate how the identity of a graduate student is constructed as a senpai in relation to other participants with the contribution of an indexed epistemic stance. The graduate student who is the founder of the club, Okada-san, often leads teaching sequences targeting other participant(s) about business-related issues. The analysis of the teaching sequences reveals that the graduate student frequently uses epistemic stance markers (i.e., interactional particles no, yo, yo ne, sa, and an epistemic verb oshieru ‘teach’) that index a knowledgeable party with the help of the content of the utterance. Other participants’ role as students, indexed by their non-use of these epistemic stance markers, creates a contrast with Okada-san’s strong epistemic stance. Okada-san does not use the strong epistemic stance markers when he is not constructed as a senpai. In order to illustrate how Okada-san’s epistemic stance of being a knowledgeable party contributes to his constructed senpai identity, this chapter starts with cases where he acts as a senpai in his teaching sequences, followed by an excerpt in which Okada-san is not constructed as a senpai in relation to others.

In Ochs’s (1996) framework, an epistemic stance is a speaker’s disposition that relates to “knowledge or belief vis-à-vis some focus of concern, including degree of certainty of knowledge, degree of commitment to truth of propositions, and sources of knowledge” (p. 410). Following Nakane’s (1967/1972) work, with its example from a bank that suggests that the senpai is a person who is experienced in their business, my claim is that senpai-koohai identities are closely related to participants’ presentation of relevant knowledge, i.e., epistemic stance. The relevant knowledge in my data is about
business-related issues, which are the contents of the graduate student’s teaching. The graduate student, who is the only person with extensive business experience among the participants, introduces the business culture in his role as a teacher. He introduces a discussion method as a resource for successful business conduct. His act of teaching about the business world is situated in the context of the club that is structured in a way that resembles a company, such as having a section named the “sales section.” The graduate student’s teaching acts and epistemic stances of being a knowledgeable party, together with the content of his teaching, contribute to the construction of his senpai identity. This is in accordance with the role of senpai, who are supposed to give training and guidance to koohai (Dunn, 1996). Other participants’ acts in these interactions confirm their role as koohai, who are supposed to give obedience and respect to their senpai (Dunn, 1994). The prototypical role of the senpai assumes, therefore, that the senpai teaches the koohai. This entails that there is supposedly a knowledge gap between the two parties about something related to the focus of their concern.

7.2 The senpai identity and being a knowledgeable party

As a graduate student, Okada-san stands outside of the club meeting discussion in all sessions, and provides assistance to discussion leaders. As the founder of the club, he holds a special status as senpai in relation to the other participants. In this section, I will show how his senpai status is foregrounded in interaction through his teaching acts about business-related issues and his strong epistemic stance.

During the meeting, where the junior student Hiroshi serves as the discussion leader, Okada-san takes over Hiroshi’s discussion leader role and teaches a discussion
method to all of the Participants. While some Participants prepare for Okada-san’s instruction, erasing the whiteboard for him, Okada-san explains the importance of knowledge about this discussion method to another Participant. He frequently uses an epistemic stance marker yo, which indexes his stance as a knowledgeable party.

Excerpt 19 (Sales Meeting 2, 2054): Okada (male, graduate student)

1 Okada chotto are da ne?
   little that COP P

2 → kaigi no shikata tte yuu no o benkyoo suru no wa, ii desu yo.
   meeting LK method QT PR NOM O study do NOM TOP good COP P
   ‘Um, [isn’t] that right? It’s good to study how to conduct a meeting.’

3 Male participant “un”
   yeah
   ‘Yeah’

4 Okada anmari sono hoohooron o kangaenakute ii no wa yappari
   much um methodology O think-NEG good NOM TOP as expected

5 keekensoku: de itteru kara
   empirical rule with go-PROG because
   ‘The reason [that you] don’t have to think about the methodology [of conducting a meeting] is, of course, [you] are doing [it] with empirical rules.’

6 Male participant “un”
   yeah
   ‘Yeah’

7 Okada → ↑ otona mo soo na n da yo?
   adult also so COP NOM COP P
   ‘Adults are like that, too, OK?’

8 keekensoku de yatteru kara, dakara ne chuushoo kigyou nante
   empirical rule with do-PROG because therefore P mid-, small-sized company as
   ‘Because [they] are doing [business] based on empirical rules, so, mid- and small-sized companies

9 → sugu ne reesai kigyou ni naru n da [yo]
   soon P small-sized company P become NOM COP P
   ‘soon come to be smaller-sized companies.’
Okada-san presents the main point of his teaching, which is “it’s good to study how to conduct a meeting,” in Line 2 with the masu form and an interactional particle yo. After Line 4, Okada-san shifts to informal talk in plain forms, describing two distinctive ways of conducting a meeting: one that is based on keekensoku ‘empirical rules’ and the other based on hoohooron ‘methodology’. His message is, in short, knowledge of hoohooron ‘methodology’ is the necessary ingredient of success in business, thus it is necessary for the club to learn this knowledge. In order to make his point, he exemplifies it with the world of otona ‘adults’ (Line 7), which is highlighted with his high tone of voice. With the nominalizer n (Line 7), Okada-san’s way of presenting the knowledge of the otona
world is treated as a matter of fact (Aoki, 1986). With the particle yo, Okada-san shows strong epistemic authority over the addressees (Morita, 2002). After Line 7, Okada-san illustrates how the world of otona ‘adults’ contains two distinctive categories, which are the group of unsuccessful reesai kigyoo ‘small companies’ (Line 9), and the other group of successful atama ii kigyoo ‘smart companies’ (Line 14). Okada-san’s explanation from Line 7 is expressed in four sentences, which are highlighted with the interactional particle yo: (1) the adult business world also contains both informed and uninformed groups in terms of discussion methodology (Line 7); (2) smaller companies become even smaller because their conduct is based on empirical rules (Lines 8 and 9); (3) smart companies hire consultants to learn methodology (Line 14); and (4) the gap in knowledge levels of the two types of companies is developed even further (Line 16). The nominalizer n that precedes a plain form copula da and yo adds an explanatory tone to his utterance and makes his description of the corporate world “matter-of-factual” (Aoki, 1986), and yo helps to construct Okada-san as a knowledgeable party. The deictic kooyuu ‘this type’ in kooyuu koto (Line 14) indexes the discussion method Okada-san is introducing, and the knowledge of the discussion method is treated as valuable knowledge that belongs to the konsarutanto ‘consultant’. In addition, the knowledge is constructed as something smart companies pay for. His use of a strong epistemic stance marker yo matches his role as a supervisor with a higher level of knowledge than the other participants. In contrast, other participants’ reactions (Lines 3, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15,

---

64 The word reesai is written in Japanese with two Chinese characters, ree ‘zero’ and sai ‘detail’. Together, these characters suggest a meaning of reesai that refers not only to the small size of the company but also to the characteristic of their existence that it is so small that its influence in the business world is insignificant.
and 17) are so minimal in content and uttered in such low voices that I could not identify who the speakers are. Less significant participation in the conversation by other participants indicates their weaker epistemic stances. Their reactions such as *un* (Lines 3, 6, 10), *a soo* ‘ah, [is that] so’ (Line 13) and *fu:n* ‘huh’ (Lines 15 and 17) function to acknowledge that they are listening, but lack further elaboration of their interest or other signs of enthusiasm about the knowledge. Especially because of this absence of further elaboration, the interaction between Okada-san and the other participants appears to be a one-directional transfer of knowledge from Okada-san to the others. Therefore, the gap in epistemic stance between the two parties indexes their positions as *senpai-koohai*.

The next two excerpts relate to the discussion methods that Okada-san introduced as a part of business culture. In the first example, the epistemic verb *oshieru* ‘teach’ indexes former teacher-student relations between Okada-san and the discussion leader, and the teaching content and the particle *yo* both support the graduate student’s teaching role. This excerpt provides an instance where teacher-student relations evoked by the interaction further index *senpai-koohai*. It comes from a situation where Okada-san helps Hiroshi, the discussion leader, by giving advice on how to conduct a discussion that Hiroshi aims to accomplish. At the beginning, Hiroshi attempts to explain to the participants how to expand one item of discussion, “the status of students,” into a subject of broader discussion.

Excerpt 20 (Sales Meeting 1, 1050):
Okada (male, graduate student, the founder of the club) and Hiroshi (male, junior, the sales section representative, the main DL for the meeting)

1 Hiroshi gakusee tte yuu mibun wa:, seeyaku ga nai tte yuu, gakusee tte yuu
   student QT PR status TOP restriction S not exist QT PR student QT PR
   ‘The status of students is, having no restriction, student,
nan te yuu ka wakasa ga chuumoku sareru teki na, tsuyomi da kedo,
what QT say Q youth S notice do-PASS like COP strength COP but
‘what shall [I] say, like [our] youth is noticed, [it’s our] strength, but

↓ yowa, gakusee tte yuu mibun wa mijuku ja nai?
weak- student QT PR status TOP immature NEG
‘[it’s] weak-, the status of student means [being] immature, isn’t it?’

4 ((brief silence))

5 Okada → sore, kyonen so yatte oshieta kke ore.
that last year so do teach-PAST Q I[MAS; VULGAR]
‘That, did I teach [it] like so last year?’

6 Hiroshi iya, ima, meesoo shiteru
no now stray do-PROG
‘No, [I] am lost now.’

7 Okada → un:to, kakezan de yaru n da yo.
um multiplication with do NOM COP P
‘Um, [it’s supposed to be] done with multiplication.

8 eeto, tatoeba, gakusee rashisa to, shikin ga sukunai tte kaketa toki ni:,
er for example student characteristic and fund S scarce QT multiply-PAST time P
‘Er, for example, when [you] multiply [two factors such as] characteristics of
students and lack of funds,’

9 Hiroshi ↑ a:
ah
‘Ah:’

With the informal nature of Okada-san’s talk indexed by the informal quotation marker
kke and the post-positioned vulgar first singular pronoun ore (Sturtz Sreetharan, 2006) in
Line 5, Okada-san initiates off-stage, one-to-one interaction with Hiroshi. Okada-san’s
teaching role is expressed with the epistemic verb oshieta ‘taught’, the past tense of the
verb oshieru ‘teach’. The verb indexes a previous event that took place last year when
Okada-san taught Hiroshi how to organize items from brainstorming in discussion. The
content of his teaching is expressed with the deictic sore ‘that’ (Line 5), which indicates
Hiroshi’s previous utterance between Lines 1 and 3. Because the knowledge of teaching
derives from Okada-san, his questioning act further refers to the mismatch between his current understanding of the discussion method and Hiroshi’s actual practice, which means that Okada-san indirectly claims that Hiroshi is deviating from what Okada-san taught. Therefore, Okada-san’s utterance in Line 5 is a negative evaluation of Hiroshi’s conduct. In Line 6, Hiroshi replies to Okada-san in the non-naked plain form, *meesoo shiteru* ‘[I] am lost’, the coalescence form of *meesoo shite iru*, which indexes his sense of the immediacy (Maynard, 2008) of his being lost. This utterance functions as Hiroshi’s confession of getting lost in front of the audience. Then, Okada-san provides an explanation with the nominalizer *n* on how to organize the brainstormed items with the interactional particle *yo*, which constitutes strong epistemic stance (Line 7). Before Okada-san completes his explanation (Line 8), Hiroshi says *a*: with a high pitch. This indicates that he suddenly comes to recall how he should have practiced the discussion method, based on Okada-san’s previous teaching. With Hiroshi’s realization token, their teacher-student relationship is once again realized in front of the other participants.

Overall, Okada-san’s teaching role and Hiroshi’s student role in the current scene are indexed, along with the presentation of recollection of the previous teaching event.

In another event where Okada-san gives on-site training to the discussion leader Hiroshi during a meeting, Okada-san’s frequent use of the combination of the nominalizer *no* and the interactional particle *sa* provides him with the authority of his knowledge. In this example, Hiroshi is not only a passive learner from Okada-san, but an advocate who treats Okada-san’s knowledge as valuable. In his role of the discussion leader, Hiroshi requests other participants to repeat Okada-san’s words. The excerpt starts with Okada-san’s advice to Hiroshi about how to proceed in the discussion.
Excerpt 21 (Sales Meeting 1, 1094):
Okada (male, graduate student) and Hiroshi (male, junior, the sales section representative, the main DL for the meeting)

1 Okada → ima made wa genjoo bunseki na no sa.
now until TOP current situation analysis COP NOM P
‘Until now, [what you accomplished was] an analysis of the current situation.

2 → ima koo yuu jootai da tte yuu bunseki na no sa.
now this way PR situation COP QT say analysis COP NOM P
‘[It is] an analysis to tell that [we are having] this kind of situation now.

3 de, genjoo bunseki ga chanto ninshiki dekita toki ni;
and current situation analysis S appropriately recognition do-can-PAST time P
‘And, when [we] can recognize the analysis of the current situation appropriately,

4 tsugi nani suru ka tte ittara;
next what do QT say-if
‘if [I] say what [we should] do next is,

5 → ja sok kara aidia o dasu no sa.
well then there from idea O raise NOM P
‘Well then, from that point, [we] raise [our] ideas.

6 → kok kara aidia shoobu na no.
here from idea game/round COP NOM
‘After this, ideas are the name of the game.

7 de, ichiban yat chaikenai no ga;
and number one do should-NEG NOM S
‘And, [what we] should not do the most is,

8 ima no genjoo bunseki ga.; tashii no ka tashikunai no ka tte yuu;
now LK current situation analysis S correct NOM Q correct-NEG NOM Q QT PR

9 → hihyoo wa shi nakyai kena no, minna de.
critique TOP do NEG-should-NEG NOM everyone with
‘[we] should do critiques about whether or not [our] analysis of the current situation is correct, with everyone.’

10 Hiroshi: (. ) hai. (. ) kok kara aidia shoobu.
yes here from idea game/round
‘Yes. After this, ideas are the name of the game.’

11 Okada: un.
yeah
‘Yeah.’
12 ((brief silence))

13 Hiroshi ((face to the participants)) YOSHI. YAROO. good do-VOL

‘Good! Let’s do [that]!’

14 Some participants @

15 Hiroshi kakugen deta. kakugen, hai. maxim appear-PAST maxim yes

‘Maxim is raised. Maxim, please.’

16 Female participant kok kara aidia shoobu here from idea game/round

‘After this, ideas are the name of the game’

17 Hiroshi HAI. ( ) san. ( ) SAY yes ((name))san say

‘Yes! ((name)) san. Say [it]!’

18 Some participants @

In his explanation (Lines 1 to 5), Okada-san ends each sentence in the plain form with no sa, the nominalizer no and the interactional particle sa (Lines 1, 2, 5), and concludes with the nominalizer no (Lines 6 and 9). The nominalizer no, along with the content of the utterance as a part of teaching, functions to present his proposition as unchallengeable (Iwasaki, 1985). The function of sa here is to make the speaker’s taking of the turn non-negotiable (Morita, 2003a), which is evidenced by the absence of any interruption from others. Another function of sa is to evoke non-negotiability of the presented content (Morita, 2003a). By repeating these particles, the strong epistemic stance of being a knowledgeable party is emphasized. On the side of Hiroshi, he first accepts Okada-san’s presentation with hai ‘yes’ (Line 10), then repeats Okada-san’s words of Line 6 kok kara aidia shoobu ‘after this, ideas are the name of the game’ in Line 10. Hiroshi’s use of the naked plain form resembles Ikuta’s TV interviewer’s use, recapturing the main point the
interviewee said in front of the audience. In this case, Hiroshi’s utterance in Line 10 highlights the importance of Okada-san’s words with a sense of immediacy (Maynard, 2008). After Okada-san’s approval of Hiroshi’s summary of Okada-san’s explanation with *un* ‘yeah’ (Line 11), Hiroshi goes back to his on-stage, discussion leader role in Line 13. The first move Hiroshi takes is treating Okada-san’s word as *kakugen* ‘maxim’ (Line 15) and getting the other participants to repeat it. Because *kakugen* denotes the valuable words that come from a knowledgeable person, Hiroshi’s treatment of Okada-san’s words further emphasizes Okada-san’s strong epistemic stance. By repeating Okada-san’s words, Hiroshi and the other participants’ position becomes that of people learning from Okada-san, which is a teacher-student relationship.

7.3 Non-hierarchical relations and the absence of strong epistemic markers

Okada-san’s *senpai* identity is not always foregrounded in the data. Okada-san is not constructed as *senpai* when the interaction is not framed as meeting-related, such as in some instances during breaks, introduced in this section. In the following excerpt, the knowledge Okada-san presents is not taken up as valuable for the participants, and his proposition is treated as a side sequence. While Okada-san’s utterances do not contain strong epistemic stance markers, another participant’s utterance contains the strong epistemic stance marker *yo*.

During the break, someone mentions that the snack they are eating is brunch to him, which causes some participants to engage in conversation about the meaning of the word *buranchi* ‘brunch’. A junior student provides his definition of *buranchi*, which receives positive evaluation from another. Okada-san joins to add his understanding of
the word *buranchi*, but his words are not taken up. Instead, the junior student who provides his definition of the term claims the authenticity of his definition with the epistemic stance marker *yo* and the *masu* form.

Excerpt 22 (Sales meeting 2, 1443):
Okada (male, graduate student), Takatoshi (male, sophomore), and Yasu (male, junior)

1. Takatoshi buranchi tte nani gohan na no.
   *brunch Q what meal COP NOM*
   ‘What meal is brunch?’

2. Male participant buranchi? ano: () @
   *brunch um*
   ‘[Are you asking about] brunch? Um:.’

3. Female participant asa to hiru no aida
   *morning and noon LK between*
   ‘[It’s] between breakfast and lunch.’

4. Takatoshi asa to hiru no aida o buranchi tte ((unclear utterance))
   *morning and noon LK between O brunch QT*
   ‘[Unclear utterance] between breakfast and lunch.’

5. Yasu ya, chooshoku o nuita toki ni:
   *no breakfast O skip-PAST time P*
   ‘No, when [someone] skips breakfast’

6. Takatoshi un
   *yeah*
   ‘Yeah’

7. Yasu hirumeshi o chooshoku to shite taberu koto o buranchi tte iu [no]
   *lunch[MAS] O breakfast as eat NOM O brunch QT say*
   ‘eating lunch as breakfast, [that’s what we] call brunch.’

8. Takatoshi
   *[O:] oh
   ‘OH:’

9. Takatoshi [kakkoii]
   *cool*
   ‘[You sound] cool.’

10. Yasu [@]
11 Okada e? juujihan toka kuu no-
huh 10:30 etc. eat [MAS; VULGAR] NOM
‘Huh? Eating around 10:30’

12 Yasu → ya, seeshiki ni wa soo na n desu yo
no official TOP so COP NOM COP P
‘No, officially, [it means] so.’

13 Okada °hee:° huu
‘Huh’

14 Takatoshi ((turns his head toward the researcher)) soo na n desu ka?
so COP NOM COP Q
‘Is [it] so?’

15 Researcher hai@
yes
‘Yes’

16 Okada a, soo na n desu ka. (.) ((to the researcher))
ah so COP NOM COP Q
‘Ah, [that] is so.

17 juujihan toka ne? chotto hayame ni [( )]
10:30 etc. P little earlier P
‘10:30, right? A little earlier [UNCLEAR UTTERANCE]’

18 Takatoshi [ja ] oosama no buranchi tte no wa
well then king LK brunch QT NOM TOP

19 machigatteru n desu yo ne?
wrong NOM COP P P
‘Well then, [the TV program] called King’s Brunch is wrong, right?’

20 Female participant un
yeah
‘Yeah’

21 Male participant maa. (.) ichigai ni wa ienai n ja nai desu ka ne.
um necessary P TOP say-NEG NOM NEG COP Q P
‘Um. [We] can’t say [its meaning is] necessarily [true all the time].’

A sophomore student, Takatoshi, raises the topic of the discussion, the meaning of

buranchi ‘brunch’ (Line 1), and a junior student Yasu, a nickname based on his family
name Yasui, provides a definition (Lines 5 and 7). Yasu’s definition starts with the negation of the previous interpretation, the meal between morning and noon (Line 3), with $ya$ ‘no’ (Line 5), and ends with the nominalizer $no$ (Line 7) that indexes his knowledgeable stance. Yasu’s definition receives Takatoshi’s positive evaluation (Lines 8 and 9). Okada-san questions Yasu’s definition with $e$? ‘huh?’ and is about to suggest another definition, i.e., the meal that people eat at around 10:30 (Line 11). Before Okada-san finishes his line, Yasu quickly negates the definition with $ya$ (Line 12) and claims the authenticity of his definition with $seeshiki$ ‘official’ (Line 12). Yasu’s claim is made with the nominalizer $n$ with the $masu$ form copula $desu$ and the strong epistemic marker $yo$. Although Okada-san reacts with a news-receipt token $hee$: (Line 13), his utterance does not sound very convinced, being made with a soft voice and relatively short, flat tone that indicates “prefacing a newsmark or confirmation of understanding” (Mori, 2006, p. 1188). Takatoshi turns to the researcher, who lives in the United States, to confirm Yasu’s claim (Line 14). The researcher is treated as a knowledgeable party who has authority in terms of knowledge about brunch. After the researcher’s approval of the definition (Line 15), Okada-san utters a realization token $a$ ‘ah’ and $soo na n desu ka$ ‘[that] is so’. Okada-san then restarts his uncompleted line, $juujihan toka$ ‘10:30’ in Line 17. This time he uses the alignment marker $ne$? ‘right?’ and further elaborates his statement. However, his line is again interrupted by Takatoshi who moves to the topic of a TV program called $oosama no buranchi$ ‘King’s Brunch’ (Line 18). Since the topic of the conversation shifts, Okada-san’s point about the starting time of brunch is never raised afterwards.
Senpai-koohai relations are not indexed in this excerpt. In the previous section, Okada-san’s senpai status is supported by the content of the knowledge that is made relevant to the club activities. In this excerpt, however, the knowledge of brunch is not treated as indispensable to the community. The mainstream interpretation of brunch is what Yasu provides, but, even to this, Okada-san resists, and a male participant provides a partial negation, ichigai ni wa ienai ‘can’t say [its meaning is] necessarily [true all the time]’ (Line 21). There is no agreement about one interpretation among the participants. In terms of epistemic stance markers, it is Yasu who is indexed as being knowledgeable. Even though Yasu is constructed as an expert on this topic, it does not lead to his having a senpai identity in relation to Okada-san. What Okada-san utters is only a tentative news-receipt token (Line 13), and he returns to his own definition even after Yasu’s claim. Nevertheless, Okada-san is not clearly indexed as senpai to Yasu, either. His definition has been negated, never taken up by any participant as valuable, and interrupted. Okada-san’s knowledge about brunch has been reduced to being a side sequence to the on-going talk.

7.4 Chapter conclusion

This chapter examines how an epistemic stance of being a knowledgeable party contributes to the construction of a senpai identity through indexicality. The graduate student often leads teaching sequences about business-related issues targeting other participants as an audience. The teaching sequences are situated in a quasi-company environment, of which only the graduate student has knowledge. During such interactions, his utterances are characterized by his use of the plain form with strong
epistemic stance markers, such as *yo* and *sa*, which index being a knowledgeable party. In contrast, other participants’ epistemic stances are weak due to the lack of such epistemic stance markers in their utterances. The participants are listening to the graduate student without engaging in much verbal participation, which helps them to be constructed as *koohai*. Teacher-student identities overlap with their *senpai-koohai* identities, for both hierarchical relations are based on a gap in relevant knowledge. On the other hand, Okada-san is not always constructed as *senpai* in relation to other participants when the topic does not relate to his special knowledge. When the content of his knowledge is not treated as valuable to their club activities, his turn constitutes a side sequence to the main discussion and his knowledge presentation lacks strong epistemic stance markers.
Chapter 8. CONCLUSION

This dissertation has examined how college students of different class levels interact in practice. In the approach taken by prescriptive studies, *senpai-koohai* relationships are treated as dominant and unchanging regardless of situation. In the discourse of *senpai-koohai*, an important feature is the relationship’s continuity, i.e., the relationship is supposed to remain the same in any situation and for their lifetimes. However, the analyses of this dissertation indicate otherwise. The construction of *senpai-koohai* relationships is context-dependent, since such hierarchical identities are not foregrounded during on-stage talk. Even during off-stage talk, the identities constructed are influenced by situations. The results of the analyses in this dissertation demonstrate fluidity in the nature of identities that is in line with the social constructionist view.

Analyses of three linguistic forms that can work to index *senpai-koohai* identities illustrate how and why the type of context and the content of interaction influence identity construction. During on-stage talk, the participants’ club roles are foregrounded, which puts less focus on their *senpai-koohai* identities. During off-stage talk, their identities are less influenced by their club roles, and this situation allows more freedom for other identities to be constructed. When the content of the interaction becomes relevant to club activities, *senpai-koohai* identities are more likely to be constructed. Even within one situation, the frames of talk are not fixed, but constantly shift. This finding helps to demythologize a stereotypical image of *senpai-koohai* identities that presumes them to be transferrable identities that endure across all situations.

The analysis of epistemic stance in Chapter 7 is a case in point. The graduate student can be an absolute *senpai* in his teaching acts targeting the junior students. His
strong voice (Bakhtin, 1981) of teaching is accompanied with strong epistemic stance markers, as he shares his knowledge of business that is situated in the club structurally as knowledge that is not accessible to other participants. The same participant can be constructed as non-senpai in relation to other participants in a different context, when the content of the discussion is not related to club issues. Strong epistemic stance markers are absent from the graduate student’s utterances in that discussion. What is crucial in differentiating these two types of relations is the content of the interactions. When the content relates to the club mission, the graduate student’s act is recognized as teaching by other participants. The graduate student’s senpai identity in relation to other participants is not foregrounded during interaction in which the content is not related to the club activities.

In this dissertation, on- and off-stage frames of talk are conceptualized as the types of talk that are distinctive in participants’ participation structure. The above-mentioned interactions happen during off-stage talk. Due to the freedom of choice in topic during off-stage talk, the content plays a crucial role in the construction of identities. On the other hand, on-stage talk by definition defines the content of interactions. Simultaneously, on-stage talk influences identity construction in such a way that it provides the participants with roles that are related to the meeting agenda. When these roles are foregrounded, their senpai-koohai identities are not foregrounded.

The context of interaction influences the meanings of linguistic forms. During off-stage talk, non-reciprocal exchanges of the masu and plain forms index senpai-koohai relationships while reciprocal exchanges of the masu form in on-stage talk index that speakers are “in role” in accordance with discussion roles.
The fluid nature of identity construction is also supported by the analysis of address and reference terms. The two participants’ identities differ depending on the frame of talk, and address and reference terms work as indexes to point to constructed identities. The use of the suffixes –san and –chan is a case in point. While a discussion leader’s use of –san indexes his role as the discussion leader during on-stage talk, his use of –chan during off-stage talk indexes his role as a senpai in relation to the addressee. Two address and reference terms that index senpai-koohai relations are discussed. The diminutive –chan indexes senpai-koohai relations between the speaker and the addressed female student, while the absence of a suffix may index the same relation between the speaker and the addressed male student.

Throughout the data, the frequent shift between on-stage and off-stage talk is observed, which influences the status of participants’ identities. This is because multiple identity constructions occur at each moment. Even during on-stage talk where senpai-koohai relationships are not foregrounded, the passive participation of quiet freshmen and sophomore participants and their position seated in the back of the room indicate that they are koohai in relation to other students. It is not that senpai-koohai relationships disappear during on-stage talk; they are only backgrounded. In other words, the discussion roles are foregrounded and dominant during on-stage talk. In addition, the status of the frames of talk is not necessarily stable at any particular moment. As Excerpt 7 illustrates, it is possible that one participant stays in an on-stage frame of talk while others are in an off-stage frame of talk. The coexistence of distinctive frames of talk is a consequence of the dynamic process of interaction during which multiple layers of contexts can be indexed.
This dissertation has illustrated how movie club members interact to construct their identities in their club activities at a large-scale, urban university. Based on the data we have seen, I cannot assert that the senpai-koohai relationships described in this dissertation are representative of those in all college clubs in Japan. Types of college clubs range from sport clubs to humanities-oriented clubs. Different activities resulting from the nature of a club may construct identities differently. Also, the genders of the club members may influence how members construct their identities. For example, clubs with only male members may have more rigid hierarchical structures. Sports clubs are known to adhere to much stricter senpai-koohai relationships, in comparison to humanities-oriented clubs. Various activities that may be the target of future investigation include taking part in sports, attending competitions with other clubs from different colleges, talking during informal gatherings, and communicating with trainers, faculty members, or graduated members. Future research on other types of college clubs would expand our understanding of the construction of senpai-koohai relations.
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