

論文の英文要旨

題目	A study of co-construction in Japanese native conversations and native-nonnative conversations — from the perspective of Discourse politeness theory —
----	---

氏名	HAYASHI (Kibayashi) Rie
----	-------------------------

This study aims to reveal the role of co-construction in Japanese conversations, comparative with the native speaker's conversations and the native-nonnative speaker's conversations. I defined co-construction is a sentence which is completed by two or more speakers in interaction and analyzed from the perspective of 'discourse politeness theory' suggested by Usami(1998, 2001a, 2002, 2008a, 2008b).

This study was composed of 6 chapters and outline of each chapter was described as follows.

In the first chapter, I was point out most previous studies of co-construction in English conversations and Japanese conversations were used qualitative analysis. Therefore, I explained the comprehensive discourse analysis (Usami2008). It is the methodology for quantitative and qualitative analysis in this study. And, to catch the co-construction as a language learning material in the interaction, I explained the process having been focused for studied through the interaction. It is needed to analyze co-construction from the perspective of communication. Therefore, It explained the Brown & Levinson's politeness theory (Brown & Levinson1987) and the discourse politeness theory (Usami1998, 2001a, 2002, 2008a, 2008b) that considered human interaction.

In Chapter 2, A quantitative analysis was done by using the conversation data to which the condition was managed because there are a lot of qualitative researches in the co-construction. For the sake of comparison, I use the conversations of native speakers, and the native-nonnative speaker's (intermediate level) conversations. As a result, the proportions of the occurrence of co-construction in both conversations is 1% level.

The similar tendency of two kinds of conversations is that the proportion of repetition of the utterance element of the proceeding utterance is a low, and proportion of complete type utterance was seen a high. From the result of analysis, it was considered that co-construction has a feature

of "showing that I understand what you will say" that Sacks (1992) had discussed.

The difference point appeared to the function of the completing utterance. There was a lot of completing utterance to have the function of "Question", uttered by native speaker to nonnative speaker in conversation. When the completing utterance was "Question", "Word search" was seen in the proceeding utterance native –nonnative speaker in conversation. I considered about recast and the negotiation of meaning in co-constriction, with the context of language learning.

In this chapter, for the first step of the quantitative analysis, I extracted this data by the condition that "First meeting, woman, and same generation", form the collected data as part of the project. Therefore, there was a difference of a time between conversations. Thus it was not analyzed enough. Then, it was assumed that data should be more of like grade and quality.

In Chapter 3, I used same quality data that is 1) native-native speaker's conversations, 2) native –nonnative (graduate student, native like) speaker's conversations, 3) native-nonnative (intermediate class) speaker's conversations. Based on the result in Chapter 2, I focused to analyze that "Word search" in the proceeding utterance and "Question" form in completing utterance. I also describe the feature of each conversation seen from the number of discourse sentences and the number turn-taking.

As a result, the proportions of the occurrence of co-construction in three conversations are 1~2% level. It is similar with the result of chapter 2. And the tendency is similar is that the proportion of repetition of the utterance element of the proceeding utterance is a low. difference point appeared to the form of the completing utterance. There was a higher proportion of completing utterance to have the form of "Question", uttered by native speaker to nonnative speaker (intermediate) in conversation. There were 50% "Word search" in the proceeding utterance in native speaker and nonnative speaker(intermediate)'s conversation, but there were few "Word search" in the proceeding utterance in native-native speaker's conversations, and native –nonnative (graduate student, native like) speaker's conversations. It was combined with the "Word search" in the proceeding utterance formed of "Question" in completing utterance, but there is not a specific tendency. Then, each conversation was examined about the type of form of "Question" in completing utterance, and "Word search" in the proceeding utterance.

I considered that: when completing utterance to become the form of "Question is in the situation that participants have a few resources to communicate. And, in the context of continuous question-answer, proceeding utterance formed of "Question" does not demand answer. I also considered proceeding utterance formed of "Question" has the role of avoiding face-threatening act, both for positive face and negative face.

In Chapter 4, I examined other type of co-construction different from “showing that I understand what you will say”. For the analysis, The two point of corded that whether proceeding utterance was ended as discourse sentence, and completing utterance was related to proceeding speaker’s projected utterance.

As a result, it is 70% or more in the conversation between a nonnative speaker (intermediate) and the nonnative speaker (graduate student, native like)’ utterance, 90% or more native speaker’s utterance, there were proceeding utterance was not ended as discourse sentence when completing sentence occurs, and completing utterance was related to proceeding speaker’s projected utterance.

Moreover, I considered other type of co-construction different from “showing that I understand what you will say” in the conversations. If proceeding utterance is ended as discourse sentence, to complete the proceeding utterance has a role of progress of conversation. Sometime proceeding speaker changes her constructional scheme by completing utterance, but it can be tolerance situation for proceeding speaker. When there is a question before proceeding utterance, the completing utterance is the answer of that question. So these are it is other type of co-construction different from “showing that I understand what you will say”.

In Chapter 5, I examined co-construction from the perspective of discourse politeness theory. Proportion of occurrence of co-constriction is very low, so it can be interpret as “marked behavior” according to the key concept of discourse politeness theory. The effect of Politeness: plus effect, neutral effect and minus effect is discussed here with concrete discourse.

In chapter 6, this study was summarized. Also, implications and future work for second language learning was described. I also pointed out the implications for that the discourse politeness theory that has come to the surface by analyzing co-construction..

